

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 30 September 1981

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

PETITION: HOUSING TRUST RENTALS

A petition signed by 28 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose the implementation of increased Housing Trust rentals, as announced, was presented by Mr Hemmings.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answer to a question, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MAN BUSES

In reply to Mr O'NEILL (19 August).

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON**: The production of the MAN prototype bus is expected to be set back approximately 19 weeks, principally as a result of industrial action interstate. A seven-week delay in chassis delivery to the MAN assembly plant was the direct result of Melbourne wharf disputes. Delays of the order of six weeks are expected as a result of the unavailability of steel tubing and because special steel stock from Lysaght (New South Wales) has been delayed by industrial action within the steel and road transport industries.

The annual shut-down period of industry (Christmas-January) which, but for these delays, would not previously have affected prototype production, will delay production four weeks, and two weeks have been lost as the result of work underestimated. Current expectations are for the prototype bus to be produced by late February 1982. Inquiries indicate that redundancies at P.M.C. have not been connected with the MAN contract.

TELEVISION COMMERCIAL

In reply to Mr SCHMIDT (24 September).

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: The Attorney-General has now advised that the television commercial depicting handicapped children is now available to be shown throughout Australia. This is provided that it is not shown during children's peak viewing time.

FLOOD RELIEF

In reply to the **Hon. J. D. CORCORAN** (24 September).

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Cabinet has approved of grants to persons in needy circumstances affected by the flooding in the Adelaide Hills on 26 June 1981. Decisions have been made on the recommendation of the Disaster Relief Committee, which has operated in earlier disasters at Port Pirie and Port Broughton, using guidelines established on the earlier occasions, but with adjustments to financial considerations in line with the movement of money values.

To date, 12 applications have been approved for a total sum of \$7 929. Loans have also been offered at a conces-

sional rate of 4 per cent per annum interest over a period of seven years with the proviso that interest need not be paid if the sum is repaid within 18 months. Two such offers have been made and, to date, one has been accepted for a sum of \$755. There is also a claim, yet to be settled, for which a sum of \$541 may be made available. The Campbelltown and Payneham councils have not submitted claims for repairing flood damage, but a claim from the District Council of East Torrens is under consideration. Councils should make special reference to the circumstances of flood damage in their areas when making their submissions to the State Grants Commission.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I am pleased to advise the House that the Government is now in a position to announce the lifting of all restrictions on the sale of petrol in South Australia from midnight tonight. This is now possible because the Port Stanvac refinery has resumed normal operations and is piping petrol to Birkenhead, and the ship, the *Messimiaki Idea*, is on its way from Altona to unload about eight days supply of super-grade petrol at Port Stanvac and Birkenhead. This ship is due at Port Stanvac late tomorrow afternoon.

The Government takes this opportunity to express thanks for the co-operation of petrol resellers, the oil companies and, indeed, the general public, during the period of restrictions and rationing.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: LAND RIGHTS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: I wish to clarify the situation with regard to consultation between mining companies and Aborigines in the area known as the Maralinga lands. The situation is that, provided conditions attached to exploration licences requiring consultation between mining companies and Aborigines are complied with, there is no objection to direct discussions between mining companies and Aborigines. This has always been the case, and there has never been any intention that this procedure should change.

Mr Lindner's role, as Liaison Officer, is to ensure that the consultations contemplated by the licence conditions take place and that licence conditions are observed. There is no objection, let alone prohibition, on other discussions. I trust that this clarifies one obvious misrepresentation.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Mines and Energy (The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy):

Pursuant to Statute—

1. Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Report, 1981.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report, 1980-81.

Auditor-General—

- i. Adelaide Festival Centre Trust—Report on, 1980-81
Regional Cultural Centres—
 - ii. Eyre Peninsula—Report on, 1980-81
 - iii. Northern—Report on, 1980-81
 - iv. Riverland—Report on, 1980-81
 - v. South-East—Report on, 1980-81.
- vi. State Theatre Company of South Australia—Report on, 1980-81.
- vii. South Australian Housing Trust—Report, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Water Resources (The Hon. P. B. Arnold):

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Engineering and Water Supply, Department of—Report, 1979-80.

QUESTION TIME

BLACK HILL NURSERY

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning confirm that a whole season of propagation of new plants has been missed at the Black Hill nursery? When I asked a question on this topic on, I think, Thursday last week in which I alleged that the Government was deliberately allowing the Black Hill nursery as a commercial operation to run down, the Minister gave an emphatic 'No' in answer. Since then I have had the opportunity to consult with people in the community who are concerned with what is happening at Black Hill. They point out that the glossy brochure which has been prepared makes no mention of the sale of plants at the nursery, and they believe that a whole season of propagation has been missed. Will the Minister now confirm that the worst fears of people in the community are well based?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: No, certainly I will not confirm that. When questioned about this matter in the House last week, I said to the honourable member that the Government was not winding down Black Hill in any way, shape or form. Sales are still taking place. I believe that the honourable member would appreciate that that is the case. I confirm, I hope once and for all, that Black Hill is not being wound down. I suggest that, if the honourable member would like to look over Black Hill, I would be happy at any time to arrange for an officer to show him just what the Government is involved in regarding the Black Hill native flora park.

MOTOR VEHICLE INDUSTRY

Mr MATHWIN: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware that Mr Chris Hurford, M.P., the Federal Opposition spokesman for industry and commerce, spoke to the main automobile manufacturers earlier this week during which he spelt out Labor's policy on that industry? If so, could the Minister tell us what effect this policy would have, particularly on South Australia?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: On the A.B.C. news yesterday morning I heard a report claiming that Mr Hurford had spoken at a meeting in Melbourne on Monday of this week and had made some statements about reducing the number of car manufacturers in Australia from five to two. I wanted a more detailed report on that, so I made some investigations and found a fairly detailed report in yesterday's *Age*, 29 September. I think all of us would place a great deal of credibility on the standard of journalism standard adopted by the *Age*. So, I think it is appropriate that I read what the *Age* had to say in at least the first part of its article. The headline is 'A.L.P. wants fewer car makers'. The article states:

A Federal Labor Government would support a reduction of the five big car manufacturers in Australia to as few as two, the Opposition's spokesman on industry and commerce, Mr Hurford, said yesterday.

It would also like to restrict the number of models of cars available, standardise the production of components and give value added, or bonus credits for Australian exports.

It concerns me greatly, especially as this House was debating the future of the Australian car industry only yesterday, to see that report of Mr Hurford's speech. First, there are five car manufacturers in Australia at present. If this number were to be reduced to two, eliminating three, we should look at which car manufacturers are likely to be eliminated, and how it would affect this State. Any analysis would show that one of the first to go would be Mitsubishi, which is based here in South Australia. That would mean the immediate loss of at least 4 000 jobs to this State. It is also reasonable to assume that one other plant that would be almost bound to go would be the Woodville plant of General Motors-Holden's. In that sort of circumstance, where there are only two manufacturers in Australia, there is every probability as well that the Elizabeth plant of G.M.H. would be closed down. If those two G.M.H. plants were closed, that would cost this State another 8 000 jobs approximately. It would mean that all the motor vehicle manufacturing or assembly would be located in Melbourne.

If the assemblers were in Melbourne, it is only fair to assume that automatically, through economic pressure, car components manufacturers would be forced to relocate their businesses from South Australia to Melbourne where the car manufacturers are. That would ultimately cost this State 16 000 jobs. The result would be almost identical for this State as the adoption of the I.A.C. Report and its recommendations.

Mr Ashenden: And Mr Hurford is supposed to be a South Australian.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am coming to that point. I find it incredible that yesterday we had the Labor Party members of this State standing up and making the sort of speech they did when the day before their own Federal spokesman on this matter had made a statement that he was only too willing to support for the Labor Party, the reduction in car manufacturers from five to two. Mr Hurford is the Federal member for Adelaide. I think it is only fair to say that this State is being betrayed by one of its own Federal members of Parliament. He is a traitor to the manufacturing industry in South Australia and, if the policy of the Federal Labor Party on automotive manufacturing were adopted, it would cost this State about 16 000 jobs.

Mr O'NEILL: I rise on a point of order. The Minister just referred to a member of the Federal Parliament as a traitor to the State of South Australia. I would ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Florey deem the statement as unparliamentary?

Mr O'NEILL: Yes, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Florey having taken the point that the honourable member for Adelaide in another place has been reflected on by an unparliamentary statement, I would ask the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs to withdraw the statement.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I withdraw the statement if it is unparliamentary to reflect on a member of Parliament in another Parliament in another place.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Withdraw!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I withdraw. My point is that here is a South Australian Federal member of Parliament, who is a key spokesman for the Labor Party at a Federal level—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order. I have heard you repeatedly in this House insist that a request

from you for a withdrawal is clear and unequivocal, and the Minister is obviously trying to get around that ruling.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. I listened very carefully and, on a request by way of interjection, the honourable Minister did unequivocally withdraw. Subsequent statements are not, in my opinion, statements which rate in the same manner.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The point is that here is a key Labor spokesman for the Federal Labor Party, who comes from South Australia, who claims to have a knowledge of the motor industry of this State, and who is espousing and supporting a policy that will bring about the destruction of that industry here in South Australia and the potential loss of at least 15 000 jobs.

I challenge Mr Hurford to come out publicly and declare which three of the five manufacturers will be abolished under the Labor Party's policy, and equally I ask the Labor Party in this State to stand up and denounce completely the policies espoused by the Federal member. When one hears statements such as this coming forth as Labor Party policy, one can begin to understand the reasons why they were not willing to have me, as Minister of Industrial Affairs, given a fair chance to speak in front of the trade unions.

If the trade unions found out about this, as I hope they do, I believe they would be just as angry, or even more angry, with their own Labor Party, which is trying to sell their jobs down the drain, than they are with the I.A.C. I challenge the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, both of whom stood in this House yesterday and upheld their Labor Party policy, to now stand up and denounce it, once and for all.

ABORIGINAL LAND RIGHTS

Mr ABBOTT: Will the Premier consider introducing legislation similar to the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act to allow for the return of the Maralinga lands to Aboriginal ownership and control, and did the Deputy Premier tell the Aboriginal Lands Trust on 18 September that, if the Government proposals were not accepted unchanged, a Minister would go to Yalata to announce that the transfer of the Maralinga lands to the trust would be deferred indefinitely?

According to Monday's *Melbourne Age*, the Deputy Premier refused to confirm or deny whether he had threatened the Aboriginal Lands Trust in this way. He was also unable to be contacted by the *Advertiser* and will not speak to other media on this subject. However, it has now been extensively reported that the Yalata Aborigines will be denied the same rights over mining on the Maralinga land as those applying to the Pitjantjatjara Aborigines. It has been reported also that this discrimination will apply despite previous undertakings given to the Yalata Aborigines.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Spence has asked two questions. The first is whether we intend to introduce legislation similar to the Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation. The answer is, 'No.' Secondly, he has made a number of allegations about the Deputy Premier, and it seems to be characteristic of the Opposition in its current state—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He asked did he do that. That's a fair question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It seems to be characteristic of the Opposition in its present state of disarray that it is coming more and more to an attack on personalities. I must put on record the fact that the Deputy Premier has at all times acted properly in this matter. There have been discussions with the Yalata people, not with the white advisers

who are taking it upon themselves now to speak for the Yalata people. We have always, at all times, been concerned with the traditional owners of the land. I may say, too, that the letter received by the Deputy Premier—and indeed I received a copy of it—arrived late on Friday, and the first I knew of it was when it was published in the *Advertiser* the following morning.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Same here.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that that is the situation with the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: A typical set-up.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not prepared to say whether it was a set-up, but I must say that one can only draw conclusions from the activities and the very full report that appeared in the *Advertiser*. Members opposite, as the Leader is doing, are congratulating themselves on a piece of clever work. I do not think it reflects very well at all on the Opposition.

I am also of the opinion that the *Advertiser* comment that the Deputy Premier could not be contacted is not accurate, either. The Deputy Premier tells me that he was available and that no serious attempt was made to contact him for comment anyway, and, quite apart from anything else, there was an undertaking given that there would be, on both sides of the discussion (because there has been discussion going on with the land trust body for some time), no public statement made. We have seen this happen before, and I do not intend to comment on it any further. The Government's proposals on that matter are quite clear. It was an undertaking originally given by Sir Thomas Playford that those lands would be handed over to the people at Yalata and to the Aboriginal community, through the Lands Trust. That is what is being progressed at present.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: MEMBER FOR MITCHAM

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition:

I wish to advise that when the House meets today, Wednesday, 30 September, I shall move that the House at its rising adjourn to 2 p.m. on Friday 2 October for the purpose of debating the following matter of urgency: the attempt by the Premier and the Attorney-General to deliberately mislead the South Australian public and the Parliament concerning the offer of a judicial appointment to the member for Mitcham following the public confirmation by the Government's intermediary, Mr Lew Barrett, that he had made such an offer on behalf of a member of Cabinet.

I call upon those members who support the honourable Leader to rise in their places.

Several members having risen:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I so move. This motion has been greeted with some jocularity from the benches opposite. I think that, by the time the debate is over, the jocular behaviour of members opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: The jocular behaviour of members opposite will be somewhat tempered by the end of the debate, I would think, but we will see. Certainly, the events surrounding the revelation that the Government approached the member for Mitcham concerning a judicial appointment reveal a degree of ineptness, and a readiness to obscure the

truth, and the sort of shabby manoeuvring that is becoming the hallmark of this Government after two years in office.

This matter was first raised in this House by means of a personal explanation by the member for Mitcham when he read out certain correspondence that had passed between him and the Premier on the matter. The matter was followed up on Wednesday, when the Attorney-General added to the misleading of Parliament and the public in relation to the Government's attitude to this issue, and finally on Thursday, too late, unfortunately, for the matter to be raised by way of an urgency motion in this House, confirmation came from the independent third party, the intermediary who had acted for the Government, that in fact both the Premier and the Attorney-General had completely misled the public on the events surrounding the issue.

We now know that an offer of judicial appointment was made to the member for Mitcham in July this year. We now know that the offer came via the Government intermediary, Mr Lew Barrett, Chairman of the board of the Savings Bank of South Australia. We now know that Mr Barrett was acting on behalf of a member of Cabinet and that it was Mr Barrett's understanding that, if the member for Mitcham had reacted positively to the approach and had said 'Yes', that he was interested, a formal offer would have been made to him by the Government.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You said that an offer was made: let us get this clear.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: The Premier interjects, as well he might, in an attempt to use the sort of obscurity and the fudging of language to get him out of it. Let us just recite these facts. Let me say that I am not surprised—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Let's be honest.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr BANNON: Let me say that I am not surprised that the Premier seizes on the word 'formal'. That is typical of the shabby way in which he has treated this matter. The offer was made, and if Mr Millhouse had said 'Yes' to that approach, the formal offer would have followed. The Premier seeks to distinguish between that process, but we will come to that in a minute. We know that the member for Mitcham rejected this approach and that then the matter was revealed publicly.

In a sense, it could be said that it was unfortunate that the member for Mitcham revealed this private approach made to him: these things, we are told by the Premier, happen all the time, and it was fairly improper for it to be raised. This issue became public not through any act by the member for Mitcham, but indeed because the Premier's mouth got the better of him on an A.B.C. radio interview. During an interview broadcast by the A.B.C. the Premier when asked about the rumour (and I quote from the transcript) 'that Mr Millhouse might be headed for the Judiciary', the Premier's answer was:

Yes, I've heard that rumour now for about two years. In fact I think it was floated soon after we came to office and I think floated by Mr Millhouse himself.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: No, I floated it first.

Mr BANNON: I thank the member for Hartley, because in political terms that is well how it could happen.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has the call.

Mr BANNON: The Attorney-General in another place tried to distinguish between the words in that transcript and the A.B.C. news item as it was broadcast. That is quite ludicrous. The A.B.C. news item stated:

The Premier says he won't be recommending that Australian Democrat Leader, Mr Millhouse, be appointed to the Judiciary.

Mr Tonkin was asked on A.B.C. radio about reports that Mr Millhouse was to be appointed to the Judiciary. Mr Tonkin said the reports were rumours which he had heard for two years and believed they had been started by Mr Millhouse.

The Attorney said that the news item was totally at odds with what the Premier actually said. Let me quote the relevant words. The news item stated:

Mr Tonkin said that the reports were rumours which he had heard for two years and believed they had been started by Mr Millhouse.

In the transcript, Mr Tonkin's actual words were:

Yes, I've heard that rumour now for about two years. In fact, I think it was floated soon after we came to office and I think floated by Mr Millhouse himself.

The news item was a totally faithful record. That is just one side issue of the Attorney-General's misleading of the Parliament over this. The inference is obviously that the member for Mitcham started the rumours, that he started them soon after the Government came to office, and that his aim was to attract some sort of offer from the Government. If we were talking about a dispute with the member for Mitcham, as put in his personal explanation, then one would say it was a despicable thing, as the member described it.

It was a stupid thing for the Premier to do, because he must have known when he made the comment that a Government intermediary, acting for a member of Cabinet, had approached the member for Mitcham and that approach had been rejected. If he did not know this, he is totally derelict in his duty as Premier of this State. The member for Mitcham then told the House, when he made his personal explanation, of his reaction to this comment by the Premier. The letters he read into *Hansard* from himself to the Premier, the Premier's reply, and his further letter to the Premier, set out the facts. I do not need to go into them at this point. The Premier's course of action, as he showed by way of interjection a minute ago, has been to immediately try to fudge the issue and split hairs. In his letter to the member for Mitcham on 15 September, he stated:

As to approaches which may have been made to you, I cannot comment, other than to say that no approaches were made on behalf of Cabinet.

The Premier has chosen his words very carefully indeed. He has seized on that phrase 'on behalf of Cabinet' to distinguish between the approach which clearly was made and of which he inferentially had a knowledge from an official or formal approach by Cabinet. Outside the House, on the day that the member for Mitcham made his statement, the Premier qualified the matter even further. He said there had been no official approach to the member for Mitcham to join the Judiciary. Again, he is splitting hairs.

The approach was certainly made. It was not made in the form of a letter patent appointing the member for Mitcham and asking for his signature to it, but it was made nonetheless. To the extent that it was not a formal letter of appointment, it was not official. The Premier is splitting hairs. This is the way in which he has been attempting to wriggle out of the whole sorry business. Next day, in the *News*, he is reported as having stood by his statement that there had been no official approach. He went on to concede:

The way these things work out, it is quite possible a Minister, and obviously that would be the Attorney-General, whose job it is to assess these things, would be concerned with it.

The matter was pushed off to the Attorney. Meanwhile, the Attorney-General, in another place, having been questioned on whether or not an approach had been made to the member for Mitcham, launched with great relish an attack on the suitability of the member for judicial office. This is a case of classic hypocrisy in what was obviously a well-planned move. He related to the Council some of the more colourful details of the career of the member for Mitcham

and went on to neither confirm nor deny that he had been approached.

We have the word of the member for Mitcham that an approach was made by the Government. We have a fudged denial from the Premier about official approaches and whether it was on behalf of Cabinet as a whole, and then we have this extraordinary attack from the Attorney-General. Left at that, I do not think the matter could be properly brought before the House by way of urgency, but it goes beyond that.

Mr Lew Barrett, an eminent accountant, a man who has served both Governments on various boards of advice, and a person of considerable integrity, was not prepared to stay silent. Having been used by the Government to carry its message and, having been left high and dry by the Premier's denials, he made a public statement to the *News*. I suggest members opposite note the statement made by Mr Barrett. He told the *News* he did approach Mr Millhouse on behalf of a Minister to test his attitude to a position on the bench. He said it was his understanding that if Mr Millhouse had reacted positively, an offer would have been made to him by the Government. In other words, all that Mr Millhouse needed to do was say 'Yes' and the formal offer would follow.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Oh, jolly good!

Mr BANNON: The Premier's childishness is quite extraordinary. It is interesting to note that Mr Barrett went even further. They discussed accommodation in Moore's, so it was quite clear that the brief given to Mr Barrett was to make the informal offer, the informal sounding, to be followed by the formal appointment.

It would be difficult for the Premier, in any case, to maintain to this House or to the public that anyone in his Cabinet could have been responsible for initiating an approach (and the approach has been proved) to the member for Mitcham without his knowledge. After all, it is a sensitive area for the Government. I will put it plainly and simply. The Government would like to shift the member for Mitcham. He irritates the Government members. They have put a lot of effort into trying to win his seat. If he left the Parliament, the likelihood is that the Liberal Party would win the Mitcham seat, because it is traditionally a blue-ribbon Liberal seat. It is in its interest to get rid of the member. Given the current performance of the Government it will need it, if it wants to pick up any extra seats. There is every reason to give him a suitable judicial appointment.

Can the Premier stand before the House in all honesty and say this has not been discussed by him and his colleagues? Who was allotted the delicate task of approaching the member? That is a matter of conjecture. The Premier suggested that it was the Attorney-General. There can be absolutely no conjecture at all that an offer was made. An offer was made.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: No. You are on record as saying that an offer hadn't been made.

Mr BANNON: The Premier will have an opportunity to make his childish debating point shortly. Let him address his mind to the substance of this matter, and I am coming to this now. At one stage, the Tonkin Government clearly thought that the member for Mitcham was a fit person to approach for judicial office. When asked about it in another place, the Attorney-General went far further than that. He said that he did not want to cast any reflections on Mr Millhouse but he went on to say that essentially he was a politician. I say that by saying that he was casting reflection on such people as the learned Chief Justice presently occupying the post and he was casting reflections on persons such as Mr Justice Travers, a former member of this place,

who was appointed by a Liberal Government, having been a Liberal member of Parliament.

He then talked about some of the member's political activities. He said that he had visited a brothel, he had run naked through the corridors of Parliament House, and he had posed as a caveman. Having recounted these things, he said that he had referred to these items because they were relevant to the matters to which the Leader had referred and they were also relevant in any consideration of any prospective aspirants for judicial office. What an outrageous attack by the Chief Law Officer of the Crown on a colleague in the profession, and a Parliamentary colleague, in the context in which this was raised! He was unsuitable, it appears, for judicial office.

There is an extremely disquieting aspect to this whole matter. The Premier has certainly tried to get out from under, and he is going to try to do it again today. In that statement reported in the *News* on 24 September, the Premier said (and I ask the House to note this):

I have no doubt an indication of his attitudes could well have been sought, just as it is sought from other people from time to time. But that doesn't mean that a decision has been made to offer a position. It's simply an indication of whether someone should be considered or not when the time arises.

It seems to me that this Government is touting judicial office around the town. This is the way they approach the making of appointments. I would like to ask the Premier how many other people have been approached in this way by intermediaries. What offers are being made? What other non-judicial appointments are being touted around this way?

Let me describe the process: one sends someone, not to offer a position, but to indicate whether someone should be considered when the time arises. Is that the way in which this Government approaches such appointment? If so, it is totally inappropriate. I think in that alone the Government stands condemned in this business. It is an outrageous attempt by the Government to find something to discredit the member for Mitcham, because he refused its offer, or as the Government saw it, its bribe, to get him out of this House. The Government has gone about it in an underhand way. It has attempted to deny it and get from under it. The Premier should come clean, and tell us the truth.

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): For the second day in succession we have heard a most astonishing performance by the Leader of the Opposition. It has been astonishing for a number of reasons: astonishing in as much as he is apparently taking up the cudgels and is championing the cause of the member for Mitcham.

An honourable member: Is he his campaign manager?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Well, it is almost as though he has a vested interest in getting the member for Mitcham either more firmly entrenched in his seat, or, as I suspect is more likely, getting rather more exposure and comment. I suspect that the real motives of the Leader of the Opposition are to ventilate this matter still further in public to the discomfiture and discredit of the member for Mitcham. I can understand why the member for Mitcham should be supported by the Opposition. He does vote for it, I think, about as often as he votes for this side of politics.

An honourable member: That is if he is here!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, if he is here. He does miss quite a number of votes, as we have seen from the record. Let me say categorically that neither I nor the Attorney-General has misled the public or Parliament, either deliberately or inadvertently, nor has there been any attempt to do so. The surprising thing about the performance of the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon is that

he has provided no evidence to show that we have. I find it an extraordinary situation.

I rather think that, if members opposite were to look at the press reports upon which they are relying, they would say that his belief that an offer would have been made should his approach have received any sort of acquiescence is very different from the Leader's standing in this place in a histrionic and rather school-debating sort of style saying, 'We know that a formal offer was made', and then in the same debate saying that he spoke to Mr Barrett personally. I hope he did, because it is rather difficult to speak to people other than personally. Soon he will be saying he spoke to him in talking, like corresponding in writing.

Later in the debate he quoted Mr Barrett, for whom I have the highest regard and respect as a very fine servant of Governments and the State, as saying that an offer would have been made. I want to know how the Leader separates those two statements. He says that Mr Barrett said that an offer would have been made, yet he said when he started the debate that he knew that a formal offer was made. Where is his evidence? He has not one jot of evidence to substantiate the allegations he has made this afternoon. His case totally and absolutely falls on the points that he has made. Where is the evidence that the Leader of the Opposition has that a formal offer was made?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: All the Leader of the Opposition can say is that he believes that Mr Barrett said that an offer would have been made. He cannot have it both ways. If this is the standard of the urgency motion, if this is what the Opposition feels, it is incumbent upon it to raise, as a matter of great urgency, that does not say very much for members opposite in their capacity as an Opposition. I think it reflects quite creditably on the Government.

Mr Ashenden: I thought they were—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd will remain silent.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is doing such an excellent job at present that the Opposition has no matter of substance to raise. The Opposition is merely nitpicking on this occasion, nitpicking on a matter of no substance, without any evidence and with nothing but very weak and empty allegations.

Members opposite would perhaps have done better to go on with Question Time, except for their performance on Thursday in this place, which was so abysmally poor because they ran out of questions. The Leader of the Opposition did not even have a second question to ask, and the Deputy Leader did not jump up, either. I find their performance quite remarkable. How many questions did they ask? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition asked two questions. What a wonderful performance. He must go to the top of the class, and I would say that the Leader of the Opposition should really watch his step. The Deputy asked one more question than the Leader. Any allegation that either I or the Attorney-General—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Premier resume his seat. I have issued general warnings to a number of members. The House is now getting to a stage where it is being unruly, and I want to hear no further comment other than that of the member who is called to speak. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Any allegation that either I or the Attorney-General has misled Parliament or the public must be predicated on allegations that there has been an offer which has been considered or decided upon by Cabinet, and I say categorically that there has been no such consideration and no such offer, formal

or otherwise from the Government. The Opposition has presented no evidence at all that either the Attorney-General or I have misled the public or Parliament. It is quite obvious why it is not able to present that evidence: because there is no such evidence, because such an approach has not been made on behalf of the Government to Mr Millhouse—to the member for Mitcham (it is very difficult to separate his judicial aspirations from his duties as a politician)—at any time.

The Attorney-General has repeatedly said (and I totally agree with this) that public disclosure of the identities of people who are or are not approached and sounded out for their views on accepting judicial office is quite improper. This has not been the practice of the present Attorney-General, nor any of his predecessors, whether Liberal or Labor and I am quite certain that the member for Hartley would bear me out on that, as would other members formerly in Government. The Attorney has said that, when there is a judicial vacancy, all of the barristers who are silks would be considered, together with other practitioners of eminence, and both their capacities for the task and their other characteristics would be relevant in any decision taken.

But that is as far as the matter could be taken or should properly be taken, because to speculate on whether or not there was any sounding out or any approach, or whether or not there was any approach to any one person, would be quite improper, and I suspect the member for Mitcham would bear that out. Let us speculate. If the Attorney were to say or to make an announcement that he approached X and X had refused and he did not approach Y, the question would then arise, why had he not approached Y. Would that be a reflection on Y? Y might be a perfectly capable barrister and, if he has refused, the question would be why did he refuse. Just imagine the sort of speculation which could arise from a disclosure of that sort of information. It would be totally and absolutely wrong. It would do a disservice to the independence of the Judiciary, and in so doing it would do a disservice to the administration of State.

Imagine what it could do to the careers of persons who may or may not have been approached, and what it would do if at some later stage they were appointed to the bench. What sort of a question mark raised by any public controversy would rest over their heads? I would have thought that any simpleton, even members of the Opposition, could quite readily see what damaging consequences would come from speculation in this way or disclosing the sort of information which the Opposition has been trying to stir up for the past week. I repeat that there has never at any time been any formal Government approach to the member for Mitcham.

I recollect that last year there was a *Nationwide* programme in which the member for Mitcham was the apparent star, when this question of his attitude to the bench and his possible appointment to it was explored. My recollection—and it is confirmed by other people—is that he did on that occasion not turn down any prospect of a judicial appointment; in fact, he kept it very much open and, in so doing, helped to float the rumours which have been going around. One would normally say that, in the absence of any particular public controversy, such as the Elliott Johnston situation under the Hall Government, it would be most unusual for a silk to make any comment on his prospects for appointment, but of course it is not at all unusual for a politician to seek to raise a variety of matters in public, and obviously that has been the conflict in this instance. It has been a conflict between a very skilful politician of some 25 years standing and the aspirations of that same person for a position of eminence in the law.

I repeat: if this is a measure of the Opposition's concern about the critical issues presently facing South Australia, about South Australia's development, its future, its job creation, matters which are of very great importance indeed to everyone else in South Australia, then all I can say is that it is a pretty sick Opposition. All this motion demonstrates is that the Opposition at present is so taken up with its own dilemmas, its own difficulties in setting policies, and its attitudes to matters so critical to South Australia's future, and it is so introverted, that it is not able to consider properly the affairs of the State.

It is so inept indeed that again today we have seen the Leader and the Deputy Leader caught, because you, Sir, decided that there should be some questions beforehand, without prepared questions, and not able to ask questions on matters of concern to the people of South Australia. It is a deplorable situation, and all I can say is that this State has one of the weakest Oppositions it has ever suffered from. I would have thought that it might learn a lesson from the events of last Thursday afternoon, when it ran out of questions. The Opposition's performance in this matter, in the Budget debate, and in many other instances is a glaring example of the Labor Party's complete lack of policies or direction.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: All it can do by bringing forward such a matter as this to the House is hope to take attention away, by dealing with personalities and petty matters, from its own lack of skill and expertise in Opposition. In the Budget debate, Opposition speakers resorted to what is becoming a very familiar formula of rhetoric and personal criticism, without putting forward any positive economic alternative strategies. With this motion, the Opposition is doing the same thing yet again; it is getting on to personalities, criticising personalities, rather than debating the issues and policies which should affect the future of South Australia.

It is quite clear that the Leader of the Opposition, in using this issue and, I may say, wasting the valuable time of the House, is trying to divert public attention from the internal problems which are wracking his own Party. Obviously, he thinks that, by raising a petty personal issue such as the motion he has put to the House, his own problems within the Labor ranks will somehow evaporate. Knowing the member for Elizabeth, I doubt very much whether they will.

I understand that there is a strong move at present on the part of the Labor Party Conference to adopt the measures and procedures adopted in the United Kingdom, which will give members of the Labor Party Conference and the trade union movement the opportunity to vote for the leadership. That is something which the Leader should be looking at very carefully indeed. I can assure him that in no way will his problems evaporate until the Labor Party develops sound positive policies which will assist in the economic development of this State, and, the sooner he realises this, the better it will be for the Leader and the people of South Australia.

The Leader spoke about the Government's touting for judges and other appointments. I find that offensive to the various people who have been appointed to the bench, and particularly offensive to the people of South Australia. This Government's record of appointments to the Judiciary has been impeccable, and we intend to keep it just like that.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I cannot claim to be entirely detached in this debate, as I seem to be the centre of it, although the Premier tried to avoid making me the centre of it. However, it seemed to me that he did not

make a very good defence of his position, nor did he seem to be particularly well at ease. Earlier this afternoon in answering a question, he said that he regretted that there had been an attack on personalities—I think that was the way he put it—by a member of the Labor Party. Well, of course, from what we have heard from the Premier for about the last 14 minutes (the last five minutes was absolute padding to try to take up the time), he did nothing but attack persons, pour ridicule on me and on members of the Labor Party, and deal with utterly irrelevant matters.

I have had enough experience in this House to know that when a person in his position adopts that tactic it is because he has nothing better to say to defend his position. I have seen it again and again from Governments and Oppositions. There is no doubt whatever in my mind that he had to do those things this afternoon because he had nothing better to say to defend what was undoubtedly deceitfulness on his part and on the part of the Attorney-General. The Premier said that there was no proof that an offer had been made to me. I have no doubt whatever in my own mind that Mr Lew Barrett was sent to me to sound me out very definitely to see whether I would accept a formal offer if it were made to me.

