LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday 5 August 1980

The PRESIDENT (Hon. A. M. Whyte) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K. T. Griffin)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1978—Betting Control Board Rules—Amendments.

Racing Act, 1976—Rules of Trotting—Amendments.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Further Education Act, 1975-1979—Report of the Director-General of Further Education, 1979.

West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954-1975—West Beach Trust—Auditor-General's Report, 1978-1979.

District Council of Light—By-law No. 19—One Way Streets.

By the Minister of Arts (Hon. C. M. Hill)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Constitutional Museum Act, 1978—General Regulations, 1980.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. J. C. Burdett)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Beverage Container Act, 1975-1976—Regulations—P.E.T. Bottles.

Mental Health Act, 1976-1979—Regulations—Fee.

Narcotic and Psychotropic Drugs Act, 1934-1978—Regulations—Various Amendments.

National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1978—Regulations—Fees—Black Hill.

Planning and Development Plan District Council of Munno Para Planning Regulations—Zoning.

QUESTIONS

SALISBURY ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Attorney-General on the subject of the Salisbury Royal Commission.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Members will recall that on 5 February this year, in the middle of the Norwood by-election campaign, the Premier ordered a report into a statement made by a Mr. John Ceruto in a book entitled *It's Grossly Improper*, being launched for the second time. Members will also recall that the book had been launched for the first time in October, but doubtless it was opportune to re-issue it during the Norwood by-election campaign.

The Hon. B. A. Chatterton: Did the Premier launch it?

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: No, but I imagine he would have if he could have done so. At the time of ordering this report, the Premier said that Mr. Ceruto's statement raised a number of disturbing matters relating to the circumstances surrounding Mr. Salisbury's dismissal. Members will also recall that the ordering of this report received a considerable amount of publicity, including a front page statement in the *News*, banner headlined "Tonkin orders Salisbury report". This was on 5 February.

In those statements that the Premier purported to rely on in ordering the report, there was absolutely nothing which was new or which had not been considered by the Royal Commission. Mr. Ceruto's statements relating to Mr. Dunstan's testimony to the Royal Commission comprised two and a half paragraphs in a front-page statement, and the assertions that Mr. Ceruto made were assertions that had been considered by the Royal Commissioner at the time of the original inquiry when the report was requested by the Premier, the *Advertiser* editorialised:

> The Government should have established Mr. Ceruto's meaning, and quickly.

A few days later, on 13 February, the Attorney-General said:

> It will be more a matter of weeks than days before the report is completed.

The *News* had gained the following impression:

> The Attorney-General's inquiry into aspects of the Salisbury sacking may not be completed until early next month.

March was the original prognosis. Nothing was then heard of the inquiry until I asked a question in the Council on 3 June, to which the Attorney-General replied:

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

Subsequently, on 25 June the Attorney-General told the *News* that the report was still some time off because of the great mass of papers which had to be scanned and because of other work pressures in his department. How the Attorney-General reconciled that statement with the answer that he gave me in the Council, I do not know. Further, it is completely inexcusable that a matter originally trumpeted with such great importance should be delayed more than six months because of so-called work pressures in the Attorney-General's Department. It raises the question whether the statement was made merely to help the Liberal chances during the Norwood by-election, which I very much suspect. It also raises the question whether the Attorney-General is on top of his department. Apparently he is not in a position to give instructions to his department to have this report completed expeditiously. He is either not on top of his department or deliberately wants to delay any inquiry and to continue to string this matter out.

As I have said, it raises the question whether the Attorney-General and the Premier want to string this inquiry out as long as possible and continue to use the former Police Commissioner, Mr. Salisbury, for the political purposes of the Liberal Party. I believe it is scandalous that it has taken six months for this report to be considered and to still have a statement from the Attorney-General—his last statement—that the report will still take some time, and that he cannot complete it because of work pressures in his department.

