HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 11 February 1982

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

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE BILL

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

PETITION: MAGILL HOME FOR THE AGED

A petition signed by 18 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain the full range of activities at Magill Home for the Aged was presented by the Hon. J. D. Corcoran.

Petition received.

QUESTION

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

GAOLING OF WOMAN

In reply to **Mr ABBOTT** (3 December).

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: My colleague the Minister of Community Welfare has informed me that the house belonging to the 73-year-old Bowden woman, Miss M. Williams, has been fumigated, repainted and furnished. One of Miss Williams's 11 dogs is in the care of a niece and the remainder were disposed of. The convictions have been withdrawn and fines imposed remitted. Miss Williams has also been received into the guardianship of the Guardianship Board. After a period in Hillcrest Hospital for assessment, she was returned home on 12 December 1981.

Domiciliary care services are being provided and Meals on Wheels will commence early in 1982. The Public Trustee now administers her financial affairs and relatives have also been located and will maintain regular supportive contact. These activities have been organised by a departmental officer, who is co-ordinating and monitoring services. It is anticipated that Miss Williams will be able to remain in her home for several years, provided that she is willing to continue receiving assistance.

Departmental officers have discussed this incident with the various organisations involved. This discussion stressed that close co-operation would be necessary to prevent similar problems arising in the future. In situations where the co-operation of the person concerned cannot be obtained, statutory action can only be proposed when the matter has become sufficiently serious. It has been stressed that advice at this stage is critical so that more appropriate steps can be taken. Close co-operation between the organisations involved is necessary at all stages of planning.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make two short Ministerial statements.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable Ministers to make statements.

In so moving, I make the point that the honourable member for Mitcham has had his fun and it is about time that he stopped wasting the time of the House.

Mr MILLHOUSE: If I may reply briefly to the speech with which the Premier supported his motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, I point out to him and to all members that under those Standing Orders any member may object to the giving of leave to make a Ministerial statement. As a member of this place, I am simply exercising a right that Standing Orders give me. If you, Sir, or other members of the Standing Orders Committee wish to recommend to this House a change to that Standing Order you are, of course, welcome to do it, and we can have a debate on it in this place. But, so long as that provision is there and any other right and privilege of a member of this place is there, I propose to use it if I see fit. Let there be no mistake about that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Capriciously!

Mr MILLHOUSE: I do not use it capriciously. As the honourable Premier knows, it is now four or five months since I raised this matter because of the abuse by the Minister of Public Works at the time of the privilege to make a Ministerial statement. I said then that I proposed to follow this course until the matter was cleared up. On other occasions when I have done this, the Labor Party has supinely gone over and voted with the Liberal Party; Labor members have then regretted it when they have heard the statement because there has nearly always been some political tilt at them in the statements that have been made. Yesterday, the Minister of Agriculture made a statement. He put in something gratuitously that was not even on the written page that we were given. I make no apology whatever for exercising the right that any member of this place has to object to the giving of a Ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'.

Mr Millhouse: No.

The SPEAKER: There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being only one member on the side of the Noes, I declare that the Ayes have it.

Motion carried.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MEEKATHARRA MINERALS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): Honourable members will be aware following press reports that a further coal discovery in the Arckaringa Basin has been announced by Meekatharra Minerals Lim-

ited. In my initial public response to the company's latest announcement, I undertook to make a more detailed statement after my department had evaluated the latest results of this exploration work, and I now do so.

The Department of Mines and Energy has advised that drilling at 36 locations at intervals ranging from one kilometre to six kilometres has outlined coal in the following categories: 1.3 billion tonnes of indicated reserves, and approximately 1.8 billion tonnes of inferred resources. Samples of coal have been recovered for analysis from nine partly-cored holes. While this number of core holes is inadequate to establish factors such as behaviour, nature and uniformity of quality of coal within the various seams and between seams, it is apparent that the coal intersected is among the best yet located in South Australia.

On an air dried basis, the coals have a moisture content of about 10 per cent ash, 6 per cent to 10 per cent sulphur, 0.5 per cent to 4 per cent and a specific energy of about 25 megajoules per kilogram. It is suspected that the moisture 'as mined' might be as high as 35 per cent, and, therefore, on an 'as mined' basis, the coals would have a specific energy of perhaps less than 20 megajoules per kilogram. These results are of great interest to the South Australian Government in the context of the upsurge that has occurred in exploration for coal throughout the State in the past two years, and in the evaluation of a number of deposits at present being undertaken to determine further sources of fuel for power generation.

In the case of these deposits in the Arckaringa Basin, which are 700 kilometres north-west of Port Augusta, it will be necessary to undertake further work before any meaningful comments can be made about specific utilisation of the coal. More closely-spaced drilling and coal sampling will have to be undertaken, and it will be necessary to conduct detailed mining feasibility studies to establish recoverability of the coals, which occur in multiple seams, whether open-cast mining is feasible, whether they are amenable to underground mining, at what cost and whether markets can be secured. Answers to these questions will be sought by the Department of Mines and Energy to allow comparisons to be made with other coal deposits being currently evaluated, including those at Wakefield, Kingston, Sedan, Lock, and Lake Phillipson.

The deposits at Wakefield, Kingston and Sedan present themselves at this stage as the most obvious options as sources of fuel for generation of electricity. They have various recognised disabilities which are now being actively assessed and compared. On the other hand, in comparison with the Arckaringa Basin deposits, they have marked advantages in relation to site location and availability of basic infrastructure.

Honourable members will be aware that about a year ago I had cause to ask certain questions of Meekatharra Minerals Limited under the terms and conditions of its exploration licences, following various press reports about the company's activities in the Arckaringa Basin. I am pleased to be able to inform the House that the discussions which followed my asking of those questions eatablished an understanding on the form and content of public statements made by the company about its exploration activities in South Australia. As a result, the Department of Mines and Energy is being kept fully informed, and I have noted, and welcome the fact, that the company intends to undertake further work of the type that I have mentioned as necessary to allow a full evaluation of the coal deposits in the Arckaringa Basin.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETRO-CHEMICAL PROJECT

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): I wish to advise the House about latest developments in relation to the petro-chemical project and to give the Government's endorsement and support to efforts now under way to establish marketing arrangements to allow the project to proceed. Last week, C.R.A. announced that it was joining Asahi in feasibility studies, and subsequently the Premier was informed by Dow Chemical Company that it would be unable to make any positive commitment on a South Australian plant in the foreseeable future.

The decision of Dow notwithstanding, the South Australian Government reaffirms its strong support for a South Australian petro-chemical project, as being studied at present by Asahi and C.R.A. Following discussions with the Federal Government and the companies concerned, the Government is confident that all conditions, such as infrastructure financing and feedstock prices can be established so that the project is very competitive on world markets.

The Government understands that, for the project to proceed, it is vital for E.D.C. markets in Japan to be confirmed. A Japanese consortium was invited by the Premier to study this project in the knowledge that it would have the best chance of organising E.D.C. consumers in Japan. Asahi's proven technology and links within the petrochemicals and plastics industry in Japan, together with C.R.A.'s standing in the Australian resources industry make this partnership particularly strong.

In relation to Dow Chemical, the Government recognises that its inability to make any positive commitment on a South Australian plant in the foreseeable future was influenced largely by the increasing financial and economic pressures currently inhibiting the further activities of United States companies like Dow.

QUESTION TIME

GOVERNMENT FILM COMMITTEE

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier give the House an assurance that the Government Film Committee will not be wound up, that the amount of money available for the production of Government films will not be allowed to fall below its already depressed level, and that a separate line will be maintained in the Budget for this expenditure? On 26 January 1982 the Director-General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet issued a circular stating:

> The Government has decided that, beginning with the 1982-83 financial year, funds for new film and video projects will not be provided through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet miscellaneous line 'Production of films by South Australian Film Corporation'. Departments and authorities will have to make financial provision for such projects within their own estimates of expenditure, and deal directly with the Film Corporation on all aspects of the production of and payment for them.

It continues:

> The Government Film Committee will continue in existence, with funding through this department, to complete film and video projects already on its programme. It will then be wound up. Ministers' offices should ensure that statutory authorities within their Minister's portfolios are promptly advised of this change in procedures.

The Government Film Committee was established during the time of the previous Government, because departments had proved unable to provide funds to a sufficient level from within their own budgets for film-making. Therefore, a special line was established; it was $700 000, which was reduced by this Government in the last Budget to $350 000

but, as the circular I have just read indicates, the amount will be reduced to nil in the next Budget unless the decision is changed.

A number of persons in the film industry have approached me expressing concern about the matter, particularly concern about the effect that this may have on employment and transference of skilled technicians and others from other States who have been attracted to South Australia by film activities. The Director of the Film Corporation said in the corporation's latest annual report:

> The number of South Australians employed on both these projects [that is, documentaries and other productions for Government] is a direct result of the work done by the documentary section of the corporation in raising standards, encouraging the training of local people and making films that have continued to win international recognition. The documentary industry in South Australia, composed entirely of independent production companies, has developed remarkably in the past few years.

He went on to say:

> . . . local film producers must rely upon the South Australian Government's wise policy of support and encouragement by the commissioning of films through the Government Film Committee. The future growth of our local industry is heavily dependent upon the continuation of this support. The benefits achieved abroad by our film-makers can be lost quickly if Government support mechanisms are weakened in ways that will turn our golden films into hastily contrived dross.

Those who have made approaches have been advised to see the Premier about it, but I would like to have him on record on this matter.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for giving me this opportunity because, if he had not done so, I think that by next Tuesday I would have been making a Ministerial statement, with the permission of the House, on this subject, about which there has been much misunderstanding. First, this Government is totally supportive of the South Australian Film Corporation and the South Australian film industry. I would like to put on record in this Chamber our very great appreciation of the work it has done, the enviable record achieved, and, above all, the level of recognition of achievement for excellence that it has received internationally. I believe that the film industry in South Australia is something of which we can all be very proud indeed.

Only this morning, I spoke with representatives of the industry who obviously had had some fears about the meaning of the changes that are to take place in the funding arrangements and the control of films being made on behalf of Government departments, and I have been able to reassure them completely that there is no intention to cut down on the degree of Government support. There is a change, certainly, in the funding arrangements, and there will be a change in the arrangements being made to guide Government departments in their choice of films and producers and exactly how they should go about having films made. Those changes, I have no doubt, will be for the better.

As to the funding, the amount of money which has normally been put into the Premier's Department for Government film-making in the past will be allocated out to individual departments for their use at the time of the next Budget. It means that they will have a degree of autonomy and will be able to make up their own minds as to what they want to do. Fears have been expressed that, because the money is not being directed through the Premier's Department, for some reason departments may decide not to produce films. I am positive that such fears are groundless. With the Government's recognition of the excellence of the film industry in South Australia and the great service that it provides to Government departments by way of educational material and promotional films, there is no question at all but that those films will continue to be made, and made to the best possible standard.

As to the control of film-making and the advice that will be available, I am happy to report to the House that the representatives of the various branches of the film industry, including independent operators, producers, and so on, who waited upon me this morning have been very happy indeed to agree to my request that they should consider representations on an advisory council or committee that will replace the Government Film Committee as such, so that they can advise the Government as to all aspects of film-making for Government departments. They will also have the brief, as the present committee has, of examining proposals put forward by each department and will take more positive action by going to each department at a set time and discussing with it proposals for films.

I was delighted to feel that the industry would have such a representative part in this activity, which, in my view, can only enhance the value of Government contracts and Government work to the film industry in South Australia, and certainly is not going to lead to any reduction in the amount of money available for the making of proper films. This, of course, does not mean in any way that the role of the South Australian Film Corporation is being diminished; far from it. It will be represented on such an advisory committee or council or whatever the final format is. At present, representatives of the industry have agreed to see me again in about a month's time with more detailed proposals from their point of view, to see how we can all make this system work in the best possible way for the promotion of South Australia and the continued promotion of excellence in film-making in this State.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier report to the House the latest unemployment figures for South Australia, and explain the implications they have for the economy and confidence in South Australia? I have been advised that the preliminary Australian Bureau of Statistics unemployment figures for January were released today, and I am sure that all members will be interested in those figures. It has been put to me that January is usually the bad month for unemployment levels because of the number of school leavers coming on to the job market and the general level of economic activity at this time of the year. Also, on Tuesday the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in moving an ill-fated motion of no confidence in the Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting upon a debate that has been held in this House this session.