There was no doubt in the way he put it to me; there was no doubt in my own mind that that is why he had come to see me, and of course, as the Leader of the Opposition has said, since this House met on Thursday there has appeared in the *News* a report of what he said confirming that himself, and of course he has confirmed it to me, because with each letter that I wrote to the Premier I spoke to him. Mr Barrett spent about 20 minutes with me when he came to see me that day. I have not put everything that he said to me in the letter, but what he said was undoubtedly to the following effect: 'I have been asked by a member of Cabinet to inquire whether you would accept an appointment as a Judge of the Local and District Criminal Court.' It does not matter whether one calls that a formal approach or an informal approach or a sounding out—the thing comes to exactly the same. Goodness knows why whoever was responsible (and I have my suspicions about that) did not have the gumption to come to me directly, here or at Bar Chambers or anywhere else. But they had to send a man such as Lew Barrett to ask me.

There was no doubt that if I had said 'Yes' I would have been appointed; there was no doubt about that at all, from what he said to me, and there is no doubt about this in his mind now, from what was said to him by this anonymous Minister. I have a question on the Notice Paper asking who it was; we will see whether it takes six months to get an answer to that, or whether or not I get a quick answer. There was no doubt in Lew Barrett's mind as to why he was being sent to me—none at all. If anyone wants any more proof than that I do not know where they will get it, but I would have thought that that was enough, and I am quite confident that it is enough for anyone outside this place who does not have to defend a Party position.

I come now to an even more important point—and this is what riled me and caused me to make that personal explanation: the Premier, well knowing that I had refused the approach (whether it was formal or not does not matter) which had been made to me, suggested that I had started the rumour myself, and then went on to say "Well, I have no intention of recommending him for appointment." Of course he did not: I would not have accepted it if he had. That was what annoyed me—what I considered was his deceit, which is the best word to use, in saying what he said, well knowing what my attitude was. That is the important point, not whether it was a formal offer or not. He knew that I would not take it. He knew that I had been approached, and yet he had the gall to say what he said.

If it had not been for that, I would never have raised the matter in the House. I made no note of Mr Barrett's conversation with me. When I heard what he had to say on the Philip Satchell show, the only note I had was in my diary at Bar Chambers, where I had a note of the time Barrett was coming to see me. I had no other note at all and would have completely forgotten it. I thought that it was a confidential matter between the Government and me. I did not want to embarrass the Government on it and I presumed that they did not want to embarrass me.

But when the Premier said what he did, I felt very annoyed. This has been compounded since by what has been said by the Attorney-General. In another place last week, he saw fit to cast aspersions on me and on my fitness. He is completely entitled to do that if he likes. It is not for me to judge whether or not I would be a fit person to be on the bench; that is for others to say, and I say no more about it. What does annoy me, however, is that he said what he did well knowing that, three or four weeks before, either he or one of his colleagues had approached me to see whether I would go on the bench. If that is not hypocrisy and deceit on his part, I do not know what is. He knew that. Let me say one thing about this: I believe it was the Attorney who sent Mr Barrett to see me.

Members interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: If it were not the Attorney who did, why is another Minister meddling in the matters which are the concern and responsibility of the Attorney-General? Why should any other Minister take it upon himself to make this approach? We will see when the amendments to the Savings Bank Act come in (if they do come in at all after this) which Minister introduces them. I make the point that the Attorney should be very annoyed if one of his colleagues has been meddling in the question of judicial appointments.

I bear the Attorney-General no ill will at all, but I rather feel that he does not have the same view of me. We have had our clashes in the past. If I may go back a few years—and these matters will be vividly in your memory, Mr Speaker, because you yourself took a leading part in them—I had my first clash with the present Attorney-General in 1973. Before that the only real recollection I have of him is that, some years before at a meeting of a youth group of which he was a member, he moved a vote of thanks to me for giving them an excellent speech. In 1973 at the L.C.L. he moved a resolution which led to the formation of the Liberal Movement and my leaving the L.C.L. He moved that resolution against my opposition at the time, well knowing that I would leave if it passed. Since that time I feel that he has had it in for me. The only other occasion on which there has been any personal clash between us was exactly two years ago when I and two other gentlemen in the profession knew (because the honourable Chief Justice had spoken to us) that we were to be appointed silk and that we had been recommended for that appointment.

The Attorney-General, who had to take the matter to Cabinet and get it through, sat on those recommendations for over two months until I started to ask a few questions of the Premier and the Chief Secretary. The Chief Secretary will remember this and then he was full of apologies. The Attorney did sit on that appointment to the very acute embarrassment, particularly of the other two people involved. I suspect that the real reason why he did that was that he was unwilling to see me appointed. I know that other appointments are about at the moment, and we will see how long it takes for them to come through the pipeline. I bet it will not be two months.

Mr Hamilton: He wasn't going to do an Elliott Johnston, was he?

Mr MILLHOUSE: I did not know at the time what he was going to do. I do not bear that gentleman any ill will, but he obviously bears me some, from what he has said and what has happened between us in the past. That is the crux of the whole matter. It does not matter whether or not a formal approach was made to me. Before the Premier spoke, and before the Attorney spoke last week, the Government well knew that I had refused to consider appointment to judicial office which had been offered to me in one form or another by Mr Lew Barrett.

I do not believe that Lew Barrett could possibly have made a mistake in that; he is a man of experience; he is a senior man in his profession, and he is a man of honour. I do not believe for a moment that he had made a mistake in that. If the Government believes that he is such a man as to make a mistake of that kind, why is he Chairman of Trustees of the Savings Bank? Of course, the Premier did not suggest it this afternoon. There is no doubt (and I feel) that he is embarrassed by what has happened. He was pretty embarrassed when he came to see me, actually, and I said to him, 'Why have you come to see me about this', 'why haven't they approached me themselves?' He said, 'I think they're embarrassed about you.' I think that is right. Of course, the Government does have the motive to try to get me out of politics. The Leader of the Opposition spelt this out pretty well this afternoon.

May I remind you, Mr Speaker, that at the last election the Liberal Party did its damndest to get rid of me in Mitcham. It had the same candidate who had worked in 1977. He wrote around to all the people in Mitcham saying that he was grateful to his Party for their permission to resume his duties in Mitcham. So he did; for 12 months he was there, knocking away. What was the result? The Liberal vote went down 12 per cent in Mitcham. Not having been able to get rid of me in that way, it did not take much for people to work out, once they were in office, that the alternative way to get rid of me was a promotion, if promotion it be, and frankly I do not know whether or not it is a promotion.

The last point I want to make (I made it in those letters to the Premier, and I make it again) is that I did not start those rumours. The first I heard of them was from some of the people in the media who had worked it out, and put two and two together, that a good and easy way of getting rid of me, once they were in a position to do, would be if I were appointed to the bench. Then, as we all know now, it gained great currency amongst members of the Liberal Party in this place. It was touted around at their Christmas party, as I said in the letter, that I was about to be appointed. There was no doubt about their having worked it out, and those rumours came from them. They did not come from me, nor have they ever come from me. I have been embarrassed by them, just as much as the Premier says that the Government is now embarrassed by what has happened.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: My opponent in Mitcham was well rewarded, but I should think he was probably one of the most disappointed people of the lot that I turned down the appointment, because he might have had another chance. Maybe the third time would have been lucky for him, I do not know. I hope they can get someone better to oppose me next time. We will see about that.

I do support this motion, because there is no doubt whatever that the Premier and the Attorney-General have misled the public of this State and the Parliament by what they have said, because they know as well as I do that it is beyond belief that, whoever the Minister was, he would not have told his colleagues of my answer to the approach.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He wouldn't have initiated it of his own volition.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I would not have thought so. Certainly, he would have reported the results. It is beyond belief that they did not know, when the Premier spoke on that radio programme and the Attorney-General spoke last week, what the real position was.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): First, let me deal briefly with the member for Mitcham. One of the last points he made was that the rumours were started by the media and he was acutely embarrassed by the rumours. His public statements tend to belie that claim. The member for Mitcham was quoted in the *Advertiser* in May this year, in connection with the speculation on his appointment to the bench. We all know that he is a glutton for media exposure and that that is the name of the game for him. The member for Mitcham complains that the House does not sit often enough for him to get publicity. The article stated:

My greatest thrill was to take silk—

To the layman that does not mean much, but to the legal profession it obviously does. Incidentally, I think that this Cabinet gave him the silk to put on. The quote continues:

It had nothing to do with politics and it meant that senior members of the legal profession felt that I had the ability to carry silk. Being appointed to the bench is a mixture of politics and luck. If the Government doesn't like the person then he doesn't get a chance—and this is no reflection on his professional ability. If I don't get an offer then I won't have a choice to make. If I do get an offer, then I will have to make a decision.

The plain fact is that the member for Mitcham lapped up the publicity. On a *Nationwide* programme—I do not watch the programme; its ratings are fairly low and I am not usually home—the member for Mitcham was preening himself and claiming to all the world that he would really be in a bind if such an offer was made. He said that he did not know whether he would accept it or not. Now he claims that he was acutely embarrassed by it all. What hogwash!

I happen to be a senior member of the Government, and I think my Cabinet colleagues will agree that there are not many things of major importance and not many major appointments about which I do not know. The first I knew of the approach by Mr Lew Barrett to the member for Mitcham was when it was raised in this House. I will swear to that on a stack of bibles as high as I can reach. The Leader of the Opposition, supported by the member for Mitcham, is trying to claim that an offer was made to the member for Mitcham to go on the bench. I knew nothing of Mr Barrett's involvement; the first I knew of it was what I heard in this House.

When I read this motion, I thought, 'Today is going to be fun day.' I could not believe that the Opposition was serious in believing it could mount a motion and take up Question Time—the time which they say is not available to them—to air a matter like this. That indicates its priorities. I cannot, for instance, imagine how the member for Hartley could see the Labor Party being involved in this exercise. How the Labor Party must rue the retirement of the Hon. D. Dunstan, the compulsory retirement of the Hon. H. R. Hudson, the loss of the Hon. G. T. Virgo and the demotion or removal of the member for Hartley from the front bench. I could never believe that under the leadership of any of those four gentlemen it could mount such a motion as this.

The member for Mitcham suggests that the Premier did not have a good defence. How can you have a defence when there is nothing to defend? If an approach had been made on behalf of the Government for an appointment to the Judiciary, the Government would know about it. I

happen to be a senior member of the Government. I was a member of the Government who considered the appointment of Mr Millhouse as Q.C. I knew about that; it was a Government appointment. In fact the Hon.—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what happened about Mr Barrett. When the Opposition claims an official approach was made by the Government to appoint the member for Mitcham a judge, I was not a party to it. The first I knew of Mr Barrett's involvement was what I heard in this House. The member for Mitcham came to me, after he was appointed a Q.C., and said he was worried that I might block it. I always thought that I was on good terms with the member for Mitcham.

The plain fact is that there is nothing to defend. For the member for Mitcham to claim that he does not revel in publicity is nonsense. Have we ever known the member for Mitcham to be embarrassed by publicity? I have before me a photograph of him dressed up like Tarzan. I have a picture of him running down the corridors of Parliament House with nothing but a towel on. That does not necessarily rule him out for judicial office. Do not misunderstand me. When I was discussing his predilection to nakedness, I was asking him about what happens down at Maslins Beach, and I am quite sure he will not mind my recounting the conversation, because he frequents Maslins Beach. I said, 'Who on earth goes down there, Robin?' He said, 'All sorts of people.' He told me that he saw a judge down there. I think the Attorney made the point that the fact that he wants to dress up like Tarzan occasionally—

Mr Oswald: It is one of his childhood fantasies.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Jane and boy are not too bad, but we will not carry that any further. Everyone in this House knows that the member for Mitcham loves publicity. I think he subscribes to that dictum which was first enunciated by the celebrated Billy Hughes. Billy Hughes used to look through the paper, I am told, and, if he got a favourable mention, the day was great; if he got an unfavourable mention, it was average; but, if he did not get a mention at all, it was crook. That is the conclusion that one must draw in connection with the member for Mitcham. For him and the Opposition to claim that the Premier is being deceitful is absolute nonsense. The fact is that there is no case and there is nothing to answer. The Government, of which I am a part, made no formal approach to Mr Millhouse to appoint him to the Judiciary.

As a member of this Government, I would be very sore indeed if something was done in an official capacity without my knowing about it. What else can one say? There is no charge to answer. We know that the member for Mitcham is loving every minute of this because he might get himself into the media again. This matter does highlight the paucity of the Opposition's ability to focus on the real issues affecting this State. However, let me refer the Democrats and the Labor Party to the editorial in the *News* today. We get major issues, such as the development of this State, a project about which an investment adviser from Melbourne says:

South Australia has the chance of developing the largest mine in the world.

We have the possibility of creating employment, with this Government setting the climate for development. The Labor Party, because it does not happen tomorrow, denies any chance of that happening. When we get major issues of vital importance to the State, such as that, the Opposition dodges them at all costs, and brings trivia into this House.

Mr Bannon: Oh!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is the importance the honourable member attaches to his motion. That indicates the priorities that the Opposition sets to matters

which really count as matters for this State, and it mounts a motion in this House, all of which is to allow the member for Mitcham to say that he is embarrassed, when we know he is loving it. That indicates just how pathetic is the Opposition's judgment. I am surprised that people of the calibre of the member for Hartley—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't patronise me, Roger.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not patronising you. I have the highest respect for the member for Hartley but I feel very sorry for those responsible and able elements of the Labor Party who see the way in which the present Leader is taking that Party. Today's motion is a case in point. It is plainly pathetic.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

INDUSTRIES ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): By leave, I seek to amend the motion standing in my name, and I now move:

That this House urges all members to study and consider the serious ramifications of the recommendations of the Industries Assistance Commission on assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984, in view of the danger to South Australian employment and industrial development should the recommendations be adopted.

I would like to follow up points raised in the House yesterday by the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Affairs in relation to the disastrous effect of the I.A.C. report recommendations if adopted. Yesterday, we were subjected to some good debate and some poor debate. I cannot agree with the comments by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that it was the Opposition's initiative that first brought this matter to public attention. It was a Government initiative.

The Minister, the Premier and the Government can stand proud on the work they have done to ensure that the Federal Government is made aware of the disastrous effect that the I.A.C. recommendations would have on South Australia's future.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to lower the level of audible conversation.

Mr ASHENDEN: I totally disagree with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he said that he felt that the speech by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday was the best he had heard in the House. It might have been good debating technique, but he said absolutely nothing in his speech about the effect of the I.A.C. proposals on South Australia.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: He would get no marks for content.

Mr ASHENDEN: He would get absolutely no marks for content, as the Premier points out. He used the opportunity to vilify the Minister, particularly, and the Government in general, rather than to work on a bipartisan approach to this very important matter for South Australia. I think the Opposition's approach yesterday, along with the attitude of the Federal member for Adelaide to the motor vehicle industry, must cause South Australian residents tremendous concern, because it is only too clear that the State Labor Party appears to be more intent on scoring political points than in getting down to supporting this Government in having the Federal Government alter the I.A.C. recommendations. Then, for the Federal member for Adelaide to recommend that the number of manufacturers be reduced from five to two would be further disaster for this State, as the Minister of Industrial Affairs has pointed out earlier today.

There is absolutely no doubt that, if that were to occur, Mitsubishi would be one of the companies that would go,

and it is quite likely that the General Motors activities in this State would also be seriously wound down. Another noteworthy point is that the motion yesterday sought this Parliament's support for a unified approach to the Federal Government. Yet, the member for Mitcham obviously did not even regard it as important enough to be in attendance at all during the debate.

The South Australian Government is opposed to the assistance proposals put forward by the I.A.C. in its draft report on assistance to the motor vehicle industry after 1984, as it believes that an inevitable consequence of the I.A.C. proposals will be a significant further winding down on both local vehicle assembly and component production, and a consequent loss of jobs in South Australia. Various figures are put forward on the number of jobs that would be lost. Certainly, the number would be in excess of 10 000. Such a loss of activity would erode the viability of many components firms and also remove so much business from supporting suppliers of goods and services that this could challenge the viability of a large section of South Australia's manufacturing economy not directly involved, necessarily, with the motor vehicle industry.

We should look at just what the I.A.C. has recommended. It has recommended that after 1984 both the 85 per cent local content requirement for Australian motor vehicles and the import quota reserving 80 per cent of the market for local producers be abolished. Tariffs on imported vehicles would then increase from the current 57.5 per cent to 60 per cent for one year only, then gradually drop to 35 per cent by 1990. It argues that this would mean lower average car prices, a smaller and more efficient vehicle and component producing industry, and other favourable economic effects.

However, let us look at what that really would mean: because South Australia produces two-and-a-half times its own market requirements. A scheme that relates employment to the market rather than to production would mean it would lose a far greater number of jobs in production than could possibly be made up through gains in increased distribution or servicing. The I.A.C. proposals rely on the belief that market forces will lead to a more efficient structure, but, there is no guarantee that the ultimate result would not be a cessation of motor vehicle manufacture in Australia. That is the point which I believe must be borne in mind when we are considering the recommendations of the I.A.C.

The I.A.C. statement goes on to say that the motor industry is one of Australia's least efficient industries, and that consumers have not been very well served. As the Minister pointed out yesterday, that is talking historically. The I.A.C. obviously has not caught up with the fact that the motor vehicle manufacturers in Australia are increasing their productivity out of all sight. As the Minister pointed out, Mitsubishi, or, as it was then, Chrysler, just five years ago was taking in excess of 80 man-hours to build a vehicle. This is now down to 22 man-hours, and is as efficient as any comparably sized manufacturing plant anywhere in the world, so how can the I.A.C. make such a statement?

It then goes on to say that high assistance to automotive production has led to cost increases throughout the economy which have penalised consumers and inhibited employment and growth opportunities in other industries. Once again, why is it that they have not looked at the most recent figures. We can take the example of the Sigma, one of the models which is produced solely in South Australia, and we find that the cost increases of the Sigma since it was released are far less than the increase in the consumer price index, and are far less than the cost to the company of many of the component parts that go to make up that vehicle.

The I.A.C. report then goes on to state that, if the recommendations were accepted, that would mean lower average car prices, a smaller, but more efficient vehicle and component producing industry, and favourable flows. I would disagree with those statements also. I have already pointed out that efficiency is improving greatly, and how the I.A.C. can determine that there would be lower prices for imported vehicles than present manufactured vehicles I do not know, because once the manufacturing sector of Australia is removed, we will then be completely subject to the pricing policies of overseas companies. Therefore, when they wanted to dump vehicles, they would lower their prices: for example, if they wanted to keep their production plants in operation in Japan. Then at the same time, if there was a demand for vehicles undoubtedly the price that the market would bear would be the price that would be charged. The competitiveness of local production would therefore not be there as a check to those activities.

I would also like to point out that many people believe that Australians are paying more for their vehicles than is the case overseas. This just is not so. In fact, if we have a look at the Toyota range of vehicles, we find, from the Corolla right through to the Crown Super, that the Corolla sells for some \$700 less in Australia than in the United Kingdom and the Crown Super sells for over \$2 000 lower than the figure in the United Kingdom. We find the Datsun top-of-the-line vehicles selling for \$2 500 less in Australia than in the United Kingdom. The full range of Ford vehicles sells for less in Australia than in the United Kingdom. The top-of-the-range Falcon, for example, is almost \$3 000 cheaper in Australia than in that country. Let us look at the Mitsubishi range of vehicles. Again, they are cheaper in Australia than in the United Kingdom. The Sigma, the locally-produced vehicle, is \$2 500 cheaper here than in the United Kingdom. The General Motors range is also cheaper here than in the United Kingdom. The Volvo vehicles are cheaper in Australia than in the United Kingdom, and there are many more examples. How can it be said that this country is suffering because residents are being forced to pay a higher price for their vehicles than they would pay if they were living overseas?

Apart from the 18 000 South Australians directly employed in vehicle manufacturing, and the 94 component-making businesses, it is estimated that at least another 12 000 South Australian jobs depend on the motor vehicle industry in this State. Almost all of these would be affected, if not lost, if Australia were to become a heavy importer instead of manufacturer of vehicles. It is far too simplistic to think that dropping tariffs on imported cars would make them a lot cheaper. I have already dealt with what I would see as one of the possible developments by overseas manufacturers if they were no longer subjected to competition from an Australian industry.

The Chairman of the importers group of the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries, Mr Donaldson, has, of course, naturally agreed wholeheartedly with the recommendations of the I.A.C., and he blithely says, 'Well, these people who are employed in manufacturing cars will be picked up and employed either in the sales or the service of vehicles, or some other area of industry.' He does not tell us what that other area of industry will be. He does not tell us where these in excess of 10 000 jobs are to be found.

A study conducted by the University of Melbourne Institute of Applied and Economic Research has shown quite clearly that it is the South Australian economy that will be hardest hit, as 16 per cent of South Australia's work force is engaged in the motor vehicle industry. If imported cars were restricted to 40 per cent of the local market (in other

words, that is doubling the present arrangement), there would still be a severe loss of jobs. The study suggests the number would be some 10 000. It also points out that there would be a 5 per cent reduction in the South Australian economy. How can we possibly stand by and allow recommendations like that to be carried out?

The analysis by that group also shows quite clearly that Victoria would be another State that would suffer tremendous disadvantages. However, that State would not suffer to the degree that South Australia would, for a number of reasons. First, Victoria has a greater diversification of industry than we have. Secondly, one of the major manufacturers is already centred in Melbourne, and I refer to Ford. Therefore, if the proposals by the Federal member for Adelaide were adopted, I would see Victoria as being in the position of picking up much of the losses that would occur when Mitsubishi was closed, and also the General Motors operations in this State wound down. Additionally, General Motors is in the fortunate position where it could transfer its operations also to Victoria. I therefore feel that it is South Australia alone, both in the short and long terms, that would suffer the serious consequences of the recommendations of this report.

Professor Parry has been quoted by a number of persons as being in favour of the recommendations of the I.A.C. I am afraid that I cannot accept the points he has made, because he has not supported the statements he has made with any concrete evidence of how it can possibly be that the South Australian and the Australian economy would not suffer and would, evidently, according to him, just carry on regardless, with no loss of jobs and no loss of income.

But even if the recommendations of the member for Adelaide were not to be adopted by members opposite, unless they come around to fully supporting the South Australian Government's approach to the Federal Government on this matter, I would still think it quite likely that Mitsubishi could leave Australia and produce its vehicles in either Japan or the Philippines, and then export those vehicles here to South Australia and the rest of Australia. If that happens, then again it may be that for a short while the vehicle would be cheaper, although I doubt it, but who in this State would be able to afford to buy that vehicle because of the loss of jobs and the loss of income to this State? That would spread over many more people than merely those directly or indirectly employed in the motor vehicle industry.

It is noticeable that all of the major manufacturers disagree with the recommendations of the I.A.C., not only those which are centred in South Australia. For example, the Managing Director of the Ford Motor Company, Mr Dix, has stated that the Federal Government must decide whether or not Australia wants a viable motor manufacturing industry. If it does not, he says, the Industries Assistance Commission recommendations on the future structure of the industry are appropriate. If it does, quantitative restrictions are necessary to control the number of imported cars, and it will need them forever, because we have a small based domestic market. Mr Dix went on to say that the only effective protection was on a quantitative basis rather than tariffs, the latter being affected by such influences as differences in currency exchange rates.

That is a point I would like to take up, because he is perfectly correct. Tariff protection will not necessarily protect Australian manufacturing in the motor vehicle industry. There must be a restriction by the Federal Government on the number of vehicles that can be imported into this country. It is well known that the Japanese react very quickly to market conditions and, if a market was depressed in one part of the world, they would quickly transfer their excess production to other areas (a point which I made

earlier), which results in dumping. Then, just to keep their production lines operational, they would be prepared to bear a short-term loss. The manufacturing industry in Australia cannot compete in that sort of market.

Another point I would like to mention in relation to the cost of vehicles in this country which, as I have already pointed out, is not higher than in many countries overseas, involves the time a worker in Australia needs to work to buy an Australian-made vehicle compared with a person working, for example, in the United Kingdom, for that person to buy a British-made vehicle. In Australia it would be necessary for him to work approximately 26 weeks to pay for an average vehicle. In the United Kingdom it is 45 weeks. So, even with our low volume, the Australian vehicle manufacturing industry is efficient.

If the industry were to die in Australia then we would become very subjected to overseas pressures in relation to pricing policy. I think that has been brought out very clearly by the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries Manufacturers Group, which has shown quite categorically that the members of that group, which are the major Australian manufacturers, would have to reconsider their total production ability and also any future expansion in this country. If this were not done, those companies obviously would be losing heavily.

No company, whether a multi-national or a small local company, can possibly afford to be in a position where it is operating at a loss. Those companies would naturally have to turn to the importing of C.B.U., or completely built-up vehicles, into this country. That would mean that there is not only no manufacturing labour required but that there is no assembly labour required either. Therefore, local content must also be retained in any decision which the Federal Government makes in relation to Australian motor vehicle manufacturing. The industry will continue to generate, directly and indirectly, manufacturing employment opportunities, provided local content is still required.

A point which the Minister made yesterday, and with which I agree wholeheartedly, refers to the situation where Australian manufacturers are seeking the ability to manufacture parts for vehicles in this country, and export them overseas under a programme known as export facilitation, which would then allow them to bring into this country parts of vehicles manufactured overseas. This means that the companies can manufacture, in the various countries around the world, those items which are most suited to that area. For example, in South Australia we are ideally set up to manufacture castings for engines; we are ideally set up to manufacture gearboxes. Therefore, Australian companies should be in a position to manufacture those things which they can do efficiently, more efficiently and more cheaply than overseas, and export them, bringing in components with which we cannot compete with overseas sources. This will retain Australian employment, and it will keep the price of Australian vehicles down.

However, I do not see that as a sole means of protecting the Australian industry. I realise that General Motors, for example, believes that export facilitation should be allowed in a big way, and it will then be able to compete. However, small companies, such as Mitsubishi, would not be able to do that. I would suggest that export facilitation should be in the region of only 7½ per cent, because anything more than that will have a negative effect on production here in South Australia.

The experience of the world's largest vehicle producers in Japan, and also that of some of the smaller producers in Europe, suggests that, whilst a well-structured industry to service the domestic market is an essential base, real competitiveness comes only with a level of export activity at least comparable to that directed towards the home market.

Whilst Australia may not be able to market entire vehicles abroad in large volumes, the Australian industry will be able to achieve world competitiveness in selected areas of specialisation through production at world scale. It is this to which I refer when I am speaking of export facilitation. This has been considered not only in Australia, but it has been shown to be the case overseas.

Another point that we should seriously consider is future investment in this country by the major manufacturers. Obviously, they will be prepared to invest only if they can see that they are going to get a return from that investment. Should the recommendations of the I.A.C. be accepted by the Federal Government, there is no way in the world that we would see any further development of investment by those manufacturers in this country.

If the Industries Assistance Commission report were accepted I would point out to members that 60 per cent of the vehicle market in Australia would eventually become based on imported vehicles. Let us compare that with the United Kingdom, where 11 per cent of vehicles sold are imported; with France, where 3 per cent of vehicles are imported; with Italy, where less than 1 per cent of vehicles are imported; with the United States, where 20 per cent of vehicles are imported, which is presently the case here in Australia.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Have you taken into account the European Common Market as a whole when referring to France and Italy?

Mr ASHENDEN: Just home production.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Less than 1 per cent?

Mr ASHENDEN: Less than 1 per cent of Italian vehicles sold on the home market are not made in Italy, on the figures I have been able to obtain.

Mr Lynn Arnold: I do not think that is quite correct. I think it is probably outside the E.E.C.

Mr ASHENDEN: I will check those figures for the honourable member. These are figures which I obtained from our own officers here in the Department of Labour and Industry, but I will take that point up with them.

Therefore, other countries obviously are protecting their home-based manufacturing industries. It is essential that Australia should continue to do so, and the free traders conveniently overlook the protection which other countries have in relation to home production. As I said, this is an aspect which must not be overlooked.

If the I.A.C. report is accepted in relation to the motor vehicle manufacturing industry, does that mean that they will turn around and do the same thing with the white goods industry? What will that do to firms like Kelvinator and Simpson in this State? Will they then look at the clothing industry? Why is only the motor vehicle industry being looked at so intently at the moment? Obviously, there are some very strong political pressures for this type of consideration, and I hope that those pressures will be quashed by the Federal Government.

There is no doubt that the Australian motor vehicle manufacturing industry is increasing its efficiency. It is restructuring; there are now far fewer models available on the Australian market than was the case a few years ago. In fact, Mitsubishi is being criticised for the lack of range of models that it is offering the public. Perhaps the pendulum has swung too far the other way. Mitsubishi, of course, is to correct that imbalance with the release of new models early in 1982, which will compete in sections of the market other than that involving the Sigma.

We have seen that the Australian industry is meeting the needs of Australians. I would agree that 10 years ago the manufacturing policy was 'They can take it or leave it', and Australian vehicles were technologically well and truly behind those being manufactured overseas. That is no

longer the case: the new Holden range of vehicles (particularly the Commodore), the new Mitsubishi range of vehicles, and the new Ford range of vehicles all incorporate the best in overseas technology, and the handling and safety characteristics of Australian cars are as good as those of cars produced anywhere else in the world at a comparable cost. We find that the Australian industry is also becoming more efficient.

It is against these facts that the generalisations of the I.A.C. report must be considered. That report is working on historical information: it gives no indication of where the jobs in question will come from, and again I point out that where there is no competition from local products we are very much subject to the pricing policies of overseas companies. Therefore, I suggest that members of this House seriously consider the continuation of a local content plan. Certainly it can be reduced but I would suggest, no further than 75 per cent. We should look at export facilitation but, again, to a maximum of 7½ per cent. We should look at a continued restriction of the C.B.U. (completely built up) imports to about the present 20 per cent of the market, and the use of quotas if necessary.

The Australian Government should also address itself to the present very unfair imbalance that exists in import quotas. For example, General Motors-Holden's, the biggest producer of vehicles in this country, has a very small import quota for bringing in vehicles from overseas. In contrast, Mazda, which manufactures and assembles no vehicles whatsoever in this country, has the biggest import quota. Where is the justice of that? That is another point to which the Federal Government must address itself. If it wants to encourage industry and investment in this country, surely its import quotas should be based on the production of vehicles in Australia, thus rewarding those companies providing jobs and employment, and not penalising them. The two companies most penalised under the present system are General Motors-Holden's and Mitsubishi.

I support the Federal Government's desire expressed in the reference for restructuring the industry, but I would certainly hope that in its restructuring it does not accept the recommendations of the I.A.C. What the Federal Government must do is recognise the importance of the motor industry in Australia's industrial structure. The need is certainly there for it to be more competitive in the domestic and export markets and for the Government to assist in that direction, and certainly the Government must recognise the need to avoid undue disruption. The continuation of the basic elements of the present assistance structure, combined with export facilitation, would achieve all these policy criteria. There has already been significant rationalisation and quality improvements under the current plan, as I have pointed out. Build times have been sharply reduced, model numbers have fallen, plants have closed, and employment has declined. These changes reflect the extremely competitive market under the current plan.

The I.A.C. received evidence on the rationalisation of the industry but chose to ignore the reality that rapid change is already taking place within the present framework. Again I make the point that they have based their arguments predominantly on historical figures, as the Minister of Industrial Affairs said yesterday. The commission also chose to ignore evidence that vehicle prices in Australia are often lower than in European countries (I have given specific examples of that), and made the unsupported assumption that they are higher. The commission has also conveniently glossed over the fact that the share of imports in the Australian market (over 20 per cent) is considerably higher than in most European countries.

I support continuation of the content plan as the best method of directing the industry towards the Government's

aims. I have looked at the long lead time and the major investment required for the rapidly changing motor industry during the next decade. These industry realities, when applied to the uncertainties of the next decade, clearly require some underpinning of investment. Only a plan concept requiring a minimum level of local sourcing provides the incentives that the industry needs. However, under the I.A.C. recommendations, there would be no minimum level of local content and no quantitative restriction on completely built-up imports. Clearly this would put at risk all the recently announced investment plans by the five local manufacturers. A significant part of this investment is to be in South Australia. With the market uncertainties of the motor industry, combined with the massive investment involved and the advantages of centralising manufacturing in Japan, why should companies take the risk of investing in Australia? There must be some concrete incentives. This has been recognised by the Government in its present plan and in the export facilitation scheme. I would certainly hope that the Government will continue to recognise that and will reject the recommendations of the I.A.C.

The present industry assistance policy of the Federal Government does result in what it wishes to achieve: it has resulted in a very competitive market, with decreases in the real prices of vehicles available to Australians. I have already mentioned the fact that the cost of the Sigma has increased well below the increase in the consumer price index, and there are clearly recognised quality improvements. In fact, Peter Wherrett, who I think is acknowledged as an expert in the field of motor vehicles, used to be extremely critical of vehicles made in Australia. Now he has stated that this country is up with the most modern technological developments in both Europe and Japan. The present policy has also resulted in significant on-going structural change in the industry, but without the undue disruption which would obviously result if the recommendations of the I.A.C. were implemented. The present system has resulted in incentives to export and achieve world economies of scale. The I.A.C. recommendations would dismantle this effective framework and substitute a policy direction which could result only in a major rapid decline in the industry, without any assured benefits.