This issue was raised as a serious one, according to the Government, at the time of the Norwood by-election, so why has it taken the Government six months to do anything about it? Has the Attorney-General completed his report on the statements made by Mr. Ceruto when relaunching *It's Grossly Improper* on 4 February 1980? If not, when is it anticipated that the report will be completed? Does the Government have any intention of reopening the question of the dismissal of former Police Commissioner, Mr. Salisbury?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Leader of the Opposition was not Attorney-General for more than a few months, so he really did not come to grips with any of the significant issues that arise during the course of one's work

as Attorney-General. With so little time in office, he would not be able to appreciate the general pressures that come upon an Attorney-General or any other Minister of the Crown. He only scratched the surface, and he did not do that very well at all.

The Premier and I, and the Government as a whole, are anxious not to string this matter out any longer than is necessary. One must recognise that the question of Mr. Salisbury's dismissal was a most serious event in the life of South Australians and this State. Not only was it a significant event for South Australians but also it was a most important issue for Mr. Salisbury.

So, it has been my earnest desire to ensure that, when a report is presented to the Premier, it is presented in what I would regard as a proper, balanced and reasonably based context, so that the matter can be treated more responsibly than the former Government treated it when it dismissed Mr. Salisbury without notice.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He should have been sacked. You never reinstated him, either.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have intimated previously that, because of my desire to ensure that the report which goes to the Premier is properly based and balanced and presents a responsible recommendation to the Premier, I have personally taken the attitude—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If honourable members want to hear my reply to the Leader's question, they should listen to it. I personally have been involved in the assessment of all the evidence taken by the Royal Commission and other relevant material, and, although I have informally reported to the Premier several times recently, the final report is not yet available. However, I hope that that report will be available in the not too distant future.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Will the Attorney-General answer my questions: first, when is it expected that the report will be completed; and, secondly, does the Government have any intention of reopening the matter of the dismissal of the former Police Commissioner, Mr. Salisbury?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The answer to the Leader's first question is that it is in the foreseeable future. The answer to his second question is that the Leader will find out when the report is presented to the Premier.

RIVERLAND CO-OPERATIVE

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I seek leave to make a short explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General, representing the Premier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: All honourable members would have been concerned earlier this year when the Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative cannery in the Riverland announced that it was suspending payments to growers for the current harvest. The background of the changes that have occurred in relation to this co-operative is well known to every honourable member. The South Australian Development Corporation has become involved, and an arrangement has been made with Henry Jones in Victoria to can a number of products from the Henry Jones range. Also, there has been a considerable reorganisation of the cannery. It is not surprising that a few difficulties have been experienced this year, the first full year of its operations.

When one looks at the co-operative's structure, and considers the assistance given by the South Australian Development Corporation and the involvement of Henry Jones Pty. Ltd., one realises that this is obviously a highly geared concern. Perhaps one of the difficulties facing the co-operative at present is that the payment of interest, etc., on loans is a large proportion of the co-operative's costs.

With that in mind, I believe that the S.A.D.C. is undertaking a review of the co-operative to see whether its corporate structure should be altered. I say that I believe that is the case, because very little information has been provided to the co-operative's grower members. If that review takes place, and there is a reorganisation of the co-operative and the S.A.D.C. or Henry Jones (or both of those concerns) takes some equity in the co-operative, its grower shareholders are very concerned that their interests will be very much diluted. One of the major reasons for their thinking this is that the co-operative still has a number of outstanding loans from the Commonwealth Government. That Government provided loans to the co-operative during the very difficult period of adjustment that the co-operative had to undertake when markets in Europe disappeared, and those loans should be considered as adjustment assistance to the co-operative.

However, they appear on the co-operative's books as a debit against the funds held by shareholders and, therefore, the apparent equity of shareholders in the co-operative is small. First, will the Premier ask the South Australian Development Corporation to keep the grower shareholders informed about investigations that have been taking place into the co-operative and about any changes that may happen to the corporate structure of the co-operative? Secondly, will the Premier contact the Commonwealth Government and make representations to it to forgive the loans that it has made to the co-operative cannery, in order that grower equity in the cannery may be increased?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Premier and bring down a reply.