Mr ASHENDEN: The Leader and the Deputy Leader stated that the economic problems in South Australia were becoming worse, and in particular they predicted that unemployment would rise by 3 000 or 4 000 in January to record levels.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the honourable member for his interest in this matter. I am quite certain that this subject would interest everyone. I was rather surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition did not use the first opportunity he had yesterday and ask the question he normally asks about the state of employment and unemployment in South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Have a look at the T.V. tonight.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am glad that the Deputy Leader has the opportunity to watch television. There you are!

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Playing golf, too.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would think so. On Tuesday, the Deputy Leader predicted the following:

The Premier cannot deny the indisputable fact that we are heading towards having 50 000 people unemployed in this State. The figure is still increasing. I am prepared to say that when the figures come out on Thursday—

and that is today—

I would not be surprised if we have not then gone beyond 50 000. In fact, I contemplate a rise of some 3 000 or 4 000.

I believe that we should consider this very carefully, because the Opposition, as usual, seems to delight in highlighting unfavourable statistics.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Actually, we are pleased that it's come down.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One would not have thought so from the attitude that has been adopted by the Deputy Leader. However, I am sure members opposite will be pleased, as will everyone in South Australia, to know that, for the second successive month, South Australia has not had the highest level of unemployment in Australia. That is not a big thing: there is still a long way to go, but at least for two months we have not had the highest level of unemployment in Australia. Indeed, in South Australia, unemployment in January 1982 was 49 100, 8.1 per cent of the work force. This figure represents a decrease of 700 in the number of unemployed compared to December 1981, and it certainly goes against the usual trend for this time of the year, particularly when one considers school leavers. The January level of unemployed is 2.4 per cent less than in January 1981, a decrease of 1 200 in the number of unemployed over the past 12 months.

That is a pretty significant trend and one which we are not celebrating with champagne but which gives great hope for the future. While the rate of unemployment in Australia has continued to increase in many States and in Australia as a whole, the rate in South Australia has stabilised and is beginning to decrease. This has been made possible by economic policies and our resulting significant job creation. Between August 1979 and December 1981 (for which period the latest figures are available), this Government has presided over an economy in which 22 100 new jobs have been created. We all know that it is not always wise to consider different months in regard to those figures and that they can vary considerably. I suspect that the 22 000 jobs that have been created since we came to office, if taken on an August to August basis, would probably be nearer the 12 000 mark.

Be that as it may, those jobs have been created. When I consider the abysmal record of members of the former Government and remembers that, from August 1977 to August 1979, they lost 20 600 jobs, all I can say is that I am very pleased indeed to report that this Government has been able to reverse that trend very convincingly. I believe it is worth considering the general history of unemployment in South Australia. South Australia's unemployment rate, according to the A.B.S. figures, has not been lower than the national average in any month since May 1977 except in April 1978, when the Australian rate exceeded the South Australian rate by .1 per cent. Since August 1978 (and this is something that the Opposition tends to ignore or skirt over wherever possible), South Australia has had the highest or equal highest unemployment rate of all States for every month except six, and in four of those months higher unemployment in other States could be attributed to divergent seasonal movements during the summer peak in unemployment.

There is no question at all that the unemployment rate, which has been the highest of all States since 1978, is beginning to show a reversal. Certainly, we have shown a reversal against normal seasonal trends in this month and I am sure all honourable members will join with me in hoping that this trend for the better will be repeated in the months to come.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Education ordered a reorganisation of the Education Department, and will there be a new Deputy Director-General's position created alongside a strengthening of the regional structure of the department? I have been informed that at present morale in the Education Department is at a low ebb, and I am told that among factors contributing to that was the decision not to accept the nomination for a position on the council of the new South Australian College of Advanced Education for Mr John Steinle on the advice of the Premier's office. I am also advised that a similar situation applied to a nomination for Mr Lou Kloeden to be appointed. I am told that departmental officers are becoming increasingly concerned at and frustrated by the work of the office of the Minister aimed at reorganising the department. I understand that among other things it is proposed that the role of regionalisation (both country and metropolitan) be strengthened and that a new Deputy Director-General position be created.

I am further advised that many teachers are concerned that, whilst the final report of the Keeves Committee which was handed down in this House this week recommends a reduction in the number of teachers (it spoke of the possibility of saving $50 000 000 in the years ahead as a result of cuts in teacher numbers), there is a proposal to boost the number of administrators. As one teacher said to me, 'Administrators at the expense of educators'.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Salisbury appears to enjoy speculation. I would simply advise him that as one of the recommendations of the Keeves Committee of Inquiry I have sought the co-operation of the Director-General in tendering to me some advice regarding a possible restructuring of his department. The same advice will be sought from the Director-General of Further Education, too. To imply that there have been discriminatory moves against either of the two Directors-General with regard to the possible appointments to positions on committees, irrespective of what those committees would be, is absolutely untrue, and I cannot imagine from where that sort of rumour emanated. It is purely a figment of the honourable member's imagination. In fact, no such advice has been tendered to me. I do not know that I would have accepted the advice in any case, but I would put it on record that I hold both of my Directors-General in very high esteem, and they work in extremely close collaboration with the Minister and Cabinet. They are men of high repute not only within the State but interstate, too, and internationally, I may say.

In case there was any speculation about dissent between the Minister and the Director-General, let me put that firmly to rest. There was also some other inference, I think a direct statement, in fact, that the administration would be further strengthened at the expense of the classroom. I suggest that if the honourable member waits until the Director-General has reported back he will find that the Director-General's intention is far removed from that and that, in fact, the Keeves Committee of Inquiry recommendations, which say that there should be some move from administration towards the strengthening of regions, may be adhered to.

AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION

Mr RANDALL: Is the Premier aware of any move to replace the States with a system of regional government in

Australia? What is the Government's attitude to such a proposal? I am aware that the concept is not new. I am also aware that the Whitlam Labor Government early in the 1970s put forward as part of the Labor Party's platform a policy of working towards the abolition of the States. It has been reported to me that the Leader of the Opposition has been promoting the system of government by regions when he spoke recently at a summer school in Canberra. I ask the Premier whether there is any merit in adopting a policy such as this.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me say right from the outset that I most vigorously oppose the abolition of the States and the introduction of regions within Australia, as has been proposed by various members of the Labor Party from time to time and most recently by the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber. I am amazed that any South Australian, even the Leader of the Opposition, with his record, should advocate the abolition of the States. The proposal, of course, lines up with the general Labor Party policy of abolishing the Legislative Council if ever it gained control of both Houses, and of abolishing the Senate, the States' House, if ever it did the same in Canberra. In my view, the establishment of regions would be the destruction of the States, and the introduction of a one-House centralist Government heavily influenced by the more populous Eastern States.

The voice of the people of South Australia, under such circumstances, would not have anywhere near the same strength if State Governments, and presumably State representatives in the Federal Parliament, our Senators, were abolished. Yet, that is exactly what the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia has been advocating at a meeting in Canberra. In his speech at the Australian Institute of Political Science, the Leader gave his support for the plan put forward by the late John Curtin for a system of regionalisation. To use his own words, the Leader believed that it was unfortunate that enthusiasm for the idea declined as threat of wartime invasion faded. The Leader went on to recount that similar plans put forward by the Labor Prime Minister, Mr Gough Whitlam, had also foundered. He added:

> However, I believe that we will eventually have to embrace some variant of the idea. Perhaps the threat of an economic disaster will have as much impetus as the threat of a military one.

There can be no doubt of the Leader's support for a breakdown in the present Federal system, the abolition of the States and the introduction of a centrally governed system of regionalism. It even sounds to me (and it is in keeping with the attitude with which the Leader has been carrying on in the past year or so) as though he is hoping that there will be an economic disaster to help bring about the demise of South Australia. It would be a tragedy for Australia; it would be a disaster for South Australia.

I repeat that we would be dictated to by the vested interests of the Eastern States, and we would have no say whatever. I find it extraordinary that this concept of destroying the State system, which I had hoped had been finally put to rest with the defeat of the Whitlam Government, should now be revived by the Leader of the Labor Party in South Australia. We will not have any part of any such anti-South Australian attitudes.

ROXBY DOWNS

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House whether he still will be able to adhere to the schedule that he announced in respect of the Roxby Downs Indenture Bill and, if not, will he explain to the House what he now proposes? On 3 December last year, in a Ministerial statement, the Minister of Mines and Energy said:

> It has been the desire of the companies, and the intention of the Government, to bring the agreement [the indenture] before Parliament at an early date to allow members and the public to fully consider this very important matter before it is debated after the resumption of Parliament next February.

Further on in the same statement, rather repeating himself, the Minister said:

> This will allow members of Parliament and the public an opportunity to fully consider the matter before it is debated after the resumption of Parliament in February.

In an article on page 30 of yesterday's *Advertiser*, John Field, Financial Editor, referred to the fact that Western Mining Corporation Holding Ltd, which is at the helm of the Roxby Downs project, suffered an 80.4 per cent profit fall from $33 200 000 to $6 500 000 for the first half of 1981-82, due to the world metals recession and soaring costs.

Further on in that article by John Field, the Western Mining Chairman, Sir Arvi Parbo, said that 'Roxby Downs was awaiting the indenture' Bill which he said should get through the South Australian Parliament in the next few months. My understanding of that is that Sir Arvi Parbo was suggesting there could be a delay, about which the Minister has not yet told the House.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Opposition has purported to indicate that the Government said that the Roxby Downs indenture would be in Parliament and that the Government had given a firm undertaking that it would occur on a fixed date last year. All the statements made were that we anticipated that this event would occur, and that was reiterated by the Chairman of Western Mining Corporation, Sir Arvi Parbo, when he was interviewed, from memory, on a *Nationwide* programme. In the event, the fine details of the indenture were not completed, and that event did not eventuate.

I would like to get this whole business into perspective. We are talking about an indenture which will put before the Parliament a $1.2 billion project, which will lead to the establishment of a township in due course as large as Mount Isa. So, when people are haggling about whether the indenture takes place today, tomorrow, next week, before Christmas, on 9 February, or on 29 February, and make a big deal out of this, when we are negotiating conditions that will be in place probably for generations, I do not think that the Opposition and those who attempt to make this a big deal have a real feel for what this is all about.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: I think I asked a simple question.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I remain confident that the indenture will be presented to Parliament during this year, that adequate time will be allowed for its deliberation, and that it will be put to a vote in due course.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: In this session?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. I do not know what all the hoo-hah from the Opposition is about. On the one hand, the Leader of the Opposition says that we do not need an indenture. He was given a fairly smart slap in the face, so to speak, by the Chairman Sir Arvi Parbo who went on television and said in effect that that was nonsense, and that, if there is no indenture, this project will go on ice. So, the Leader, from saying that he does not want the indenture, is now clamouring for it.

Where does the Labor Party stand on this issue? On the one hand, it says it wants the indenture as quickly as possible so that it can defeat it. The Labor Party is thrashing around, not having the numbers—the balance at the moment lying with the member for Elizabeth. It is thrashing around in this morass on the uranium question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Let me expand on that. The balance lies with the member for Elizabeth and Bob Gregory, because we know that, when the Leader made his encouraging noises on television last year, on the Saturday morning he had a telephone call from Mr Scott, and the head was well and truly pulled in smartly.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You must live in dreamland.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It might be dreamland, but I do not hallucinate to the extent that the Opposition does and has been doing recently. Precisely the same thing happened to Dr Cornwall, who unbuttons his lip very frequently and then has to button it up smartly when he gets the telephone call. That happened to Dr Cornwall on precisely the same issue. Where does the Labor Party stand? It asks these pernickety questions about whether the indenture will be introduced on 1 December, 2 December, 9 February, or 30 February, when the pertinent facts are that the State is not prepared to bring in a half-baked indenture when we are not entirely satisfied. It would have been better, and for the good of the State, if in the past the Labor Party had satisfied itself when it was writing indentures.