For these reasons I have sought to amend my original motion to allow debate. I urge all members of this House to consider carefully the report of the I.A.C. so that they can make effective representations to their Federal members and the Federal Government in order to reject those recommendations. I would urge the South Australian Government to continue applying pressure and giving advice to the Federal Government on this matter, because members should make no mistake: if the recommendations of the I.A.C. are adopted it will be the deathknell of industry and the economy of South Australia.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

BEVERAGE CONTAINER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mr BLACKER (Flinders) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976. Read a first time.

Mr BLACKER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is very short and has five clauses, but is specific in intent. The Bill is designed to bring some equality into beverage container legislation to ensure that all types of beverage container are treated equally. I think it fair to say that the reason why I have introduced this measure is not so much

for the container industry, but more to the point of litter and its implications on our country towns and metropolitan cities, and more specifically our beaches. Without fear of contradiction, I believe that the beverage container legislation has been of some embarrassment to the former Government and, to a certain extent, to the present Government, for the reason that we have two sets of standard—one for the soft drink manufacturers and another for the alcoholic beverage container manufacturers. That is why the inequities and the litter problem have been further accentuated.

The Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln, being the only city corporation within my district, has had the problem of litter for a number of years, and it has mounted a campaign going back to 1954. So, it is a long and protracted campaign. The specifics of that campaign to do something about the litter problem associated with the beer bottle is connected with its price. I will read a reply to the late Senator Rex Pearson from the Premier of the day, Sir Thomas Playford, as follows:

In reply to your letter of 24 March 1954, I have to inform you that the local governing bodies have authority to make by-laws dealing with the dumping of rubbish or materials on any public road or place. The suggestion that a payment be made for empty bottles higher than the normal manufactured price would mean a higher price for bottled beer and cannot therefore be agreed to.

That was the attitude of the Government in 1954. If we went back through the records, every member could find a great list of articles and of approaches made to the various Governments and Ministers of Environment and, in general, find much support for the whole concept of a standardisation of the container legislation. In 1954, the then Adelaide Bottle Co-operative Company Limited wrote to the Town Clerk of the City of Port Lincoln. Although the company sympathised about the litter problem, it was not prepared to take any real action. I think it fair to say that the present Minister of Environment has been contacted by many councils, and I will deal with some of those approaches directly. At a recent Spencer Gulf Cities Association conference, held in Port Pirie, the Premier was present (this was many months ago), and three motions were moved by Mayor Davey of Port Lincoln and Councillor Werfel of Port Pirie, all calling on the Government to introduce a 10c deposit on the glass beverage containers. I add that since that time there has been some modifying of the attitude of the Port Pirie Corporation. I will quote briefly from an editorial in one of the Spencer Gulf papers, headed 'The ugly mess', as follows:

A move by the Port Lincoln Council to have deposits placed on beer bottles and other glassware is a meritorious one and should receive the support of the community in general.

To outline the anomalies presently within the beverage container legislation, I will quote from an editorial in the *Port Lincoln Times* of 16 May. It is headed 'Pull-rings and pulled strings', and states:

When is a pull-ring not a pull-ring? The answer, for South Australian beverage containers legislation, appears to be when it is on a beer bottle and not a beer or soft drink can. In its efforts to reduce environmental eyesores the former State Government took much of the joy out of using beverage cans by outlawing pull-ring openers and causing manufacturers to introduce the fingernail breaking push-in opening.

Most people accepted this as part of a very necessary campaign to reduce unsightly litter. However there must have been a massive loophole somewhere because next thing we see are even larger and shinier pull-rings on the tops of small beer bottles which have largely replaced beer cans in popularity because of their negligible deposit compared with the cans five cents.

There is no doubt we should have been far better off with discarded cans—pull-rings and all—than the more unsightly bottle pull-rings, plus bottles (mostly broken), plus the hideous and unfortunately durable cardboard six-bottle containers which are fast converting our beauty spots into one vast brewery advertisement.

One day we may be lucky enough to get a State or even a national Government with sufficient immunity to big business

string-pulling to enact the legislation necessary to stop our country becoming a huge rubbish heap.

As I mentioned earlier, the whole complex problem of bottle deposits has been a very protracted one. When the Hon. Mr Corcoran was Minister of Environment he found that conflict existed within his Party about this measure, and many articles in local papers back up that statement. One report of 15 September 1978, under the heading 'Deposit on beer bottles rejected', states:

The Minister for the Environment, Mr Corcoran, has rejected an A.L.P. sub-branch call for a deposit of at least 5c on beer bottles. Mr Corcoran was reporting on a call by the Glenelg Central sub-branch at a previous council meeting that a deposit of at least 5c be imposed on all soft-drink and beer bottles, including Echoes.

Glenelg delegates criticised Mr Corcoran's report. Mr A. Ross said it was a two bob each way, pussy-footing, fence-sitting recommendation that showed the association between the A.L.P. and the brewery industry.

Unfortunately, that is the feeling that does come out—that there must be some connection between big industry in this field and the particular Government in power. The Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln, in its endeavours to promote the campaign it has been mounting and in an endeavour to have some legislative action taken on the litter problem, particularly in the street, published a pamphlet which was circulated to all local authorities and which called on them to support the campaign. The pamphlet was very well set out and well drafted and it basically revolved around the theme of fact and fantasy. It has been clearly shown that the deposit system did cut can litter. It has been firmly established that a higher deposit would cut the litter problem associated with glass. I first gave notice of the Bill on the opening day of Parliament, 31 July 1980, and the debate then lapsed through expiry of private members' time. I also gave notice of the Bill on opening day of Parliament this session. I was rather intrigued, on the very next day, when the Bill was originally foreshadowed, that the member for Rocky River should raise a question specifically relating to bottle deposits, as follows:

Does the Minister of Environment intend to respond to a call for a 10 cent deposit on all bottles and, if not, why not, and can he say what steps are being taken or have been taken to ameliorate the litter problem caused by bottles? I refer to a report in the *Advertiser* of 27 October 1979 wherein the Local Government Association of South Australia at its annual general meeting called for a 10 cent deposit on all glass beverage containers in the interests of public safety and litter control.

The member for Rocky River gave further explanation. The Minister gave a lengthy reply, and made it obvious that the question had been a Dorothy Dixier, in view of the notice that I had given a week previously. He spoke about the bottle manufacturing industry having voluntarily increased the price from a ½ cent a bottle to 30 cents per dozen for those bottles. The Minister concluded:

I believe that a 10 cent deposit on all glass containers would cause significant dislocation in the industry, and I am personally yet to be convinced that such a measure is entirely necessary. I would suggest that industry is as aware of its responsibility as is the Government, and I am confident that we can work together to determine positive environmental and health benefits through the voluntary recycling of containers.

To a certain extent I have some sympathy with the Minister's reply. However, I am not yet convinced that the logic behind that statement can be sustained. When the container deposit legislation was being debated before this House it was stated on many occasions that there was a very high return on beer bottles. If we are to accept that, there should be little or no consequence on the bottle manufacturing industry, because the likelihood of any reduction in bottle manufacture, bearing in mind that the vast majority of them have been returned for refilling, would be totally inconsequential. To that extent there is a flaw in the argument being proposed.

It is far more accurate to suggest that there is not a very high return of beer bottles for refilling, and the very reason that the bottle manufacturers wish to continue their campaign for a minimum deposit is that it gives them a far higher through-put in the manufacture of their bottles. One of the bottle manufacturers came back soon after a statement was made by the Minister in an article to the paper and stated that its viability depended quite significantly on high export orders. I think that the industry is to be commended in every way possible for seeking export orders. However, to mount a campaign to prevent the introduction of an additional deposit on beer containers on the premise that there is a high return of beer bottles is totally false and misleading to the community. I cannot accept that; it is either one or the other.

If bottle manufacturers are getting a high turn-around of beer bottles for refilling, the likely impact on them will be totally insignificant if the deposit increases. However, if there is not that turnover, it is obviously a very lucrative component in the replacement manufacture by the bottle manufacturers. What I am saying is that, if the turnover is not there, the manufacturers have additional jobs to provide those bottles back into circulation. That is where the crux of the whole matter lies. Thus, somebody has not been telling the complete or the whole truth during that time.

Soon after the member for Rocky River asked his question in Parliament and the Minister responded (and I have suggested that was as a result of the Notice of Motion that I had given on the previous sitting day), the 'From the Back-bench' column by the member for Rocky River appeared in the *News* of 21 August 1980, just a little less than a fortnight after the matter was raised in Parliament, headed, 'Deposit rise should help bottle blitz'. Most of the comments made in the column I fully agree with. I would like to quote one extract from it, as follows:

It is estimated that the current return rate for cans is 85 per cent compared with soft drink bottles (20/10 cent deposit) 85 per cent, beer bottles 83 per cent and Echo beer bottles 55 per cent.

If the raising of the deposit to 10c will cause a 2 per cent difference in the return rate, we are being quite pedantic about the arguments being presented by the bottle manufacturers.

It is just not on—if 83 per cent of a commodity with a small deposit is returned and 85 per cent of an identical container with a deposit of 10 cents is returned, then why all the hassle? There should be no need for any hassle or opposition whatsoever over the arguments being put forward.

In its campaign, the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln sought support from its local government counterparts in a circular it sent to most of the councils throughout the State. I have copies of replies from 74 councils and corporations, in which only three councils did not totally support the 10 cent deposit container legislation. It can be seen that in 71 replies out of 74 there is strong support for the introduction of a 10c deposit bottle legislation proposal. I think it only fair that I should mention some of the replies from the local government bodies that the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln received. One was from the District Council of Murray Bridge, which is a town at the centre of the district of the Minister of Environment. In part, the letter said:

Council has previously supported the retention of deposits on those containers which currently have them and it supports the proposal put forward by your council for a 10c deposit on all glass beverage containers. It has done this as the items involve luxury items and it is considered that this figure is not excessive.

The District Council of Mannum supports the proposal and wrote to the Port Lincoln council accordingly, as did the

District Council of Mount Barker. Those district council areas are in the District of Murray, which is the district of the Minister of Environment. I believe I have copies of letters from corporations or district councils in the district of every Minister and, in fact, every member of this House which all support the 10c bottle deposit legislation.

I must say quite sincerely that any member who stands up and opposes the implementation of a 10c deposit legislation is flying in the face of his local government authorities. That is a serious accusation but I point to the fact that local governing authorities in all districts support the request for the 10c deposit legislation. I have examples of letters I would like to quote from corporations and councils in every district. I certainly have copies of letters from every country district, including that of the member for Rocky River whose comments in his press column do not agree completely with those of the local governing bodies in his district. I say that as a word of advice. Mr Acting Speaker, most of the district councils in your own district have responded to the call by the Corporation of the City of Port Lincoln, and they have called on the support of the Minister. I have no doubt that the local governing authorities will have sent copies of this correspondence to all members of Parliament.

I believe the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation tabled its minutes of evidence relating to the P.E.T. two-litre plastic containers. That report indicates that the P.E.T. containers are a potential hazard.

I had intended to write into the amendment of this legislation specific requirements that the P.E.T. bottle be incorporated in this measure. In the original drafting of my amendment, I found, it did not completely cover the intent of my proposal. To that end, the amendment that I have before the House is slightly different from the one I presented in October 1980. The reason is that the Beverage Container Act covers all beverage containers throughout the State and any specific category can only be excluded by a proclamation by the Governor or the Government. To that end, it meant that any legislation governing the Beverage Container Act was taken out of the hands of this House and was carried out by regulation and proclamation.

As a back-bencher, the only way I can influence that decision is by attempting to amend the original amendment so as to make specific mention of the category to which we specifically refer. As I have mentioned earlier, I intended to include the P.E.T. container (which means polyethylene terephthalate). As the Government has indicated that it intends to cancel the 12-month term, which has now expired, for a deposit-free trial and have the P.E.T. bottles come under the jurisdiction of the Beverage Container Act and therefore attract a 5c deposit, I have not specifically mentioned that container in this legislation.

I do, however, bring to the attention of members an article which appeared in the April-May 1981 edition of *Probe* which was entitled 'Why buy in plastic?' The article was prepared by the Conservation Council of South Australia. It gives a detailed outline of the introduction of P.E.T. bottles into South Australia and it makes the comment that South Australia is being used as a guinea pig for plastic drink bottles.

One other comment I would like to make about the P.E.T. bottle is that I see that particular form of container as probably being the greatest threat to the glass industry in this State, because it is a relatively simple process to have the bottle-blowing equipment at the head of a production line where the bottle is formed under heat with inert gases. It is, therefore, sterilised, filled, and comes out the other end of the production line. For a glass container, every bottling outlet has to have the appropriate sterilising plants, and so on, to go with it.

I see the introduction of plastics and containers like P.E.T. bottles as being the greatest single threat to a glass-manufacturing industry in this State. Since announcing my intention to introduce this measure in Parliament, I have received only one piece of lobbying, if I can call it that, against the measure. That came from Sir Norman Young. I believe a similar circular was sent to every other member of Parliament. I could go through that in detail and find a counter argument to every statement proposed.

I understand that there are about 34 000 000 beer bottles in circulation throughout the State, only 9 000 000 of which are not within direct control of the manufacturer or bottle-filling station. Some of the arguments can be countered quite readily. Regarding the 44 000 tonnes of sand, 15 000 tonnes of shell grit and 13 000 tonnes of soda ash, we can all find argument with that. Obviously, those comments are made on the basis that every bottle will be recalled from circulation, not reused or melted down, but a totally new supply of raw materials would need to be provided for those replacement bottles. An argument could be found to counter those comments.

I received some support, following notice I gave to introduce this Bill in Parliament. After receiving some local publicity, a local doctor contacted my wife saying he would like to give me a letter of support. I subsequently received a brief letter from someone who spontaneously responded to this call. That letter states:

We the undersigned doctors in Port Lincoln wish to record our support for legislation designed to discourage the abandoning and breaking of empty bottles. We have all seen many injuries, some severe, caused by glass fragments and it seems to us that a substantial payment for the return of bottles is urgently required.

The letter is signed by seven doctors. I cannot read all of those signatures.

Mr Mathwin: Would you like the advice of a pharmacist?

Mr BLACKER: A pharmacist may be able to help me. I present this Bill with a specific request for all members to consider the implications and wishes of their own local government authorities. I have cut short the considerable volumes of evidence that I have, but at the conclusion of the debate I intend to quote from those letters evaluating my comments in the interests of the litter problem in South Australia, the health hazards and safety of children who run on our beaches, and the safety of the citizens of the State. I seek support of members of the House for the Bill.

Clause 1 is formal; clause 2 provides that the measure may be brought into operation by proclamation. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which contains definitions of expressions used in the Act. The clause inserts a definition of 'beer container' as being any container made or produced for holding beer. The clause amends the definition of 'exempt container' so that beer containers may not be declared by regulation to be exempt containers and thereby be excluded from the operation of the Act. The clause also amends the definition of 'glass container' so that beer containers may not be declared by proclamation not to be glass containers and thereby be excluded from the operation of the Act in so far as it relates to glass containers.

Finally, the clause inserts a new definition of 'refund amount' under which a minimum refund amount of 10 cents is fixed for glass containers and a minimum of five cents for other containers. Under this new definition, a greater amount may be prescribed by regulation in relation to particular types of containers. These amendments would have the effect then of ensuring that beer containers made of glass would have a minimum refund amount of 10 cents, while beer cans or other beer containers not made of glass would have a minimum refund amount of five cents.

Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act which provides that a retailer of glass containers must accept the

return of such containers and pay the refund amount applicable to the containers. The clause amends this section so that it does not apply to beer containers that would otherwise be glass containers. Clause 5 substitutes a new definition of the containers to which Part IV of the principal Act applies. This Part provides for the establishment of collection depots at which non-glass containers may be returned for the refund amounts applicable to the containers. The result of the new definition proposed by the clause would be that the collection depot system would apply to beer containers whether made of glass, metal or any other substance. I call on members to add their support to this measure, and say that if members have travelled interstate and seen the effects that the beverage container legislation has had on South Australia's drink container litter problem, surely every members' support must be assured. I commend the Bill to the House.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKET GARDENING

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I move:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a Joint Committee be established as a matter of urgency to inquire into all aspects of the market gardening industry in South Australia with particular regard to:

- (a) wholesaling and retailing of produce, including the question of growers' markets; and
- (b) the need for technical assistance to the industry, including the proposal for a vegetable research institute.

Members will be aware that ever since I have entered this Parliament I have been concerned at the state of the market gardening industry in South Australia. My concern goes back some years prior to that, as I have been actively involved in my own area in trying to support the market gardeners' efforts to reorganise the industry and improve their prospects. I have been interested in this, of course, because my own electorate contains a significant number of market gardeners who supply produce to the metropolitan area in South Australia, and some produce for interstate and overseas trade.

I do not want to recapitulate at length all the comments I have made on this matter in the House since I have been here, because they are on written record. However, I would like to give an inventory of those comments so that members can quickly find the references and peruse them at their leisure.

Therefore, I quote the references. In *Hansard* of 19 February 1980, page 1016, I asked a question of the Minister. On 8 October 1980, in the Estimates Committee B, at page 359, I asked questions of the Minister again on the same matter. On 5 November, I moved a motion related to growers markets, asking that this House call on the Government to provide financial and planning assistance to enable the formation of growers markets for the retail sale of fruit and vegetables in various parts of the metropolitan area and in the larger regional centres of this State. That appears on page 1810, and that debate was continued on 19 November at page 2047. Also, on 19 November I moved another motion, that this House urge the Government to establish a State Government vegetable research facility in this State (page 2031 and following eight pages, *Hansard* of 19 November).

That is just to help members in their consideration of the matter I have brought before the House at this stage, so that they can understand the motivation behind calling on this House, in concurrence with the other House, to establish a joint committee to pursue these matters. The purpose

of establishing a joint committee is that I believe, in the light of the information we have had presented to this place and in the light of activities and events that have occurred outside the confines of this place, it is necessary that we guarantee that there be proper consideration by the Parliament of the issues raised, and that there be opportunity for consideration by the community of those issues.

I raised these matters previously by way of a private member's motion. Owing to the passage of the Parliamentary calendar and the way in which the diary worked, the Minister found himself unable to reply to the matters I had raised, although I understand that he wanted to, and consequently the debate lapsed. Now I am suggesting an alternative method, that we take the generalised debate out of this Chamber into the area of a committee, which can pursue the matter at greater length and at greater depth, giving everyone a chance to adequately put a point of view.

I draw the member's attention, first, to the present state of the industry which is, in my opinion, a state of crisis; indeed, the industry has been in a state of crisis for some years now, and that crisis will, in fact, get worse as the years go by if nothing is done to help the industry.

Secondly, we have had some degree of debate this year in the community at large on the question of growers markets. Members will know that in my own electorate a market gardener, upset at recent events, a local corporation having refused to establish a growers market, had chained himself to a chair inside the reception area of that local corporation and said he would stay there until something was done. Of course, he did not stay there until a growers market was established, because he was very quickly carried off. He finally served time in the Yatala Labour Prison for refusing to pay fines related to this whole affair. That certainly, in the public's eye, brought the whole question of a growers market to a head.

The public at large started to debate not only the right of market gardeners to market their produce through such means but also the possible benefits or disadvantages that may take place in the community. As a result of that, various people took various initiatives. I certainly was actively involved at the time with the market gardeners. I spoke at two public meetings organised by market gardeners, one in the Virginia and Two Wells area and one in the Salisbury area, stating my attitudes to this matter and the direction in which I felt it should go from here. The Minister of Agriculture himself also met market gardeners and had discussions with them on ways in which this whole issue had been pursued, and the Salisbury Council, the local corporation in my area, also considered the role it could possibly play in this area.

The result of all that was that a group of market gardeners formed themselves into an organisation known as the United Market Gardeners Organisation, with the distinct purpose of that body being the controlling authority in a growers market established on land owned by one of the levels of government. The proposal advanced further, and two sites of land were suggested, one being land presently controlled by the Department of Further Education within the city of Salisbury, and the other one land controlled by the State Transport Authority, again within the city of Salisbury. United Market Gardeners considered both these proposals and, on the basis of information available to them and on the basis of their subjective assessment of those two blocks of land, chose the State Transport Authority land, and accordingly had further negotiations with the local corporation, and put in an application for the proposal to establish a growers market to be approved.

At about the same time, a business man within the local area who ran an auction market also put in an application to the corporation for approval to organise a growers mar-

ket. Both those applications, for reasons set out by the corporation, were rejected. Consequently, I feel it is important that we now start to look at the wider issues. It is important that we now start to establish for ourselves whether or not growers markets have a place in the hierarchy of vegetable outlets in this State, whether or not growers have a right to sell their own produce direct to consumers (and likewise whether consumers have a right to purchase their produce direct from growers), whether or not it is true that growers markets will disadvantage other outlets including vegetable shops, and whether or not price control mechanisms or mechanisms to monitor prices established by the various vegetable outlets need to be considered.

That brings us well and truly within the forum of this Parliament and the various methods that it can bring about to effect consideration of the matters I have raised. I do not want to comment directly on the rejection of the application by the Corporation of the City of Salisbury, because I know that other corporations in the northern area are very interested in this matter. I believe it is even possible that in time to come the corporation of Salisbury may itself reconsider this whole matter. Therefore, it would be inappropriate for too many comments to be made at this time on the decision made regarding the two applications.

But I come back to the point that this is a very important issue for the State to be considering. There is perhaps in a direct sense to consumers of this State no other area of agriculture that has such close contact with consumers as the market gardening industry. Certainly, all sections of agriculture are vitally important, but in terms of what the average householder of this State is aware of, it must I suppose be the market garden sector that has the greatest significance. It represents a very important part of our economy. It provides incomes for many people. By and large, market gardens are much smaller than other farms in this State and, by consequence, have a greater degree of labour intensiveness.

I have said before that the industry is in a state of crisis. It is in a state of crisis partly because of its own failure to reorganise itself, partly because it has not been given the support it ought to have received, partly because it has become the victim of pricing mechanisms beyond its own control that have worked to its disadvantage, and partly because of events quite beyond anybody's control. Of course, I refer there to hailstorm damage that has occurred on a number of occasions throughout the 1970s.

If we do not agree to give it support, if we do not even agree that the matter is one worth debating, what we will ultimately see—and I fear it might not be that much in the long term, but very much sooner—is the loss of most of that industry to South Australia, as many market gardeners make the decision that it is not in their own interests to stay on in the industry; that they would be better off selling their land for other purposes, their land which admittedly has some considerable capital value and upon which in many instances they could make some capital profit. They may decide to take that capital profit and re-establish themselves in some other occupation.

Mr Lewis: In my electorate, in the Mallee, with that beautiful water there.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: They may even establish themselves out in the Mallee. By consequence, we would have lost possibly to market gardening large areas of land. The impact of that would be to import all market garden produce from other States, States that are taking a very aggressive stance in the production of such products.

I want to make quite clear, before coming to the matter of community attitudes on this whole area, that my proposal does not merely confine itself to the question of growers

markets and their desirability. It goes much further than that. I believe that the growers market strategy is but one option of a number that should be taken up. I am not even going to say that it is the most important one, but it is an important one.

What other options should be considered? Again, I have touched on these on other occasions in the House, but I wish to go through them briefly now so that honourable members can be reminded of them. I have called for a vegetable research institute. I believe that one of the reasons why the local market gardening industry has fallen behind, perhaps, to a certain extent, in its competitiveness with interstate producers is that it has not kept ahead technically of producers in other States.

A vegetable research institute would give it that capacity to advance. It would follow up not only improvements in the growing of market garden produce, but it would follow through such questions as the design of equipment, including buildings, namely, the glasshouses that are used. Again, to remind the House of the significance that that could have for us, I would draw the attention of honourable members to a facility that I had the good fortune to tour last year in the Netherlands, namely, the vegetable research institute half way between the Hague and Rotterdam, in the heart of what is known as glass city.

Mr Lewis: I know of none better.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It is quite a fantastic facility, as the member for Mallee points out. It has existed for a great many years, in fact for 80 years, which is only some 20 years less than market garden glasshousing has been a major industry in that country. It has pursued the matter of developing the plants, the crops, grown in glasshouses, as well as the matter of glasshouse design and other technical aspects related to the industry.

By consequence, it has kept the Dutch market gardening industry well in the forefront of European market gardening; so much so, that it can compete against other producers who appear to have natural advantages in their favour. Just one example that was shown to me—and there are many others—related to egg plants. About 13 years ago in the Netherlands egg plants were not grown in significant quantities. Largely, they were imported from France, where they grew in the open, in soil that did not need much extra support. They were then harvested quite easily and sold very cheaply.

In the Netherlands, by virtue of climatic conditions, it was necessary to grow the egg plants in glasshouses, and that was started 13 years ago on a commercial basis. Now, the egg plant is produced so competitively, of such good quality, and so cheaply that the Dutch can undercut the price charged by French producers of the same item. That is a testimony to the impact that a vegetable research institute can have, especially when it is based upon adequate consultation between the growers and the Government as to what exactly should be pursued.

Mr Lewis: Is there any subsidy on that?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The subsidy for the vegetable institute is paid by levies on growers. It is virtually financed by the industry. That is something we could well follow up. It is not a new concept for this State to have research facilities into certain areas of agriculture. We have quite a number of them, but we do not have an institute relating to market garden products. That is not to say that we have not had research projects in South Australia. My question to the Minister in the Estimates Committee was to ascertain the areas in which we have furthered research in market gardening, but they have not been significant enough, and there have not been enough of them, and we have not identified that as a major area of endeavour. I believe that

becomes the second of the strategies that should be considered.

The next strategy to be considered is a price reporting mechanism and the marketing mechanism adopted for produce in this State. I have suggested many times that I do not see the growers market supplanting the entire wholesale marketing mechanism for vegetables in this State that presently exists. That could not happen; even if it could, I do not believe it would be desirable. As I see it, the growers market would end up with about 15 per cent to 20 per cent of the distribution of production of vegetables. The remainder would still be handled through the other avenues presently being used, namely, the East End Market and private sale arrangements between growers, and, for example, supermarkets.

I see that the existence of growers markets will help act as a control mechanism on the East End marketing system, for example, and the private arrangements that exist between growers and supermarkets.

Mr Lewis: It would put a floor in the price.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is correct. I have to draw the example of the Dutch as being the developers of mechanisms well worth our consideration. They have an auction-type system in their big central auction for vegetable market produce, and many other types of produce, that minimises the fluctuation in price day by day or week by week. It controls the fluctuation so that there is some degree of price stability. It also controls the supply of produce available by means of a mechanism that has worked very reasonably for a considerable number of years. That price mechanism means that market analysis is done on the estimated demand that may exist, and it has been possible to perfect the estimated demand for market garden produce. It has been possible to calculate what type of demand might exist in the days ahead, and thereby assess how much produce should be delivered. The supply over and above that amount of assessed demand is not permitted to be sold, and is subsidised by a levy on the produce that has come in at a rate less than the cost of production.

That is an interesting feature. First, it does give some financial return to growers who may, by the fate of fortune, have that much produce available on that day, and so they get some return on it, but it is a disincentive to deliberately overproduce in order to take advantage of subsidies, because the subsidy is set at less than the cost of producing the material. Honourable members will know that, over the years, there has been in many countries an abuse of subsidy systems in relation to agricultural produce because the subsidies have provided a profit to the grower of the produce; therefore, it has been an incentive to grow more than the market really wants.

That brings me to the fourth strategy or option that should be considered, namely, the question of market analysis. I think we need much more positive scientific analysis of the likely supply and demand for market garden produce in this State.

It is a significant area, because all of us consume market garden produce every day of our lives. So, in South Australia there are well over 1 000 000 people consuming a fair quantity of such produce, thereby creating a fair demand. One example that I would hope a joint committee would look at is the model established recently by the market gardeners and members of the municipality of Rome, where they have developed over some years the capacity to predict reasonably accurately estimated supply and demand for market garden produce, again with the distinct aim of increasing the level of knowledge in the industry so that people know exactly, within reason, what their prospects are if they pursue a certain line of production, and likewise so that bulk consumers, for example, have some idea of the

estimated supplies over a season. Taking those four strategies in total, we then have something that could result in the industry being advanced to its benefit, to the benefit of consumers and, by consequence, to the benefit of the State at large. The situation involves those four areas, and that is why my motion goes much further than growers markets, and even goes further than the vegetable research institute, introducing the concept of inquiring into all aspects of the market garden industry.

I mentioned before that it is important that the community have the capacity to put its ideas on this matter. Certainly, on this subject I have had very close contact with the opinions of market gardeners and many consumers. While those two groups by and large have tended to favour, for example, the growers market, a section of the community has opposed that one particular strategy. That section has included not only, but predominantly, other retailers of fruit and vegetable produce and of course wholesalers of fruit and vegetable produce.

I have received a number of letters from them on this matter. Indeed, they have been very strong letters, challenging first of all my support for the growers market and, secondly, the value that a growers market may have to the industry at large. I think the criticisms, the attitudes and the opinions they have raised deserve consideration by a joint committee, because it is certainly true that the people concerned have opinions on this matter that are very important and worthy of attention. That is not to say that I believe they are a correct analysis of the situation, or indeed if they are a correct analysis that they are not insurmountable. I merely say that they are important and worthy of attention. Having worked on a joint committee myself from past experience, I know that it can entertain such ideas presented to it and give them serious consideration. If members are wondering about the types of criticisms or comments that have been made by people, I shall give some examples. One fruit and vegetable retailer, by no manner of means the only one, wrote me a letter strongly criticising the concept of a growers market. One of his prime criticisms was that a growers market would be beyond regulations that apply to fruit and vegetable retailers. I wrote straight back to him saying that I did not believe that to be the case. On that occasion I said:

I certainly believe that any growers markets that are established must be controlled by the relevant regulations.

On another occasion I said:

Any such market should operate within the confines of regulations and legislation and any offence should be proceeded with as they would against any other persons selling such produce.

That is to say, a person selling from a growers market should not have any fairer attention or consideration than any other retailer of such produce would have. We would expect that a retailer of fruit and vegetable produce would adhere to hygiene standards, to conditions of the Health Act, to local council regulations, to weights and measures legislation and also to fair trading practices. It should not be the case that those selling at a growers market should be any more exempt from those regulations than those selling from any other outlet. I still believe that growers markets will work and be successful, that they can operate successfully on a basis of fair competition and not unfair competition. That viewpoint needs to be thrashed out, and a joint committee needs to consider whether or not the application of those regulations is a necessity, and how they could apply to marketing situations that are somewhat different from the traditional shop-type format of other retailers.

The other question that I think needs to be considered by a joint committee is the question of employees in the industry. One of the retailers put to me the proposition that

a growers market would be endangering the jobs of those employed in fruit and vegetable shops. I do not think an economic analysis of the industry would bear that out. I will point out in a few moments why I do not believe that will happen. Nevertheless, I think this question needs to be considered and taken further than the proposition that was put to me. I would also put the proposition of those employed in the growing of produce. In this State we have taken advantage of the extensive use of non-paid family labour in market gardening. That has just been the way of things, and it has not always been too fair on those involved. As a former teacher of many students who grew up on market gardens, who would come to school too tired to work, because they had been up since 4 o'clock changing the watering system, picking produce or going to the market, and who then came to school for a bit of a rest before going home at night to carry on with the harvesting, I know that the extensive reliance on that practice may not necessarily be the best thing for the industry. We should take the question of employment, the structure and type of employment within the industry beyond just the retail stage and also include the growing stage.

Another matter that was put to me was the question of when such markets would be allowed to operate, and there are diverse opinions on this. Some would suggest (predominantly growers) that the growers market should be able to operate at any time it so chooses. There are others who suggest that its operation should be strictly limited to certain times, in the early morning or on weekends, and that question needs to be considered by any joint committee. I am a supporter of some limitation on times of operation because I believe that that would help growers markets fit more easily into the hierarchy of outlets and be accepted more by others if they could be reasonably certain that growers markets would not operate overlapping the entire times of their trading.

That brings me to the question of the hierarchy of outlets which needs to be studied. I have made the contention that a growers market would fit acceptably and successfully into such a hierarchy, but of course, that is just a contention. I know it is something that has been supported by the study into the East End Market undertaken by the Department of Agriculture in 1978. Nevertheless, I believe more consideration is needed, including consideration of opinions from all those involved in the industry and community. By 'hierarchy of outlets' I refer to all possible avenues available to the consumer for the purchase of produce. At present consumers of fruit and vegetable products can go to their local fruit store, local supermarket, the Central Market, or even to the East End Market if they are prepared to buy in bulk. Then there are roadside stalls, which are a type of diverse or dispersed growers market, I suppose. Also there is the North Arm Market, which initially set out to be a type of growers market but is much less than that now.