LIQUID PETROLEUM GAS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question about the use of liquid petroleum gas.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Goldsworthy) recently stated:

> Liquid petroleum gas would make a significant contribution to Australia's liquid fuel requirements and national development during the next 10 years. L.p.g. will become a vital motor transport fuel and petrochemical input. In a few years, it is expected that all l.p.g. produced in Australia will be needed for local use and that none will be exported. On a national basis, about 10 per cent of petrol consumption in motor vehicles is expected to be replaced by l.p.g. by the end of the 1980's. This represents an enormous saving of about 28 000 barrels a day on Australia's rising bill for imported petroleum. In South Australia, the potential for l.p.g. use is clear. Our reserves in the Cooper Basin are sufficient to satisfy 40 per cent of the annual requirement for motor fuel in South Australia.

He further stated:

> The new Federal price arrangements for l.p.g. would result in an on-going and substantial margin between the price of petrol and l.p.g. This margin will be of the order of 50 per cent.

In the light of the Minister's statement, has the

Government considered the possibility of progressively equipping Government vehicles to use l.p.g. and so significantly reduce the Government's fuel costs? If it has not, will the Government consider this suggestion?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Minister of Mines and Energy and bring down a reply.

REDCLIFF PROJECT

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a brief statement before asking the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Environment, a question about the proposed Redcliff petrochemical plant.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: There is widespread controversy and deep concern in the community presently about the possible environmental effects of the proposed petrochemical plant. I should like to make clear the Opposition's position regarding that plant. The Opposition continues to support the project subject to the most stringent environmental safeguards. However, as I said, there is much uneasiness in the community, and it seems to be persisting for two reasons. The first reason is the general lack of information that is coming from the Government and the general disinformation that is coming from other sources. The second is the Government's "gung ho" open-slather approach to mining and energy projects generally. It is significant that, when negotiations were in an advanced stage under the previous Administration, there did not seem to be anything like the level of concern about the environmental aspect that is now present. It is imperative that absolutely no shortcuts be taken by either State or Federal Authorities in examining and assessing all environmental planning and social factors that may be concerned at Redcliff and Port Augusta.

It should be possible not only for members of the public to be informed of the positive and negative likely impacts but also for them to be given the chance to give evidence at an open inquiry. Members of the public and concerned groups should have the opportunity to give evidence to that inquiry and to have the full evidence of the positive and negative impacts laid before them.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: Did you do that when you were in Government?

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: We had not got to the advanced stage that this Government has reached. The Federal Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act of 1974 makes special and specific provision for public inquiries into environmentally controversial developments. It was under these provisions that the Ranger Inquiry was set up under Justice Fox. The whole sequence of events concerning an indenture Act, the preparation of an environmental impact statement, the assessment of that e.i.s. and all the other matters concerning a petrochemical plant, particularly at Redcliff, are matters of paramount importance and public concern.

Specific legislation to cover the environmental and social impacts, particularly on Port Augusta, are also necessary. These are all matters of very substantial public importance and must be publicly heard. It is not good enough to say that these matters cannot be aired publicly because they might prejudice so-called delicate negotiations. Dow will establish and operate a petrochemical plant for one reason and one reason alone. That, of course, is money, or profit, and there is nothing wrong with that. However, it is quite stupid of us to think that Dow will come here as philanthropists or in an effort to make this State great again or stop the job rot, or any of the other ridiculous cliches to which we have been subjected for the past 12 months. That organisation will come here because it can get 15 per cent out of Redcliff rather than 10 per cent or 12 per cent elsewhere. If they can get 15 per cent, they will come. They have said they will be happy to be subjected to the environmental protection requirements that we may impose upon them. Having said that, I repeat that the Opposition will welcome the plant, provided all the environmental and social problems are met.