However, the State is not prepared to bring in an indenture unless we are perfectly satisfied on all points that we have done a good deal for the State. If that takes a week or two longer than was anticipated by all the Parties, I make no apology whatsoever for that—none whatsoever. Rather than rush something in to get a cheap headline or to enable us to announce a project like the Redcliff petro-chemical plant (which was announced without any agreement at all just to get a headline), the Government will wait. So, in answer to the honourable member's question, I propose to bring it in when it is ready.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr GUNN: Can the Minister of Education inform the House whether the statements made recently by the President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers in relation to salary justice are correct when one compares the salaries of teachers with those paid in other professions? In the *News* of Tuesday 9 February it was reported that the President qualified the salaries push by claiming that teachers had not had a rise outside indexation since 1975. She was reported as saying:

> Teachers are not trying to grab more money, they just want wage justice.

I should be pleased if the Minister could inform the House of the exact situation.

The SPEAKER: The Minister of Education may answer the question, but not the statement that is in the newspaper.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I can enlighten the House. It is correct that 1975 was the last time when a full-scale work value award was made to the teaching profession. However, I think that it would be fair to members of the House to point out a few other very pertinent facts regarding the salary increases, not only in the teaching profession, but also, by comparison, in others (and they are not my statistics, they are independently obtained).

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is there anything wrong with your statistics?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If the honourable member will listen, he will perhaps be able to make his own assessment, being the excellent mathematician that he no doubt is; otherwise the honourable member would not have such a keen interest. In fact, there have been two other increases in teachers' salaries, although, through no fault of the Education Department, the increases to classroom teachers and principals, senior promotional positions, have gone out of kilter. In about 1977-78 an interim award was made for senior positions, those in the top promotional positions, but an interim award was not made for the classroom teachers. In fact, it was during the life of this Government that, by consent, I allowed, I think it was, a 4 per cent or 4.3 per cent interim increase to classroom teachers at the recommendation of the salaries tribunal. So, it is quite incorrect to say that there has been no increase for teachers outside the normal c.p.i. indexation.

An independent survey that was published in an Adelaide daily newspaper towards the latter end of last year in fact did compare teachers' salaries on incremental step 8, which is in the middle of the range, and pointed out that from 1975 to the end of 1981 teachers' salaries had increased by some 67 per cent, and that was the top of the range of the 72 different salaries that were assessed. That is quite surprising when we consider that we are being told that teachers have fallen behind; their salaries have increased by 67 per cent since 1975. By comparison the lowest increase was in one branch of automotive engineering, and I think that that was as low as 43 per cent over the same period. Parliamentarians, that much maligned group, had a 48 per cent increase, putting them in the bottom six of that 72 salary brackets. So, from the point of view of comparitive statistics, I find that the report attributed to a member of the Institute of Teachers does not line up with the facts as the independently obtained statistics show them.

One other fact must be borne in mind, namely, that there is an incremental creep which is very rarely taken into consideration but which is relevant in Public Service and teacher awards in so far as, irrespective of the cost price indexation and a salaries tribunal award on work value, there is an automatic increase on each step that is awarded to a teacher up to a certain scale.

This, of course, increases the amount of money being paid out to the Public Service generally. They are the facts as I see them. They do not line up with the report that I saw in the newspaper, and they show that teachers in South Australia have had well above the average salary increases from 1975 until 1981.

FAMILY COURT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Will the Treasurer take immediate action to stop the collection of stamp duty on property transactions directed by the Family Court? The Treasurer would be aware that in 1975 the Commonwealth Government passed family law legislation setting up the Family Court. A provision in that legislation stipulated that no stamp duty should be collected on property transactions directed by the court; in other words, it was thought that that would have been an unjust and unfair impost. In December 1979, this matter was challenged in the High Court, and the High Court declared that part of the Act to be constitutionally invalid. Since then, however, I belive that the State Commissioner of Taxes has been collecting this tax. I think the Treasurer would appreciate that I have no personal interest in this, but representations made to me have shown that real hardship has been involved in having registered property transactions directed by the court, because the people concerned, especially the wives, do not have the money to do so.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I think everyone in this House would recognise that he has no personal interest in the matter; far from it. I know that he is concerned, as are members on both sides of the Chamber. As to the decisions affecting past transactions, there is no intention on the part of the Government to look at those past transactions and try to

collect back tax. That would be quite an horrendous job, and we do not intend to undertake it, but I must say that, in making some inquiries, particularly about the attitude in other States, I have been informed that at least two other States (I think, from memory, New South Wales and Victoria) have decided that there should be no concession given and no allowance made, and that stamp duty should be paid in the usual way. The matter is before Treasury officials at present for report, and it will be considered by Cabinet shortly.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr BLACKER: Following his Ministerial statement this afternoon, will the Minister of Mines and Energy say which sites are being considered by C.R.A. and Asahi as being potential sites for a petro-chemical plant, and can he say whether the Government has given any guidelines to those companies as to preferred sites or environmental conditions to be respected, or whether a completely open book has been given to the siting of a petro-chemical plant?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The sites being considered are at Stony Point and Port Adelaide. I think it is true to say that the Redcliff site has been abandoned. That site was chosen by the former Government without any environmental inquiry having been made. The Labor Party went on, and it was up to the present Government to go through the full environmental procedures to validate that site. Those are the two sites under consideration, and whichever proves to be the better site economically would be subject to full environmental impact statements and full environmental procedures. Unless results of the studies are satisfactory, the project would not proceed on that site. At present, I believe that the company has indicated a preference for the Port Adelaide site.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Gillman.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, that is the site for which the company has indicated a preference. I do not believe that one should read any more into it than that, except that the company is pursuing studies with particular reference to that site. Those are the two sites that would be under consideration.

PORT ADELAIDE ADULT MATRICULATION SCHOOL

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Education take immediate steps to remedy the blatant discrimination and denial of equal opportunity that exists in the provision of education that has been created by the decision to discontinue the services of a student counsellor for students who attend the Port Adelaide Adult Matriculation School?

The Minister's decision to remove the services of the half-time student counsellor from Port Adelaide while all other adult matriculation schools maintain a full-time counsellor can only be interpreted as discrimination against the school, the students and the district of Port Adelaide. The decision also directly contradicts the declared need for such services for adult matriculation students—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to deal with fact and not to comment.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, Sir. Reports emanating from the Education Department declare the need for student counselling. The report of a survey of adult matriculation students in South Australia, dated September 1981 (only a few months ago), by Rosemary Osman and Tim Jones, states at page 4:

> . . . problems related to lack of time for mature age students raise policy questions concerning the provision of part-time study, evening and weekend classes, courses of different durations or structures, and so on, as well as the issue of counselling on time allocation and subject choice. Problems related to lack of knowledge about the required standards and about self-confidence raise questions concerning the provision of 'bridging courses' in areas such as study skills, mathematics, and so on, as well as adequate counselling and information services.

A submission to the Committee of Inquiry into Year 12 Examinations, prepared by the Department of Further Education, under the heading 'Adult Matriculation' (page 9), states:

> A strong feature of the adult matriculation provision has been the extensive counselling given to prospective adult students in order to enhance the effectiveness and appropriateness of their study programmes.

Further, at page 35, the submission states:

> Career counselling has been generally regarded as a professional responsibility of all teaching staff, particularly in the Department of Further Education system. Staff have not neglected this duty but it is now time for an expanded and specially staffed careers counselling service . . . The general neglect of careers counselling was noted in an earlier quotation from the Schools Commission. The need for upgraded effort and skills has since been supported in major reports which will be familiar to the committee. In the present context, the Department of Further Education simply reinforces such opinion. The education of a much greater number of specialist counsellors is an urgent necessity.

Deep concern has been reflected in the community, and I have received a letter from a group that calls itself 'The Friends of the Adult Maticulation School, Port Adelaide'. I will quote this letter, because it clarifies the situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! In seeking to read the letter, the honourable member must recognise his responsibility to other members of the House and their opportunity to ask questions and receive answers.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, Sir. I will read the letter as quickly as I can. Addressed to me, it states:

> I am writing to you on behalf of the Friends of the Adult Matriculation School to seek your influence in redressing an injustice perpetrated by the South Australian Government against the people of the western metropolitan district. The Government has seen fit to deprive the Port Adelaide Community College of its only counselling service, provided last year by a half-time contract appointee, Miss Linda Are, whose esteemed services are presently being provided without remuneration.
>
> A part of her work is involved in the specific area of vocational counselling but the most valued contribution to students' well-being is in the area of personal counselling and the development of study skills. It is especially important that her services be maintained, because the people of this district are culturally deprived and their need for assistance and support is greater than it would be in more fortunate districts. I wish to lay heavy emphasis on the fact that, despite this, the Port Adelaide Adult Matriculation School is uniquely disadvantaged, being the only one which can now offer no specialist counsellor skills. The Minister of Education's most recent ludicrous statement, that Port Adelaide students can go to the D.F.E. information centre to get counselling, is a shining example either of his abysmal ignorance of the role of a counsellor, or a callous disregard of his responsibilities to provide equitable distribution of the State's educational resources. This glaring injustice is made the more—

The SPEAKER: Order! I recognise that the honourable member is reading a letter. He is also reading a letter which allows for comment in a rather excessive way. I would ask the honourable member to come quickly to the end of his explanation.

Mr PETERSON: Certainly, Sir. If the Chair so deems, I will lay the letter aside. The letters are there for the Minister to read, and I am quite prepared to supply them to him. I would like him now to give a reply on counselling.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This matter is certainly familiar material to me, since the member for Henley Beach raised the matter quite strongly in the early part of December last year, and the honourable member who has just asked a question in the House has perpetuated many of the arguments put to me at that time. Members will realise

that the Government is not winding down activities at Port Adelaide. There was an inference that we were doing that. In fact, what we have done is purchase additional premises at Port Adelaide and spent a considerable sum in refurbishing them to establish the Department of Technical and Further Education even more strongly there.

Mr PETERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The reply being given is not relevant to the adult matriculation class. The colleges at Port Adelaide are colleges of advanced education.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member should know that under Standing Orders a Minister can answer a question in whatever manner he so decides.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The response is relevant in so far as the people who have been making representations allege that this was one of a series of moves to wind down activities at Port Adelaide. The counsellor at the Port Adelaide Adult Education Centre is responsible for counselling people along the seaboard from Port Adelaide southwards. A number of alternatives were put to the committee and to the school Principal through the Director-General of Further Education. One of the moves was that initially we were winding down the adult studies at Port Adelaide. In fact, we decided that our strongest move would be to reinstate some of the courses that we had reduced.

One of the compromises was that there would be insufficient funds for the college to conduct all the courses we had originally envisaged. We offered them a compromise and said that, if they could provide an alternative area in which to cut the funds allocated for their courses, that was an option open to them. So far no alternative has been brought forward and, if the college council recognises that a fair allocation of funds has been made to all colleges and an additional staff member or part staff member to be allocated to their college would mean reductions elsewhere, then if they can come up with a suitable compromise we will consider it.

HOSPITALS

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Health say what action she is taking to ensure that visiting medical practitioners treating their patients in South Australian public hospitals are financially and professionally accountable for the use of hospital facilities? I refer to an article in today's *Financial Review*, headed 'Hospitals overspend by $15 700 000. Committee could recommend visiting doctors pay their way'. The article states:

> Visiting medical practitioners treating their private patients in New South Wales public hospitals could shortly find themselves having to pay for the hospital facilities they now utilise as a right. This is likely to be one of the key recommendations of the impending report of the New South Wales Parliament's Public Accounts Committee, which is inquiring into a cost overrun of $15.7 million in the State's public hospitals' budget during the 1980-81 financial year . . .
>
> To expedite its investigations, it initially sought written explanations from the 37 hospitals whose budgets were exceeded by more than 0.5 per cent or $50 000. The overruns ranged as high as $2 000 000 in the case of Royal Newcastle Hospital and 16.9 per cent at the Wentworth District Hospital in the far south-west of the State . . .
>
> It is thought that the committee [the Public Accounts Committee] will make four broad recommendations to State Parliament.
>
> First, the committee is almost certain to recommend that private medical practitioners be charged for the use of any hospital facilities or services that they request for their own private patients. This would bring them into line with specialists employed by hospitals who may engage in limited private practice . . . Secondly, the committee is expected to urge that the role of each hospital be clearly defined to limit the kind of medical activity . . .
>
> Thirdly, the strict delineation of doctors' privileges when in hospitals should be anticipated, as the committee is keen to make the medical profession more accountable to health administrators for the costs they necessarily impose on the public purse. Finally, the Public Accounts Committee is expected to press strongly for more rigorous systems of reviewing the treatment of patients by private practitioners, to prevent over-servicing and over-hospitalisation. Additionally, it is believed that the Chairman [of the Public Accounts Committee], at least, is attracted to the idea of scrubbing fee-for-service altogether in public hospitals, replacing it with sessional payments, on the basis that costs can only be constrained when there is no system of incentive payments for medical treatment.