Mr Lewis: They are horse traders there.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, that may well be a correct comment. We need to analyse how the industry can survive with such a hierarchy of outlets. There is not just one option presently available. People do not only have fruit shops or supermarkets: they already have a number of other types of outlet. My consideration in the past of adding another, namely, the growers' market, would not have the devastating effect that has been suggested. It is a point that needs further attention. This therefore gives us the reasons, in my opinion, why full opportunity for the community at large is needed. I have established that, if we do not do something designed to improve the industry and its commitment and participation in the economy of South Australia, that industry will further decline and we as a State will lose important segments of it as they go interstate.

There is a positive side to that coin. The positive side is that we can more aggressively take part in interstate markets and overseas markets if our own industry is in a healthier state. There are options available overseas for market garden produce. One of the options presently being pursued (and I believe it is not the wisest one) is trying to develop markets in the Middle East. I know from the work of the Food and Agriculture Organisation that that body is stimulating the development of market gardens in those countries. Our own growers would be making a mistake to believe there is any long-term future in that. There is only at best, to my mind, a short-term future. There are other avenues overseas that represent long-term marketing possibilities. They are possibilities that will be able to be taken up only if the industry is itself healthy, so the state of the industry becomes important.

The variety and diversity of opinions that have been expressed on the whole question this year, for example, since the notorious cucumber criminal, Con Argarov, was chained to the chair in the council chambers, needs to be pursued and argued, and some resolution reached. It needs to be pursued beyond the level of just local government. I am not criticising local government in this matter; it has a vital part to play. We are dealing with a broader issue than just one that pertains to a planning issue in one locality. We are dealing with economic problems that relate to the State at large, hence the relevance to this House. I hope that members will concur with my proposal in this regard. I hope it is debated fully here and that the Government takes up this issue and does appoint a joint committee to pursue an inquiry into all aspects of the market gardening industry in South Australia.

Mr GLAZBROOK secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 23 September. Page 1129.)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I resume my remarks in relation to this measure and thank the House for giving me this opportunity. Since the last occasion on which I spoke I have had time to turn up some information relating to the proportion of personal total expenditure spent on gambling in Australia in recent times. I refer to a small booklet called *Facts* published by the Institute of Public Affairs in October-November 1978 where, on page 6, we read that the proportion of total personal expenditure on food in this country was 17 per cent; on travel and communication, 15 per cent; on rent, 15 per cent; on alcohol and cigarettes, 9 per cent; on household goods, 9 per cent; on clothing, 8 per cent; and on gambling, 18 per cent. Gambling caps the lot.

Mr Peterson: What does that indicate?

Mr LEWIS: That indicates that people are already willing and prepared to spend an average of 18 per cent of their personal income on gambling. Any facility, such as a casino, which would further increase personal expenditure on gambling would be the most detrimental thing we could provide to increase the demand for higher wages. A casino could not be anything other than inflationary. People who support this measure and argue that there would be no increase in the percentage of personal income spent on gambling are really advocating that the amount of money spent on gambling in other areas like racing, dogs, or whatever, would be reduced. Therefore, the infrastructure and jobs in those other areas would be reduced. We cannot have it both ways: either we are going to have an increase

in the amount of money out of personal income spent already on gambling or we are going to reduce the amount spent on other forms of gambling.

I remind members that, in addition to that, there are a number of things which I have referred to previously and which I will recapitulate. In my opinion, gambling is bad. It depletes household money in ways I have already described. It puts pressure on people and increases the demand for more wages. It puts stress on marriages and families, because it reduces the amount of money left for other things. Casinos are particularly bad. With the races or bingo, there are only a few occasions on which one has an impulse to bet: once the card is finished, it has gone. In casinos, the number of opportunities to bet is much greater and the period of time over which bets can be laid is much larger. The impulse, therefore, quickly becomes a strong reflex action. Chips are used instead of real money. At races, bookmakers will not accept chips. By using chips people feel insensitive to the fact that actual money is slipping through their fingers as they lay their bets. Money that should have been used for their family's benefit has suddenly gone. Odds are stacked against the gambler. They have to be, or the casino proprietor goes broke.

In a casino, people are ripped off. They are tempted, and often succumb to playing. We should all know this, and should know that we are thereby creating more welfare problems, not solving them. The argument that a casino creates employment is evil; it does so quite immorally. One could equally argue that drug-pushing, drug production, and drug trafficking create jobs. The logic is the same. The consequences are equally immoral and disastrous.

Casinos provide an opportunity to launder dirty money.

Mr Peterson: So does the T.A.B.

Mr LEWIS: I did not say it did not. I am telling you that it is easier in casinos because of the volume of cash turned over. It gives organised crime an easy means of laundering money. It gives illegal, ill-gotten gains from the various activities of evil, nefarious kinds, such as drug-trafficking, protection racket premiums, and brothels, the chance to be laundered. Organised crime is bad and undesirable. We should discourage it. Because casinos will make it easier for organised criminals to operate, by making it easier for them to launder their money, they are bad, in my opinion. However small or large that help, it is still a help to organised criminals without any real benefit to the community.

More welfare costs will result than can be financed by the gambling tax revenue obtained. If we are bold enough and irresponsible enough to judge the misery we are creating in the lives of others, in terms of dollars, by saying that the tax we get from gambling will more than meet the cost of welfare demands that will result, this concept is abhorrent to me.

I say that casinos would use up workers' time, and I made this point previously also. I recapitulate it in different terms for members to more clearly understand its impact. If we use up workers' time, if we use up tradesmen's time and skills, and if we provide money for the materials that will have to be used to build a casino, I believe we are being less than moral in our attitude for the provision of welfare housing. That material, that time and that skill would be better used and put to a better purpose if it were used to build houses in which people who are desperately short of such facilities at the present time could live.

The kind of bleating that we hear from members in this House who now, I imagine from remarks I have heard in the lobbies, will stand and support this measure shows the hypocrisy of their position when they are speaking about the need for welfare housing on the one hand and, on the other, advocating the construction of a casino which would

completely eliminate the possibility of building another 300 such houses at least in this State.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): While I appreciate the sentiments contained in this Bill, I have expressed previously my view that, before a Bill of this nature for the establishment of a casino in South Australia is passed, an expression of opinion by the public on the matter by way of a Select Committee is essential.

I certainly do not support those parts of this Bill that would make this Parliament (that is, the Speaker and six other members of this Parliament) the licensing authority with respect to the measure. I do not believe it should be the prerogative of this Parliament or a committee of this Parliament to determine such matters. I see some particular dangers arising from the Bill. Clause 5 provides:

The functions of the committee are as follows:

- (a) to call for and consider applications for a licence to establish and operate a casino in this State;
 - (b) to recommend to which (if any) of the applicants the licence should be granted;
- and
- (c) to recommend the terms and conditions upon which the licence should be granted.

I listened with interest and, indeed, some amazement to the comments made by the member for Mallee. I certainly respect his views on gambling, but I believe that his contribution was mainly a lecture on the evils of gambling. I believe that he used the argument of one of his colleagues to bolster his argument and I refer to comments made by the Minister of Tourism. I think it is only her opinion that a convention centre would be better for this State than would a casino. The member for Mallee went to some lengths to quote the Minister's remarks as a supposed expert on the matter, no doubt to bolster his own argument, because the Minister's views coincide almost entirely with the views expressed by him. They are both opposed to a casino; they are both opposed to gambling. For the information of the House and the member for Mallee, in particular, I would like to quote from the report of the United Kingdom Royal Commission into Betting and Gaming, which stated:

On the moral issues involved with casinos, the comments of the United Kingdom Royal Commission which inquired into gambling would appear relevant.

'We find no support for the belief that gambling, providing it is kept within reasonable bounds, harms either the character of those who take part, no matter what their economic status, or their family circle or the community generally. . . it is the concern of the State to see that gambling, like other indulgencies such as liquor, be kept within reasonable bounds. But this does not imply that there is anything inherently wrong with it.'

The report also stated:

'We are led by all the evidence we have heard to the conclusion that gambling, as a factor in the economic life of the country or as a cause of crime, is of little significance and that its effects on social behaviour, in so far as these are a suitable object for legislation, are in the great majority of cases less important than has been suggested to us by some witnesses. We therefore consider that the object of gambling legislation should be to interfere as little as possible with individual liberty to take part in the various forms of gambling but to impose such restrictions as are desirable and practicable to discourage or prevent excess.'

For the information of the member for Mallee and the House, I point out that the Royal Commission indicates that there is nothing inherently wrong with gambling. Of course, various Governments throughout Australia, including South Australia, acquire, support and condone a variety of gambling activities for a number of reasons, the main one being the revenue it brings to the State.

Earlier this year this Government introduced into South Australia another form of gambling, Soccer Pools, and the member for Mallee and the Minister of Tourism supported that legislation. If they did not support it, they did not

make any comment against it at that time. They did not vote against it and I would take it from that that they supported the legislation even though it might have been a tacit acceptance of it.

Mr Peterson: Maybe their Caucus told them what to do.

Mr SLATER: That may be the case, but the member for Mallee has made a public condemnation of gambling. He used the word 'hypocritical', and whether it may apply in that sense it is up to him to determine. Nevertheless, he did support the introduction of Soccer Pools when his Government introduced that legislation earlier this year. It suited the Government's purpose, no doubt, politically for Soccer Pools to operate in this State.

Even though they and other members of the Liberal Party supposedly oppose gambling, they are prepared to subjugate those principles for political expediency if it suits them, as I suggest was done in regard to Soccer Pools. Governments gain considerable revenue from the various forms of gambling undertaken in Australia. I have not the figures with me, but they are substantial.

In comparison with New South Wales and some other States, South Australia has not rated high revenue. We have never been regarded as a gambling State. No doubt, gambling has increased because of the increased opportunity to participate in modern devices and forms of gambling. We have introduced soccer pools, and, in the past 15 to 20 years, lotteries, and so on. People have more opportunity to spend their money in these areas, but individuals have a choice. No-one is compelled to go to the races, the trots or the dogs; no-one is compelled to participate in soccer pools, or lotteries, and no-one will be compelled to go to a casino, if we ever have one here.

I quote figures on returns to the Tasmanian Government from the Wrest Point Casino. Casino tax is based on 30 per cent of gross profit for the first three years of operation, and 25 per cent thereafter. Also, a licence fee applies, which will be shown in the figures I quote. The casino opened in February 1973, and from then until June 1973 the Tasmanian Government received \$683 000 in revenue. In 1973-1974 the Government received \$1 650 000; in 1974-1975 it received \$1 856 000; in 1975-76 it received \$1 655 000; in 1976-77 it received \$2 020 000; in 1977-78 it received \$2 084 000; in 1978-79 it received \$2 610 000; and in 1979-80 it received \$2 836 000.

Of course, I do not have the figures for 1981, but the total revenue for seven years to the Tasmanian Government from the Wrest Point Casino operation was \$15 394 000, a not insignificant amount for that Government. I believe that there is good and bad in a casino. I give these figures to show that revenue goes to the Government from casinos and other forms of gambling. Another spin-off for Tasmania is the tourist boom. I quote from an article in the *Tasmanian Examiner*, as follows:

The Wrest Point hotel-casino is officially recognised as giving the Tasmanian tourist industry its greatest single boost.

In the year of its opening, Tasmanian tourist figures jumped by 22.03 per cent.

Figures in succeeding years have been: 74-75, 4.1 per cent; 75-76, 0.33 per cent; 76-77, a slight decline; 77-78, 10 per cent.

Nevertheless, there has been a significant increase in tourism from the Wrest Point Casino. The spin-off in other ways has also been significant. I refer to taxis, restaurants, coach tour operators, souvenir sales and all the other things that go with tourism. The revenue increase has boosted that State's economy considerably. I do not have employment statistics but one could be sure that direct and indirect employment through the casino would be significant, giving additional employment opportunities. Those are the advantages.

Certainly, there are some social disadvantages that may or may not occur. Members may remember that during a

debate in 1973 on this matter I voted against the establishment of a casino here for two reasons, which are recorded in *Hansard*. I did not believe that a casino 80 kilometres outside Adelaide would be viable, and I had doubts about its social disadvantages. I have mellowed a little in that view because of the Wrest Point experience. Also, I have visited the Alice Springs Casino recently. Some of my fears expressed by me and others at the time have not come to fruition. Nevertheless, I still respect that point of view.

That is one of the reasons why I do not directly support this Bill. I could say that I was sitting on the fence, as was said about me regarding other private members' business that was similar. I may be, but I still believe that we should have a more thorough investigation into the establishment of a casino in South Australia before supporting such a Bill.

I respect the sentiments in the legislation, and believe that the member who has introduced it was motivated by a genuine desire for a casino, particularly for its benefit to the tourist industry. I have said this Parliament should not be the licensing authority. That can be better handled outside. The most appropriate body to consider this matter and report back here is undoubtedly the Industries Development Committee, which considers references regarding industry, tourist activities and similar matters. However, I have reservations about that being the most appropriate authority to consider a licence application and other aspects.

In conclusion, I say I received a number of letters in 1973, expressing strong opposition to a casino's establishment in this State. A South Australian No Casino Committee was formed, which submitted a proposal. Various religious bodies sent letters, and a multitude of letters opposing a casino was received from individuals. A petition was sent to all members by the South Australian No Casino Committee. I would like to give those people the opportunity to make formal submissions to a Select Committee of this House and give evidence about whether a casino is good or bad, rather than their writing letters. This evidence could be considered and a decision could be taken by the committee based, on all submissions made.

So, I do respect their point of view. I have made the point that I believe personally that a casino certainly has practical advantages and that we ought to investigate, if anything, whether any social disadvantages would be involved in a casino operation. I regret that I do not support the Bill in its present form.

I am gradually coming around to the belief, from all of the investigations that I made personally and all of the reports conveyed to me, that eventually (I hope it is not too long) a casino will be built in South Australia. If we wait too long the advantages will not be as great as they would be if it occurs in the next two or three years. There is no doubt there are practical advantages, and that it would boost tourism.

At present, we have the highest rate of unemployment of any State of Australia, despite the arguments put forward by the Government, and this would be a very significant opportunity for people not only to be employed but to gain specialised knowledge of the hospitality industry. One thing that was noticeable to me when I visited Alice Springs was that the Federal Pacific Hotels people there are employing all local labour. I am talking of staff generally; not everybody, but most people involved are residents of Alice Springs. To this stage it has created between 250 and 300 jobs for the residents of Alice Springs, not insignificant in a town of that size.

In addition, the opportunity is given for people to gain what I might describe as sophisticated experience in the hospitality industry. I am afraid to say that to some degree that is lacking in South Australia. I am pleased that the

member for Brighton is nodding his head in agreement, because the important thing in the hospitality and tourist industry is goodwill. As I have said, it starts with all the staff, from the bottom up. The first impression of a traveller or a tourist is gained from the first meeting with whoever the person might be. If you feel welcome it creates an atmosphere that you are pleased with the situation, and you are likely to return.

So a casino would give us in South Australia this opportunity to develop some expertise in the hospitality industry. I am not suggesting that that opportunity is completely nonexistent in South Australia; in some cases it exists, but there is plenty of scope for it to be improved, and I believe that this may be a way in which that can occur. Finally, however, I am afraid that I do not support the Bill, for the reasons I have expressed.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I wish to indicate briefly that I will not be supporting this measure. I shall not take much time—no more than two or three minutes—from honourable members, but I want to explain why. First, my lack of support is not for the reasons expressed by the member for Mallee. That is to say, I do not believe that gambling in itself is an evil although, of course, I quite accept that, as with all human activities, in certain circumstances it can become an evil. I would like the House to note that when my Government some years ago introduced a Government measure of this kind I did in fact oppose the Bill and crossed the floor on that occasion with a number of others, and this led to the measure's defeat.

On that occasion I was activated, I suppose, by two main thoughts. First, I was against the idea of private enterprise being involved in the running of the casino to the exclusion of the Lotteries Commission or other public authorities which I thought could do it just as well. Secondly, I was not happy with the track record of Federal Hotels, and I am still not happy with the track record of Federal Hotels. Those who are interested can check *Hansard* and find the exhaustive investigation that I, with the assistance of accountants, carried out into the affairs of that company.

However, I want to acknowledge the very careful and sincere preparation of this measure by the member for Semaphore and the excellent second reading explanation that he gave. I also acknowledge that he has taken into account one of the points that I raised, that in some way a public authority, divorced from the private entrepreneurial groups, should be involved in this. Like my colleague from Gilles, I would have to point out that looking at a Parliamentary panel or committee to oversee the activities of the casino could conceivably lead to worse dangers in the sense of the finger's being pointed at various members of Parliament, and its being suggested that it was a plum of office, or that they were benefiting from their involvement.

However, I acknowledge the work that the member for Semaphore has done on this, and I acknowledge, too, the excellent speeches that he and my colleague from Gilles gave in their respective contributions. I indicate as well that I have, in the interim period, taken the opportunity, although I have not travelled there for this specific purpose of, first, investigating the casino at Wrest Point, and, secondly, investigating the casino at Darwin. In terms of the running of the enterprise I was impressed. I thought it was well run, and that little exception could be taken to it. I think, like my colleague the member for Gilles, that I am gradually being edged around towards the concept of a casino being a viable proposition in South Australia, and playing a role in the economy of the State.

I want to end on two matters only. First, I would like to say to the member for Semaphore, in view of the challenge

that he gave, that I do not see that the reference of such a measure to a Select Committee is in fact to avoid one's duty. I think that on occasions, and especially in the case of delicate matters of this kind which are, especially in South Australia, the subject of a great deal of public debate, it can be an opportunity of getting informed and reasonable discussion. It is quite remarkable, and I think all members of this House who have served on Select Committees will have noticed this, how Party differences can sink beneath the need for getting realistic and sensible guidance, working together as a team. I think it would have that benefit.

I want to make one final point in relation not only to this measure but also to a number of other measures, including my own, which are before the House at the moment. I think it would be a disgraceful situation if we had a repeat of last year's performance in which hardly any single measure got detailed and relevant consideration right through to the end. I can no longer see the significance of private members' day if we are to have repeat of the performance of last year and the year before that. I do not want to differentiate between political Parties. Whether it is the A.L.P., the Liberal Party, or whatever Party is in office, unless some of these measures (not all of them, because that is impossible) are to get detailed and proper consideration, in the same way as Government business does, I see no purpose any longer in private members' day. We might as well scrub it off the book as so many useless words.

Dr Billard interjecting:

Mr McRAE: I think the member for Newland has missed my point. It may well be that last week there was some confusion. That has always been the case on private members' day, I can assure him, and today is a great improvement on the norm. Even if we could get one-third to one-half of the measures through all stages and have votes on them, that would be a significant achievement, a significant plus. It seems to me that the only way in which we can do this is, as back-bench members, to sit down and work it out between the lot of us. We cannot all get our way, but we could try to work out between us that at least some of the measures will be taken through all stages to a vote.

Having made those points, and acknowledging that I have in no way covered the field, nor have I tried to, because I have been conscious that the longer I speak the more I put in doubt what I am asking for, I regret that in the circumstances I am unable to support the measure put forward by the member for Semaphore.

Mr MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CASINO

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Slater:

That, pursuant to Joint Standing Order No. 1, a Joint Select Committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the implications of the establishment of a casino in South Australia and what effect and potential a casino may have on the tourist industry in this State.

(Continued from 23 September. Page 1129.)

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I am very pleased that the member for Playford, in another debate, expressed his view on the importance of certain matters dealing with private members' time and the need for those matters to be debated and voted on. Too often in my time as a member of Parliament, matters of great social interest have lapsed on the Notice Paper, and I intend in relation to this motion of the member for Gilles that that should not happen. Last

week, when I sought leave to continue my remarks, I threatened that I would give the House a learned dissertation on the values or otherwise of gambling and casinos. Since then, I have considered the merits of the issue, and I am prepared to concede that the argument for the establishment of a casino in South Australia has been very aptly and ably put by the mover.

In another debate, we have heard the classic argument against the establishment of a casino in South Australia. No matter what I could say, I could add not one whit to the argument either of or against. I shall content myself today, in the five minutes that I intend to address to this topic, with passing one or two comments about the establishment or otherwise of a casino in South Australia. My own personal view is a very easy one. I have never been too fussed about having a casino in South Australia, and I have never been too concerned about not having one.

If we were not to have a casino in South Australia, I do not believe that, personally, I would feel any loss at all. I am not a devotee of gambling, although there are any number of gambling opportunities available to people in South Australia. Whilst a casino is another avenue for gambling, I do not believe one would encourage any more dollars from the pockets of South Australians than are already taken from those pockets. If we do have a casino, personally I will not be visiting it very often. However, there is one thing about casinos that concerns me. If we are to have a casino in South Australia, it is important that somebody make the correct decision as to where that casino ought to be established or, in fact, whether we are to have only one casino or more than one. As a member who represents two significant country centres, I know that there could be a good argument that a casino, or a gambling facility of the nature of a casino, is equally entitled to be established in the northern part of South Australia as it is in the Adelaide metropolitan area, or as it is in the South-East. They are serious questions to which this Parliament ought to address itself.

There are many other serious questions to which the Parliament ought to address itself, and the best way that the Parliament can do that, as I have already pointed out, is by establishing a Select Committee so that South Australians as a whole, and organisations as a whole, can give evidence to that Select Committee and so that the full weight of opinion, both for and against, can be expressed to that Select Committee and the report brought down to this Parliament.

I was a member of the prostitution Select Committee. The members of that committee came to it with differing views about prostitution and what ought to be done about that very contentious issue. However, each of those members agreed, with absolutely no argument at all, after many months of consideration, to the report that was brought down to this House. Unfortunately, the House saw fit not to accept that report. I am absolutely certain that, if a Select Committee was established to investigate all the issues surrounding the establishment of a casino, the evidence would be such that, as a result of extensive investigations, those members would bring down a unanimous decision to this House as to what ought to be done.

I think that this House ought to be content with that machinery. It is well accepted machinery in matters of this kind, so I strongly support the motion moved by my colleague, the member for Gilles, that there be a Select Committee established in South Australia to bring down a report to Parliament on the need or otherwise to establish a casino, and on all those issues surrounding such an establishment. In my view, if that was the only view I was required to express in this House, and that was the only view that required me to vote in this House, I would vote for a casino

because I do not have any strong objection to one. In addition, I have to vote for all those people in the District of Stuart and they are entitled to have a full report brought down to this House that I, as their member, can examine and vote on in accordance with that information. I hope that the House sees fit to support the motion that has been moved.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I move:

That the words 'pursuant to Standing Order No. 1 a Joint Select Committee' be deleted from the motion and the words 'A Select Committee of this House' be inserted in lieu thereof.

I support the action taken by my colleague, the member for Gilles, and I therefore support his motion with the amendment I have moved. The situation, I understand, is that in the Council last week a proposal for a Joint Select Committee under Joint Standing Order No. 1 was rejected. In view of that, the motion as it now stands, in procedural terms, would be of no value. The only difference my amendment will make is that it will prevent an aborted motion. If the House saw fit, we could get a Select Committee of this House under way in the near future.

I would again, as I did when speaking to the motion moved by the member for Semaphore, call upon all private members to grasp the nettle on this matter one way or the other. If they are against any form of a casino in any circumstances, then let us get that message by way of a vote. If they are of the view that a Select Committee may provide evidence on which they could make up their minds, or change their minds, then let them say that. It is an affront to the public in this State to have this debate going on via the newspapers, as it has been for some months, and to have this House continually adjourning the matter from day to day, hardly making any progress. It is an affront to the member for Semaphore and the member for Gilles, both of whom have worked hard on this matter. Most of all, it is an affront to the public of South Australia.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I am trying to interpret what the member for Playford is attempting to achieve by his amendment. It is a significant amendment when we consider that it is taking the original proposal away from a joint Select Committee and proposing a Select Committee of this House. I have always believed that legislation in this House, or in the other House, should be considered through the committee system. Having listened to the remarks of the members for Playford and Stuart that private members' time deserves better consideration, I am wondering whether, if we refer this matter to a Select Committee, we would achieve anything, whether we would achieve a long, unwieldy inquiry like the one into prostitution, and whether it would have any merit or not. I believe that the majority of members know how they are going to vote in relation to a casino. I think the majority of members are sufficiently mature to make a decision, and from what I understand most have had the opportunity to visit a casino in Tasmania or Alice Springs.

Whilst visiting Hobart some years ago on another matter, I spent two hours at the casino. Frankly, I was not impressed. It happened to be Hobart Cup night and that apparently did not add to the atmosphere. I do not think I have seen so many people staggering around half drunk anywhere else—not that that worries me. I was horrified at what they had done to the good old traditional Australian game of Two-up. They have absolutely ruined Two-up, as I and every other Australian know it. I would rather see Two-up legalised and have it run properly out in the bush, as we know it has been played for years, than have it in a building such as this one or in a room somewhere. It did nothing to me at all.

The situation was, of course, that it was late at night. It was about half past twelve. A person there who was trying to toss the penny could hardly hold the thing and I do not know how many times he tried. I probably went on a bad night, as it was extremely crowded.

Mr Slater: Have you seen a drunk at the races?

Mr BECKER: I did not go to the races. We arrived late that evening from Sydney and we decided to go and have a look at the casino. We perhaps picked the worst night, which was probably unfair to the people involved. That was my first experience in a casino. I had plenty of opportunities overseas recently to look at them, but I did not bother.

I cannot accept the statement and the theory that we need a casino in South Australia to boost tourism. Frankly, I think we have missed the bus. Tasmania was the first State to recognise the need for a casino and certainly it has established a most impressive hotel and has done very well out of it. I have not had a chance to go to Alice Springs (I have not been there for 15 or 20 years), although I have no doubt that the casino there will be successful.

At this stage I cannot justify the building of a casino in South Australia. I know that illegal casinos are operating in Sydney, although I have never been to them, and I am surprised that the New South Wales Government has not decided to legalise them, as there is a large number, and why not legalise them? New South Wales is in the position of already having them, so they could make the best of them. In South Australia we do not have anything that I know of as such. We have the odd illegal card games operating in some of our clubs, and perhaps we should look at that matter.

I am a realist in these matters. I know that I would not be popular for saying that we should act on these matters, but I think that if people want to think about various gambling forms, then perhaps we should look at the whole range. I am not averse to poker machines if they are strictly controlled. I think the Australian population is mature enough now to accept poker machines in a limited way and under controls.

No matter where one goes in certain parts of Europe, particularly in Germany, one sees those electronic poker machines, where one can put in only 30 pfennigs at a time, and the jackpots are only around about 10 marks—not very much. There were always two or three of these in every bar, restaurant, coffee house, and so on. There was never a queue and never any problem for anyone who wanted to put in 30 pfennigs. I did not see any adverse effects of such a thing as far as Germany was concerned. Perhaps that is something we should look at. The fact that they had those machines in Germany was not the reason why I went there. In fact, I did not enjoy my visit to Germany at all; I had great difficulty in communicating with the Germans. I am very mindful of the amount of money that has been spent in both Houses during the past 12 months on Select Committees, which I believe is in the vicinity of \$60 000. In the present economic situation I cannot justify—

Mr Slater: It's a weak argument.

Mr BECKER: No. If we are considering a Select Committee on a casino, it should be done properly. An amendment has been moved to make it a Select Committee of the House of Assembly as opposed to a joint Select Committee. We are facing a cost of \$13 000 to \$15 000. The member for Gilles said that I am putting up a weak argument, but he also wanted a joint House Select Committee.

We would have to be looking at about \$13 000 to \$15 000. I have never been on any of these large Select Committees that have been held in the past. I have never been fortunate enough to be selected. I have looked at the track record of several Select Committees recently, and I

am starting to wonder whether this is just a thumping great perk.

Mr Keneally: You're on this one, Heini.

Mr BECKER: If the motion is carried and I am put on it, I am prepared to do it for nothing. I am not prepared to be paid. I do not think that Select Committees should be paid, anyway.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: The member for Mitcham always complains about the perks and lurks that go on. However, he gets on all the large Select Committees and gives the committees about as much time as he gives the House. He is not here again. I was on the mental health Select Committee with him, and we were lucky to get a half hour of sitting out of him. However, he puts out his hand for the \$12.50. I am not that type of person. If one is going to be paid, one should do a fair day's work.

Mr Keneally: You put an hour in for the \$12.50.

Mr BECKER: I put in a little more than that. I may have been five minutes late occasionally, but I certainly sat there through the whole thing. I am not always the most punctual person in the world; I admit that.

Mr McRae: What do you think about disposing of private members' business?

Mr BECKER: I agree with the member for Playford, and that is why I am opposing his amendment and the motion. We ought to get on with the real issue, which is the Casino proposal currently before the House. To enable me further to enlarge on the debate, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Mr SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ABORIGINAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Lynn Arnold:

That this House endorses the work of the Aboriginal Community College and calls on the Federal Government to affirm its commitment to the college and the college's positive role in Aboriginal education; and furthermore, is of the opinion that—

- (a) the funds be at least maintained in real terms so that the college can continue to provide the type of educational programmes that it has done for the last seven years;
- (b) the autonomy and Aboriginal identity of the college be preserved at all costs;
- (c) that Federal funds be allocated to procure decent premises for the college so that it can operate in accommodation that is comparable to other educational institutions; and
- (d) no decision be made on the future of the college until all reports, evaluations and recommendations have been thoroughly examined, and after full consultation with Aboriginal people in South Australia and with the college staff.

(Continued from 16 September. Page 951.)

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I wish to close my remarks on this matter. Members will recall that on 16 September I drew attention to the valuable work being done by the Aboriginal Community College presently sited in North Adelaide and, in the closing moments of my remarks, I was starting to address the matter of its possible future site. Members will be aware that there had been a proposal that the college be resited at the Largs Bay Orphanage, within the City of Port Adelaide. Members will also be aware that the Port Adelaide council has turned down the planning application in this regard and, I believe, put the college in a rather invidious situation. The major alternative site, which was accepted by the college as being in its best possible interests, may now be in some danger. I cannot say it any better than the comments of two persons

who wrote to the *Southern Cross* newspaper regarding this matter, which letter appeared in this paper on 24 September. The letter stated:

The refusal of the Port Adelaide council to allow the Aboriginal Community College to resite at Largs Bay in the former orphanage of the Order of the Sisters of St Joseph is a decision to be deplored.

The Aboriginal Community College has become an educational institution that is unique in Australia in meeting the needs of the Aboriginal people.

It is part of the wider educational system in Australia, yet it has been able to focus on the educational needs of a people who have previously been alienated by the educational system.

Now the college with its unique programme finds its North Adelaide site inadequate.

The Order of St Joseph has offered a large suitable building at Largs Bay. This building was established to meet the educational needs of a disadvantaged group, orphans in South Australia.

Because of new policies in child care the premises are no longer suitable for their original use.

The Aboriginal people are another disadvantaged group, and they could make good use of the premises.

To refuse them permission is to stifle the growth of a much needed college; more so it is to stifle the growth of a people who, with much patience and struggle, have achieved a good measure of success in this educational venture. It is a venture to be encouraged.

We voice our objection to the decision of the Port Adelaide council and urge that council to reconsider its decision as a matter of justice.

The letter is signed by Sister Patricia Fox, Sister Pak Poy and 72 signatories from the Sisters of Mercy. I believe that the Sisters of Mercy have very eloquently put not only the argument as to why the Largs Bay Orphanage should be made available but also arguments that supported the motion before the House. They have spoken about the vital role in education that the Aboriginal Community College plays. Indeed, they have even touched on its wider educational implications beyond the Aboriginal community. By implication they have spoken of its significance for the education of all Australians. They have identified that the Largs Bay Orphanage, which is a building with a history of meeting the needs of the community, has a possibility of meeting another need.

Unfortunately, the decision by Port Adelaide council looks like forestalling its capacity to meet that future need. I wonder what alternative it is envisaged that the Largs Bay Orphanage will be put to in the minds of those councillors who voted against its being used as the Aboriginal Community College. Will its alternative use be as socially useful and socially positive as the use to which the college would have put it? We would do well to remember the present siting of the college, not because it is inadequate (although it certainly is, and that is why they wanted to move) but because of where it is situated.

The college is in North Adelaide next to the Oberoi Hotel and specialists' consulting rooms in Brougham Place. That is a part of the city where one might suppose there would be people who would object to having a college placed next to it. Perhaps they would object to a college that follows the educational processes and methodologies of this particular college. However, there has never been serious complaint by the neighbours of the Aboriginal Community College in Brougham Place about its operations; there has never been any serious complaint at all.

Indeed, they have found that the college has worked quite satisfactorily and has performed its job very well without unfairly impinging on its neighbours. Why should it be any different in the Largs Bay Orphanage? Indeed, if at any stage there had been any problem with noise from the building, as there must be from any educational institution, such a problem must be less at the orphanage, because it is more isolated from surrounding buildings than is the present site in Brougham Place, where there is virtually no separation at all from neighbouring buildings.