Therefore, will the Minister ensure, and will the Government guarantee, that the provisions of the Federal Environment Protection (Impact of Proposals) Act of 1974 concerning public inquiries on environmentally controversial developments apply, in order to inform the people of South Australia in general, and the people of Port Augusta in particular, on this subject; and, if not, why not?

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

WOMEN'S ADVISER

The Hon. BARBARA WIESE: Will the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, say whether it is true that the Government does not intend to replace the current Women's Adviser to the Education Department when her contract expires in a couple of months time? Secondly, is it true that the Government intends instead to appoint an equal opportunities officer whose job it will be to pursue the problems of all minority groups in the Education Department? Thirdly, if this is so, how can the Government justify including women among minority groups, as I understand it proposes to do, when they make up approximately 60 per cent of the Education Department teaching staff?

Finally, why is it necessary to appoint an equal opportunities officer for minority groups when there are already a number of officers in the department working on the problems of disadvantaged groups, including Aborigines, ethnic groups, and others?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will refer those questions to the Minister of Education and bring back a reply.

VISITS TO PARLIAMENT

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I want to direct a question to you, Mr. President, regarding a particular matter that came to my attention a short time ago. It is in regard to the system in this place, as I understand it, dealing with visiting schoolchildren. The fact is that the manner in which children come into this place is to some extent not as well organised as it should be. The brochures issued to students who want to come and see how a Parliament works, or is supposed to work, are indeed limited and, therefore, the questions will be directed to you regarding at least part of the Parliament.

First, will you consider having a much more detailed brochure made available to students who visit this Council and will you co-operate with the Speaker of the House of Assembly towards ensuring that a total pamphlet or brochure is produced for the whole Parliament rather than having the two brochures that now exist in some limited form for the House of Assembly and the Upper House? Secondly, will you ensure that, if a member's duties are

such that he cannot carry out an undertaking to conduct these tours, Ministerial staff will be supplied with a brochure to give to students who visit this Parliament?

This afternoon I saw and heard a quite horrifying address, but I will not name the person concerned or the Minister. That has prompted me to ask this question on a matter that has been in my mind for a considerable time. Therefore, Mr. President, I request that you give these matters consideration, together with your colleague in another place, as I know you will.

The PRESIDENT: Regarding the honourable member's query about the brochures and a co-ordinated brochure being available, I agree with both requests and will take the matter up with my colleague the Speaker. Regarding tours and instructions to Ministerial staff, I have no jurisdiction over Ministerial staff but I believe that, with a properly documented brochure, it would be much easier for any person, whether staff of the House or someone requested by a member who is not able to attend, to explain the working of the House. I will co-operate with the member and find out whether I can arrange that.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I desire to ask a question of the Attorney-General on the matter of the fuels and energy Select Committee last year and seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: Last year, as members know, this Council appointed a Select Committee on fuels and energy and the committee spent many hours examining witnesses. Some very useful information was gathered, but the State has not been able to make any use of that information because it was locked away after an uncompleted investigation. The evidence given should be fully sifted in the search for better use of our energy sources and other ways of providing energy from other resources. I asked a similar question last October and the Attorney-General answered me, in part, as follows:

> The Government recognises that the valuable information given to various Select Committees should not be wasted. If there is some way we can rescue the information we will do so.

Has the Government yet examined the information given to that Select Committee; was any of the information considered to be useful; and is the Government likely to reconvene that Select Committee?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The Government has not examined the evidence, because, under Standing Orders, it is not available for Government scrutiny. So far as decisions about the evidence or the deliberations of that Select Committee are concerned, I certainly have not considered the matter. The Minister of Transport may have given some consideration to it, but I will inquire and bring back a reply.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I wish to ask a supplementary question. The Attorney-General says that the report is not available to the Government, because of Standing Orders.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: I said that the evidence was not available for scrutiny by the Government.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Although Standing Orders preclude that evidence from being made available, will the Attorney-General consider the right of members of the public who have submitted evidence to the committee to write to their members of Parliament so as to have the matters that they have raised before that committee taken up in Parliament?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am not sure what the member is seeking.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Does the Government deny the right of the citizen to have those matters submitted in evidence conveyed to a member of Parliament by way of correspondence?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Members of the public made submissions. If they made them in writing, they are entitled to make their own submissions and make copies available to anyone they like but, regarding evidence given to a Select Committee, the Standing Orders prevent that evidence from being made available to all members of the Parliament and the public at large. If there are special matters about which persons who have made representations to a Select Committee are concerned, it is within their province to take those matters up with members or the appropriate Minister and have them brought before the House in the proper way.