The 14th report of the South Australian Public Accounts Committee referring to the financial management of the Hospitals Department on page 8 recommended that visiting specialists be charged for the use of hospital resources when treating private patients, and on page 115 of that report dealt with the rights of medical practice. That report was brought down in this Parliament on 28 February 1979. The New South Wales Public Accounts Committee visited South Australia last year and, following discussions, no doubt this is the reason for the inquiry into the hospitals system in that State.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, when I read the article in this morning's *Financial Review* it occurred to me that the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee had indeed learnt something from the South Australian Public Accounts Committee. I was also interested to see that action taken by the South Australian Government and the South Australian Health Commission on some of these recommendations is well in advance of what is proposed in New South Wales. In other respects, of course, this Government may not be moving to implement some of the things that are recommended in that projected New South Wales report.

The first recommendation dealt with the desirability of private medical practitioners being charged for the use of hospital facilities. That is already in train in South Australia, particularly in respect of diagnostic resources provided by the hospital. Radiology and pathology charges are raised for private practitioners who use those resources. There are also some facilities charges, depending on the nature of the facilities. For example, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital the cardiac unit raises charges for the use by visiting specialists.

In respect of this second recommendation that is expected, namely, that the role of the hospital be clearly defined in order to limit the possibility that ambitious hospital boards might try to convert their hospitals into mini-Mayo clinics at huge costs to the State, considerable progress is being made by the Health Commission in respect of defining the roles of all hospitals in South Australia, not only the teaching hospitals but also the recognised hospitals throughout. We are not yet at the stage where we can release a report, but much work has been done on that and we regard that definition of hospital role as being absolutely essential to cost control and cost containment.

The third recommendation was in relation to the strict delineation of doctors' privileges in order to make the medical profession more accountable to health administrators for the costs they necessarily impose on the public purse. Guidelines for the delineation of privileges by doctors were announced by me last month. They are available to anyone who seeks them and are designed to ensure that hospital boards know that when they outline the role which a doctor can play in a hospital he or she is equipped to play that role. Of course, that delineation of privilege is very closely linked to the definition of the role of the hospital. It would be quite inappropriate, for example, for cardiac surgery to be performed in a country hospital, however large and well equipped.

The fourth recommendation for rigorous systems of reviewing the treatment of patients by private practitioners to prevent over-servicing and over-hospitalisation is already in train in South Australia through the peer review system in our hospitals. The question of fee for service payment is and always will be a controversial one. At the Lyell McEwin Hospital, sessions have been introduced as opposed to fee for service and, as a result of that, substantial savings are expected to be made in that hospital's budget in this current year. But I would see no possibility that the South Australian Liberal Government would ever seek to completely eliminate fee for service payments by visiting doctors or by salaried doctors for the right to private practice.

VICTOR HARBOR RESORT

Mr HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning, in his capacity as such and as the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government in another place, give an assurance that any decision by the Victor Harbor council to approve or otherwise the proposed $12 000 000 beach resort at Victor Harbor will not be taken until the suspension on the Victor Harbor council has been lifted? I have been approached by many residents of Victor Harbor expressing fears that there has not been sufficient public discussion on the proposed beach resort. I understand that the development was approved by Cabinet in October last year and that an application for planning approval will go before the Victor Harbor council next month.

Residents feel that, due to the faction fighting that has been taking place in the Victor Harbor council since 1980, their views on the project have not been taken into account in the initial discussions, and that the present administrator, Mr Russell Arland, is not aware of their views and of the deep division within the community over the development. They maintain that only when the suspension has been lifted and the council is working in a harmonious fashion should the planning application be considered.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I suggest that this is entirely a matter for my colleague the Minister of Local Government, and I will take up the matter with him. I made a statement earlier in the week on this matter, but I will refer it to my colleague.

MARKET GARDENERS' ASSISTANCE

Mr RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Agriculture provide short-term financial assistance to certain market gardeners at Virginia in the Adelaide Plains region? Grower constituents of mine have drawn to my attention their cash flow problems following a tomato crop failure during the current season. Apparently, some growers in the region planted a variety of tomato which was still subject to trial, and the results were disappointing, hence the cash flow problem being experienced by those growers.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

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

Holden Hill Regional Police Headquarters and Courts Complex.

Ordered that report be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REGIONALISM

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: During Question Time, in answer to a question from the member for Henley Beach, the Premier made the extraordinary allegation that I was in favour of the abolition of States and had, in fact, advocated such a course during a speech I made to the Australian Institute of Political Science seminar in Canberra last month. That is totally untrue. In fact, the extracts that the Premier quoted from my speech were quite misleading, particularly given the emphasis that he placed on them. If I could, in explanation, simply quote, first, my reference to John Curtin's proposals:

> I recently read H. C. Coombes' *Trial Balance* in which he recounts John Curtin's enthusiasm for proposals that the Commonwealth and the States develop a system of regionalism within the Federal Constitution.

That was the emphasis of that reference and the whole point of it. At another point in my speech I pointed out that the special problems of the States had to be attended to and that States such as South Australia and Tasmania had consistently fared worse than others, particularly under the policies of the current Federal Liberal Government and so-called new federalism, in the authorship of which the Premier claimed some large part. I said:

> Australia will only move forward as one nation if the Federal Government—

and that means any Federal Government—

> is committed to developing every region and every State, and the key to this is an approach which sees each State and its Government as the key component of a regional economy.

If the Premier examines the record, he will find that, on the contrary, I am putting an extremely strong national case for South Australia's special place in the Federation and the recognition and strengthening of this State.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Audit Act, 1921-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Its purpose is to implement the commitment given in my policy speech in August 1979, whereby it was proposed to exend the powers of the Auditor-General. In recent times the Auditor-General has expanded the traditional interpretation of his role to include value for money audits, but a major portion of his department's activities is still directed to ensuring that public funds are spent in a duly authorised manner for properly approved purposes. Although the present charter under which the Auditor-General operates goes some way towards providing for Parliamentary review, public scrutiny and accountability, these mechanisms are limited

in their scope, leaving some forms of waste and inefficiency to go unreported.

It is considered that the needs of Parliament will be better served by strengthening and broadening the role of the Auditor-General to conduct efficiency audits in a manner similar to that now applying in the Commonwealth. It is now proposed that the Auditor-General be given the power to investigate public authorities such as Government departments and statutory authorities and other bodies that make use of public funds for the purpose of forming an opinion whether the operations are being conducted in an economical and efficient manner. In addition, the Auditor-General will examine procedures adopted by the organisation for the purpose of assessing its own efficiency and economy. The main responsibility for ensuring that financial, manpower and other resources are properly and efficiently managed rests with the management of the organisation, and the thrust of the efficiency investigations by the Auditor-General will be towards an assessment of management controls and organisation performance in implementing Government policy with efficiency and economy.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 amends the long title of the principal Act. The new powers given to the Auditor-General by this Bill create a new role for him and this should be reflected in the long title to the principal Act. Clause 4 inserts a definition of 'authorised officer' into the section of the principal Act that provides for matters of interpretation. The new term will be used in the provisions introduced by this Bill and in other provisions throughout the principal Act. Clause 5 replaces section 11 of the principal Act with a new section that embraces the existing provision and in addition enables the Auditor-General to appoint a person to conduct an efficiency audit on his behalf. Clauses 6 and 7 make consequential amendments incorporating the term 'authorised officer' in sections 27 and 31 of the principal Act.

Clause 8 enacts new section 41b which empowers the Auditor-General to investigate public authorities and certain other bodies to ascertain the economy and efficiency of their operations. Subclause (1) sets out the organisations that will be subject to examination. The organisations include Government departments, instrumentalities and agencies of the Crown, bodies the accounts of which the Auditor-General is authorised to audit and bodies that within two years preceding the investigation have received public moneys by way of financial assistance. The Government does not wish to include in this category bodies that receive minor financial assistance. The Governor will have power under subclause (2) to fix the limit of assistance above which bodies will be subject to investigation. Subclause (3) provides that an investigation shall be made at the direction of the Treasurer or may be made by the Auditor-General of his own motion. Subclause (4) provides that where the section applies to an organisation by virtue only of the fact that it has received public moneys an investigation must be at the direction of the Treasurer. Subclause (5) requires the Auditor-General to prepare a report following an investigation that states his conclusions and his reasons for those conclusions and any recommendations that he feels are warranted. Subclause (6) requires the submission of the report to the organisation concerned for comment before the final report is issued to the Treasurer and the other persons and bodies referred to in subclause (7). Subclause (8) gives the Auditor-General or an authorised officer powers necessary to conduct an investigation and subclause (9) provides penalties for non-compliance. Subclause (10) excuses an examinee from answering incriminating questions. Subclause (11) provides a definition. Clause 9 makes an amendment to section 44 of the principal Act that will excuse a person being examined by the Auditor-General under general powers of examination contained in section 15 of the principal Act from answering incriminating questions. The clause also increases the penalty provided by the section to a more realistic level. Clauses 10, 11 and 12 amend sections 45a, 46 and 47 to increase the penalties prescribed by those sections.

Mr BANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

NAPPERBY STOCK RESERVE

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Lands): I move:

That the reserve for camping ground for travelling stock, section 345, hundred of Napperby, as shown on the plan laid before Parliament on 25 November 1980, be resumed in terms of section 136 of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1977: and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

The reserve contains an area of 8.6 hectares and was dedicated in the *Government Gazette* dated 1 March 1973 as a reserve for camping ground for travelling stock and placed under the care, control and management of the District Council of Pirie, subject to an easement to the Minister of Water Resources. A request from the District Council of Pirie has been received by the Department of Lands for the re-dedication of the land as a refuse reserve as the land has been used by the residents of Nelshaby and Napperby as an unofficial refuse depot since 1973.

In March 1978, council cleaned up and buried all the old rubbish that had been scattered over the section and excavated a pit which is back-filled by council at least once a week. The council took this action believing that the land had been vested under its care and control for refuse dump purposes. There is no other suitable area in the vicinity for this use, and it is estimated that the usable area will accommodate the district requirements for the next 20 years.

The existing operation is being well controlled by council, and the area has been inspected by the South Australian Health Commission and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, both of which have stated that it is not causing any present or potential threat to the area. The State Planning Authority has also indicated agreement to the proposal. There is no demand for the use of the land as a camping ground for travelling stock, and there is not likely to be any demand in the foreseeable future.

The adjoining section 346, hundred of Napperby, has been developed by the Apex club as a public park with barbeques, playground equipment and oval. The council has planted three rows of native trees adjoining the pit area, which will effectively screen the actual pit from view. As the pits are back filled, the council proposes to develop and beautify the area as park lands. Following resumption the Department of Lands will take the necessary action to rededicate the land. In view of the circumstances, I ask members to support the motion.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 February. Page 2774.)

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I rise to support this Bill, which is a long-awaited Bill as far as this House and I are concerned. If one looks at the history of this matter, one sees that we are referring to a Bill that deals with the

abolition of the unsworn statement, about which I believe we as a Government and certainly as a Party are concerned, particularly in relation to cases of rape. We tried last session to bring into operation legislation to remove this obnoxious clause, which is certainly out of date and which was put in United Kingdom legislation in the mid 1800s. It was included, no doubt, to protect the illiterate people who could not look after themselves. I believe that this is well out of date and certainly needs dismissing from the Statute Book.

Mr Crafter: Are you saying that there are no illiterates left in the community?

Mr MATHWIN: We will look at it generally, and not from the intellectual point of view only, as the member for Playford did last night when the only quote he made was that recently by Justice Bray. Let me talk about the real things of life. If the member for Baudin will wait for a moment (and as a family man he will appreciate what I am going to refer to), it will be well worth it.