I do not know where this leaves the community college. I do not know whether options will be open to it to pursue the question of the Largs Bay Orphanage, or whether there is a possibility of appealing against the decision that has been made by the council. I do not know whether other sites are being looked at. I hope that anyone involved in education in South Australia will be asking themselves what other sites may be available. I imagine that, when the Minister of Education rises to speak to my motion (and I have no doubt that he will), he will indicate that he has been interested to find alternative sites that will have the same degree of satisfaction as will the Largs Bay Orphanage if finally it turns out to be unavailable.

We must come back to the fact that from the students' point of view, the Largs Bay Orphanage site was eminently suitable. It was not just a second-best option. In fact, it was quite an ideal option from the students' point of view. There may have been some problems from the staff's point of view, but I know that the staff was quite happy to put up with the problem of distance that it would present. They realised that the important thing about the college was its ability to provide services to the students. That problem needs to be solved.

I conclude my remarks on the general context of my motion. I acknowledge that the college has survived the dangers that faced it in recent times, but I feel that we still need to debate this motion so that we can give our guarantee of support, because the college may possibly be faced with other dangers threatening its independence, continued growth and existence. Therefore, it is still important for us in this Parliament to affirm where we stand in relation to the unique role played by the Aboriginal Community College. The Federal Government's actions earlier this year may well be repeated in future if we do not give that motion of affirmation and an indication of where our support lies.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

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

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Demonstrations are out of order.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In moving the motion, I feel constrained to say that it is a great pity that a first-class grand final is going to be the subject of two second-rate teams on Saturday.

The message that we require to be sent to the Legislative Council is purely technical. It enables the Ministers who are members of the Upper House to appear before the Estimates Committee in this House. It is a routine move and, despite of the rather off-putting occurrences in the House, I am sure that the motion will be supported.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 September. Page 1260.)

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I thank honourable members for the contributions that they have made to this debate. Unfortunately, I must add that the response and contributions from the Opposition members to the Government's Budget have been a major disappointment. We have heard a succession of speeches from members opposite attacking and criticising the Government's Budget initiatives, and no positive alternative proposals have been put forward. Not one constructive suggestion has been put forward. One can only ask, Sir: where are the alternative policies and initiatives that we would expect to get from any Opposition? If the Opposition claims the right to criticise, surely it has the responsibility to the voting public to put forward its own solutions to the current financial difficulties being experienced in South Australia, but there has not been one sensible or responsible suggestion from the Opposition. The taxpaying public could well ask what the Opposition is doing.

The Government has presented a responsible Budget, which honours our commitment to hold down taxes and, at the same time, is a Budget to reduce the size and the cost of the public sector. If the Opposition has an alternative plan, it is being very careful not to disclose it. Perhaps the honourable member for Elizabeth can assist the Leader of the Opposition with some thoughts, ideas and initiatives for an alternative Budget, but there is no secret that the Government has had little alternative than to bring down a tough Budget. We do not resile from that position, and we make no apologies at all. We openly admitted in the weeks before the Budget was brought down that it would be tough. It could not be any other way.

The Government has constructed a Budget designed to be tough on itself and not on the taxpayers. We have put before this House an effective package to ensure that the public sector lives within its means. We have cut our cloth to fit the funds available. Faced with this very tight Budget situation, which, I might add, is not of our doing, I believe that the electorate has the right to know, and should have been told, what the Leader would do. The Leader has indicated without being specific that the Government's policy of reducing Government expenditure is wrong. The alternative is obvious, if unpalatable, to the majority of South Australian taxpayers. It would result in a sharp rise in State taxes and charges. Let there be no misunderstanding and confusion about that significant point. If the Labor Party believes in increased public sector employment and increased Government spending, the inevitable result must be increased taxation.

Perhaps the Leader and the Labor Party intend to reintroduce gift duty or death duties. Do they favour the return of land tax on the home of every family in the State? Will they increase pay-roll tax, as the Labor Premier in New South Wales has done, or do they have in mind some other form of wealth tax, as was put forward at the Labor Party convention? Obviously, the Leader of the Opposition and the A.L.P. must surely have some alternatives in mind, but what are they doing? They are simply not letting us know about the alternatives. Obviously, the alternatives are too unpalatable and too unacceptable to be unveiled in the most important economic debate in this Parliament.

I must emphasise in winding up this debate that, in framing its Budget, the Government was shackled by constraints beyond its control or influence. The State's revenue position would be vastly different and vastly improved if the Commonwealth had not changed the tax sharing arrangements that affect the States. Commonwealth Budget paper No. 1 shows that personal income taxation revenue in 1980-81 increased by 16.6 per cent over the 1979-80 figures. If the States were still participating in sharing that

taxation pool, South Australia's tax sharing grant in 1981-82 would be just over \$800 000 000, and not \$753 800 000 included in the Commonwealth Budget papers and the South Australian Budget for 1981-82.

That higher amount would have provided nearly \$50 000 000 extra to South Australia, which would have eliminated the prospective recurrent deficit of \$47 000 000 on Revenue Account and, therefore, the need to transfer funds from the Capital Account. In other words, the Commonwealth Government's budgetary strategy has significantly contributed to South Australia's Revenue Budget shortfall. Rather than offsetting the Commonwealth cuts with increased State taxation, an action that I am quite convinced the Opposition would have preferred, my Government has decided to cut expenditure. Although a transfer is still required under these circumstances from the Loan Account to the Revenue Account, the stage has now been set for a much improved situation in next year's State Budget.

It has also been claimed in the Opposition's excuse for a Budget response that South Australia fared better in overall funds from the Commonwealth and that I, as Premier and Treasurer, apparently am unaware of this fact. That was the situation that the Leader put forward. I certainly hope that the Opposition never has the opportunity to put its financial reasoning into practice in negotiating with the Commonwealth, because, obviously, it does not understand. The Leader claims that the Commonwealth payments to South Australia in 1981-82 compared to 1980-81 would increase by 8.7 per cent, compared with the figure for the States as a whole, 8.1 per cent, New South Wales 5.6 per cent, and Victoria, 8.6 per cent.

The Leader's figures are totally misleading, because they are distorted by infrastructure borrowing. On the day before the Leader was to make his speech, it was fascinating to hear an A.B.C. *Nationwide* programme, which also propagated similar inaccuracies. One suspects a very close liaison between the staff of that programme and the Leader's office. The point is that South Australia's infrastructure borrowings this financial year have increased by 398 per cent from a very low base of \$15 000 000, whereas the increase in New South Wales was only 1.9 per cent, from a much higher base of \$201 000 000.

In Victoria the increase is 14 per cent from a base of \$173 700 000. The Leader's reasoning is rather like that of a man who says that, if somebody earns \$10 000 a year and goes to the bank and is given permission to borrow \$5 000, his total income is \$15 000 a year. That, of course, is absolutely ridiculous. That is the sort of reasoning that the Leader of the Opposition has been putting forward. If we adjust for the significant distortion which he has made and also for payments in respect of universities and colleges of advanced education which have no impact on State Budgets, the position is quite different. It shows South Australia, 5.8 per cent; New South Wales, 5.7 per cent; Victoria, 8.8 per cent; and all States, 7.1 per cent. For the Leader's benefit, these are the figures prepared and approved by both Treasuries. They show quite clearly that South Australia is in about the same position as New South Wales but considerably worse off than Victoria and the States as a whole.

Maybe Opposition members would prefer to continue distorting the figures to encourage the Commonwealth to cut South Australia's allocation even further. They apparently delight in putting the worst possible interpretation on the State's economic, industrial, and development record. This State is on the road to recovery. The key economic factors amply demonstrate that. What is needed now is optimism from every sector of the community—from the business sector, the unions, the average worker, the average

member of the community, and the Opposition. Instead of that, we hear nothing but predictions of gloom and disaster.

There is no doubt that, in the Budget responses, Opposition members have continually referred to the reduction in funds available for capital works and the effect which the setting aside of \$44 000 000 from capital funds to support the current operations will have on the building and construction industry and on employment. Again, the Leader has not reported an accurate picture either deliberately (which I suspect is the case) or because he simply does not understand the Budget details. When capital expenditure from State funds in 1981-82 is combined with planned spending by the Electricity Trust, the Highways Department, the State Transport Authority, and other agencies whose capital works programmes are financed in whole or part from outside the Budget, the total planned capital expenditure for 1981-82 represents an increase in real terms over 1980-81. The money is ploughed directly into major capital works, which create the jobs that Opposition members are claiming will be lost. In addition, I announced last week that an extra \$20 000 000 would be pumped into building rental accommodation for the South Australian Housing Trust.

Mr Bannon: That investment decision had been determined months ago.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Which just goes to show how little you really do know. Additionally, last week I announced that an extra \$20 000 000 will be pumped into building rent—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: You are just as inaccurate with that statement—

Mr McRAE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Twice the Premier has referred to the Leader of the Opposition as 'you' rather than as the Leader of the Opposition. I ask that you, Mr Speaker, enforce Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order that the normal practice is for a member to be referred to by his electorate name or his particular office. I also take the opportunity of advising members on both sides of the House that the reference to other members by their Christian names, as has occurred this evening and earlier this afternoon, is not Parliamentary. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In which case I can say that the Leader of the Opposition, in his recent interjection, has been just as inaccurate, and I suspect deliberately so, as he has been in almost everything else he has said in his Budget reply. The construction of up to 600 new homes is likely to result from the injection of that extra \$20 000 000.

The arrangements with the South Australian Superannuation Trust and the State Government Insurance Commission, which have been concluded in the past two weeks, will have a significant impact on the housing construction sector and employment in the building industry. I can only refute claims that the short-term need to use Loan funds to cushion the effect of the Revenue Account deficit will bring disaster to the building and construction industry; it will not. In real terms, the Government and its agencies will be spending more on planned capital projects this financial year than was spent in the previous financial year. That is not to say that we would not like to do more. Of course we would like to do more, but the picture is not nearly as serious as the Opposition would have us believe.

Again, I come back to this question: what alternative suggestions have been put forward by the Opposition in this debate that would help overcome our difficulties? The answer, quite simply, is, 'None'. In the past, the Labor Party's answer to economic difficulties has been to throw money after difficulties and problems. If the Opposition's answer is to spend more money and to buy the State out

of the current financial restrictions, I get back to the inevitable conclusion: the only way it could find that money would be by higher State taxation, and everyone, every man, woman and child in the State, ultimately would suffer the impact of crushing taxation if the hidden policies of members opposite were ever put to the test.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Why do we not hear what members opposite have in mind if it is not increased taxation? All of the measures that they might have up their sleeves—increasing the size of the public sector, increasing State taxation—have been tried previously by a succession of Labor Administrations. The results of the Labor Party's policies are still fresh in the minds of most South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that this has been a most disappointing debate. The Government made no secret of the severity of the budgetary difficulties facing South Australia. It made no secret of the solutions it intended to apply and the remedies that I believe are now working, and the Opposition, in its response to the Budget, has attacked, without offering any alternatives or any policies. The long and the short of it—and this has been clearly shown by the Opposition's performance in this debate—is that it has no policies which are acceptable to all members in the Labor Party's divided ranks. Members opposite have no policies, no positive plans, no ideas for the future of South Australia except the suggestions that I have heard made from some of them that they would stifle the development of South Australia and hold it back at all costs.

The Opposition has resorted to its now familiar theme of knocking or criticising the Government's firm economic action in the same way as it knocks and criticises at every opportunity the Government's vigorous attempts to stimulate resource development in this State. Let me say now that I was prepared to give genuine consideration to any responsible suggestions the Opposition might have put forward to improve South Australia's Budget situation but, after the pitiful contribution from members opposite, I hold no hope at all for any worthwhile or constructive help.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: Put more on the pay-roll, pay them more, shorter working hours, and balance the Budget—what nonsense!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Deputy Premier has summarised, very succinctly indeed, our concept of the Opposition's policies. We are told that Labor's alternative strategy will be presented to the people next year. I suggest that the reason for the Leader's modesty in keeping his ideas for economic salvation from the public can only be the subject of speculation. I do not think there is any doubt at all about the degree of embarrassment. Two options come readily to mind: either the Labor Party's alternatives contain the need for heavy increases in State taxation, which the Labor Party is hoping to conceal from the public, or Labor is devoid of any worthwhile financial strategy to cope with the present difficult budgetary situation and, what is more, lacks the intestinal fortitude to put into operation the strong measures which are necessary.

I leave it to members of this House and members of the public to make up their own minds about the Labor Party's economic alternatives, but after this debate I am left in no doubt that the Opposition is totally bereft of any responsible economic strategy for South Australia's future.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the House note grievances.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): We have had a very interesting summary of the Budget debate from the Premier. He was disappointed in that debate, he tells us, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Oh, don't leave.

Mr BANNON: I do not think it matters whether he leaves or stays. I am going to use some figures, which he would find difficult to understand. In fact, it turns out that the burden of the Premier's complaints, in fact the burden of his whole speech, is not to try to defend his own Budget and his own Government's mismanagement and financial bankrupting of the State, but to try to demand from us our policies and our alternatives. I find that fairly flattering—it certainly accepts the inevitable, it certainly accepts the inevitable fact that the economic managers of this State for the rest of this decade after the next election will be the people sitting on this side of the House. Certainly, he will be interested, indeed, to hear our policies when they come through. I thought—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader has the call.

Mr BANNON: The Premier, in calling for our policy, says we have none, absolutely nothing. He says nothing was suggested. A bit later on he was qualifying that—'not one sensible policy', he said. He cannot have it both ways. The facts are that we have produced a large number of broad strategic directions in which this economy should be going, which are linked to our criticism of the disaster into which the Government is leading us, and we will have the specifics, the i's dotted and the t's crossed, when the time is appropriate, and we will do it in our own time when we want to announce our policy and not when the Premier wants it in order to try to steal some of our ideas. Let us hear the Premier and his colleagues defend his budget and not ask the Opposition what its policies are. That is an interesting new line.

For the past three months or so, and certainly for the past two weeks, after the Premier made the public admission that our economy was sick indeed under his administration, we have seen a constant attempt to blame somebody else—the sins of the past—ignoring the financial heritage that he, in fact, took over; then, the sins of the Federal Government, ignoring the fact that he urged us to support that very Government and its policies—indeed, at one stage, he claimed to be an architect of those very policies, but now he blames them. Also, he blames world and international conditions; he blames everything except his Government and its policies.

Now we have a new variation on that theme—we are not only going to look backwards to the past, but we are somehow going to blame the Opposition of today for the parlous state of our economy, because we are not producing our policy. What absolute nonsense. The Premier had better face up to the fact, and after two years he still has not done it, that he is sitting in the Premier's chair, he is responsible for the Budget and the policy of this State and he had better deliver the goods or he will be out on his ear.

At least the Premier gave us one indication—the stage is set, he said, for a good Budget next year. I bet he will be battling to raid what is left of the reserves, to call in every single amount of money he can find from any hidden sock in our Budget in order to try to produce some sort of balanced result. The speculation around in the media and elsewhere at the moment is that he will try to find some pretext to go to the people before he has to produce another budget, before he does reveal his total bankruptcy—we will see.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What do you think he will do?

Mr BANNON: I think he will try desperately over the next 12 months to see if he can find some money from somewhere. He is hoping that something will turn up but, if it does not, and if it looks as if his Budget is going to be a disaster, he will pull an election. If the Premier thinks he can paper things over and make the position look fairly good, he will wait a little longer. I think that is the scenario to that. The Premier then had the outrageous cheek to suggest that in producing figures of Commonwealth income sharing—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Agriculture will assist the debate if he is silent.

Mr BANNON: In producing income figures the Premier is suggesting that we are encouraging the Commonwealth in some way to cut back its funding to South Australia. This statement comes from the Premier who, by squandering our capital funds on recurrent expenditure, has given us the weakest bargaining power at the Federal level since the pre-Playford days, when we were virtually bankrupt. He has the cheek to talk about our encouraging the Commonwealth. By his slavish adherence to the Fraser philosophy and his total mismanagement at the State level of Commonwealth Loan funds with which he has been entrusted, he has left us completely vulnerable, so I hope we hear no more of that talk. If nothing else has been established during the course of this debate, it has been the dimension of the financial crisis facing South Australia.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I will have a word to say about the mismanagement of resource development, too, something the Deputy Premier might be interested to hear. We have now found the full extent of the financial crisis. All the supposed good management that was going to be installed when the Government came into office has been exposed. The Government had its chance, and it has completely muffed it. In two years the finances of this State have been turned around from a position of surplus to one of record deficit. We know that our recurrent expenditure was in the red to the tune of \$43 800 000 last year, and a further shortfall of \$47 000 000 is expected this year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It should not be necessary to protect the honourable Leader of the Opposition from his own members.

Mr BANNON: Certainly not—I welcome and encourage the solid support that we have on this side of the House. The member for Hanson, one of the few members opposite who understands figures, knows very well that what I am saying about the State accounts is true and, in fact, if he had been in Cabinet perhaps the Premier, who patently cannot handle figures, could have been advised to be a bit more cautious. We had an accumulated deficit of \$6 600 000 last year, which will grow this year to \$9 600 000. We have had that massive drain of capital funds to which I have referred, and underlying our problem is the inability of the Government to manage the State's finances and maintain growth and development.

Much of the revenue shortfall comes from the simple fact that South Australia has a depressed economy that the Government has been unable to stimulate. All its predictions about revenue collection have failed as a result. The Government has tried to make it up with massive charge increases. The Premier's own Financial Statement makes clear that the Government does not expect an economic improvement in the near future. That statement is in black and white, and in defending the Budget the Premier says nothing about economic improvement at all. Any increase in our revenue, the Budget document states, will be from inflation and not from any economic up-turn. What an

admission of failure on the part of the Government! While the nature and dimensions of our economic and financial problems are clear, the Government's strategy for working the State out of this current stagnation is not apparent at all, and it ill behoves the Premier to ask the Opposition for its plan, when his Government is signally failing in this area.

One of the most alarming aspects of this Budget is its total lack of vision. It contains no blueprint for the development of the State, no indication of how the people of South Australia might contribute to and benefit from the State's progress. Why is this? The reason is that this Government is obsessed with one project—Roxby Downs. I suggest and suspect that this obsession has more to do with the belief that there is electoral advantage to be gained in championing uranium mining than with any considered planning for the balanced development of South Australia, or for the balanced development of that project. It has become quite clear during the past week that the Premier's only answer to the increasing numbers who are questioning his competence to run this State is his trying to generate a highly politicised debate on uranium.

He has allowed speculation that any rejection of an indenture Bill will mean an immediate election. He has played down the other vital development projects which we support, in an attempt to portray uranium mining as the only hope for the State's economic future. He has ignored the fact that, at this moment and in the foreseeable future, the jobs of most South Australians depend on the manufacturing industries which are struggling and which need as much Government attention and support as it is possible to give, and not airy rhetoric of the type we have been subjected to over the past two days. He has done all this because it is politically expedient for him to represent uranium as that central strategy.

If the Premier wants a uranium election, let him call it now. If he wants to go to the people and say that the cornerstone of what he has to offer is an industry whose future is uncertain, and whose safety is totally unproven (and has been rejected by referenda in some nations and is the cause of violent social division in others), let him put that before the people of South Australia and call an election now. If he wants to go to the people and tell them that he will lock South Australia into the nuclear fuel cycle at a time when there are no adequate safeguards concerning the use of uranium, let him call that election now and get the matter debated and decided.

Mr Oswald: You've changed your mind.

Mr BANNON: Not at all. That is consistent with our policy as it has been stated. We welcome such an election. Leaving aside the implications of the involvement in the uranium industry and the nuclear fuel cycle, I point out that there is also the question of the time scale involved in the Roxby Downs deposits. Expert opinion seems to be that, even if we assume that copper prices improve from their current depressed levels (and let us remember that basically Roxby Downs is a copper mine; that is where the vast deposit is), development of those large deposits is not likely for a number of years.

Mr Alan Carrol has been given publicity recently on the question of mining development. It is worth remembering that he is also a consultant to both the Western Mining Corporation and B.P. He is not exactly a totally uncommitted observer of the state of the project and the economy. In an interview with the Finance Editor of the *News* in September last year (12 months ago), Mr Alan Carrol said:

It [the mine] probably will not be operating fully until the end of this century or early next century . . .

In April of this year a magazine produced by the Cavpower organisation featured an article on Roxby Downs backed

by an editorial signed by the President of the Chamber of Mines, Mr E. C. Schroder. That article points out that, given good results from the feasibility studies (which are still in process and the findings of which have still not been produced), production at Roxby Downs could begin no earlier than 1989 or 1990. The article continued:

... subject to the numerous contingencies that can occur when dealing with projects of this complexity.

Mr Tim Drysdale, Manager of the Chamber of Mines, in an article last month in the *Adelaide News* on mining development, added what the *News* reporter called a cautionary note, as follows:

You must always remember when mining is being discussed, you have to talk in fairly long time scales. A development like Roxby Downs will take at least five years to get seriously under way (and no doubt that would be after the end of the feasibility studies which are not due to finish until at least 1983) and probably another five before it was really operating to the full extent.

We are really talking about 1988 on the one hand and the 1990s on the other. The question of the time scale of development becomes more relevant when we consider how immediate and pressing our economic problems are. The stark question facing South Australia at the moment is not what will happen if and when Roxby Downs comes on stream but what we will do for the rest of this decade with what we have got. The situation is not hopeless, but the way in which this Government is performing and the way in which it is so blinkered in its economic strategy suggests that we will be in real trouble if its tenure of office is very much longer.

In my second reading speech, I pointed out that the Australian Federation of Construction Contractors and the Master Builders Association had expressed grave doubts that their vital industry—their employment-generating industry—would survive to take part in the resources boom. It is a question of survival. In effect, they said, 'Sure, this resources boom sounds all right, but by the time it gets here we will be out of business.' They were adamant that the policy of cutting back public works, as carried out by this Government, was destroying their viability. They had no illusions that the promise of the resources boom presented by the Government would materialise in the near future.

This State needs a development plan which addresses the immediate problems confronting the State, as well as providing for the balanced development of our natural resources. It needs to ensure that resource development takes place in a way that maximises the spin-off benefits for manufacturing, which is so important in this State and which has been neglected and ignored by the current Government in its search for the mirage over the horizon. It needs to be based as far as possible on resources whose value is not subject to wide price fluctuation as is copper, uranium and other metals. It needs to be based as far as possible on industries which are secure and which have undeniable prospects for sustained growth.

Mr Oswald: For example?

Mr BANNON: I have grave doubts about whether this Government is capable of producing such a programme. It prefers to seek short-term political gain by politicising the issue of resource development, making it political rather than planning properly for the future of this State. Ironically, this very week, while it was beginning its campaign to create an election issue out of uranium mining, the real cornerstone of resource development in South Australia was showing just how viable and strong its prospects were. In response to the member for Morphett's interjection about an alternative, I can tell him that the Cooper Basin is such an alternative. Let us have a close look at it. It is a tangible resource which is real, which is on stream, which is earning

us money, and which ought to be developed to the greatest extent possible.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: I ask members opposite to listen to the story of the Cooper Basin, which is something on which this whole State's development depends. Last week C.S.R. announced its \$500 000 000 bid for the Delhi International Oil Corporation. In doing that, it made clear that it would be directing the major part of its resource capital to exploration in the Cooper Basin. On Monday of this week, Mr Allan Bond, one of the Directors of Santos and someone who has been highly praised by members opposite (certainly he is an active entrepreneur), told a meeting in Sydney that Santos is currently in the final stages of raising \$600 000 000 through a credit line with overseas banks. Massive sums of money are being raised here and now to be spent here and now.

According to a report in Tuesday's *Australian*, Mr Bond told that gathering that senior Santos representatives in London were dotting the i's and crossing the t's on the credit line to finance development of the Cooper Basin. The massive investment includes a stake in a collection and treatment complex costing \$470 000 000. The 659-kilometre pipeline will cost \$128 000 000, and a complex at Stony Point will cost a further \$158 000 000. These things have not just happened in the past year or so, or the past two years. The lead times are there and are well recognised. They are happening because a far-sighted Labor Government many years ago supported this venture in every way possible to get it off the ground. It supported it when prices were down. It supported it by signing contracts when times were tough, and that is why the Cooper Basin is coming on stream today.

The Cooper Basin reserves could be worth \$30 000 000 000 to \$60 000 000 000. It is for that reason international banks have written to provide finance to groups such as Santos and C.S.R. Mr Gordon Jackson of C.S.R. was able to raise the money for his company's takeover of Delhi in 24 hours. They are falling over themselves to invest. Is that the same situation with some of the other resource developments that are so many years down the track?

Mr Ashenden: Tell us about Redcliff.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd has been heard for the last time this evening.

Mr BANNON: The surface is yet to be scratched in the Cooper Basin. According to Mr Bond there will be 200 rigs operating by 1985, and the basin's liquid reserves could be doubled.

In the rush to politicise uranium mining, these announcements have been ignored; they have been down-played. The massive potential of the Cooper Basin has been minimised by the Government. Why? Because it suits the Government's political interests to split the community over the issue of uranium. It does not suit it to draw attention to the fact that this massive development is going on and that the Labor Governments of previous times were responsible for it.

The only time we hear the Cooper Basin mentioned in this place by the Minister of Mines and Energy is when he misrepresents the reasons why it was necessary to sell natural gas to Sydney in the early stages of its development. It is a very odd thing for the Deputy Premier to keep talking about now. Without that and those gas sales to Sydney during that time and with prices what they were, there would be no Cooper Basin infrastructure available to take advantage of the prices today. That is the truth and you know it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: The odd thing about it is that, at the time that deal was signed by the company, in the time of Premier Dunstan, the then Liberal Opposition, led by Steele Hall, was falling over itself to take credit for it. It is there in *Hansard*. 'We did it,' members opposite proudly proclaimed. They said, 'This is our deal; this is something you have to give us credit for.' That was nonsense, but it did not matter: they did not take the credit. Now we are being told it was the worst deal ever made. That deal is the foundation on which the Cooper Basin development has taken place and, thank God, it was signed. That is the only carping reference we get to this great development.

Yesterday the *Financial Review* revealed that a new gas discovery in the Queensland section of the Cooper Basin had put renewed pressure on the South Australian and Queensland Governments to speed up negotiations over the destination of gas reserves found in the sector of the basin that lies under that neighboring State, a section that is not being explored to any great extent. I do not recall any comments on this problem by the Minister responsible. We have not heard any recent reports on the Minister's negotiations with the Queensland Government, if, indeed, they are taking place. That, of course, is vital to the future of gas supplies and vital to this State. We are going to have the pipeline and we are going to have the ability to do something with liquids, gas or whatever else comes down the line, provided it comes in this direction, so why is not the Minister up there doing something tangible about this very important point?

Will Queensland, by itself, be able to develop it? That is most unlikely. I think it would do all members good if they could read a paper prepared by the former Minister of Mines and Energy, who knew his subject backwards, and did not skate over the top of it and did not try to politicise. That was Mr Hugh Hudson, now a visiting fellow of Monash University, someone who knows more about this area than any other person. He talked about the Queensland prospects and pointed out that the position would be significantly improved if there was certainty that gas in the Queensland portion of the Basin, would be available. He said:

Because of the limitation to the Brisbane market, a gas pipeline from the Cooper Basin to Brisbane would result in very high transport costs per m.c.f. As a consequence, the price of gas to consumers in Brisbane might well be unattractive. The reality for the Queensland Government therefore is likely to be one of earning royalties by supplying Adelaide and Sydney from the Queensland portion of the Cooper Basin or earning nothing.

This is the very dilemma we faced in the early 1970s. Queensland must come and deal with us and we ought to be dealing with Queensland. We ought to hear more about it, but not a bit of it. We are going to chase after this election issue, this short-term political expediency that the Government is all about.

We have not got any idea of the Government's attitude to the gas. Any resource development strategy in South Australia must be based on the Cooper Basin, its oil, its natural gas, and its liquids. We are talking here about a ready market in Australia and overseas at a stable price. It is a product which could be the basis of other industries, in particular, the petro-chemical industry, which itself could spawn further development and lead to the establishment of a whole range of companies, producing diverse quantities.

Members of the Government have been to Alberta and have seen the potential there. The Cooper Basin offers a resource development base which is real, achievable and secure. That is what we should be concentrating our attention on. The Government should be doing everything in its power to ensure that South Australia gets a fair share of the investment foreshadowed in the statements by Mr Bond and the plans announced by C.S.R. It is not automatically

the case that we can sit back and expect the money to flow in.

Our local industry did not have the capacity to produce the pipeline that Santos required in the time in which Santos needed it. It could produce only part of it. Therefore, it is pertinent to ask whether this Government is content to see that sort of situation repeated. In other words, what is the Government doing to ensure there is a linkage between investment in resources and production in our manufacturing industry, which means jobs for South Australia? The Premier's financial statement gives no indication that his Government is able or willing to give up its political campaign on uranium to ensure that South Australia benefits from resource development.

If South Australia is to be anything other than a mendicant State, relying on a benevolent Government in Canberra, we must start planning for the future. It is the Government's responsibility to give us the lead. We need a Government that says there is a need to take an honest, proper, active role in the development of this State. We should not sit back and let the Government create phony issues on which to hold an election because it suits short-term expediency. Let us get down to real development in this State. The Premier calls for our plan. He will have it soon enough, and when he has it, the people of South Australia will have it, too. They will breathe a sigh of relief and return us to the Treasury benches to get on with making this State great.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I had not intended to speak in this grievance debate, but I cannot let the nonsense we have just heard from the Leader go unchallenged. I have mentioned the Opposition's economic strategy previously. Briefly, it is as follows: first, do not increase any State charges or taxes; put more people on the public pay roll; reduce working hours in the Public Service to a 35-hour week; and balance the Budget. That is the economic package put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That is the magic formula.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, that is the magic formula that the Opposition is proclaiming. I must comment on what the Leader has said in relation to resource development. This Government fully appreciates the importance of the Cooper Basin to the economy of this State. However, the Government is also fully conscious of the benefits that will flow to the State as a result of the Roxby Downs development. The Leader likes to sweep this matter under the carpet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Leader says that his lead times are such that the final mine will not be up and running until 1987. What if he is correct? The fact is that decisions have to be made now by those operating companies to commit exploration money to the tune of about \$150 000 000 to further the work. In effect, the Leader is saying that the companies are quite happy to defer this development for another two or three years or until his Party can come to terms with its hang-ups about whether or not to let mining go ahead. The plain fact of life is that decisions must be made now, and anything that the Labor Party does in this regard will simply hold things up.

Mr Hemmings: Didn't you hear me, Roger?

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that this is a subject of acute embarrassment. Members opposite probably heard the comments made on the interstate T.V. news last night. A Melbourne adviser stated that this will

be the world's largest mine. We know that it will be a world-class mine, but the Opposition does not care whether it delays the project indefinitely. It has nothing to do with the lead time: decisions must be made now.

The Government is actively negotiating an indenture with the operating companies, and without that indenture money will not be further committed to the project. The suggestion that the Government is ignoring the Cooper Basin is a patent falsehood. The development of the Cooper Basin has been accelerated as a result of the election of this Government. The time scale for the development of the liquid scheme is such that everyone is bending over backwards to ensure that the liquids come on stream early in 1983. That has been accelerated, as has been the Roxby Downs development, as a result of the election of this Government.

Mr O'Neill: Rubbish!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member can say 'rubbish' if he likes. He does not know what he is talking about. This Government has a team of people working daily in co-operation with the Cooper Basin producers. I see the new Chairman of Santos every time he comes to Adelaide to progress this development. We are in the process of writing an indenture: we are accelerating that so that it can come on stream at the earliest possible time.

I have criticised the contracts written by the Labor Government when it was in office because they were the most amateurish short-sighted contracts that one could imagine. We are not arguing about the sale of gas, but who but a short-sighted Government could sell gas to Sydney to the year 2006 and to South Australia to the year 1987? *Hansard* tells the story. I have discussed this with Steele Hall, with the people concerned, and with the companies. I suggest members opposite talk to the Delhi people. The Government was warned by Delhi and Government officers that the State's interests were not protected. I am told that the Premier of the day waved his hands and said, 'We will find plenty of gas' and they wrote the contract.

This Government is pursuing options vigorously to overcome the difficulties in which this State finds itself because of that short-sightedness. We are pursuing all options vigorously to see that further gas supplies are found for this State. I have been to the Northern Territory on three occasions, the last time being quite recently, to discuss with them possible supplies of gas from their gas fields when they are proved up. I have been to Queensland and have waited upon the Queensland Premier. One of my officers is going up there shortly.