One must recognise that the evidence given to any Select Committee, if there has not been any decision made by the Select Committee as to the weight to be given to that evidence, can only be taken at face value and will not be properly balanced in the light of all the evidence given before the Select Committee. If the committee has not finished its deliberations, it is in greater difficulty, because there may be available further evidence affecting the weight to be given to evidence already received.

The Hon. C. W. CREEDON: I do not know whether the Attorney is aware, but my memory leads me to believe that that particular Select Committee was open to the press.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I am prepared to look at the matter of that particular Select Committee and the question that the member has raised, and to bring back a response. I think it is also open to other members of the Council to reach their own conclusion on the course of action that should be followed.

CRIME WAVE

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about a crime wave in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: First, I will refresh the memories of honourable members about some of the propaganda that was put out by the Liberal Party and some of its cohorts prior to the last State election. I believe it is very important to keep these matters before the Council so that we know precisely what the Liberals promised the people of South Australia before September and what they are saying is going to happen now.

There is a wealth of material in relation to law and order, crime waves, and so on. However, I will refer briefly to only some of it. One particular advertisement urging people to vote Liberal was perhaps the most shocking of all. It showed a hired stooge, with a stocking over his face, looking very evil, intimidating the general public, and stating:

> Why does Parliament provide sentences which are so lenient in some cases as to be laughable?

That advertisement attempted to frighten people into voting Liberal. A Bill was before this Council during the previous session to give the Crown the right to appeal against allegedly lenient sentences, but the present Government refused to support that Bill.

The Hon. K. T. Griffin: That is not correct.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In effect, that is what happened. The Government's action is certainly different from some of the propaganda that it used to urge people to

vote Liberal. Further in that same advertisement the question was asked:

> And why are so many early paroles given to serious offenders?

The Minister of Community Welfare has said that the parole system is to be vastly extended a lot further in the area of juvenile offenders, but he has certainly not explained to Council's satisfaction just how that will stop juvenile offenders. Perhaps he will be able to persuade us, but he certainly has not done so yet.

I now refer to several articles written by Jennifer Adamson for the "From the Back Bench" column. As all honourable members would be aware, she has been in the news over the last couple of days in relation to another matter.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In one of Mrs. Adamson's articles she referred to the previous Labor Government as—

> a Government that has done little or nothing about public concern with violent crime and lenient sentencing.

In a Liberal Party advertisement, Mrs. Adamson also said:

> I am concerned at the increase in violent crimes and drug abuse. Family life and the safety of our community must be safeguarded.

I also have a Liberal Party advertisement with a rather nice photo of Robert Worth looking a little pensive; he must have foreseen the result in Mitcham. However, worst of all was the infamous advertisement that appeared in the *Il Globo* newspaper. That advertisement appeared on behalf of and was authorised by the Liberal Party and was the subject of some remarks by Justice Mitchell in the Court of Disputed Returns. That advertisement stated:

> A Liberal Government will make the streets safe for your daughters to walk on, without being molested by those hooligans (thugs) who have been acting as if they owned the place for the last 10 years.

As I said, that advertisement was authorised by the Liberal Party and was commented on by Justice Mitchell. She said it was deplorable, and she was quite correct.