The original Bill that the Government introduced was foiled by the Labor Party in the other place, which decided to appoint a Select Committee on this matter; and that was way back in 1980. If we look at pages 34 and 36 of the report of the Select Committee, we will see the number of extensions for which they applied when setting up that committee. The Select Committee was allowed to adjourn from place to place and to report to the Council on Tuesday 4 November 1980. On that date it was moved that the time for bringing up the report be extended to Wednesday 26 November. On that date the committee asked for another extension of time to Wednesday 4 March 1981. On that date, it then applied for an extension until 31 June 1981. The committee then asked for an extension of time to bring up the report on 10 June.

Finally, on 10 June 1981, the committee brought in a report, which, I submit, was an itty-bitty report. As far as I am concerned it is an excuse for a Select Committee report. There is no continuity in it, and one must search the papers, if one is interested enough, to try to find the true story concerning who submitted evidence to that Select Committee. Other facts that have to be considered include the scope that is available. In particular, I am talking about the unsworn statement, particularly in relation to sexual attacks and rape. We must consider the scope that is available, particularly for the experienced criminal, who has already been on a number of charges, perhaps of rape and sexual offences. Such persons can use this method to abuse the victim, and it is often used in this way.

In some cases I am quite sure that the legal eagles who represent us in court write out these obnoxious statements for their clients to read out in open court and denigrate the woman or the girl who happens to be the victim. Neither she nor her counsel has any right to question the matter which has been brought forward in this type of unsworn statement. In many cases absolute down-right lies are told and they cannot be charged. These statements include hearsay and inadmissible remarks. I remind the House that hearsay evidence consists of oral or written statements of persons other than a witness who are testifying as to their making.

The general rule is that such evidence is inadmissible as evidence of the truth of what is asserted. The basic reason for the rule is that this type of evidence cannot be tested by cross-examination. That is the situation. These people who make these statements with the aid of other people who are pretty clever and are used to the business are liable to wander in their statements or to digress into irrelevancies. Such persons are more able to tell lies in an unsworn statement than they would be if they were giving evidence on oath, and can suggest that the unfortunate victim at the time of the offence fancied them. They can suggest, whether she is a young girl or an older person or a middle-aged decent married woman, a grandmother or a grand child, that the victim welcomed the attack and led them on. They can suggest that the victim wanted them to do it, and they are given total freedom to say whatever they want, with no questions asked at all.

An honourable member: That's not true.

Mr MATHWIN: It is true. In the case of a pack rape, the poor victim stands in the court. I was recently in a court watching and trying to give some moral support to the poor victim who was there and she was questioned by six barristers and a Q.C. Her defence was through her own barrister, who represented the State. That is the situation in which the female victim is placed.

Mr Crafter: It has nothing to do with this Bill, though.

Mr MATHWIN: I am talking about an unsworn statement, as the member for Norwood would well know.

Mr Crafter: You are talking about the examination of the prosecutrix.

Mr MATHWIN: The victim is put through the hoop in every detail. Is the honourable member suggesting that the unsworn statement is never used in rape cases? Is my legal friend, the member for Norwood, the solicitor, suggesting that the unsworn statement is never used in a rape case?

Mr Crafter: No, I am not.

Mr MATHWIN: Are you suggesting that they do not use it?

Mr Crafter: You are talking about something completely different.

Mr MATHWIN: I am talking about unsworn statements and the effects of them on victims. The honourable member well knows what I am talking about, and it is to his shame that he is suggesting that this is incorrect. The victim can be put through the hoop in every detail in relation to this type of evidence and the way in which it is given. Why should the evidence of an attacker, an accused person in a rape case in particular, or an accused person in any other type of sexual offence, not be challenged?

In other areas witnesses are attacked on the basis that they are lying or mistaken. In sexual offences it is usual that the attacker will base his defence first of all on lying and, secondly, by saying that the witness is lying, attempting to point out that the female is lying or that such a person is immoral and consented to what was done—in fact putting out a false story of what actually occurred. I believe that that is quite wrong and that the ability of people to do that should be withdrawn and taken from the Statute Book. I think that it is disgraceful.

When the member for Playford spoke in this debate last night he quoted from the Select Committee's report; he gave only one quotation which was not evidence given to the committee but a statement made by Justice Bray, not to the committee. The member for Playford plucked it out of the air. He related that to the House and suggested that eminent people would agree with that statement. I ask the member for Playford and also the member for Norwood, who is to speak after me, I understand, whether they have read the Mitchell Report and whether they agree with it in this respect. At page 130 of the Mitchell Report the recommendation 7.3.5 in respect to the unsworn statement stated:

(a) We recommend that the right of the accused person to make an unsworn statement be abolished.

The honourable member talks about the learned people who believe that the unsworn statement should remain. Does he believe that the people who formed that committee, the personnel of that committee, are not people who know what they are about? The person who chaired the committee was the Honourable Justice Mitchell, C.B.E., LL.B.(Adel.). Another member was Professor Colin Howard, LL.B.,

LL.M.(Lond.), Ph.D.(Adel.). LL.D.(Melb.), Hearn Professor of Law, University of Melbourne. Would he know what he was talking about? The other member was Mr David Biles, B.A., B.Ed.(Melb.), M.A.(La Trobe), Assistant Director (Research), Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra. Are they not well known people? They are the people who brought down the Mitchell Report and were responsible for it, and at page 130 they recommended that the unsworn statement should be abolished.

Mr Crafter: You agree with the Mitchell Committee Report, do you?

Mr MATHWIN: I agree with some of it.

Mr Crafter: On unsworn statements?

Mr MATHWIN: The member for Playford said that as far as he was concerned he did not believe that the Liberal Government had a mandate in this area. Let me remind the Opposition that this Government has a mandate for this action, and furthermore, I think that it ought to take it and I think it should be supported by all members of the House.

I refer now to the N.S.W. Discussion Paper on Unsworn Statements of Accused Persons of 1980, which is a recent report. Referring to the abolition of the unsworn statement, it is stated at page 20:

> *(a)* The right is an historical anachronism—it was imported into our procedures as a device to give the accused a voice at a time when the law did not allow him to give evidence, and the reason for its existence has long since disappeared; most other 'common law' systems have either abolished it or in other ways rendered it nugatory.

The reason is given there why it was originally put in so many long years ago. It is further stated at page 20:

> *(b)* It is a significant departure—and the only one—from a system based on the principles of evidence and examination and cross-examination.
>
> *(c)* It allows the professional criminal to lie without the appropriate test—

This is a matter on which the member for Norwood challenged me before, when he said that I was incorrect. I refer him to those statements in the discussion paper, from N.S.W., which State is under the reign of a Government of his ilk. The paper states:

> It allows the professional criminal to lie without the appropriate test applied to other witnesses, to introduce irrelevancies and in other ways—

The SPEAKER: Order! What did the honourable member quote?

Mr Millhouse: I think it is all right; he is talking about someone lying.

Mr MATHWIN: I am quoting from a report. It allows the witness in a court case or the person giving—

Mr Millhouse: What he is saying is absolute nonsense, but I do not think it is against Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may continue.

Mr MATHWIN: The paper continues:

> —and in other ways to obscure the court's search for the truth.
>
> *(d)* The 'incapable' accused is unlikely to be prejudiced by giving evidence—the jury will make an assessment of him just as it will of any witness.

I wish to quote two other matters from the N.S.W. report. At page 22 it states:

> *(a)* that once the accused was given the right to give evidence the right to make an unsworn statement became anachronistic;
>
> *(b)* the right has often been abused in practice; for example by being used to introduce inflammatory or otherwise inadmissible materials;
>
> *(c)* an innocent man has nothing to gain by declining to give evidence: the statement is merely a device to assist the guilty.

I turn now to a publication entitled, 'The Unsworn Statement in Criminal Trials', published in Melbourne in 1981, by the Law Reform Commissioner of Victoria, report No. 11. At page 14, the report states:

> In England the right to make an unsworn statement was specifically preserved by the Criminal Evidence Act of 1898. Its abolition was recommended by the English Criminal Law Revision Committee in 1972. This recommendation was allied with other recommendations generally making inroads into the right to silence and the opposition was such that it has not been accepted by the Parliament and the 1898 Act remains in full force. However, the recent Royal Commission inquiring into the investigation and prosecution of Criminal Offences in England and Wales has recommended that the right to make an unsworn statement be abolished, although so far no Parliamentary attitude to the recommendation has emerged.

The document goes on to refer to matters in South Australia, Western Australia, and some of the other Australian States. I turn now to the evidence given to the Select Committee in Adelaide, and I refer members first to page 69, where the witnesses were Ms R. Wighton and Ms W. Eyre. The transcript reads as follows:

> **The Hon. ANNE LEVY:** What about all the other rules of evidence, admissibility of hearsay evidence and that sort of thing? I gather that there is confusion as to whether these rules of evidence apply to unsworn statements. If they do apply they are not always upheld? . . . (Ms Eyre) That is my understanding.
>
> Your view would be that, currently, unsworn statements contain much material that would be excluded by the rules of evidence? . . . That is correct. I think that the Mitchell Committee in its report adopted the same sort of view, that too often statements, which if given in evidence, would be inadmissible, are let in by way of unsworn statement.

On page 70, the transcript states:

> **The Hon. BARBARA WIESE:** Is it your impression that because of the protection afforded the accused by the unsworn statement as opposed to the victim, who usually gives evidence, that the two positions are weighed equally? . . . Do you think the prosecutrix is disadvantaged by that? . . . I think that the defendant may be advantaged in the sense that his story is untested...

Turning now to page 85 of the evidence, we see the following:

> **The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS:** Are you saying that the abolition of the unsworn statement will not disadvantage anyone or are you saying that you accept that it may and that it should, in spite of that, still be abolished? . . . (Ms Wighton) More like the second, I think, although the comparison is not quite as you stated. I think we are saying that the abolition of the unsworn statement will not be doing as much damage to as many people as its retention.

A number of people were questioned by the Select Committee, and one of them was Ms Ann O'Grady, speaking on behalf of the Society of Labor Lawyers. On page 89, the transcript states:

> **The CHAIRMAN:** Will you proceed with your submission? . . . The simple situation is that Labor Lawyers oppose the abolition of unsworn statements because we believe that it will deprive the accused of a right that has grown up historically, and the fact that it has grown up historically as an aberration should not necessarily mean that it now does not exist as a right. We believe that people who want to abolish it should give good reasons for doing so, rather than the reverse, that persons who want it retained should have to give reasons, especially as so far no good reasons have been advanced for abolition.

We can understand now why the member for Playford and no doubt the member for Norwood will support that they are obliged to support it, no doubt, because of the findings of the Society of Labor Lawyers of South Australia. Ms O'Grady said:

> I have read the Mitchell report. All those authorities are very heavy, but I think that people are still not convinced that there are reasons for abolition. One has to remember, also, the unsworn statement is not evidence. Juries are advised of that. They then weigh that fact. From the evidence we have on rape trials, they appear not to be particularly impressed by the fact that an accused makes use of an unsworn statement and does not give evidence.

Another person to give evidence to the committee was Mr Sidney Herbert Ellis, who said, in a reply to a question from the Chairman, that he had no objection to his evidence being made public. He said:

> I have an interest in this—one may say that I am emotionally involved. That is possible, but what I say will not be controlled by my emotions. I have reasoned this thing out and I wish to say this:

my daughter was murdered in 1977—brutally murdered. The defendant in the case, which was her husband, took the unsworn statement, and it was a magnificent piece of writing by himself in collaboration with the gentleman who defended him, who happened to be also a homosexual, and that was Mr Derrance Stephenson, who as we know is no longer with us.

On page 108 of the transcript, Mr Ellis is reported as follows:

My daughter was not a saint by any means; she was a normal girl, but by the time the defendant and his counsel had finished with her, anybody could have said that she was Lucretia Borgia herself.

He spoke as a worried parent who found the whole thing rather shocking. In a final question the Hon. Frank Blevins said:

There is some conflict in what you said. You are strong in your support of the abolition of unsworn statements, although you indicated you would accept some modification. You said the unsworn statement was a useful thing, but then you indicated that lawyers and courts have abused it. Am I correct that your opposition is to the abuse of the unsworn statement, rather than the unsworn statement itself?