This Government would have a better chance of getting along with the Queensland Premier than would anyone opposite. We are pursuing with the Queensland Government the question of further exploration in the Queensland portion of the Cooper Basin, with a view to that being fed into the system. We have had discussions with the Bass Strait people and are currently having discussions with the Australian Gas Light Company, which has contracts with the Sydney gas supplies.

For the Leader of the Opposition to get up and try to make out that we do not recognise the importance of the Cooper Basin is arrant nonsense. This Government is acutely aware of the importance of the Cooper Basin to this State. This Government and my department have been working actively to facilitate the development of those resources and to try to overcome some of the problems we have inherited owing to the lack of business finesse and plain common sense of our predecessors.

I know that the Leader of the Opposition has attempted to divert attention away from the fact that they are in a bind in relation to the whole question of mining in this State, but the Opposition cannot escape the fact that since

we have come to Government mining exploration permits have more than trebled. We have record levels of exploration. There was not one offshore oil exploration permit in place when we came to Government. We now have well in excess of \$100 000 000 committed to offshore oil exploration. We have record levels of interest and activity in this State. From my contact with the companies who have been concerned (and they need very big pockets to go into this type of venture), I know they are frightened of the Labor Party.

Mr O'Neill: So are you.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We are not frightened of you.

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

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: When they hear the Leader of the Opposition and the Federal spokesman talk about a resource rental tax, that is when the money dries up. That is a return to the Connor years. The policies of this Government, which are plainly developmental and plainly to encourage people who have risk capital to spend it in this State, have been highly successful. I am proud to say that we have all-time record levels of exploration in this State. If there is no exploration nothing happens: it is as simple as that.

I state categorically that the development of the Cooper Basin has been accelerated by the efforts of my department and this Government. The Leader of the Opposition can rant and rave as much as he likes, but I will stand on the record of the Government and, in the resource area, on the record of my department and the Government. The Opposition has a real problem with Roxby Downs. It cannot get over the fact that that development would be a major world mine, and members opposite are doing their darnedest to put off the evil day when they have to make a decision.

This Government is not trying to politicise that matter. It intends to bring before the House an indenture into which an enormous amount of work has gone, an indenture which will not be as foolishly drafted as was that negotiated by our predecessors. I had not intended to speak in this debate, but I could not let go unchallenged the arrant nonsense to which we have been subjected by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): I want to refer to some comments of the member for Todd and his interpretation of my remarks relating to the amount of money to be provided in the Budget under 'Minister of Industrial Affairs' for the purpose of making available greater amounts under the Establishment Payments Scheme. The member for Todd went to some lengths to criticise what he interpreted as my attitude to the Industries Development Committee and its role in assessing applications under that scheme. My comment was to the effect that I was a member of the committee which dealt with those references and which had to assess how many jobs were created in industry by that incentive scheme.

The member for Todd waved about five or six foolscap pages of paper listing a number of approvals given by the Industries Development Committee. In doing so, he referred not only to establishment payments but also to other matters with which the committee deals. He quoted 2 100 jobs which he said had been created under the Establishment Payments Scheme. Even though the committee has given approval for the applications on perhaps all of the five foolscap pages that he waved around the House the other night, many of those references have not yet been taken up.

I want the honourable member to understand my comment. I am not criticising the Industries Development Com-

mittee; on the contrary, I am criticising the Government in relation to what is described as its incentive scheme, challenging the aspect of whether or not it is a worthwhile job creation scheme. I believe that each job costs the South Australian taxpayers about \$3 000, and we must look at that figure to decide whether we are getting value for money from that operation. I was questioning the doubling of the amount of money to be provided in the Budget in anticipation of an increased number of applications under the scheme.

For the information of the honourable member and of the House, let me say that I have been a member of the Industries Development Committee for about eight years, having spent five or six years of that time as Chairman. I think the member for Todd was present at a committee meeting this morning when a senior officer of the Housing Trust complimented the committee on respecting the confidentiality of evidence given by those who appear before it. I am rather concerned that the member for Todd may be implying that I am politicising the Industries Development Committee.

I am looking at it from two points of view: first, from a taxpayer's point of view, and, secondly, as a member of the committee. I believe that the committee has done an excellent job in the past two years. In the time I have been a member of that committee I have appreciated that it has been a non-partisan committee which has always respected people's confidentiality in relation to their business practices. So, my criticism is not of the committee or its members but of the Government and its endeavours to give a false impression regarding the provision of employment. We know that the Government is desperate to prove to the people of South Australia that it is providing jobs that it promised prior to the election. We hear the Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs and other members opposite tell us from time to time how they have created employment in this State. We still have record unemployment. We still have over 47 000 unemployed.

What is the real position regarding job creation by the Tonkin Government? From August 1979 to June 1981, the employed population in South Australia increased from 547 400 to 559 600; thus, 12 200 jobs have been created. However, that achievement must be measured against two other factors. The first is simply the growth in population over that period and the consequent growth of the labour force. In the period August 1979 to June 1981 the employable population, aged 15 and over, increased by 21 300. Of those, 11 200 have entered the work force. Thus, it was necessary for the economy to create 11 200 jobs just to keep pace with population growth. The real gain to the economy over the two-year period has been 1 000 jobs. At this rate, it will take 88 years to mop up the present pool of unemployed.

However, the situation is even worse when one considers the second factor. The labour force participation rate is to be examined. This is a measure of the degree of participation in the work force of those of employable age. When the Labor Party left office the participation rate stood at 60.9 per cent; that is, 60.9 per cent of the employable population was either employed or seeking work. In June 1981 the figure was 60.7 per cent. The lower figure means that a further .2 per cent of the employable population has dropped out of the labour force. Almost certainly, these people represent discouraged job-seekers.

The present labour force totals 603 900 people. Had the participation rate been maintained at 60.9 per cent when Labor left office, the labour force would now be 605 900, a difference of 2 000, which is measured as disguised unemployment. If it is set against a growth of 1 000 in employment, it can be seen that the employment position

in this State, relative to population growth and labour force participation levels, has decreased by 1 000 jobs since the Labor Government left office in 1979.

Those are the real facts and the real figures. I challenge the member for Todd, the Premier, the Minister for Industrial Affairs, the Minister of Agriculture (who I know is expert on figures), or any other Minister to show that that is not the case: that the Government has not created jobs at all. In fact, as I have stated, we are down 1 000 jobs. The Government has been juggling the figures and is trying to fool the people of South Australia, but they will not be fooled. They can be fooled for a certain time, but they will not be fooled for ever.

The real facts are as I have stated, and the Opposition will be making this known to the South Australian public. The member for Todd challenged me to come up to his electorate before the next election, and I will certainly do that. The challenge was not needed, anyway, because I intend to assist the Labor Party candidate for Todd, John Lewis, who will be the member for Todd after the next State election.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): Tonight I do not wish to continue my remarks about the Marlboro man but I will take a different tack, although there is some connection. In the *Advertiser* a few days ago was an article concerning figures from the South Australian Health Commission about smoking, and strong concern was expressed in the article about smoking amongst the unemployed. It is those young unemployed people about whom I want to talk tonight, as I did last Wednesday evening. I hope that the same result occurs as that which occurred last week, because together with the member for Spence and the member for Price I was supporting projects such as Comskill and the Garage, which are CYSS projects. To our delight, as well as that of many of my colleagues on this side of the House, on opening the *Advertiser* on Friday, we saw a reversal of the decision by Federal Minister Brown concerning CYSS.

Obviously, the Government is concerned about the unemployed, regardless of what members opposite say from time to time and regardless of what some members of the community think. Projects like HUG (Henley Unemployed Group) have been continuing now for some four or five years. When the Liberal Government was elected in September 1979 the word went out that projects like HUG would be closed, because the Liberals did not care about the unemployed. I am proud to stand in this House tonight and say that the Government has continued that project, and, what is more, increased funding to that sort of project. I hope that the Minister of Community Welfare, when he is considering the recommendations from his advisory committee, will again support the HUG project during the coming financial year. I know that the project serves the local young unemployed community.

I want to detail to the House some of the group's activities and the targets at which it is aiming. It is aiming at the long-term unemployed people who seem to display a sense of social uprootedness and a low measure of vocational skills and experience in the work force. Unfortunately, a number of young people throughout my electorate would fall into that category. The group is aiming also for more motivated, short-term unemployed people who are looking for more saleable skills to offer an employer. Unfortunately, some of our young people in the western suburbs leave school a little early in the hope of getting a job pretty quickly, and in some cases they are able to achieve that. Unfortunately, many are able to be employed only in short-term jobs, perhaps as a shop assistant. Because of a lack of skills, these people do not have a lot to offer a potential

employer and are therefore at a disadvantage when they apply for jobs for which they are aiming. So, a project like HUG can help young people to learn, boost and maintain new skills.

The project is also looking at people who stay at home. These people have been contacted in the streets and at their homes, and a number of those contacted have shown a lack of knowledge of resources available in their own community. They seem socially isolated, confused and thus feel alienated from the general community. HUG also discovered a new generation of unstructured youth that are congregating near shopping centres. Some of these people are still of school age and are not coping with their school situation and will probably form part of the statistics of unemployed data next year. Unfortunately, that is true again of the area that I represent. I refer to young people who have left school early, or who are thinking of leaving school early, and who have not learnt some of the skills of applying for a job, or about what is required for a job application. Fortunately, the high schools in my electorate, as are those in many other electorates, are beginning to grapple with this whole problem of training young people in relation to job applications as well as how and where to look for a job, and about the way in which the community is structured and how it operates. High schools are beginning to cope with that. Young people are beginning to learn about it but we need projects like HUG to continue that training.

One thing that concerns me is groups, perhaps like the Unemployed Workers Union, that I believe are going to march on Parliament House next Friday after meeting first in Victoria Square at 4.30 p.m. The idea is to march down King William Street (this is as advertised, but I do not know whether it will actually happen) right at the crucial time for transport, in the late afternoon, and supposedly storm the steps of Parliament House. I agree that young unemployed people have a story to tell and a point to get across, but the responsibility of those who lead these groups must sometimes be questioned. I will watch with interest, as no doubt others will, to see what responsibility is taken by the leaders of that group next Friday. I do not deny the right of young unemployed people to put their message across and publicise their concern. Some people moving in those groups are irresponsible and, when these groups are given incorrect leadership, they may do things which damage their credibility. I appeal to the leaders of that group next Friday to take care to maintain some form of credibility so that the message does get across in a credible way, and not to destroy their credibility in the community.

Getting back to HUG, I believe that they are a credible group within the area in which they operate. They operate with a full-time worker who is classified as a social worker and paid accordingly. They also have a half-time worker and many volunteers and assistants, who offer their assistance in various areas. A couple of volunteers were two student nurses who were placed at Sturt college and were able to talk about things like first aid, to teach the young unemployed people how to cope with inexpensive meals, and to teach them the most nutritional foods to buy. These volunteers were able to offer positive advice and help in that area. There has been and there is a strong need in our community for elderly retired people to come out and support community groups like HUG. This is a problem that such community groups suffer from.

We hear of people in our community who are concerned about the unemployed. They march and protest. What do they do in the meantime? Nothing! When the time comes for community groups like HUG to have annual general meetings and call for volunteers to participate in their community committees, where are they then? They are not around. I question the concern in the community about

unemployment because, when the time comes to be counted, those people are not around. They are vocally there in the protest marches and are vocally concerned in the newspapers, but when it comes to the hard work of monthly meetings, sitting down and co-ordinating and helping a project to achieve something in the community, they are nowhere to be seen. The challenge to the community is that, if you are concerned about unemployment, get involved in a community group like CYSS.

Mr Abbott: I attended it: you weren't there.

Mr RANDALL: I am not having a shot at the member opposite as a politician. I do not believe that politicians should be involved in the day-to-day activities of unemployed groups. I believe that they should be the co-ordinators. It is up to individuals in the community, those people who have the time to be fully involved. I am saying that community people need to be involved if they are concerned about unemployment. Elderly people have a lot to offer to such projects, even if it is only a couple of hours a week teaching a couple of young people carpentry skills at the local high school. There are many elderly people who want to do something in our community. We unfortunately do not have the communication means whereby these people can be gathered together and play a positive role. There are many who want to. Community groups perhaps are not encouraging enough elderly people to get involved. I strongly endorse community groups like CYSS and HUG in our community.

In conclusion, I refer to the Submission to the Community Welfare Grants Advisory Committee, which states:

Henley Unemployed Group Incorporated offers activities and courses that are tailor made to suit specific target groups. As part of our work we offer counselling and resources to the local unemployed both in the centre and in outreach. The numbers of unemployed using HUG's resources and the group's role in the local community is expanding rapidly. Although we have increased our resources (physical, human and financial)—

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

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I refer to a particular problem that I believe is intensifying quite rapidly because of the inability of this Government to make submissions of any substance to the Licensing Court in an endeavour to curtail the noise of disco entertainment emanating from hotels. I believe that this Government is showing an inability to give some teeth to the Environment Act as it now stands. This problem is not new. Obviously, with unemployed youth and youth in general using this entertainment as a social meeting place and with the big hoteliers being in favoured trading positions, using the Licensing Act as a legal protection for their disco entertainment, the problem can do no other than intensify in activity and noise pollution.

Recently, during the football season I visited my football club in my electorate. It was a Sunday night and a paid band was playing at the clubrooms at 8 o'clock. I arrived at the clubrooms at a quarter to five and the band members were in the process of setting up their instruments in the clubrooms. I was absolutely astounded that it took them from a quarter to five until about half-past six to do nothing else but carry all their equipment from their truck and set it up. In fact, at one time I thought they were laying a cable to New York. There was so much cable on the floor of the clubrooms that it was indescribable. There were also four microphones and five speakers. On top of that, and this is what really astounded me, they had a fellow who did not play in the band but controlled the noise. He certainly controlled it—he nearly blew it out the roof.

Surely we should be able to visit places of entertainment without having to put up with so much noise that it blows the whole place apart. I am concerned about this because

recently in my city, two police officers were attacked at a disco entertainment spot. One of those police officers is in a serious condition. I am certainly not suggesting that this sort of thing should happen, but I believe that this will result in extra police activity and, to counter this, extra youth activity. I believe the situation will then extend from that activity into something that none of us really wants.

The Government has set up a working party which has prepared a 73-page report containing some 20 recommendations. I believe that the setting up of this working party is an exercise by the Government to go through the motions of so-called noise control, but it does practically nothing about the problem at all. The fact of the matter is that the Government, before the setting up of this working party, had every legal right to make submissions to the Licensing Court for that court to act on complaints of noise emanating from discos, particularly early in the morning, but it chose not to do so. The approaches to the Licensing Court that I have referred to would have forced that court to at least investigate the numerous complaints being received.

I refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 8 April 1981, where it said that this working party had brought down the report. I believe that it was an exercise by the Government simply to curtail any movement at all. The member for Morphet is shaking his head. Let me say to the member for Morphet that we all know by now, surely to God, that the licensing laws that have been introduced were, in fact, originally brought in for social drinking. There is nothing wrong with that. I do not think anybody has any objection to that. They were never brought in for what we are putting up with at the present moment. But the licensing law gives the right to the hotelier to open his entertainment place, or his big lounge room, or whatever you want to call it, 24 hours a day seven days a week. That is what I say is wrong. All the hotelier has to do is provide a *bona fide* meal. I know the *bona fide* meals: they are cheap. We knew all this before this working party was set up. Let us have a look at the recommendations of the working party. The report recommends major changes to the Noise Control Act and the Licensing Act. Is that not the very thing I am saying at this very moment? That is what it is all about.

An honourable member: Do you support it?

Mr MAX BROWN: I say there ought to be changes in this area, not because I want to stop people having a drink or going to entertainment centres. I am not saying that at all. What I am saying is that there ought to be a responsibility in some area. If it is not in the Licensing Court or the Act, where is it going to be? It seems to me that it has to be somewhere in that area. There ought to be a steady influence exerted.

The recommendation goes on to say that there ought to be increased power of entry for police. I do not know that I agree 100 per cent with that. There have been reports of incidents to me suggesting perhaps that, in fact, the power of the police is too great at the present moment. Maybe it is; I do not know, but I do not agree that the increased power of entry for police will solve the situation.

The recommendation says 'Power of seizure of equipment by noise control officers'. On the night I went to my football club, if anybody had walked in and had the power to seize the equipment, they could have been there for three hours getting rid of it. The recommendation refers to 'Noise abatement orders'. I agree with that. It goes on 'For larger gatherings, a condition of a licence should be the employment of security guards to maintain order in car parks and outside the premises.' I do not know whether I agree with that. I can only say from the experience of my own city that, in fact, one hotelier has his own security guards, and

the noise still goes on. So I do not know whether that is 100 per cent right, also.

The report went on to say that, while there is a risk of hearing damage on noisy premises, the risk is moderate. That may be right. It says that habitual patrons of noisy premises are exposing themselves to risk of hearing damage. I have no doubt about that, because on the particular night I referred to I am sure my hearing was damaged. I believe that immediate steps should be taken in the Licensing Court to do something about this situation, and from there the environment legislation should be amended. The quicker the Government tackles the problem of noise pollution, which is present in most areas of the community, the better.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I must say that I have some sympathy for what the member for Whyalla said, but I believe that we may be betraying our age somewhat if we compare our opinion to the opinion of some of the young people in the community. I wish to refer particularly to youth between the ages of 12 and 17. Many people have believed that some of the problems experienced by young people can be solved by sporting activities and the like. Some people hope that in providing facilities in this area, a bridge will be created between the organised groups, such as those run by churches and other organisations, and the things children like to do.

Having spoken to a number of young people, I have discovered that many of the organised groups are somewhat too regimented for their liking. Some of the groups tend to be too pushy or too heavy because of the many rules and regulations. Young people who have some free time on their hands and who are involved in non-active participation in a group seem to fall into a dangerous area, particularly when they come into conflict with the law.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members to reduce the tone of their speaking, in deference to the honourable member for Brighton.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I spoke to a group of young people a few days ago, one of whom was dressed in a ballerina-length white wedding dress, under which she wore bright red leotards. She was wearing barbed wire in her ears. I asked her why she was wearing the barbed wire and she told me that she had graduated from the punk level to the blitz level. Having asked about the difference between 'punk' and 'blitz', I was none the wiser.

However, the conversation progressed and we talked about what these young people did during their many moments of free time. It seems that one of the problem areas revolves around the pinball machines and more particularly the space invader machines. One of the things they told me perturbed me a great deal. It was put to me that some delicatessens grant children credit on sales so that the children can use their money for the pinball machines. It was further put to me that at some stage a collection is made, or the word is put out from the retailer that it is time to pay up.

Mr Randall: How much money is involved?

Mr GLAZBROOK: Sometimes it is a fair amount. This young person indicated to me that her cousin, who had just been caught for breaking and entering for about the one-hundredth time, had been feeding the habit to the tune of about \$1 500. Like other members, I felt that it could not happen. I wanted to check out with some parents what they knew.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did you leave it for nine months this time?

Mr GLAZBROOK: No, if the honourable member had been here earlier he would have heard that it was only a few days ago. I spoke to some parents, and it concerns me (and I am looking into this question) that there would be

a silliness by some shopkeepers to advance credit on sales to minors. It would be very difficult for these shopkeepers to enforce payment from minors if they had been silly enough to give credit. It concerns me that, wherever one seems to go these days, whether it is the quick service food outlets or in many of the delicatessens, one finds space invader machines conveniently just inside the doorway surrounded by a crowd of young people putting in their 20 cent pieces one after the other.

Indeed, about a week ago I happened to be in a fish and chip shop on a Friday. Whilst waiting for the food to be cooked and served, I watched the manipulation of one of these machines by a young man. I think he put about \$2 worth of 20 cent pieces into the space invader machine before he moved on. I was listening to the conversation between him and another young chap. He was saying, 'That is \$10 I have spent on this machine in the past couple of days.' I guarantee that he could not have been more than 10 or 11 years of age. It seems to be rather tragic to see those machines filtering into this type of establishment. I am not against the machines *per se*. In fact, if they were placed in licensed premises, they would serve a very good purpose. In other words, it would give some young people the opportunity of having that type of entertainment as an outlet. However, I do object to seeing these machines being increasingly used in delicatessens and quick service food stores.

It also concerns me that we have not come to grips with the problems of youth and are not aware of what young people really want. We do not seem to be asking them what they really want. I was surprised to find, when talking to these young people recently, that they are looking not for licensed premises as discotheques but rather for unlicensed premises.

Mr Trainer: With free space invader machines?

Mr GLAZBROOK: Probably. They want to go out into an area which is safe and in which they do not have to worry about drugs and drink. It seems as though nobody wants to do this, because of the problems of vandalism that occurs by visiting groups. In my electorate, I am led to believe that some groups come in and cause a little bit of trouble if a discotheque is going on. A classic example was that the Marion council used to organise a disco at the Pioneer Hall on the corner of Sturt and Morphett Roads. It was stopped by the council, even though it ran it, because many of the toilets in the male and female toilet blocks were just ripped out. That is part of the scene. The council felt it could not keep on running the dances, if this type of vandalism was to occur. We have difficulty in understanding the problems of youth.

In my area there is a problem with glue sniffing. Some of the children have told me that the use of hashish is quite common, and that the going rate is about \$45 for a small length of about half an inch at the end of a pencil. It seems to be quite apparent that we are not coming to grips with the real problems of the generation of between 12 and 17 years of age. They seem to be slightly misfitted into society; they are neither grown up nor young. I think we have to come to grips with this problem, and I am hoping that, through persuasion, the Department for Community Welfare and the Minister of Health will shortly address this problem and that we will find some amicable solution between Government and voluntary organisations to explore what we can do constructively in providing entertainment and facilities for youth. I hope that we may see less and less use of drugs.

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

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I wish to take the opportunity in this debate to refer to the provision of \$6 700 000 in the State Budget for detail design and construction work on the O'Bahn busway. Today, following the statement to the House yesterday by the Minister of Transport, I have received numerous telephone calls and personal representations from constituents who are most concerned about the Minister's statement. They are even more confused than they have been in the past in relation to the Government's policy on this matter, but they are now becoming angry indeed at the way in which the Government is presenting this proposal to the community, particularly to those who will be directly affected by it. I dare say that there will be no community more affected by this proposal than will be those living in my electorate.

The first aspect of the Minister's statement which is of concern is the increase in expenditure from some \$45 000 000 (and the estimated cost seems to have slowly crept up since the pre-election estimates, which were generally in the \$30 000 000 bracket) to about \$68 000 000, and the Minister carefully has not told the House in what dollars that is calculated. It is of vital importance to our budgetary considerations to know the amount of money we are considering in any financial year and what the projections are for the years in which this money will be expended, so that the community can make an accurate assessment of the worth of the project and the reality of the Government's proposals.

We see in this statement an increase of some \$23 000 000 in expenditure, which if doubled is the amount of \$45 000 000, the sum the community was previously considering in relation to the proposal. That is indeed a substantial increase in money and a substantial burden on the State, given the statements that the Premier, as Treasurer, has been making to this House for many months about the tight financial situation in which the State finds itself. Yet we have before us this innovative public transport proposal. It is untried. The Minister has said in his statement that it is now well established, but we know that there is in fact in commercial operation only one track, in Germany, and that is not in the circumstances in which we will be providing the track in this State.

As I understand it, the track in Essen is not one that goes down a river valley, having to cross that valley on a number of occasions by way of bridges. Since it was designed in Germany for a different set of circumstances, it will be completely innovative in South Australia. We find that the Government has hastily prepared this scheme. Before the last general election, it did not allow for a full public discussion of the merits of that proposal, as did the previous Government with its various proposals for public transport to the north-eastern suburbs, and it was regarded by the great majority of people as an election gimmick. We did not see the full details of the proposal. We were told in misleading advertisements, very clearly, that there would be one bridge across the Torrens River, and many people drew from that their judgment that the O'Bahn busway would not proceed down the lower section of the Torrens River from Portrush Road to Park Terrace.

During the various elections in the Norwood District, there were personal representations, as I have said on previous occasions, by the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and Liberal Party activists, telling people that the O'Bahn would not proceed down that section of the Torrens River. When the final election had been held in the Norwood District, the decision was announced to proceed with the building of the busway down that very delicate section of the environment of the Torrens River between Lower Portrush Road and Park Terrace. In the Minister's statement to the House yesterday, he said:

It was necessary that special consideration be given to the environmental impact of the busway in the Torrens River Valley. For this reason, O'Bahn guided technology was to be adopted from Park Terrace to a point east of Portrush Road.

That is a clear indication that, when he was shadow Minister in Opposition, he knew that the complete justification for the O'Bahn scheme was to put it down that section of the Torrens River Valley. He did not see fit to tell the electorate that at election after election, but after the last election he announced it. There has been great personal and financial distress caused to many people in my electorate because of the withholding of that vital information.

There are numerous cases of families spending amounts in excess of \$10 000 refurbishing their houses because they believed that a Liberal Government would not build a busway down that section of the Torrens River Valley, yet here we have the Minister's statement that the only justification for building the busway was to protect the environment of that part of the Torrens. Now we have the further statement by the Minister that the O'Bahn technology will be used along the complete route. Now we see in those two decisions that the complete justification for the adoption of the O'Bahn technology was, indeed, to take it down that very delicate environmental area of the Torrens River.

We see that the Minister has justified the extension of the O'Bahn technology to the Tea Tree Plaza area on spurious grounds indeed. A number of people to whom I have spoken today are sceptical about the justification for this additional expenditure on the O'Bahn technology to the ultimate point of the busway. I will state the reasons given by the Minister. He said that an advantage would be comfort, and I would have thought there would be a marginal degree of added comfort between those same buses travelling on an exclusive busway constructed of the same concrete, presumably, than on a guided busway, the difference being that it is guided by an extra wheel rather than being driven physically by a driver.

Secondly, he said that it will be quieter. Once again, I think that is a marginal factor. Thirdly, and as the substantial factor, he says that it will be safer. Why will it be safer? Because there will be a possibility, albeit a slight possibility, of a head-on collision between buses travelling at a combined speed of at least 160 kilometres an hour. I would have thought that that is an indictment of the engineers and on the advice to the Government on the construction of the exclusive busway. To then justify the extension of the O'Bahn guided busway because of the possibility of collisions is, to me, an unsatisfactory reason for this further increase in funds for the project.

We can see that some very shallow statements have been made to the House and that the real reasons for this have not been explained in detail. Further, we know that the track, no doubt once it is laid, will not require a great deal of maintenance. There is, in the statements by the Government, a clear indication that buses will be converted to electricity or that some other form of propulsion will be used to move them along that track when new technology is found. The Minister and the Premier have said on several occasions that that will be a matter the Government will have to consider within the next decade, so we see that these buses will in the interim be using expensive fuels that are, in fact, environmentally disadvantageous.

Further, the bus construction will have to change within a decade, at further great cost to the community. This will add to the overall cost of this proposal, so we are seeing slowly but surely the cost of this ill-thought-out proposal that was not given to the community for proper analysis, consideration and discussion.

In fact, we are seeing the north-east busway administration dominating the other works being carried out in the

Torrens Valley, particularly the work being done to protect the environment of the valley, and indeed, the work being done on the flood mitigation programme which has been conducted during the past six months or so. Indeed, there is great damage to the environment of the valley and to the peaceful living of the community that surrounds that valley.

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

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): When the Premier replied in this debate tonight he proceeded to deliver a speech that was predictable in its absolute entirety. I believe it was written for the Premier some six months ago. It sounded very much like the predictable press reports on Parliamentary salary c.p.i. increases earlier this year, and those that will be written again early next year can be read now. Instead of accepting responsibility for his own financial bungling, the Premier proceeded to blame everyone except himself. As the Treasurer of South Australia, he has been exposed as a disaster and a complete failure in his feeble attempt to handle the State's finances. I believe the Premier is the greatest false pretender since Nat King Cole.

Before the introduction of the State Budget, the Premier was reported to have made the following remarks: one, that there is a smaller pie to be cut up with the same number of people to be served; two, the difficulty is in balancing priorities; three, there will certainly be cuts in real terms in every area of the State Budget; and, four, it is fairer that everyone misses out rather than one section missing out on the lot. The Premier also said that in the critical areas of health, community welfare, education and community protection, spending had to be maintained at reasonable levels.

We know now that things did not turn out that way at all, as those three critical areas, namely, health, community welfare and education were the hardest departments hit. In regard to the difficulty of balancing priorities, it appears that the razor gang, the Budget Revenue Committee, comprising the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Industrial Affairs, and the Attorney-General, had no difficulty at all in looking after their own departments. So much for priorities! Everyone certainly missed out, but it was not at all fair, because some departments, particularly those I have mentioned, missed out on the lot.

So far as the smaller pie being cut up with the same number of people to be served is concerned, that also is only partly correct: there most certainly is a smaller pie, thank you very much to the Premier's counterpart and Party colleague, the Rt. Hon. Malcolm Fraser, but the statement that the same number of people are to be served is not true. The Premier knows that people are leaving the State for greener pastures. He admitted that himself. He knows that unemployment is worse in South Australia now than it has ever been before. He knows that more people are living in poverty and he should know that there is a greater demand for community welfare services. That is one critical area where spending is not being maintained at a reasonable level.

I want to refer briefly to the Government's extremely poor record in the area of Aboriginal affairs. At the opening of the current session of Parliament, the Government, through the address delivered by his Excellency the Governor, said that it would continue to place importance on Aboriginal affairs.

Whilst a very minor amount of finance is allocated by the State Government for Aboriginal affairs, we do have a Minister responsible for that portfolio. The Commonwealth Government will spend a total of \$228 700 000 on special programmes for Aborigines this financial year. Of this amount, the greater percentage will be in direct spending

by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs. That department has available a total of \$147 000 000 for Aboriginal programmes in 1981-82, an increase of \$19 500 000 (or 15.3 per cent) on 1980-81.

An amount of \$81 700 000 is available for Aboriginal programmes through the Commonwealth Departments of Education (\$31 700 000), Housing and Construction (\$34 200 000), and Health (\$1 900 000), and through the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs. Other grants have been made to a number of Aboriginal organisations and programmes, such as medical and health services, legal aid, culture and recreation, employment programmes and support for training and education. While these grants will go some of the way in improving the lot of Aborigines, I believe it is incumbent upon the State Government to co-operate in a much more meaningful way with the Aboriginal community of South Australia than it is presently doing.

Let us look at a few areas. The first is the Aboriginal Education Foundation of South Australia. For 1981-82 only \$8 000 is being proposed for the A.E.F. In the 1980-81 Budget, \$10 000 was approved and this ran out half way through the year, and when services to Aboriginal kindergarten children were threatened, the Minister was forced to provide an additional \$1 000. In this Budget, only \$8 000 is proposed and, although a mini bus has now been provided for transport purposes, the A.E.F. is now expected to pay the driver's wages.

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has been written to, and it was pointed out that the estimated shortfall will be \$4 722 and, unless this is reviewed, the foundation will be forced to dispose of further assets. If this is not rectified, the only ones to suffer will be the Aboriginal children. The Ralkon Agricultural Company (Bartlett's farm) dispute at Point McLeay has still not been settled. If anything, it has got worse. This project is an excellent Aboriginal enterprise and the State Government should be doing more in trying to solve the faction fracas that is presently occurring at Point McLeay.

The Government's recent decision to close the Oodnatta Community Welfare office was racist and heartless. The co-ordinator of the Government's Aboriginal co-ordinating unit described it as a slap in the face to the Aboriginal people of South Australia. I have been told that the Minister of Community Welfare has now established a task force to study, and make recommendations concerning, the future direction of Aboriginal welfare services within his department. One wonders whether this will mean the end of the Project Aboriginal Consultation and Training (PACT) programmes. The PACT advisory and convening committee is responsible for informing Aboriginal community workers on policy and planning issues, collecting information from them, advising the department on Aboriginal welfare issues, and reporting back to Aboriginal workers at State meetings.

The Aboriginal community youth services project is another programme designed to reduce the level of offending among young Aboriginal people. I sincerely hope the task force will not recommend the end of these quite valuable projects. The Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement reported recently that in the past 12 months there has been a very substantial increase in the number of multiple offences.

The problems of juvenile offences causes that body very deep concern. The movement believes that great emphasis needs to be placed by those who are seeking to establish programmes which will avoid the situations that give rise to those offences. The Government's record on Aboriginal affairs is bad and, as Senator Baume said, we must show ourselves to be intent on giving them as many meaningful

choices for their own future as possible. That is not being done under a Liberal Government.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): The member for Spence referred to predictable speeches. I assure him, the Government, the Parliament, and the public of South Australia that there is nothing more predictable than the approach that the Opposition takes in its debates in this House. It is a continual approach of knocking and denigrating the Government's policies. Indeed, it is not even accurate criticism of Government policies.

The member for Spence referred to the drift of the population from South Australia. Had he taken the slightest trouble to refer to statistics from the Bureau of Statistics, he would have seen that, in the last two quarters there has been, for the first time since the first quarter in 1978, a positive growth in South Australia's population base. Indeed, that belies the comments that have just been made by the member for Spence. Therefore, the criticism by members opposite is not even accurate.

The member for Spence also amplified the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition, that is, that the Opposition has no policies to put forward. I really wonder what the Opposition does at its shadow Cabinet meetings, although, having sat through Parliament over the last two weeks, I suppose that it may become obvious to the lay political observer. When one considers the Opposition urgency motions of the substance that was debated in this House today, one realises that the Opposition really must be dipping into the bottom of the barrel for issues to promote on the Parliamentary scene in this State. There is a whole range of issues relating to the importance and well-being of the citizens of South Australia, but the Opposition selected that one. Very much to the embarrassment of the Leader of the Opposition, as he launched into his speech today, he was interrupted by the member for Hartley. To his embarrassment, the Leader skipped and repeated part of his speech. If that is the best that the Opposition can do after shadow Cabinet meetings and in launching an urgency motion in this House, I would say that the future looks very bright indeed for this Government.

Constructive criticism can be taken by the public and Parliament as a whole, provided that it has a creditable base. It will have a creditable base as constructive criticism only if alternatives are put forward upon which people can judge those alternative policies and, if, as the Premier highlighted today, the Opposition does not have the intestinal fortitude to announce its policies or, when criticising the Budget brought down by the Premier and Treasurer, to highlight variances in it and say how it would take a different course of action, its criticism has no basis at all and it is not credible criticism in the eyes of Parliament and the public of South Australia.

It is easy to make policy decisions in an expanding economy. It is easy to make those decisions when one is spending more money. However, the hard options come in a contracting economy. The hard options come when one has to decide where reductions will be made and where public expenditure will be reined in.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: And where you expand it in the important areas of need.

Mr. OLSEN: Exactly. The Opposition has not been prepared to say where it would exercise those hard options. It is not prepared to point up where the inadequacies of the Budget lie. One can only conclude that those inadequacies are not there.

It seems to me that the Opposition is intent on creating a climate in South Australia, a public perception that is inaccurate. It does so to fall in line with its knocking attitude of Government policies. I have referred to one,

namely, the statistics in relation to population growth in South Australia. I referred also to another in relation to bankruptcies. The Opposition released the figures indicating that, in its opinion, South Australia was the bankruptcy capital of Australia. It was supported by Mr Chris Hurford, the Labor member for Adelaide. We have seen the credibility of Mr Hurford brought to the test in the Parliamentary debate earlier today.

What is the situation in relation to bankruptcy? What about this doom and gloom that the Leader of the Opposition has propounded? The statistics indicate quite clearly that, in relation to bankruptcy, South Australia has been apart from the norm in Australia. Whereas in Australia there has been a steady increase in the number of bankruptcies, the reverse has occurred in South Australia, by stark contrast to the Australian position, as I have indicated. The number of bankruptcies on a percentage basis and a numerical basis, has reduced since 1977. The South Australian percentage has fallen from 21.2 per cent in the last year of the Labor Government in 1978-79 to 19.4 per cent in 1979-80 and 18.2 per cent in 1980-81. This proves that the Opposition is prepared to use any configuration of figures to create a story and a public perception in this State that is totally inaccurate in relation to the facts.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is Chris Hurford a member of the Opposition here in this House? Is that what you're saying?

Mr OLSEN: If the honourable member had been listening, he would be aware that I referred to Mr Chris Hurford as the Labor Federal member for Adelaide. The Leader of the Opposition, speaking in the second reading debate on the Appropriation Bill, referred to some comments that I had made in relation to pay-roll tax. I indicated that in my opinion pay-roll tax was an insidious tax; it was a tax by stealth as a result of increasing wage levels in the community. The Leader criticised the Government's performance in relation to that. Once again, this is an inaccurate criticism that does not stand up to the test.

If one looks at the Governments performance in bringing down three Budgets since it came to office, one will see clearly that during that three-year period there have been three adjustments to the level of collections of pay-roll tax. Let us compare that to the period from 1971 through to the period when the Liberal Party came into Government. In that eight years they made but three adjustments; in three years we have made three adjustments. Therefore, our record is indeed a little better than what the Labor Opposition can boast about when it was in Government and in control, and when it was capable of making some active decisions in that regard.

The Opposition cares to overlook that, in fact, average weekly earnings in South Australia on a percentage basis are lower than those in the Eastern States and are lower than those applicable for pay-roll tax collections in other areas. The other thing of which the Opposition seems to lose sight is that its colleagues in New South Wales, who happen to control the Treasury benches of that State, have acted to increase taxation in the pay-roll tax area by putting a surcharge of 1 per cent on some sections of the pay-roll tax collection area. I wonder whether that is one of the Opposition's policy options. Would it, in Government, undertake to increase pay-roll tax?

Let us consider the incentives that this Government has allocated. The allocation for the Minister of Industrial Affairs, which has increased 15.6 per cent over last year, is due basically to increases in allocations for incentives to industry, including the establishment payments scheme, the vehicle industry assistance scheme, the export bridging finance scheme, pay-roll tax rebates, and land tax rebates. Members opposite conveniently lose sight of the fact that

those concessions amount to about \$5 563 000 in regard to regional development programmes. That includes \$5 500 000 for the rebate of the pay-roll tax and land tax scheme, which is designed to maintain employment in decentralised areas.

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

Mr McRAE (Playford): I would like to begin by congratulating the member for Rocky River and his wife on the recent successful and happy birth of their child. Having begun on a happy note, I will now move to a most unhappy one. I was disgusted that throughout the day the Government has adopted the line of trying to suggest to the public that there was a split in the Opposition ranks. I assure honourable members that that is not the case in the slightest. As one connected with the Labor Party over many years and as a member in this place for 11 years, I assure honourable members that there is no split in the Labor Party ranks and that we are a united group. In fact, we challenge the Government to an election.

If the Government wants an election now, let it call an election. I will be only too pleased to face an election in my district and to wipe out the sadness of 1979. However, I know very well that my Parliamentary colleagues from Newland and Todd will not be so happy, because they will be wiped out in the cataclysm that will result. This Government has produced the most disgraceful social result in that area that any Government in South Australia has ever produced. If we are being challenged to face an election, let us have an election on any issue. If the issue is to be uranium, let it be uranium; if the issue is to be mining, let us have an election on the issue of mining. Members opposite should be quite clear that, on whatever issue the Government calls an election, the Opposition will not be caught. The Opposition will ensure that the whole broad range of issues is before the electorate.

Mr Olsen: What about your policy options?

Mr McRAE: I have no time to reply to interjections, which are out of order, anyway, so I will move on to my next point. The Government does not have the courage to call an immediate election. This is just a ring-in that the Government has worked out with the Murdoch press and, to a certain extent, with the *Advertiser*. Even then, the *Advertiser* is becoming very weak-kneed about the whole thing, and the *News* is not much better. If the Government does not have the courage to call an immediate election, let us face some mutual problems together to help this State along. I could cite some areas in which the Government and the Opposition could work together very successfully. Some of these areas are vital to our economy.

The first issue is the road to Alice Springs. It is an absolute disgrace that Commonwealth Governments of both political complexions (both A.L.P. and Liberal) have not been prepared over the years to fund this major national enterprise in the way that it should have been funded. I demand that this Government get on with the job and get stuck into Malcolm Fraser. The Government should no longer be a running dog with Malcolm and his pack of discredited curs. It should get on with running the country, with the backing of the Opposition. Next, I demand that the Government obtain some justice for this State. When I talk about justice, I refer to justice in the law system. Why does Perth have a magnificent combined Commonwealth/State law system office block (which leaves anything in this State for dead) while we have nothing?

Thirdly, why is it that in this State we have got no appropriate Commonwealth Administration blocks to cater for the obvious needs of this State, whether it be A.L.P., L.C.L., L.P., National Country Party, I do not care. I am

referring to the workers of this State. I am demanding that we do something about it and I am calling upon this Government to do something about it.

If the Government has not got the courage to face an election immediately, as we have, let us try and work out a tax strategy. God knows, the people in my electorate and those in the north-eastern electorates of Newland and Todd and other places are being crushed by iniquitous tax rates, indirect taxes, taxing the poor to pay for the rich, and iniquitous tax interest rates brought on by the speculative investment of mining companies and others not in legitimate pursuit of long-term resource development, but in speculative pursuit.

Why do people in our electorates have to put up with this kind of punishment, and indeed punishment it is? Why is it that the Prime Minister can seriously say that his whole strategy is designed to give \$500 000 000 away in tax savings when, having taxed the poor to pay for the rich, he will now give \$500 000 000 back to the rich? I demand that this State Government do something about it. The Premier of this State is merely a running dog for Malcolm Fraser. His Ministers and back-benchers are the curs that yap at his heels. I demand that, of the \$500 000 000 he says he will save, this State get \$50 000 000, which it could use for welfare housing, roads and other tangible benefits and which it could use to produce employment where it is so badly needed.

I believe that the Liberal Party in this State, protected as it is by such members as the members for Davenport and Bragg, does not appreciate the realities of life. Let us be academic for a moment. Why cannot we get on with the constitutional convention? Fraser has dropped that. Why cannot we get on at the State level with a State constitutional convention? It appears that the Hon. Trevor Griffin has forgotten that very conveniently. He promised it about three years ago, as I recall, but he has conveniently forgotten it because he is frightened that there might be something like a Bill of Rights introduced.

Let me turn to specifics—the people in my electorate are groaning under the unjust burden of workers compensation payments which are a disgrace in a country of this size. It is appalling to refer to any callover of the list of the Industrial Court and find that it is four, five or six months behind. There are widows and people badly injured suffering because of this Government's inaction—this Government which is seeking to blame everyone but itself. Why is not the same Hon. Trevor Griffin doing something about law reform and trying to put it into action? I have no doubt as to why he is not. It is because the thugs and gangsters that roam the front benches of the Government have told him to do nothing about it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I suggest to the member for Playford that those comments are not the traditional comments used for criticism and I suggest he rephrase his remarks.

Mr McRAE: I will always take your guidance, Sir. The Hon. Trevor Griffin has been overborne by the heavy tactics of some of his colleagues on the front bench in this place, and he has forgotten his priorities. I demand that he get his priorities straight. I demand that we get some justice for the working people of this State.

What is more, I am demanding that we get it fairly quickly, because from what has been happening today it is very obvious that this Government is in such a state of desperation, so tangled within its own ranks, that it has been determined to launch an attack on the Opposition, suggesting that the Leader has not got support. Let me assure you, Sir, that he has the full support of every member of the Opposition. There are no factions within this Opposition. We are ready to go to an election tomorrow. I

personally am willing to fact the people of Playford tomorrow, and I will retain my customary 70 per cent win in Playford, if not better. This Government will be swept aside, and that is why I can see the white faces on the back benches of the Government, such of them as are left. Most of them have deserted the camp.

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

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move: That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to use my 10 minutes to let members of this House know of my disgust with the blatant waste of \$20 000 000 by our millionaire squatter Prime Minister on his ego trip with the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting, in Melbourne. This Prime Minister who is wasting \$20 000 000 of the Australian taxpayers' money is the Prime Minister who, earlier in the year, refused the requests of our Liberal Premier when he journeyed to Canberra, together with the Premiers of other States, to plead for a decent deal so that the State could be run reasonably. We all know, and the Ministers and back-benchers opposite know, how embarrassed they were when the Premier came back with his tail between his legs, saying that he just could not get around the Prime Minister and the Treasurer. A few days later, the Prime Minister and the Treasurer blatantly revealed in the press that it was a big joke and that they had conned all the Premiers, including our South Australian Premier, when there was money in hand that could have been allocated. Our Premier was not strong enough to get any additional funds allocated to South Australia.

I return to the matter of the blatant waste of \$20 000 000, or \$2 500 000 a day. What is it for? Let me point out that \$8 000 000 of that amount is for the provision of 3 000 extra police officers. I do not know what will happen to crime in Victoria or who is looking after that State, nor do I know where they have been able to get an extra 3 000 police officers. It is a disgraceful situation. We hear talk about law and order, but there are kids in the street taking dope and people flogging dope to the children of those States, yet here we have 3 000 additional police officers to look after the Heads of Government.

What do we get out of it? I would like to know what benefit we get. I have the editorials of the *Sydney Morning Herald*, the *Age*, and even the *News* and the *Advertiser*, and we know that they are not usually sympathetic towards the A.L.P., except on the rare occasion. Part of the editorial is headed, 'The tame terror'.

I am referring to Melbourne. I am not talking about Ireland or Russia, which Government members are always saying are so unruly. I have heard the member for Glenelg come back from overseas and say how peaceful it is in Australia. This report comes from our own *News*, which I would not think is sympathetic towards the worker, pensioner or the unemployed person. It is stated that this \$20 000 000 has been blatantly wasted. Why should there be luxury such as these people are being treated to in Melbourne at present when there are people starving who cannot buy one meal a day, let alone the money and food that will be wasted at that conference—enough to keep many unemployed people fed for months and months?

This is the type of Federal Government we have in this country, and the State Liberal Government that supports its actions. One of these papers that supports the Liberal Government said that to see the marksmen taking up their vantage points around the streets of an Australian city is

disconcerting to the Australian man and woman in the street. Wouldn't it be! How would you like to walk up King William Street or North Terrace and have marksmen lining you up with a machine gun, with helicopters flying overhead? The honourable member opposite can shake his bloody head, because in actual fact he has never been without a feed, but I have and I know what I am talking about. It is all right for Government members to shake their heads: they have never been hungry. I know what the waste will be.

Mr Mathwin: Rubbish.

Mr PLUNKETT: I would like the member for Glenelg to get up later and explain to members of this House the benefits we will receive from the meeting of the Commonwealth Heads of Government for eight days and tell us what the \$20 000 000 will be wasted on. What good are we going to get out of it?

An honourable member: Your brother is in Africa.

Mr PLUNKETT: I do not think that Joh Bjelke-Petersen is a mate of members on this side. However, from an article in the *News* last night it appears he had a bit of principle. I did not think he did have, but he had the principle to refuse to be a hypocrite and sit down at the table with Fraser and his cohorts. He saved the taxpayers at least \$150 to \$200, which it would cost at least a head, because he thinks Fraser is a hypocrite and he would not sit at the same table with him, because he knows very well what type of person Fraser is.

Fraser claims he is the champion of the Aboriginal. I tell you what he is: he is a hypocrite, that is certain. For six years the Prime Minister has postured as a supporter of Aboriginal welfare. He is now monumentally embarrassed by the World Council of Churches report on the eve of the Commonwealth talks in Melbourne. He should be no less embarrassed by his Government's spending programme on Aboriginal welfare over the past six years. In real terms spending has fallen 35 per cent since the last Labor Budget. If the Prime Minister honoured his election promises to maintain existing levels of support programmes for Aborigines, this Government would be in debt to the Aboriginal people for \$213 000 000 in accumulated loss of funds over the past few years.

Mr Mathwin: It makes your mouth water.

Mr PLUNKETT: It makes you laugh all right! Aboriginal housing programmes are down 43 per cent, education funding down 30 per cent, and health funding down 22 per cent. Members opposite do not like any person to stand here, raise his voice and tell them what hypocrites the Federal Government is, and the State Premier is. I can tell honourable members opposite what they will be doing in 18 months—they will also be getting the wrath and fury of voters who will be showing them what hypocrites they are. The Government has talked about not increasing taxes but it has increased them in every way. Honourable members opposite should go and ask the worker or his wife, who has to pay extra money for everything she buys in a shop, about this.

What happened about petrol? The stupidity of members of the Liberal Government caused South Australian people to suffer the loss of millions of dollars. That was a blatant example—\$20 000 000 was wasted—

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the member for Glenelg tell me what benefits came from that, because I will be listening for his reply. There is no benefit for workers, unemployed people or pensioners. The Prime Minister is prepared to waste \$20 000 000 to satisfy his own ego. What about giving something to the unemployed and pensioners? Pensioners are never mentioned. The Prime Minister was born with a gold spoon in his mouth, and has never had to earn money

in his life. I know where he got his property from—it was given to him. All the Frasers have not had to worry about earning money to buy anything.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I wish to address myself to three main issues this evening. First, I must address myself to comments made by the member for Florey in regard to his completely unfounded allegations against members of the Liberal Government concerning reasons why the Minister of Transport has announced that the Government will have a guideway system for the full length of the busway between the near city area and Tea Tree Plaza.

First, the honourable member alleged that the Government had decided to do this because of the amount of concrete that would be required to build the guideways, with the consequent amount of stone, rubble and so on that would be needed for the manufacture of that cement. I point out to the member for Florey that, had a light rail system been implemented, there would also have been a tremendous amount of rubble required as ballast for the construction of the rail system. If there had been a conventional busway, it would also have been constructed of concrete; in fact it would have required far more concrete than will the guided busway. So much for the allegation that the decision was made to look after, so it was suggested, people in the Liberal Party.

The member for Florey also alleged that members of this Government are associated with Mercedes-Benz. Once again, the honourable member did not mention any particular names, so a good broad general smear of everyone in the Government is made. I challenge the member for Florey to name the members of the Government Party, either in this House or in the other House, who supposedly have a financial interest in Mercedes-Benz. I shall be most interested to hear his speech, as he has not yet spoken in this grievance debate. I also point out to the honourable member that perhaps people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, because there are many members present and past in the Labor Party driving around in Volvo cars, and we all know how many Volvo buses were ordered by the previous Government.

Mr Slater: What do you mean by that?

Mr ASHENDEN: This evening, the member for Gilles made a number of statements obviously designed to be critical of the Government and the money it is spending to develop industry and employment in South Australia.

Mr Slater: That's right.

Mr ASHENDEN: I trust that that interjection by the member for Gilles has been recorded in *Hansard*. This evening the member for Gilles has repeated what he said last night when he agreed that he is anti-business development in South Australia. Those words are in *Hansard*, and I will have great delight in using them in the electorate of Todd. The honourable member said that each job created through the proposals that have been approved by the I.D.C. will cost this State \$3 000. How long will it take before that money is recouped by this State? The fact is that over 2 000 people will be gainfully employed, instead of being required to live on unemployment benefits. It will not take long for that \$3 000 per job to come back and be paid over and over again in positive contributions to this State. Therefore, if each job has cost the State \$3 000, I believe that is \$3 000 extremely well spent, and this is the same Party that criticised this Government for its supposed lack of interest in the unemployed.

The honourable member then went on to criticise the Government because it is doubling the amount of money devoted to attracting industry to South Australia. This is also money well spent, and it is a sign that this Government intends to continue the excellent work it has done in attracting industry and investment to South Australia.

The honourable member then contradicted himself tonight on a point he made last night, when he said that growth in employment in South Australia is only tied to the growth in population. Yet, last night he spent five minutes telling us that the population in South Australia was declining because everybody is going interstate.

Mr Slater: I'm talking about the alleged growth in the work force, you bloody numskull.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I ask the honourable member which side of the coin he is calling, heads or tails. He then made a ridiculous point that what the Government is doing would take 88 years to take on all of the unemployed in South Australia. The point is that this Government is doing something about unemployment. Whereas the number of jobs available in South Australia was declining at an extremely rapid rate in the last two years of the Labor Government, from September 1979, the number of jobs available in South Australia has increased even more steeply than was the decrease under the previous Government. Unemployment is still unacceptably high, but we took over from a Government that had the highest unemployment in Australia. We have set about creating jobs and employment in this State and will continue to do so. Had this Government not been elected, South Australia would now be confronting an absolutely disastrous situation.

I note that the member for Gilles has indicated that he will help the A.L.P. candidate in Todd at the coming election. He will be more help to the Government than he will be to the Opposition, and we will be in Government again after the next election. I look forward to continuing here as the member for Todd.

Let us look at what members opposite are doing in their attempt to destroy the economy of South Australia. This is the third occasion I have raised the situation in relation to what the unions have been doing over the past three months.

Mr Slater: Here comes the basher again.

Mr ASHENDEN: I am sad that members opposite call me a union basher, because I am going to quote to honourable members statements from members of the A.C.T.U. Congress and other unionists who are stating exactly what I am stating. Let us hear what some of their fellow members have to say.

Because two unions cannot agree as to which union a man should belong, all of Australian National rail transport throughout the southern half of Australia has come to a complete halt. This has happened because the Australian Railways Union and the A.W.U. cannot agree to which union the man should belong. I hope members all read the article in today's *Advertiser* by Mr Colquhoun, as that article pointed out perfectly the absolutely ridiculous situation that exists. Let me quote statements that have been made by the gentleman concerned. He first said:

I'm a nervous wreck. It's made me upset and I don't want to hurt anyone, especially my work mates.

The next quotation is as follows:

The dispute has stopped the movement of interstate passenger trains.

He goes on to say:

I wish they'd sit down and thrash it out so I can get back to work. Times are hard enough, especially with five children.

This poor man has been stopped from working, not because of a dispute between union and management, but because of a dispute between union and union. If any member opposite (and they think it is hilarious) can justify to me an inter-union dispute being legitimate, then let me hear his argument. This man then continues:

I don't care which way it turns out; I just want to get back to work.

That is exactly what most members of unions want to do—get back to work. It is union management that is stopping them from working and earning their rightful income. He goes on to say:

I'm too scared to go to the pub for a drink.

What sort of indictment is that of the union movement, a movement which is supposed to exist to protect the rights of the working man, yet this is the sort of thing it does.

I refer next to the veteran New South Wales Secretary of the Australian Workers Union, Mr Oliver, who is a member of the A.C.T.U. congress. Referring to his remarks, a newspaper report states that he said:

There was no more divisive issue confronting the congress than demarcation disputes. At present, the A.W.A. had 400 members 'out of work on the grass, because of a demarcation issue'. It was totally stupid, but a fact of life, that there were more disputes in industry today over demarcation than there were 'against the bosses.'

How on earth can I be regarded as a union basher when all I am doing is agreeing with members of the union movement who want to work? That is the point that I have been making. The unionist himself wants to work, but he is being prevented from working because of the stupidity and short-sightedness of so many of the union management who are supposed to be looking after the interests of the workers, such as those to whom I have referred this evening. If that is looking after workers, I cannot understand it at all. The sooner we have industry unions and not trade unions in Australia the better off this country will be. In that way we will then bring sanity to bear.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I find it difficult to speak after being subjected to such absolute garbage. For the life of me I could not work out exactly what point the member for Todd was trying to get across. I do not think that he knows himself. In fact, he is following on from the conduct of the Deputy Premier and the Premier earlier today and the inanities that they came out with. They bring to mind the old Greek saying—and I say this in the context of a coming election—that those whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad. But that is not the main point I wish to make in my contribution.

I would like to refer instead to the problems being faced by the Women's Studies Resource Centre which was recently criticised by the members for Brighton, Henley Beach and Mallee and by other back-benchers in this Chamber and outside it.

Some concern has been expressed in some circles about Budget funding for Women's Resource Centres and for other matters related to women in the Education Department, particularly now that the positions of Women's Adviser in the Education Department and in the Department of Further Education have been renamed Equal Opportunities Advisers. I understand that, in relation to the Women's Studies Resource Centre, a working party was recently established at Ministerial instigation to review the funding of that centre. It would appear that that working party has been set up as a result of Festival of Light

pressure on the Minister, possibly via some of his back-benchers. I am curious about how safe the Women's Studies Resource Centre really is.

Mr Slater: How many back-benchers are in the Festival of Light, do you think?

Mr TRAINER: I do not know, but I might make some comments about that aspect later. It is certainly very strange how members opposite seem to knuckle under to the Festival of Light so quickly. There could well be a danger, as a result of funding cuts in this Budget, that we will see the progress that has been made in the Education Department during the 1970s completely done away with. I will be examining very closely the Budget line under the Education Department, 'Minister, Miscellaneous', to see what attacks are being made on the Women's Studies Resource Centre.

It has been very strange that, recently (and I am not necessarily referring to the Minister of Education), there has been some sort of Ministerial support for activities connected with the Festival of Light and with certain attacks made in this place. I suspect some sort of Ministerial assistance was given to the member for Brighton in the preparation, typing and photocopying of his speech. It appears that there was some Ministerial examination of the speech before its delivery. Certainly, there was some sort of Ministerial assistance so far as press secretaries are concerned in relation to the distribution of that speech to the press gallery prior to its delivery in this House.

An honourable member: It was a bloody shame, a tragedy.

Mr TRAINER: It was a disgraceful speech, absolutely disgraceful and rather inane. It was rather fortunate, however, that one or two inanities in the prepared speech were deleted before the member presented it to the House. He dropped the reference to Nostradamus and fortunately he also dropped the reference to H. G. Wells writing about a new order in 1984. Presumably, he was intending to say George Orwell.

Returning to my theme regarding the attack on health education and the side effects as a spill-over from that particular attack; namely, attacks on the Women's Studies Resource Centre. When the member for Brighton delivered his Marquis de Sade diatribe on 4 August, he expressed views apparently derived from a publication originating in Geelong, dealing with sex education in Victoria. There were some very strange views expressed in that particular pamphlet entitled *They have got your kids*. The Minister himself referred to that particular pamphlet in a reply to a question asked by the member for Salisbury. In that reply, unfortunately, he declined to give any sort of a firm defence against the charges of the member for Brighton against the teaching profession. In that response the Minister mentioned how the member for Brighton had acted in what he called 'good faith' and referred to the pamphlet *They have got your kids*. He said that in that pamphlet 'it is quite unquestionable that the various claims made in the article were addressed to members of this House'. I have had a look at that pamphlet. I have a copy that was originally delivered at a Christian Revival Meeting down in Millicent as it was distributed on this side of the border as well as near Geelong, and I cannot find any reference at all to the South Australian Parliament.

The Minister also went on to say, 'It is still to be proven whether, in fact, this document is erroneous,' and he said 'I am taking that up personally'. We are still waiting to hear what the results of the investigation are and I wonder whether we ever will hear. Let us consider the contents of that pamphlet, its background, and where it came from; for example, it quoted comments of the Secretary of the group

that produced it, the Concerned Parents Association, a Mr Denis Bayles. Referring to the Victorian situation in the *Geelong News* of 1 August 1980, an article quotes him:

The Education Department should revert to 'the old style of biology course—about a one lesson job as far as reproduction goes'.

It is far better for a child to learn about sex behind the shelter shed than in the classroom. It is less dangerous there than to let the child to be subjected to the barrage of information and values they are getting at the moment.

Other comments made in that particular pamphlet were as follows: it implied that, for example, sex education in schools was damaging the basic literacy and numeracy skills of students. The leaflet states:

Parents would do well to ask themselves why their children are apparently unable to concentrate, unable to master the basic skills of literacy and numeracy, and unable to communicate. It has been shown that the exposure of children to explicit sex education damages their general learning ability.

The slogan at the end of the pamphlet states: 'Act now! Your taxes are paying for the seduction of your children.' The group that produced that rather strange pamphlet, the Concerned Parents Association, is centred in Geelong. The President, one of the Vice-Presidents and the Secretary are all Geelong men. I think it is rather significant that only men are taking a leading light in the matter. They have attempted to expand the group to cover the whole of Victoria. The key person seems to be one Paul McLeod, who is just one parent of a student in Belmont High School in Geelong who kicked up a fuss and who whipped himself into a frenzy, and he was in a key position in the community as a sub-editor with the *Geelong Advertiser*. He was responsible for a whole series of lurid articles dealing with sex education.

Later, apparently, he lost his job with the *Geelong Advertiser* as a result of the storm that was kicked up, and he is now a public relations consultant with a building society. Mr McLeod in his articles, for example in the 21 June 1980 *Geelong Advertiser*, talked about a communist document, 'Rules for Revolution', which states 'Corrupt the young; get them away from religion; get them interested in sex.' He also quoted an article from the American John Birch Society publication, *American Opinion*, as follows:

When General William F. Dean was released from a Korean Communist prison camp, the young Chinese psychologists who had been trying to break him said: 'General, don't feel bad about leaving us. You know, we will soon be with you. We are going to capture your country.'

Asked how, they replied: 'We are going to destroy the moral character of a generation of your young Americans, and when we have finished, you will have nothing with which to really defend yourself against us.'

The member for Brighton whipped himself up into a lather on 4 August after reading that sort of material, and I have already dealt adequately with the content of his speech. It was very strange that a Festival of Light pamphlet appeared within a day or two, with a photograph of the member for Brighton on the front. Under the heading 'Children at Risk', the pamphlet stated:

Come and hear what our children are reading in their school books.

I think most members would have had a chance to look at the pamphlet. It was strange that it stated, concerning 27 August:

It is time to stand up and fight . . . Don't miss hearing him.

Apparently, all the people who went to the Crusade Centre did miss hearing the honourable member, because he did not turn up at that meeting, at which he was to be the key speaker. He was in the House. It was very strange that, on that night, nine pairs were granted, and yet for some reason or other the member for Brighton did not consider that his big moment of glory was important enough to justify the

granting of a pair. I will leave it to the people to come to their own conclusions.

Some other members were pretty stupid in regard to this subject. For example, the member for Todd went even further than the member for Brighton. Referring to the four letter words, he stated:

The member for Brighton was using language which was being used by some teachers in some schools.

Even the member for Brighton was not silly enough to say that teachers were using four letter words to their pupils, but the member for Todd said that. The member for Henley Beach, who is a rather stupid individual, and, I understand, the member for Brighton, have since visited the Women's Study Resource Centre and they might have learnt something that might make them back down.

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

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): As a result of the continued procrastination by this Government in regard to providing adequate delivery of health services to the northern region, more and more people are now being directed into the Central Districts Private Hospital, which everyone knows is an offshoot of the notorious Hospital Corporation of America. This corporation, after being denied the right to expand its operations in the United States of America, has turned its attentions to rich pickings in this country. I have been receiving more and more information that people are being channelled into the Central Districts Private Hospital by surgeons.

It has been suggested to me that there is a conspiracy by some doctors to promote the hospital at the expense of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I do not know whether this is true, as the majority of surgeons who practise in the Salisbury and Elizabeth area are ethical people and would not be party to promoting a hospital that was set up for gain only. Eleven medical people are on the advisory board of the hospital. The Minister of Health has said in the past that private hospitals are more efficient in financial terms than are public hospitals. If the treatment that one of my constituents received recently at the Central Districts Private Hospital is any indication, that may well be so, because the treatment she received was nothing short of scandalous. The shadow Minister of Health, Dr John Cornwall, has continually called for checks into the operation of private hospitals that exist for profit only, but this has been met by an uncharacteristic silence from the Minister of Health, who usually rises to the bait every time.

Since the opening of the hospital, the permanent staff has been scaled down considerably. Services to patients have been cut to make more profit. Two sisters and four enrolled nurses are on duty at night to cover 68 beds and I am told that sometimes the staff work seven to eight day shifts to keep down the number of staff employed so that the hospital can save money. My constituent was admitted to the hospital on 11 September for minor surgery to remove teflon mesh from her abdomen. The mesh had been placed there some years ago when she had a hernia operation and had gall stones removed.

She was admitted at 10 a.m. and had the operation at 2 p.m. Whilst her husband was visiting her in the evening, she complained of feeling sick. The husband called for a nurse over the intercom system and was told to select a bowl and look after his wife himself. After he left that night she again felt sick and asked over the intercom for some water. She was told that water was available in the bathroom and that she would have to fetch it herself. During the night she was continually sick and was given water.

In the morning she apologised to her fellow patient in the room, a 13-year old girl, for disturbing that child's rest. She explained that it was due to her being continually sick. The child's answer was, 'That's all right, it was I who was looking after you.' My constituent's suffering had been ignored by the hospital and it was left to a 13-year old child, a fellow patient, to administer her needs.

The matter does not end there. Thirteen days after the operation my constituent noticed that her eyes were going yellow. She thought that she was contracting hepatitis, so she arranged to see the surgeon, who, within one hour, had her admitted to Flinders Medical Centre. After blood tests were taken, it was found that she had halothane poisoning.

Halothane is the anesthetic used in the operation. She was questioned as to why this had not been apparent to the staff at the Central Districts Private Hospital after the operation. She told the specialist of her traumatic experience that I have outlined to the House. Another specialist was called in and she was asked to repeat the statement. After hearing it, that person said, 'My goodness, what kind of post-operative care have they got up there?'

My constituent has now to wear a medical bracelet stating that she is allergic to halothane. I have been told that halothane poisoning can be fatal if not treated early. I am not suggesting that it was through the Central Districts Private Hospital that she became allergic, but if she had received the proper care and surveillance that night by professional staff instead of treatment by a 13-year old fellow patient, corrective measures could have been taken earlier.

My constituent speaks highly of the surgeon and of the treatment she received at Flinders Medical Centre. Her anger is quite rightly directed at the Central Districts Private Hospital. She has asked me to publicise the affair. Her treatment at the hands of this hospital should be publicised so that others can be made aware of the dangers of going to the Central Districts Private Hospital. I may add that the cost of her princely treatment at the hospital was \$114 a day.