The witness replied that, if there is a bad law, it must be abolished altogether and not retained in any half measure. That was the basis of the argument of Mr Ellis as a worried parent and a person who had a lot to put up with in relation to the murder of his daughter by her husband, who submitted an unsworn statement that made the girl look a complete harlot in the eyes of the community and of people who did not know her. I hope that the House will support this Bill.

I understand that a Select Committee was set up in Victoria to consider the use of the unsworn statement and that it was stated in evidence that the unsworn statement was used in that State in less than 15 per cent of criminal trials. However, it was stated that in South Australia the unsworn statement was much more popular; for example, in 1973 the unsworn statement was used in 67 per cent of trials that came before the Supreme Court and in 30 of the 94 trials that came before the Central District Criminal Court. It appears that the unsworn statement is used much more frequently in South Australia than in other States.

I support the Bill. This matter has been given a lot of thought over the past few years. When a Bill dealing with this matter was previously introduced by the Government, it was rejected in the Upper House, which appointed a Select Committee that met over a long period. That committee was represented by only one Party—the Labor Party—and, with due respect, I suggest that the members of that committee could well have been swayed by the evidence given by the Labor lawyers of South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the Bill and, with due respect, I must say that I do not believe that the member for Glenelg said anything to advance the cause of its passage, because, quite frankly, he just did not understand what he was talking about. I will leave what he said and refer to the situation in this Parliament at present. Last session, or the session before, the Government introduced a Bill in the Legislative Council to amend the Evidence Act. Among other things, that Bill proposed to cut out the unsworn statement. The Bill was laid aside in the Legislative Council after a controversy, and subsequently a Select Committee of that Chamber was set up to inquire into whether or not the unsworn statement should be abolished. That Select Committee, on which, if my memory serves me correctly, the Government refused to serve, brought in a report to the effect that the unsworn statement should be retained, but with some modifications. The matter has rested there.

Now, the Government has introduced in this House that part of the original Bill that seeks to abolish the unsworn statement, because it knows that it can get it through here. The other part of the Bill, concerning access by police to commercial records, and so on, has been introduced as a separate Bill in the Upper House. That Bill will probably get through the Upper House; it will come here and be passed, and that is all right. From memory, I have some reservations about the matter, but we will see about that in due course. The Government proposes to get the Bill for the abolition of the unsworn statement through the Assembly, present it to the Legislative Council and say, 'Pass it.' One cannot think of a greater slap in the face from one House to the other than to do that, when quite obviously the Legislative Council, by a majority, has shown that it is opposed to abolition.

It is ironic that the Liberal Party, which has always championed the two-House system in this place and which has regarded the Legislative Council as a very important part of the legislative process, should be prepared now to give it a slap in the face in this way. I can tell members opposite that the Bill will not pass the Legislative Council: my colleague the Hon. Mr Milne was on the Select Committee, he concurred entirely with its recommendations and, from my conversations with him, he has not changed his mind one jot. Unless the Labor Party backs down, and I doubt that it will, there is no hope of the Bill going through the Legislative Council.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Are we in your pockets this time?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Sometimes the Labor Party acts as though it is; when I give a lead, sometimes it will follow, regrettably not as often as it should. Sometimes it has sufficient sense to do that, and I give the member for Salisbury full marks for doing so on the rare occasions when his Party follows me. However, I will leave aside that matter. This Bill will not pass the Legislative Council unless there is a change of mind by the Labor Party, and I do not think that there will be. Certainly, there will not be a change of mind on the part of the Liberal Party—nor should there be. So we are really wasting time on this Bill. I believe that the Government introduced the Bill because of a sullen obstinacy by the Attorney-General to try to get through something that is not, in the judgment of most people who know anything about it, a desirable measure.

Mr Mathwin: What about the Mitchell Report?

Mr MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg did a lot of special pleading in his speech. He picked out little bits of the evidence here and there that seemed to support his case. But, if he remembers that a number of bodies, such as the Law Society, the Bar Association and the Legal Services Commission (I believe the member for Norwood has a list of those bodies) are all opposed to the principle of this Bill, he will see that this is not just a Party-political wrangle and that there are very weighty considerations in favour of retention. I support those considerations.

A lot of emotional nonsense is being talked, particularly by women's groups, through a complete misunderstanding of the situation about it being necessary to abolish the unsworn statement to help victims of rape. That is absolute nonsense. It is not necessary to abolish the unsworn statement to help victims of rape. Of course, by no means is it only in rape cases that unsworn statements are given. I do not propose to argue the merits or the demerits of the matter. All I can say is that, in my judgment, unsworn statements should remain, with the modifications recommended by the Select Committee. From my discussions with other people, I have found that that is the opinion of a majority of those who know anything about the topic.

Mr Mathwin: Why is it being changed in other States and in the United Kingdom?

Mr MILLHOUSE: I do not care two hoots what is being done in other States or the United Kingdom. Only today

the Premier made much of what he said was the wish of the Labor Party to abolish the States. We have our own State Legislature and our own South Australian community, so that we can do what we want, and I understood that that was the thrust of what the honourable gentleman was saying. We do not have to follow the other States if we believe that we are doing better ourselves. That is an absolutely sterile argument, which we have heard time and time again when people cannot think of any better argument. I am not prepared to accept it. I point out to the member for Glenelg that in every State and in the United Kingdom the position is subtly different, and it is impossible in a matter such as this to make a direct comparison. Apart from what I have already said, that should be sufficient answer to the honourable member's interjection.

I oppose the Bill, and I will oppose it right through. I prophesy that the Bill will be opposed in the Upper House by my colleague and that it will be defeated there, so the less time we spend on it here the less time we will have wasted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I find it quite surprising that the last speaker should be critical of the Government for reintroducing a Bill when, in fact, it was categorically committed at the time of the last election to the abolition of the unsworn statement. I think that great Scotsman Robert Bruce said, 'If at first you don't succeed, try, try, try again.' Certainly, the member for Mitcham would be one of the more persevering characters in this House. The Government has done what it maintains to be correct. It has reintroduced a Bill upon which it has a considerable amount of feeling.

We have been criticised, I consider unjustly, for introducing the Bill in the House of Assembly when, in fact, when the Bill was previously introduced in the other place we were criticised for doing precisely that on the basis that this is the House where the first judgment should be made. It appears that it is difficult to please people when they are quite single-minded in their opposition to a piece of legislation and are engaging in all sorts of extraneous criticisms which are quite irrelevant to the central issue.

The Government is committed to the abolition of the unsworn statement. Oddly enough, the member for Elizabeth was also committed to its abolition late last year, but he is conspicuous by his absence from the Chamber this afternoon. I wonder which way he would be speaking if he were here. It is quite true that the unsworn statement no longer exists in Western Australia, it was abolished in New Zealand as long ago as 1966, and, where abolition has been recommended in the United Kingdom, there is obviously an equally strong body of opinion, for whatever reason, for the abolition of the unsworn statement. It is one of those issues on which there are diametrically opposed points of view and the arguments which have been put forward in the House against the abolition and those which have been put forward for the abolition are obviously not going to meet.

The Select Committee which sat on this matter put forward some compromise suggestions, but we do not regard the report of the Select Committee as a strong one and the amendments which are to be introduced by the member for Playford go only part of the way towards meeting the Liberal Government's commitment to abolition. They are not really satisfactory compromises. There is no evidence from what we have been able to adduce that the abolition of the unsworn statement has led to an increase in the conviction rate. One of the fears is that people would not be able to adequately defend themselves if they were compelled to make a sworn statement and be subjected to cross-examination. It is certainly not the aim of the Attorney-General to increase the conviction rate, if such allegations have been made. There have been suggestions that that would be an outcome. We do not believe there is any evidence to demonstrate that, although the member for Mitcham maintained that the women's lobby, those women who have been extremely concerned, believes that the alleged victim in a rape case is subject to all sorts of harrowing experiences in the court and that the defendant can simply make an unsworn statement and thereby prevent any cross-examination. Emotional though that may be, there is certainly a lot of substance in the fact that the one who has suffered the worst experience is the one who has to suffer most in court in an attempt to prove what happened.

It is interesting that the words of the former Chief Justice, Dr Bray, have been quoted almost as though they were in direct submission to the former Select Committee. That simply was not so. Those words were presented as part of a submission, I think by the Legal Services Office. They were also quoted in submissions to the Mitchell Committee, which reported in favour of abolition. I suppose the fact that that committee, with quite a lot of experience on it, would have considered Dr Bray's submission and rejected it is a matter of equal significance and therefore it can be presented on both sides as a matter which has been considered by people with differing points of view; one has accepted it, one has dismissed it. There again, we were left in no man's land. It was not a submission to the Select Committee instituted by the Legislative Council.

The arguments which have been put forward in the House vary very little. There is nothing of substance; nothing new has been presented by those on either side of the debate; both are lined up against one another. I do not intend to protract the debate by reiterating what I said during the session when this was introduced prior to its being laid aside in the other Chamber. Suffice to say that the Government is strongly committed to the abolition of the unsworn statement.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Randall, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood (teller), Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs Evans and Rodda. Noes—Messrs McRae and O'Neill.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Evidence by accused persons and their spouses.'

Mr CRAFTER: I move:

Page 1, line 17—Leave out 'subsection (3)' and insert 'subsection (2)'.

Pages 1 and 2—Leave out paragraphs *(c)* and *(d)* and insert paragraph as follows:

and

(c) by inserting after its present contents as amended by this section (now to be designated as subsection (1) the following subsection:

(2) Subject to subsection (3), a defendant forfeits the protection of subsection (1) VI if—

(a) the nature or conduct of the defence is such as to involve imputations on the character of the prosecutor or a witness for the prosecution; and

(b) the imputations are not such as would necessarily arise from a proper presentation of the defence.

(3) A defendant does not forfeit the protection of subsection (1) VI by reason of imputations on the

character of the prosecutor or a witness for the prosecution arising from evidence of the conduct of the prosecutor or witness—

(a) in the events or circumstances on which the charge is based;

(b) in the investigation of those events or circumstances, or in assembling evidence in support of the charge; or

(c) in the course of the trial, or proceedings preliminary to the trial.

This amendment to clause 2 stands in the name of the member for Playford. I will not take the Committee's time by making a long explanation in justification of this clause. It is obvious from the second reading debate that there is no-one opposite who has a grasp of the complexities of this matter. They have been canvassed at length in the Select Committee report. This amendment results from the committee's recommendations. That committee, as has been said, met over a long period and took evidence from a wide group of people in the community. There can be no doubt that this is a fair and reasonable conclusion to be drawn and it should, in the interests of the criminal justice system of this State, be embodied in this legislation. Therefore, I call on members to support the amendment.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We will not be accepting this amendment. It has the effect of reinstating the defendant's right to make an unsworn statement, although with some qualifications. We maintain that the Bill before the House removing the right to make an unsworn statement also presents sufficient qualifications to prevent misuse of the Bill. The two points of view are really diametrically opposed.

Mr CRAFTER: I ask the Minister to explain to the Committee how it is that he can draw that conclusion, given the evidence that was presented to the Select Committee from organisations representing such disadvantaged people as Aborigines in our community when they appear before the courts. The Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement gave evidence, as did the Legal Services Commission, a number of women's organisations, the Law Society of South Australia, the South Australian Bar Association and eminent jurists in this State.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The opinion of the Government and the Attorney-General is that there has been an equal amount of convincing evidence presented for the opposing view. Obviously there is an area upon which the two differing factions will not agree and there is, as I said in the concluding address in the second reading stage, no evidence that there is an increased conviction rate. I believe that the statement which was made by the member for Playford about the Chief Justice's statement that juries are not fools applies equally well in either situation, whether it is the defendant or anyone else who is questioned. Therefore, we do not believe that unfair practices will follow as a result of the abolition of the unsworn statement.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I suggest to the member for Norwood that it is quite useless arguing with the Government on this. They have made up their minds without any thought or any reason.

Mr Evans: Isn't it fair to say that you have done the same?

Mr MILLHOUSE: No. I have given this a lot of thought, as many people who are in a position to know about this have. The tragedy is that most people on the Government side (and this was exemplified, if I may so with charity, by the member for Glenelg) are not in a position to make an informed judgment on this, but it is useless arguing with them.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter (teller), Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (22)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Chapman, Eastick, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs McRae and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs D. C. Brown and Evans.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr CRAFTER: I move:

After clause 2 insert new clauses as follows:

3. The following section is inserted after section 18 of the principal Act.

18a. (1) Subject to this section, a person charged with an offence may, at his trial, make an unsworn statement of fact in his defence.

(2) No assertion my be made by way of unsworn statement if, assuming that the defendant had chosen to give sworn evidence, that assertion would have been inadmissible as evidence.

(3) Where an assertion made in the course of an unsworn statement is such as would, if made on oath, have been liable to rebuttal, evidence may be given in rebuttal of that assertion.

(4) Where—

(a) in the course of making an unsworn statement, a defendant makes assertions with a view to establishing his own good character or involving imputations on the character of the prosecutor or the witnesses for the prosecution;

and

(b) the defendant would, if the assertions had been made on oath, have been liable to be asked questions tending to show that he has been convicted or is guilty of an offence (other than that with which he is charged), or is of bad character,

then, evidence may be given to show that the defendant has been convicted or is guilty of an offence (other than that with which he is charged), or is of bad character.

(5) A person is not entitled both to make an unsworn statement under this section and to give sworn evidence in his defence.

(6) This section operates to the exclusion of the right, previously existing at common law, to make an unsworn statement but, subject to the provisions of this section, the rules of the common law relating to unsworn statements apply in relation to unsworn statements under this section.

(7) In this section—

'assertion' means any allegation or statement of fact.

As I said previously, this matter has been well canvassed in the Select Committee's report, and I do not intend to take the time of the Committee in going over that matter, given the attitude that we have seen expressed by members opposite during the debate on this most important matter. However, this is a vital clause, which establishes the right of an accused person in the criminal courts of this State to make an unsworn statement. The amendments that follow and that have preceded this are in line with the Select Committee report, which brings about a rearrangement of the rules of evidence in this matter to bring about that compromise which the Minister said he did not think could be achieved by which I and members on this side of the House believe has been achieved through the work of the Select Committee.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Government opposes this amendment, which has the effect of referring the intention of the original Bill before the House. It reinstates the right to make an unsworn statement. Therefore, the defendant is unable to be cross-examined. There are qualifications and protections which we admit are built into this clause, but we also maintain that those protections are similarly built into the existing Bill. The very essence of this amendment is that there is now a right to make an unsworn statement. We believe that the unsworn statement should be abolished.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, Corcoran, Crafter (teller), Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, Millhouse, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Noes (21)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison (teller), P. B. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Wilson, and Wotton.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs M. J. Brown, McRae, and O'Neill. Noes—Messrs Ashenden, Billard, and Schmidt.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr CRAFTER: The other amendments that I foreshadowed are consequential upon those that have been defeated and, at great regret to the Opposition, I will no longer persist with them.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December. Page 2276.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition supports this very short, but nevertheless necessary and important, Bill. It has three major amendments, on which I will simply give a view.

The first is that the position has come about whereby people who are employed as hairdressing teachers by the Department of Further Education have been found in some cases (I do not say in all cases) not to be registered hairdressers as such. I do not know whether that is a bad thing or a good thing, but it is a fact of life at the moment. However, if we are to ensure that all other hairdressers are registered, which I think would be a good thing, there seems little doubt that those people who are employed as teachers of the trade should be registered.

The Opposition has no quarrel with that. We think that it is a good idea and that the provision will give protection to those people who are going to work for the Department of Further Education in the future. Also, the provision takes into consideration any retrospectivity that may have occurred in relation to those people who are already employed. Evidently there are some. The Minister does not say in his second reading explanation just how many there are, but he states that there are people currently employed by the Department of Further Education who are not registered. The actual situation is probably that some are registered and some are not.

However, those who are not registered will be protected by the framing of this amendment, so that they do not lose their jobs. This is essential, as I do not think that people should be affected because a Government decides that any future employee is to be registered, and therefore recognised. Clearly, those people who have been in the industry previously should have the protection that this clause provides. The Opposition has no opposition to this proposition and, indeed, supports it.

The other amendment takes into consideration the fact that the Act as it presently stands could prohibit an apprentice hairdresser from practising the trade during the term of his indentures. I notice that the Minister in his second reading explanation used the term 'could prohibit', which simply means that it is doubtful. Obviously, someone has come up with the conclusion that it might be quite illegal for apprentices actually to practise the trade during their indenture period.

I do not know whether that is a fact of life, and possibly the Minister does not know what the real situation is, either. If that is the case, quite clearly it ought to be cleaned up, so that there is no doubt about the situation in regard to apprentices. It seems to me that apprentices would be in a very awkward, and indeed an almost impossible, situation if they could not go and practise their trade. Quite clearly, the amendment to ensure the right of apprentices in the future is a correct one.

The final amendment takes into account the out-of-trade hairdressers who were not actually practising the trade as at 1 April 1979, which was the operative date of the 1978 amending Act. Although those people were clearly identified at that stage as hairdressers, the fact that they were not able to get jobs is not sufficient reason to deny them the right to receive registration. The reason might have been that people were wearing their hair longer during that period. Most of us have shortened it, which is probably a good thing, because it has created more employment. I noticed in the final paragraph of the Minister's explanation he said:

> Finally, I mention that the proposed amendments have been discussed by officers of my department with all interested parties, including the Department of Further Education, the Apprenticeship Commission and the Hairdressers' Registration Board.

The Minister does not say whether or not the union has been consulted. I do not know whether the Minister of Industrial Affairs is here. However, it is not of any great significance; I imagine that the Minister of Education is going to handle it. Is the Minister able to tell me whether the Hairdressers' Association was taken into consideration as well as the Hairdressers' Registration Board and the Department of Further Education. The Minister said that all parties had been subject to the discussion, so one would imagine that, if all parties were taken into confidence and they agreed to the proposed amendments, they all require them. Therefore, I have no opposition to any part of the Bill, and in fact, support it.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I agree with what has been said. There seems to be an anomaly, however, between this Bill and the previous Bill concerning hairdressers. The situation pertaining to the previous Bill was that one had a six month-leeway to register or one was disregarded. A case of which I am thinking concerns a 50-year-old man who had to go back to school, and is still there, because he did not register. Under the present Bill, if one happened to be working as a teacher and did not register at that time, such a person is now being given a second chance.

I ask why, if these people are to be given a second bite of the cherry (because logically they should have registered at the same time), the people who by accident missed out on the previous occasion are not being given the opportunity to register now under that provision? The barber to whom I referred is severely handicapped by having to go back to school to obtain qualifications, after working in the trade for 20 years as a barber. The anomaly is that, if he had registered within the time, he would have been all right and would have been recognised as a barber and able to carry on, or, if he had lived a certain distance from Adelaide, as he does now, it would not have mattered. It seems to me that, if a certain group of people are to be given leeway to register now, that provision should extend to cover people who have been badly affected by the provisions of the previous Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): A couple of points were raised by the last two speakers. One was

relevant to clause 3. As the Act is presently drafted, a person practising hairdressing in the metropolitan area of Adelaide must be registered with the board. However, it is not unusual for an interim period to elapse between the completion of an apprenticeship by a person and the date on which he obtains his registration certificate. Therefore, this clause provides that that hiatus, that interim period, is covered so as to permit those people to practise hairdressing legally during that period. That is the reply to the question that the Deputy Leader was asking. The provision permits the practice of hairdressing by an unregistered hairdresser for a period of up to six months from the completion of an apprenticeship, provided that during that period such a person is in the employ of a registered hairdresser.

I should have thought that clause 4 (2) *(a)* covered the circumstances outlined by the member for Semaphore where difficulties have been experienced by some persons who have been resident in the metropolitan area and who have been seeking registration and, although they were practising hairdressers, were not physically practising hairdressing before 1 April 1979, and therefore found themselves unable to take advantage of that automatic regulation. And therefore this clause regularies the situation.

Mr Peterson: Are you going to register this barber now? He was a practising barber at that time and he missed the opportunity to register because he missed the notification. Can he now be registered? He went back to school to try to comply with the requirements of the Bill.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The clause regularises that situation and allows flexibility, particularly when country areas are prescribed.

Mr Peterson: If he were in the country he would be all right, but he is in the metropolitan area.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I would be surprised if that matter has been overlooked. On the question of total conference between the parties, I can give an assurance that that happened, because the various parties visited me in my office and I referred them to the Minister of Labour and Industry. They represented the Hairdressers Association, D.F.E., and the Apprenticeship Commission.

Mr Peterson: He is 50 years of age, has been practising 30 years, and is forced to go back to school because, by misfortune, he missed out. Now you are giving these people a second bite of the cherry, and I do not deny them that, but I think it should be both ways.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If they are employed by D.F.E. they will not be required to obtain registration. It is possible that there is an anomaly in the one case the honourable member has cited, one that has been missed. We believed that all possibilities had been covered, and I can only undertake to have the situation checked.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I apologise to the House that I was out of the Chamber during the brief second reading debate and for the first two clauses in Committee. As I think honourable members realise, there is at present a most unfortunate dispute involving the *Troubridge*, and I have been trying to get it resolved as soon as possible. I understand that only one question was raised, and that was by the member for Semaphore. I am aware of the problem of one of his constituents, and we have looked at it previously for him. This Bill does not affect that in any way. I think I am right in saying that. We have not been able to resolve the problem.

Mr Peterson: You are giving these people preference over him. They can register and he cannot.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I undertake to look again at the problem for the honourable member. I shall go through the second reading speech of the Deputy Leader and reply later to any points he has raised. I thank honourable members for their contributions.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RURAL ADVANCES GUARANTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 November. Page 2096.)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): This Bill is consequential on one that passed this House yesterday, and the Opposition sees no reason for opposing it.

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

PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

JUSTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

EXPLOSIVES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want to continue the remarks that I began in an adjournment debate earlier this week, when I had really begun to get into what perhaps could be termed the nitty-gritty of the problem. Those remarks were based on the report given by the Hon. Lance Milne in the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on uranium resources. In particular, I referred to his remarks—and I quote them again—when he said:

> Apart from that, there is a vast difference between uranium and any other fuel. All other known fuels generate heat and burn away, leaving relatively harmless gases or ashes.

In my remarks earlier this week I showed, in some respects, just how ludicrous that statement was in the light of known pollution from coal-fired power. At the end of that time, I began to discuss the more global impact of the burning of fossil fuels in general. Of course, coal power is one large source of fossil fuels in the world today. I referred briefly to two articles which I inadequately sourced. One article, from the *Age* of Friday 8 January 1982, referred to a meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science in Washington, where several speakers addressed this subject. Dr Roger Revelle of the University of California stated:

> It now appears inevitable that the atmospheric carbon dioxide level will double some time in the next century.

Dr James Hansen of the Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York stated:

We can expect a large climatic impact, very large changes.

Other comments were made by a range of scientists from different areas, among them a geophysical leader. I previously sited a Space Study Centre report. One can see that the comments that have been made have not come from an isolated group of scientists but from a very widely based group of scientists who are researching this subject and who are all arriving at similar conclusions. Of course, there are variations in what they conclude from their studies, and one might expect that, but there is a great body of concensus in what they are finding.

They believe that changes are occurring because of relentless increases in the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere, and that these increases are occurring as a result of the burning of fossil fuels, combined with a depletion of the world's forests. They are unanimous in the view that there will be dramatic changes in the world's climate as a result of these changes in the carbon dioxide levels. There is a consensus view that the time scale for action is about 50 years, and a view is also put forward that it will take about that time for the world's economy to become unhooked from the use of fossil fuels.

So one can see that this is not an insignificant problem. I am rather afraid that, when people make glib statements about uranium *versus* other fuels, they perhaps ignore the fact that we face major problems in the world in regard to the burning of fossil fuels and in the potential dangers, not the least of which is the fact that the problems are global.

If we established an industry in a certain area that created great dangers for the people who lived in the district, we would expect an outcry, and the Government responsible for administering that area would very quickly ensure that that industry ceased to pollute the area. When the dangers are gradual and of a global scale, who is responsible? Which Government will say that it will do its part, even though other Governments perhaps will not be responsible and will continue to excessively rely on fossil fuels?