Mr Oswald: Can you name the matron?

Mr HEMMINGS: If the member for Morphett wants me to name the people concerned, I will name them. The cost of her princely treatment at the Central Districts Private Hospital was \$114 a day, whereas the much maligned Flinders Medical Centre, which receives a lot of criticism from our worthy Minister of Health, charged only \$86 a day. It is high time that these private hospitals which exist purely for profit and which try to extract every dollar they can out of the community through so-called health care were exposed for what they are. They are profiteers and charlatans.

The one thing that worries me and that concerns members on this side of the House is that these private hospitals, which exist for profit, are being supported by this Government. At no stage has the Minister of Health criticised the private hospitals that exist for profit only. She has criticised public hospitals for their increased expenditure, and she has criticised every area of health which is carried out on a public basis, and it is about time, if the Minister is concerned about the health of this community, that she checked the profit motives of the Hospital Corporation of America, which is fast growing in this State.

Mr Oswald: Do you know what sort of staff they had on that night?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes. There were two sisters and four enrolled nurses to cover 68 beds.

Mr Oswald: All full?

Mr HEMMINGS: They were full at the time, but the thing is that the Central Districts Private Hospital does not work by nurses coming around to see how the patients are. The patients have to contact the nurses through an intercom system. It is all very well to say, 'We will give you a private room, a share room, a television set, and everything else,' but the whole basis of professional health care is that the nurses look after the patients. The way the Central Districts Private Hospital works—

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

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want tonight to direct most of my remarks at what this Government is doing about bikeways but, before I start on that, I think it is appropriate to answer some of the statements made in the past two days by some members opposite about this Government's proposals for the O'Bahn system to service the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. We have now a rather interesting political situation. We have the member for Florey, who is shadow spokesman on transport, and who is trying to push an intelligent Opposition line, and yet he is in a cleft stick: if he suggests that the people of the north-eastern suburbs are to have a rapid transit system, whether an O'Bahn or an l.r.t. system, obviously he will lose a lot of votes for his colleague, the member for Norwood.

We heard the member for Norwood tonight make a lot of very critical statements about the rapid transit system going down the Torrens Valley. The Minister of Transport, who is the member for Torrens, at least has had the courage to come out and tell his own constituents, as well as the public of South Australia, what this Government proposes. He has proposed something which I believe will provide the best option for the north-eastern suburbs. It will provide a very superior rapid transit system, and a system that will create minimal environmental impact on the inner suburban areas.

Therefore, we have pressure on the Opposition to say what it would do if it were in Government. We know that, prior to his demotion from the position of shadow Minister of Transport, the member for Elizabeth had suggested that if Labor ever got back into power it might not abandon the O'Bahn concept, depending on circumstances. So, he in fact has withdrawn what had been the A.L.P. policy up to that time. We are now left in a vacuum. The public at this point has no idea what the A.L.P. policy would be, what it would offer the people of the north-eastern suburbs as a rapid transit system, and they deserve to know now. If people are going to criticise, then such criticism is fatuous unless it is placed within the context of what alternative is offered.

Criticism with no alternative is fatuous criticism, and that is what we are hearing at the moment. I believe that the Opposition is not game to say what it would offer because, as I said, on the one hand it would lose votes in the north-east and, on the other hand, it would lose the seat of Norwood. Let us look at some of those criticisms and at what honourable members opposite have said. The member for Florey last night accused the Government of procrastination. Then, in the very next sentence, said that it was rushing into a decision. How one can reconcile those two statements, I do not know. To my mind, and to the minds of most people in South Australia, those statements are contradictory.

The fact is that an alternative was offered at the last State election. It has been investigated in a most proper fashion. The decisions that have been taken at each stage have been most cautious and considered decisions, and I think that the proof of that is that the Government was prepared to limit the guideway portions to the inner suburbs

where the overpowering environmental consideration had to be taken into account. It was prepared, as at August 1980, not to include the guideway all the way to Tea Tree Plaza so as to avoid possible soil problems that might have been encountered farther out. The proof of that caution is that now, following further investigation, it is prepared to expand on that original concept, having seen that its initial investigations had under-estimated the benefits of the O'Bahn guideway system. That was clearly seen in the following decision that has been taken.

Following the comments of the member for Florey last night, the member for Norwood tonight repeated some of those allegations, saying that the proposal had been hastily prepared and that it did not allow for full public discussion. Yet, the same members, in June and July last year, accused the Government of wasting time and said that it should hurry up and make a decision. Certainly, there was some view within the community in the north-eastern suburbs that, having five or six years of public discussion, they wanted to see something happen. Now they will see it happen, and construction will begin in February next year. I think that they will be most delighted with the result.

Let us look again at some of the allegations made by the member for Norwood. I think that some of the statements which he has been making, and which no doubt he will continue to make, will make good propaganda for the Liberal Party in the north-eastern suburbs. He alleged, for example, that the buses will have to be converted to electricity. He went on to say that that would have to be done within the next decade. No such statement has been made by the Minister. The Minister has said that with a bus-type system it is possible to change to different motive-powered systems. That will happen when the buses normally come up for replacement. However, if we have a tram system, that cannot happen for at least 30 to 35 years.

Finally on that subject, I refer members to an article by Ron Struan, the S.T.A. Chief Engineer, who saw the O'Bahn system. I think that his response is typical of the response of those who have gone overseas and actually seen the system. He was reported in an article in *Among Ourselves* as follows:

Well, after being a little sceptical at home, I must confess that I am almost a convert to the system.

So, here is a man who admits that he was prejudiced against the system before he went to see it. Now if one reads the article, one finds that the only criticisms he had were very minor criticisms indeed. In fact he said:

The ride was very smooth and quiet. The beauty of the O'Bahn system is that it can be built up in stages from the normal bus service to the ultimate system as funds become available. The O'Bahn system is probably the first system proposed which combines the advantages of both bus and rail travel, and is convenient, speedy and flexible.

Mr Keneally: And unproven.

Dr BILLARD: As I said, the only criticisms were those which applied not to the O'Bahn system that we are using but to what they call the ultimate system, where the buses do not leave the guideway, but stay on it for ever. In the one minute that remains, I want to direct members' attention to what I found in Germany at Braunschweig, regarding bikeways, because that city has quite an elaborate network of bikeways that are built into the footpaths. I thought that that was very interesting. In fact, the bikeways varied from between 3 feet to 10 feet in width and were delineated by a surface of a different texture, so that, if the footpath was made out of pavers, the bikeway was made out of asphalt, and vice versa. So, there was a system of bikeways that were actually built into the footpaths, which I thought was quite an interesting idea. Obviously, they had some laws relating—

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I am pleased that the previous speaker is still in the House. In fact, I am a little disappointed about what we heard from him, because I thought that he might take some time at least to refer to a matter on which he took the trouble to address a seminar, the results and comments of which were published in the *Central Times* on Thursday, 2 July. The topic was a seminar on uranium, which was organised by the Social Justice Commission and which allowed a wide range of views to be presented on a diverse subject. The reporter, Alastair Blake, said:

Dr Brian Billard, a Liberal Party member of the State Parliament, referred to the difficulty of assessing the relative safety of nuclear energy and alternatives such as coal.

So, clearly the honourable member does not have the position clear in his own mind, because he actually spoke about that point.

Dr Billard: That is a misinterpretation of what I said.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If the honourable member has a complaint, I suggest that he take it up with Alastair Blake, and not with me: I am simply reporting what is contained in the 2 July issue of the *Central Times*. Alastair Blake further went on to say (and I believe that this was very interesting):

A Government must seek independent advice and then make a decision. He also warned of the 'political tricks' that can be used to propagate support for a point of view.

I only hope that the honourable member remembers those quite sensible remarks that he made concerning the use of political tricks when the matter is further debated, which it will be.

My main reason for speaking tonight is to place in *Hansard* and to make known to those members of the House who are here what I believe is the most chilling document outside the chronicles relating to the concentration camps of World War II. The document, entitled 'Counting the cost of radiation', is official, in the sense that it is a news release from the British Consulate-General in Sydney. It is dated 19 August 1981, so it is reasonably current. The document states:

Britain's National Radiological Protection Board has made what is believed to be the first attempt to quantify the cost of exposure to radiation within the dose limits laid down internationally.

In this way it is believed it will be possible to weigh the cost of reducing the risk to the individual against the cost of premature death from radiation.

Many countries, including the United Kingdom, have adopted international collective dose levels that should not be exceeded, but the problem is in putting into practice the recommendation of the International Commission on Radiological Protection that all exposures within those limits should be kept as low as reasonably achievable after economic and social factors have been taken into account.

Although collective dose levels are limited, individuals working in and around nuclear establishments can be exposed to higher than average doses of radiation. The individual risk factor is thus much higher for such people and it is difficult to decide just how much should be spent to reduce their exposure which is already within the accepted limits.

The NRPB [the same body we are speaking of] has now produced a system that takes into account both individual and collective exposures and attempts to put a price on risk levels so that operators of sources of man-made radiation can be helped in deciding what is the lowest exposure limits they can reasonably achieve.

Bearing in mind the time remaining, I am happy to make the rest of the intervening portion of the release available to any member who wishes it. I want to stress certain points. The release continues:

The board lays down that the cost of a premature death from an accumulation of low levels of radiation [inside the accepted levels] can be \$165 000 in terms of that person's lost output and

cost of health care. In the case of a person exposed to levels close to the dose limit the figure rises to \$4 000 000. Against this—and this is the chilling part of this coldly factual scientific release—

operators can weigh the cost of extra shielding of radiation sources or equipment to cut the level of radiation discharged from a plant. Thus such measures taken to eliminate a single death could justify on a cost-benefit basis an investment varying between \$165 000 and \$4 000 000.

That is the way science sometimes approaches these matters: it is a life—one can put a cost on it and one can then weigh up whether we ought to double the thickness of lead recommended (or whatever may be provided for a shield) and we can take into account also the social and economic factors and then we can make that decision and, if we make the decision the wrong way or the way that the cost benefit analysis comes out, then Jonesy is dead, stiff cheese.

I am not making up any of these statements. This is a news release of the date I have given from the British Consulate General and emanates from the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom is often cited by members opposite as a place where safe practice totally exists in relation to the nuclear fuel cycle industry. I make no further comment than that. If members opposite are happy to dismiss what I have brought to the attention of the House, that is their business. I am not happy to dismiss it. I said that it was coldly chilling. It can be only put against the sorts of arguments that must have been bandied around drug laboratories when the decision was taken to manufacture thalidomide and to state in coldly scientific cost evaluative terms that it was quite all right to use that particular drug in the circumstances in which it was marketed. The world now knows differently. If members opposite wonder why we have a course of action in respect of uranium that is somewhat different from their approach (a course of action that is more cautious and says, 'Wait a minute, let us be sure in this dangerous area') then I draw those two matters to their attention.

There is one other area where the Premier has run out of credibility. The Government was elected on a promise of getting everything in this State going and fixing it up. He said that mining would fix it all and it was only just around the corner. However, *Johnny Green's Journal*, the journal of the South Australian Chamber of Mines Incorporated, in July this year in relation to the time scale and under the heading 'Resource boom', stated:

It took Santos 20 years with no profits to develop the Cooper Basin. It took Mt Isa 24 years and at least three bankruptcies to get going. It takes from 10 to 20 years to develop a major mine. It will probably take until the mid 1990s to fully develop South Australia's uranium mining, milling, conversion and enrichment potential, provided there are no adverse major changes of Government policy, altered financial requirements such as resources rent, taxes, wars, prolonged strikes, etc. etc.!

They are not the words of the Labor Party: they are the words of the Chamber of Mines in this State, authoritatively placed in that journal under the heading 'Resource boom'. Therefore, the shallow nature of the false promises made during the election campaign and at other times by the present Government are clearly exposed by those who are most competent to analyse those sorts of statements. They are published for all to read, should they wish, in this particular journal.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I have a number of points I wish to grieve about tonight but, before doing so, I wish to acknowledge in *Hansard* my thanks to an ex-member of the *Hansard* staff, the now retired Mr Gordon Stacey, for the work that he has done with *Hansard* for many years. As one of the new members referred to when speeches of thanks were given in this House, I have had good cause to appreciate the work that Gordon Stacey did

during my first months in this Parliament, as one of the speedier of speakers in my earlier days and perhaps still as one of the speedier of speakers.

I very much appreciated the support and understanding he gave me as I found my way in this place, established myself, and came to understand that some of us speak at speeds greater than others and contain in those speeds a lot of words that have to be noted. Indeed, they are of such weighty significance that even the Minister of Agriculture should listen to them all the time. I place on record my thanks to Mr Stacey for that. At a time when I felt a little bit self-conscious about the speed of my speaking he reassured me and indicated that *Hansard* was well capable of coping with it. Indeed, the *Hansard* staff has done so excellently throughout my time here to date and I have no doubt that they will continue to do that in the years ahead.

I now turn to the matters of grievance that I wish to raise tonight. It was very difficult to identify which areas I should bring up, because there are so many areas in education that I could grieve on for hours upon hours, even giving each one only cursory attention. In fact, I was going through my files tonight looking for something that I might talk about. I have come up with a thick wad of papers that should be dealt with. Unfortunately, I will not be able to talk about all of them in the 10 minutes that I have, and I doubt whether I will be able to get through them during the Estimates Committees in a fortnight's time.

There are too many things that require action by this Minister which is not being taken. I will quickly try to identify just a few. When I was looking for points of grievance to debate I was astounded to find that I had received a letter from the Peterborough area referring to a leaflet that the member for Eyre had circulated in that electorate. It is similar to others circulated by many other Liberal members of Parliament in relation to education. It is labelled 'Education—the other side of the story'. I do not have time to go through that leaflet in its entirety, but it is quite an astounding document. It contains a number of things that are blatantly untrue and a number of other things that are blatantly misrepresented.

The statement that sums up the attitude presumably of the member for Eyre is this: the Liberal Government will maintain the present high standards of education for your children. That is what the member for Eyre tells us about the Liberal Government. I suppose there is no better person to ask about the quality of Liberal education in this State than the Premier. He is the one who knows in what direction he is taking his Government. He is the one who can tell us what the philosophy is and the priority is towards education.

The Premier wrote a letter in reply to a citizen of South Australia, who had written to him on 18 August this year, complaining about the attitude of the Minister of Education and about the attitude of this Government at present. Amongst other things, the Premier indicated that he could not agree with the criticisms of the Minister of Education. He and the Minister can at least form a twosome in their solidarity of being the two in the State who do not agree with the criticisms made of the Minister. In the penultimate paragraph he says, 'I am confident that cuts contained in the education Budget will not cause'—and note this next phrase carefully—'any noticeable deterioration of the high standard of education in this State'. He is not denying that there will be a deterioration of education in this State as the result of cuts: he is merely saying that, as far as it is within his capacity, it will not be noticeable. It is certainly true that in the Budget papers they have tried to keep its noticeability (if there be such a word) as low as possible. Let the Government be reassured that in the Estimates Committee on education on 14 October that will not be the case.

That is quite in contrast to the member for Eyre's pamphlet, also distributed by other Liberal members, about maintaining the present high standard of education. Here in this letter the Premier has acknowledged that there will be a deterioration, so that puts a lie to what was distributed at least in that area and certainly in quite a few other areas, too. I will raise in the Estimates Committee on education, and on public works loans, quite a number of areas relating to spending on education and spending on school buildings. At the moment I want to bring to the attention of the House one area that deserves attention equally as well as a great many others. This is not to give this any more or any less priority than the others, but to indicate just how important is the need for adequate investment in education.

The Flagstaff Hill Primary School, in the electorate of the member for Brighton (who apparently is not all that concerned about the situation, because he has not raised the matter in this House), has a population of just over 1 000 students. The grounds of that school are adequate for 400 students. The grounds of the school consist, if one actually looks at them, of one oval. For most of the year that one oval is under water. It is not really suitable for being used by the students of that school. So not only does the school have less than half the area of ground that it should have but also the ground that it does have is inadequate. The number of teams that have to use that area depends on the number of students who form themselves into teams. I am reliably informed that there are at least nine sports teams at that school which would like to use the grounds available and which, naturally, have difficulty using those grounds. We will follow that up in the Estimates Committee. I am sorry the Minister is not here in the House; he was here a while ago and I was hoping he would be here to give an immediate answer by way of interjection, with your indulgence, Sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, that needs to be answered. The community has had a school provided for it, and it needs to be given an indication that the grounds have some importance and that the community will be given a fair degree of response by the Government that the grounds will be developed in a manner adequate to the needs of the students of that community.

I refer now to a kindergarten that is situated in my district. The directors of the kindergarten have written to the Minister complaining that the kindergarten does not have adequate facilities to cater for the many young children who live in the district. I am well aware of the number of young children who live in my district. The letter to the Minister stated:

On behalf of the parents and staff of Lantana Kindergarten, we wish to register the strongest possible protest at the lack of full-time kindergarten places available to four-year-olds in Parafield Gardens. At present, only three-quarters of the four- and five-year-olds enrolled at Lantana Kindergarten receive the full four kindergarten sessions per week. This situation will deteriorate even further over the next few years as the kindergarten's catchment area continues to grow with several new Housing Trust areas opening up.

The letter goes on to detail why that situation is quite unacceptable. The situation is unacceptable. The Minister, in his policy statement to the people of South Australia before the last election, indicated the importance of pre-school education. This situation is not an isolated case: many similar situations occur throughout the State, where adequate facilities are not available. The Minister's response was quite unsatisfactory; in fact, he acknowledged that. At the end of his letter, where he told the community that it

would not get extra facilities in the short term, the Minister stated:

I trust this information, whilst not entirely to your satisfaction, will satisfy you that my Government is attempting to meet the pre-school needs in all areas of the State but that these needs must be met first where they are most pressing.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to raise an issue that has been raised many times before in this House—daylight saving. Last week I received a letter from Mrs J. Hitch, Secretary of the Pinkawillinie Women's Agricultural Bureau near Buckleboo. The letter has some merit and, more particularly, it outlines some of the difficulties experienced by people in the western part of the State because of the way in which daylight saving affects them. The letter states:

Dear Mr Blacker,

We, the members of the Pinkawillinie Women's Agricultural Bureau are concerned about the daylight saving referendum that will possibly be conducted at the next State election. Although we are opposed to daylight saving we would like to see an alternative to the YES/NO voting, that being that daylight saving run for a shorter period of time, that is, from 1 December to 1 February.

Mr Whitten: What about a longer period—one more month?

Mr BLACKER: The letter continues:

There are many aspects that daylight saving affects in our rural areas. Due to our geographical location, schoolchildren are going to bed in daylight, which is still the heated part of the evening. Large numbers of these small children in our outlying areas have many kilometres to travel to and from school by bus during the hottest part of the day. Parents and children find it a hassle to readjust to the change that is made in daylight saving time a month after starting school of each new year.

Our farming husbands experience the inconvenience of closing grain silos during mid afternoon when reaping is at its fullest capacity and the weather is still suitably hot. These are a few objections we have to daylight saving as it is now and we are hoping you will give our suggestion your consideration and fullest support.

Hoping you are able to help,

Yours faithfully,
J. Hitch

I am aware that daylight saving has been the subject of debate on numerous occasions, but I do not believe that the majority of the members in this House fully appreciate the inconvenience that daylight saving creates for the people on the western part of the peninsula and in other parts of the State.

The meridian by which the time for this State is set is very close to the Victorian border and for every few kilometres that one travels to the west, the impact of daylight saving is accentuated. If we were to be fair in ensuring that all people in South Australia shared equally the benefits and disabilities of daylight saving, perhaps we should consider shifting the time meridian to the central part of the State or at least through Adelaide.

Therefore, all time schedules would be allocated according to that time meridian. People on Eyre Peninsula and those in the western part of the State experience a daylight saving disadvantage under normal time schedules. However, with the additional daylight saving added to that, we find that the inconvenience is further accentuated. The suggestion made by the Pinkawillinie Women's Agricultural Bureau is valid; that is, if a referendum is held (and we have the Premier's assurance that it will be) there should be an additional question that, if daylight saving is to continue, it should run for a shorter time. The member for Price interjected on an earlier occasion and suggested that it should be longer. That question could well be put on the referendum. I do not believe that any section of the community should be prevented from expressing an opinion if it can be included in the referendum.

The people on the western part of the Peninsula believe, as was suggested in this letter, that the period should be shortened to operate from 1 December to 1 February. I believe that it is fairly obvious why these dates were picked. First, it provides for the two months of daylight saving but, more particularly, it is within the period of school holidays. I realise that 1 December falls before the school break-up, but the point in question is that there is little inconvenience to students.

It should also be pointed out that people in the western part of the peninsula have extremely long bus runs, and many students in grades 1 and 2 have to board the bus at 7.5 a.m. That is extremely difficult for those children. Other members may have examples of long bus runs for children. The farther one goes to the west of the State, the greater the impact and the influence of the disadvantages of daylight saving.

The other aspect raised in the letter was in relation to grain handling. Naturally enough, it only applies in rural electorates to those persons who have to operate in conjunction with grain-handling facilities and silos. One could say, 'Why not have the silos open at a later time?' That is a valid point, but penalty rates are immediately applied so that the cost to the grain-handling authorities, and obviously to the farmers who pay the cost of bulk handling, are at least half as much again if not double during that time. There are some associated incidental costs. Not only are there direct costs of wages for opening a silo after 5 or 5.30 p.m., but also there are the costs to the farmer for additional grain storage on his property to tide him over in relation to grain he cannot deliver after 5 or 5.30 p.m.

Those persons in the Chamber who have an association with farmers know that on many days farmers, particularly those with farms near the coastline, cannot start reaping until 4 p.m. When daylight saving applies, it means that the silos are virtually shut before they can get the first bin of grain ready to cart to the silo. The only alternative is to provide a greater capacity of grain storage, and this causes additional problems.

Within the last three months, from memory, I wrote to the Premier on behalf of a constituent, Mr Bill Moody, who suggested that, before a referendum is held, during the coming daylight saving period we should revert to the traditional time so that persons who will be asked to make a decision when the referendum is ultimately held will have a basis of comparison on which to draw.

Honourable members will recall that daylight saving came into effect in 1971, so this will be its eleventh year. That has been a long period, and many members of the younger generation in South Australia have not experienced the traditional time period, especially as it affects employment opportunities. I do not wish to go further than to ask that the Government give serious consideration to the request made by the Pinkawillinie Women's Agricultural Bureau that, when the daylight saving referendum is being drawn up, an additional question (or questions, as prompted by the member for Price) be asked; rather than having a simple 'yes' or 'no' question, there should be a further explanation of a shorter period, from 1 December to 1 February. I trust that the Government will give this due consideration.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I am pleased that the member for Flinders has mentioned the referendum, because I believe in daylight saving, and I would like to see a question in the referendum asking whether people would favour an extension of the daylight saving period. However, that is not what I want to speak about tonight. On 16 September the member for Salisbury moved in this House a motion relating to the Aboriginal Community College, situated

near the Oberoi Hotel, in Brougham Place, North Adelaide. One of the clauses of the motion referred to Federal funds being allocated to procure decent premises for the college, so that it could operate in accommodation comparable to that of other educational institutions.

The Aboriginal college had plans for resiting in the Semaphore electorate, at the Largs Bay Orphanage, which was considered a suitable location. Unfortunately, some problems have arisen. The Port Adelaide corporation has at its disposal planning regulations, and I think a council should have the right, under those regulations, to decide what can happen in its district and where. However, in this case I think more consideration could have been given to permitting the college to be sited at the Largs Bay Orphanage.

I have received letters from people who have asked me to raise this matter and perhaps to influence the council to change its decision not to grant the college permission. Many people have expressed concern to me that the Aborigines are being denied the right to use the college. Many Aborigines live in the electorate of Price, in Port Adelaide, and in the neighbouring electorate.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What are you talking about?

Mr WHITTEN: The Minister should open his ears. There is an old saying to the effect that there are none so blind as those who do not wish to see. I think that that refers to the Minister of Agriculture; he is not only blind, but deaf as well.

Mr Keneally: And he is stupid.

Mr WHITTEN: I will not cast reflections on a man's intellectual capacity. I have my own views about that. There may be an opportunity after 3 October to do something about this, because council elections are held on that day, and I believe there will be a considerable change in the councillors in the Port Adelaide council. The council will then have the opportunity to reconsider this matter, and perhaps there will be a different vote.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He tried to organise—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Agriculture has been given the opportunity to cease interjecting earlier this evening, and I ask him to stop now.

Mr WHITTEN: It seems to me that the Minister of Agriculture is treating this matter as a joke. I do not think it is a joke in any way whatsoever, nor do a lot of other people. I have a letter here signed by 72 persons from the Convent of Mercy, 34 Angas Street, Adelaide. The letter is addressed to me. It is written out of concern expressed by the sisters at their annual meeting and concerns the decision of the Port Adelaide council to reject the application of the Aboriginal Community College. It is signed by Sister Maryanne Loughry, who enclosed a copy of a letter signed by Sister Patricia Fox, Sister Patricia Pak Poy and 72 other Sisters of Mercy at the Convent of Mercy in Adelaide. That letter states the following:

The refusal of the Port Adelaide council to allow the Aboriginal Community College to re-site at Largs Bay in the former orphanage of the Order of the Sisters of St Joseph is a decision to be deplored.

The Aboriginal Community College has become an educational institution that is unique in Australia in meeting the needs of the Aboriginal people. It is part of the wider educational system in Australia, yet it has been able to focus on the educational needs of a people who have previously been alienated by the educational system. Now the college, with its unique programme, finds its North Adelaide site inadequate.

The Order of St Joseph has offered a large suitable building at Largs Bay. This building was established to meet the educational needs of a disadvantaged group, orphans in South Australia. Because of new policies in child care, the premises are no longer suitable for their original use.

The Aboriginal people are another disadvantaged group and they could make good use of the premises. To refuse them permission is to stifle the growth of a much needed college; more so it is to stifle the growth of a people who, with much patience and struggle, have achieved a good measure of success in this educational venture. It is a venture to be encouraged.

We voice our objection to the decision of the Port Adelaide council and urge that council to reconsider its decision as a matter of justice.

I think that, after reading that letter, even the Minister of Agriculture would no longer wish to make a joke about this serious situation, which he endeavoured to do when I started to speak. That letter, as I said, was signed and contained the signatures of all the sisters from the Convent of Mercy. On the other side of the spectrum, another organisation of a totally different persuasion also sent me a letter. That was the Seamen's Union of Australia.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Oh!

Mr WHITTEN: The Minister can joke again. I am sorry about the ignorance of the Minister of Agriculture. This is not a joke: it is a serious matter. The Port Adelaide Branch Secretary of the Seamen's Union of Australia, South Australian branch, addressed the following letter to me:

Following a Ports Committee Meeting, it has been decided to request you raise in the House the question of the refusal of the Port Adelaide Council to grant permission for the disused Orphanage at Largs Bay to be used as an Aboriginal College. We see this as being purely a racist attitude on the part of the council and the minority voters they are pandering to. While realising that the House may have no authority to overrule council, we feel that, if this question is brought up, public opinion may be stirred to the extent of council reconsidering.

I have mentioned earlier that there is a council election on Saturday, and I think that there is a possibility of a change of council members. Perhaps then this question may be raised again and perhaps the previous decision may be overturned. If that is not the case, I would think that the Aboriginal college should make an application to the Planning Appeal Board. It is a possibility that the college can be resited.

Surely all fair-minded people would realise that the site next to the Oberoi Hotel in Brougham Place, North Adelaide, is much too small. The Aboriginal people at the college deserve better premises, larger premises, and a better campus, which can be provided at Largs Bay. I would hope that in the near future there will be an alteration of thought on the part of the Port Adelaide Council so that this may come into being.

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): First, I place on record my gratitude to Mr Gordon Stacey, the recently retired head of the *Hansard* staff, for the assistance he has rendered to me during the short time that I have been here. He certainly showed every kindness to me whenever I had cause to take a matter up with him.

The matter that I want to draw to the attention of the House concerns fares on public transport. The House will recall that under the former Minister of Transport a system of fare structure was arrived at which, in a very short time, was recognised as a vast improvement on the pre-existing system and it seemed to be accepted by everyone. The bus operators, railway personnel and the passengers of the system were generally happy with it. Not long after this Government came to office there was an increase in the cost of fares on public transport, which was not well received. Nevertheless, ordinary people must rely on public transport to a large extent to get where they have to go, so they must pay the fares.

What happened this year in August was something that had a very marked and detrimental effect on the public transport system. The Minister announced in June this year that there would be fare rises of up to 20 cents on S.T.A. transport. The Minister also indicated that there would be several features to soften the blow. Therefore, the Minister had no illusions about what he was doing to the public transport travelling fraternity in South Australia. He knew that he was going to deal them a blow, but he said that the Government had a method of introducing the system that

would soften it. In today's *Advertiser* it is reported that this new ticketing system has not been all that it was cracked up to be. On page 30 the following statement appeared:

Bus fares: S.T.A. passengers have not given good support to a new system of buying booklets of tickets at a reduced price. Under the new structure which took effect on 16 August booklets of 12 tickets can be bought for the price of 10.

The Minister of Transport, Mr Wilson, said at the time the innovation was to encourage people to buy tickets in advance and speed up boarding times. He said yesterday an S.T.A. interim report showed support for the scheme was not as strong as had been hoped.

I venture to say that the last statement is putting the matter mildly. In fact, a large section of the public is confused. I have been given to understand from telephone calls I have received that a smaller section of the public has worked out a way to utilise the system to their advantage, and certainly the operators in the railways section and in the bus section have had a large number of complaints about the new system, especially concerning the block tickets.

One of the problems as far as the railway employees are concerned, especially the people who have to handle the tickets, is that the system is so loosely slung together that the idea of providing 12 tickets for the price of 10, and using a block of tickets that is merely stapled together raises the possibility of people being able to subvert the system by prising the staples open, taking two tickets off the back, selling them separately, and handing on a block of not 12 tickets but 10.

I do not suggest that this is happening, but it certainly has been raised by employees of the S.T.A. railways division as a possibility. That places added strain on those people when it comes to recovering allocations of tickets and in handing over duties from one employee to another. There are many anomalies that I do not have time to go into at this stage.

I want to mention the problem that confronts bus drivers. Bus drivers have enough to do in handling large vehicles and being responsible for the passenger loads they carry. They were quite satisfied with the system of zoning and fare charges that operated before this Government came into power and, indeed, operated admittedly at a higher rate after this Government increased prices last year. They were satisfied until August this year.

We now have a situation where considerably more strain is placed on the operators and this creates a totally inadequate and unsafe situation whereby drivers are responsible for the money and tickets and have to work out a considerable number of mental calculations in respect of fares charged. Some drivers have reported to me that they do not feel they should have to carry this out. They are not policing it. They say they have a primary responsibility (and rightly so) to the travelling public, the motoring public and the general public. Drivers have to give their primary attention to safe handling of their buses. One fellow put to me, 'I do not care if they show me an old boot. If they get on, that is their problem and if an inspector catches them,

they are dealt with under the by-laws of the S.T.A. I have enough trouble handling the bus and I am not going to be involved in a system like this.' This does not lend to good public relations between the S.T.A. employees and the general public.

The next point I wish to raise is one relative to the alterations in schedules for the Port line rail services. I received a telephone call this morning from an irate person who lives at Brighton and works at Port Adelaide. He said, 'Contacting that so-and-so who represents us down here is a waste of time, so I am ringing you. He will be out at the next election. What is the name of the Labor candidate, because I will not be supporting this man again.' He explained that, with the previous time-table, he had no trouble in making his connection from Port Dock to Adelaide and then to Brighton.

He said that now he is in the situation, with the cancellation of the Port Dock trains that he has to catch the 4.47 p.m. train from Commercial Road which should allow him to connect with a 5.10 p.m. from Adelaide to Brighton. During the past five working days he has failed to make that connection three times. He told me that yesterday they left Commercial Road Station, and got down the line a little way, and they were held up. He said there was a train ahead of them and both trains were held up because there was a red signal against them. There was considerable to-ing and fro-ing of guards on the trains to the nearby signal box and finally the guards were told to instruct the drivers to proceed against a signal, with their sirens sounding, at a low speed. They arrived in Adelaide considerably late, and the gentleman concerned was over an hour late arriving home at Brighton. So he is not very impressed at the way in which this Government runs the trains.

We all know that the Premier gives a fairly good imitation of Mussolini when he starts eye-dodging. If he concentrated on getting the trains to run on time he might get a bit more support. The situation in relation to the public transport system in South Australia is a scandal. Under the previous Government we were beginning to see considerable improvements and innovations, and we looked like going into the 1980s with one of the best transport systems in Australia. In the *News* tonight we are confronted with some sort of submarine service operating up and down the Torrens Valley. I think that might be nearer the truth than Government members are aware at this stage.

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

Mr GUNN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 1 October at 2 p.m.