We face a major problem. The public is not sufficiently aware of this problem at the moment. The Hon. Lance Milne made a diabolical statement—that 'all other known fuels generate heat and burn away, leaving relatively harmless gases or ashes'. That statement is so ludicrous to me that we must question how information is being disseminated in this place. I should have thought that that committee had a great mass of information placed before it; I am certain that it would have had information on this subject placed before it, yet we hear statements like that.

Mr Lewis: Acid rain is harmless!

Dr BILLARD: I dealt with the subjects of acid rain and other direct pollutants of coal-fired power in my speech earlier this week. We have to encourage the use of non-fossil fuels, and that includes uranium. Uranium is a non-fossil fuel and does not pollute the atmosphere in this respect. In the past, people have focused on what they feared might be possible harmful effects at some time in the future, and yet these possible harmful effects that they are talking about are several orders of magnitude less than the harmful effects that we know about which come from coal-fired power.

Therefore, we are comparing the dangers that we know from coal-fired power with alleged possible fears of future harmful effects from nuclear power. Even when one considers the worst possible estimates of anti-nuclear scientists and their worst possible estimates of the death rate that would result from nuclear power, there is still a difference of several orders of magnitude from the known death rate from coal-fired power. An order of magnitude in scientific terms is normally a factor of 10. Several orders of magnitude would be anything from a factor of 10 to a factor of 1 000.

If the anti-nuclear protesters of our age had alighted on the scene in 10 years time and had not been predisposed to their present position, they might well be championing the cause of nuclear power and arguing, demonstrating and marching down the streets saying that we should be closing down our fossil-fuel power stations and charging governments with extending nuclear power. But presently these people are hooked into opposition to nuclear power which is a most destructive and dangerous opposition in the light of the problems we face in the future.

I appeal to the Hon. Lance Milne to look again at the statements he has made and at the evidence placed before the committee. This is not an idle matter that he is considering. The future of South Australia depends upon his decision, to a large measure, and the future of the power-generating industry in the world could well be affected by the contribution that South Australian uranium could make to the world power industry. In conclusion, I believe that both the Hon. Lance Milne and the public in general—

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): As mentioned by the member for Spence on Tuesday evening, I also received a telegram from the Hindmarsh council requesting that I place on record in Parliament the total opposition of that council to the location of the proposed remand centre at Port Road, Brompton. During the past eight months or so, I have been inundated with letters and telephone calls from irate constituents over the Government's plans to build a remand centre on this site, which has been described as totally impractical and preposterous. In particular, many parents of children attending the Hindmarsh Primary School, which is directly opposite the site and situated within my electorate, are up in arms. It has caused great controversy among the residents and a number of parents have threatened to take their children away from the school. Others who attended the public meetings and the public hearing conducted by the Public Works Committee are annoyed because they feel that their views and the evidence, which was overwhelmingly against this site, have been totally ignored; they believe it a complete waste of time and they are bitterly disappointed that their views have been overruled.

It is interesting to note that, now that the party is over, the Chief Secretary, who is the Minister responsible for correctional services, has now come out of his shell, and is making statements. He was not seen or heard of before on this issue. He made no statements; he declined invitations to attend meetings, and he kept well in the background and would not even say 'boo'. Of course, we all know that his Ministerial colleagues had to handle the rough stuff for him.

Now, as was reported in yesterday's *Advertiser*, the Chief Secretary (Mr Rodda) had the audacity to say that the Opposition's suggestion to build the remand centre at Regency Park was grossly impractical. Yet when the Labor Government recommended the Regency Park site he said nothing. He did not oppose that site. Things must be different when they are not the same.

Much concern has been expressed about security and the appearance of such an institution, and looking at the tabled report it is stated that the security concept is predominantly 'the building as the wall' instead of the more common heavily patrolled perimeter walls and fences. Consequently, the secure sections of the complex will be six metres high at the minimum, which allows the accommodation units to be two floors high. I should not think that six-metre high walls will enhance the appearance of this rundown area of Hindmarsh.

With regard to zoning, it is noted that the site, in the town of Hindmarsh, is zoned general industrial except the Port Road frontage which is district commercial. Remand institutions, being unclassified, are subject to council consent. When one considers the total opposition of the whole of the Hindmarsh council, some difficulty may arise in obtaining that consent. Council and the general public were under the impression that the Adelaide Gaol was declared a National Trust. However, on the Television news on Tuesday night it was announced that the old Adelaide Gaol was too old for repairs and would be bulldozed and reverted to parklands, and this has confused the public mind even further. Perhaps the Chief Secretary could clarify that aspect.

There are many other aspects of the report, such as environmental impact, traffic aspects, car parking facilities, expansion programmes and Housing Trust involvement that I could speak about but time will not permit me to do so. However, one final point that I feel I must make is in relation to the discussion on alternative sites. According to the report, the Regency Park site, immediately north of the State Transport Authority bus depot, was inappropriate for two key reasons.

This site is a prime industrial site for transport-associated industrial development, as it is immediately west of a potential railway goods yard associated with the new standard rail link into Adelaide. This is completely contrary to the reply the Minister of Public Works gave to the member for Glenelg last year when he asked a question about the site at Regency Park. In fact, it seemed that he deliberately misled the House. On that occasion, the Hon. D. C. Brown said:

> The reason for the remand centre's being relocated from the proposed site at Regency Park was simple. Since coming into office, this Government has successfully negotiated with the Federal Government for a standard rail link from Adelaide to Crystal Brook as part of a national link-up—a great achievement for the Government. The proposed site for the remand centre was required for the standard rail link and the associated goods yards, and it is of far greater importance to the State that we make sure that the rail link and the associated goods yards should proceed as soon as possible and on the most suitable land available.

Shortly after that, the Leader of the Opposition made the following statement, as quoted in *Hansard:*

> The site was not in the railway area but was immediately north of the State Transport Authority workshops and west of the land reserved for railways purposes, contrary to what the Minister said.

I have now brought to the attention of all members that the Hindmarsh council is very upset and concerned about this Remand Centre being built in the middle of the Hindmarsh council area. Not only is the council upset, but residents from all over Hindmarsh are up in arms about it, and I think there will be much more trouble than the Government expects in the future prior to its being built.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I would like to address my remarks this evening to irresponsible actions taken by the unions over the last few weeks that have had a very serious and negative effect on South Australia and its economy. First, I refer to the problems occurring on the wharves in South Australia, and particularly I refer to the *Troubridge*. Yesterday, the unions gave an assurance to the South Australian Government that that vessel would be able to operate normally between Port Adelaide and Kangaroo Island to provide much needed supplies to the residents of the island. So, the vessel sailed last night as agreed, returned today, and was loading apparently to move again to Kangaroo Island, taking much needed supplies to the residents, when the unions again placed a ban on the *Troubridge* so that it cannot sail. How any person can defend the action of the unions in relation to that incident, I will be very interested to hear in a grievance debate next week.

The island depends upon air and sea transport for its survival. Obviously, air transport is far too expensive; therefore sea transport becomes the only alternative for moving supplies to the island. We find that, when Tasmania has similar problems, the unions almost always allow movement to and from Tasmania, whether it is air transport or sea transport, but the union movement in this State has decided that Kangaroo Island must suffer even more than the rest of South Australia is suffering because of the foolishness of the union movement in not allowing movement into and out of the ports of South Australia.

That is a very large issue, but I want to emphasise particularly the abysmal performance of the unions in looking after the interests of the people on Kangaroo Island. There are families on that island and there are businesses, and, as we have seen from the press, they have found the situation becoming untenable because they are running out of food and emergency and urgently needed supplies.

Over the last few months we have seen a very successful tourism campaign conducted by the South Australian Government with its Hit the Trail campaign. As a result, tourism has picked up tremendously on Kangaroo Island. What have the unions done as far as allowing that development to continue? Of course, they have done their best to bring it to a halt.

Tourists have been trapped on the island. Other tourists or potential tourists with bookings have been unable to fulfil their trips to the island. I will come to what I believe is the reason for this action by the union movement after I have discussed some other actions that that movement has taken over the past few weeks, as I see one common denominator. That is that the A.L.P. and the unions have got their heads together and have decided that the present Government is going so well and that the economy and business are picking up so rapidly that they had better jolly well do something to bring this to a halt; so, they have got together, and this is what they are going to continue to do, and the tourism trade and the people of Kangaroo Island are the pawns in this attack by the unions and the A.L.P.

Last week the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation black banned a number of businesses in South Australia. Let us look at what the V.B.E.F. black banned. It picked only on the Mitsubishi and General Motors-Holden's dealerships. In other words, Mazda dealers, Datsun dealers, Ford dealers, and all the other dealers were untouched, but the only two manufacturers that we have in South Australia, Mitsubishi and G.M.H., were attacked by the union movement. It was only those businesses that were forced to do without receiving cars and spare parts to sell. In other words, once again the attack was aimed wholly and solely at South Australian businesses, and the union gave the reason as being that it was looking for a wage increase.

I immediately asked why, if it did this, it selected only industries that were selling South Australian products. Why was it so selective? I have it on good authority that a wage increase was not the reason. It was not a wage increase that the union was after but an increase in union membership. I will dwell on that point later, because I have a nice little case of blackmail going on in my electorate now.

There is another thing that the unions have decided to hit. Recently the *Advertiser* reported that there were bans on the Stony Point project, a major project so far as the future welfare of South Australia is concerned and one that will bring a lot of jobs and money to this State. Once again, the union movement has decided that it must stop that one. Once again, we have seen the development encouraged by the South Australian Government being hamstrung by the irresponsible action of the union movement and the A.L.P.

When we look at all three matters, taking away of the *Troubridge*, the hitting of only Mitsubishi and G.M.H.

dealers, and the problem at Stony Point, there is one common denominator. That is to slow down the growth of South Australia, to make the situation in this State bad leading up to the election so that they can say, 'This State is going badly and we have to get rid of the Government.' The only reason why anything will go badly will be continuance by unions of the irresponsible type of action that they have obviously decided to move into quite deliberately in conjunction with the A.L.P. Let us look at another type of union action.

An honourable member: You're a union basher.

Mr ASHENDEN: I would like that recorded, because I am not a union basher but, when unions act irresponsibly, I will get right into them. That is exactly what the union movement is doing now. Let us come back to a business in my electorate. At the moment, it is very profitable and viable, with a number of employees, and the employees are very happy. I have spoken with them. None of them is a member of a union, so a union has now moved in and said to the management, 'If your employees do not become members of our union, we will black ban your business. You will get nothing in through your front doors and you will get nothing out through your front doors.' That completely contravenes the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act, but that does not matter!

The union has found a viable business with a number of employees and it has decided to zero in on it. This only reflects the attitude of members opposite. We find in the *Herald*, that is, the Labor Party's publication, an article concerning the advertisement placed in the daily papers in relation to 'Two great years of steady achievement by the Tonkin Government'. It is stated, quite proudly:

> John Trainer provided the name of the person who provided some of the backing for this advertising campaign.

The article gave a name of a person and his company. The article continues:

> Anyone wanting to buy kitchenware now knows where not to go.

In other words, if one dares to support a Party other than the Labor Party, if one dares to come out and put a point of view that does not agree with the Australian Labor Party's, then do not buy their products. They call this democracy! They call it democracy when members working for a very successful business are not even allowed to decide whether they want to be unionists or not. The union says 'Your men will join [the men do not want to join] or your business will be black-banned.' This is absolute blackmail. There is no way that I would see that countenanced. I will certainly do all I can to protect that company from the invasion from the union movement.

Mr Abbott: South Australia has got the best industrial relations record in the country.

Mr ASHENDEN: That seems very much to be becoming something that should be said in the past tense, from what we have seen. Let me go over it again: the *Troubridge*; Stony Point; the picking on the South Australian car agencies, and so on. In other words, the good record can come down to only one thing. Thanks to the Minister of Industrial Affairs and a very effective Public Service, we have had the best record, but obviously the union movement and the A.L.P. have got their heads together and said that this must stop and that it has got to bring South Australia to its knees; otherwise it has no hope of being returned at the next election. Obviously, these are the first salvos to be fired in that blast. I want to bring this to the attention of the members here and to the public, because it must be stopped at all costs.

Motion carried.

At 5.17 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 16 February at 2 p.m.