I now turn to what has happened since the last State election. On 2 July a headline in the *Whyalla News* read, "Warning on Crime Wave". That made me think that the election was on again. The article said:

> Escalation of violent crime in South Australia could reasonably be expected within the foreseeable future, warned the State Attorney-General, Mr. Griffin, during his visit to Whyalla on Friday.
>
> The Minister expressed the concern felt by himself and his department in an interview with the *Whyalla News* in which he referred specifically to the Roxby Downs uranium and Redcliff petrochemical proposals.
>
> Establishment of such major industries, attracting high density populations, could well mean a spread westward of recent waves of violence and disorder in the eastern States, he said.

That article frightened the life out of the people of Whyalla. Obviously, the Attorney-General's intention in visiting us was to wish a plague of violent crime upon our city. However, the Attorney-General referred to all of South Australia and not just Whyalla. It is interesting to note the many things that the Liberal Party has praised about Roxby Downs, but it has never—apart from that article in the *Whyalla News*—said that the establishment of Roxby Downs will result in a wave of violent crime in South Australia. That statement is very interesting and I believe that it is worthy of wider coverage than it was given by the *Whyalla News*.

The Hon. L. H. Davis: This is a very long question.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: Well, your Party has a very long history of frightening people about crime. However, since the last election we have seen no evidence of what the Government will do about this matter. We have seen reference to a crime wave and the fact that the Attorney-General believes a new one is coming, so I am sure he will be able to answer my questions. What evidence does the Attorney-General have to support his statement that an escalation of violent crime is expected within the forseeable future? What measures are being taken by the Government to protect the citizens of this State and our daughters from this perceived threat?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I have not seen the *Whyalla News* of 2 July, but the statement referred to, whilst attributed to me, was not made by me. I was in Whyalla recently to present certificates to justices of the peace who had finished a course of study qualifying them to be made Justices of the Quorum. On that occasion I made no mention of a crime wave or anything else. I talked about the responsibilities of justices of the peace and the history of justices of the peace.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Will you sue the *Whyalla News?*

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will not sue anyone. I am surprised to see that that sort of statement has appeared and that it is being attributed to me in circumstances that did not deal with any aspect of crime—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: In 1974 the previous Government was presented with the first Mitchell Committee Report dealing with criminal law and penal reform measures. Very little, if any, action was taken on many of the recommendations in that report until the middle of 1979 when the previous Government was beginning to move towards some consideration of implementing recommendations. In effect, there were no substantive legislative steps taken to implement the recommendations of that or subsequent reports by the Mitchell committee. The present Government has announced that during the current session it will be doing a number of things that will take up some of the recommendations of the Mitchell committee with a view to progressive implementation of many of the recommendations.

In relation, for example, to the release of prisoners, the Chief Secretary has announced that he will be introducing new legislation which, among other things, will provide that, instead of a prisoner earning remission and, on being released, having taken advantage of the remission, being a totally free person, such a prisoner will be released conditionally.

Therefore, if an offence is committed during the period of the conditional release and the offender is convicted and again sentenced to a further period of imprisonment, he or she will be returned to gaol to serve out the balance of the term of conditional release in addition to the additional period of imprisonment that is imposed.

The Chief Secretary has also announced that he will be making some changes in the way in which parole is considered and in the way in which persons who are serving indeterminate sentences will be released. The Chief Secretary has indicated that, where prisoners are serving an indeterminate period of imprisonment, the Parole Board will make recommendations to the Governor in Council, and the Governor will make a final decision on whether or not that person will be released.

I indicated last week that the Government would be taking steps this session to abolish the right of an accused person to make an unsworn statement. This has been a matter of considerable concern in the community for a

number of years. However, the former Government, which is now in Opposition, did not take any initiative with a view to abolishing unsworn statements. I have also indicated that the Crown will, if the legislation receives the Council's support, be given the right to appeal against sentences in all cases.

The Hon. Mr. Blevins was quite wrong when he said that the Government refused to support a private member's Bill that the Leader of the Opposition introduced last session. In fact, if the honourable member reads *Hansard*, he will see clearly that the Government supported that and was not prepared to be petty about opposing it in the Council for the sake of gaining points, as the Government believed that it was an important issue that should continue. The honourable member will know that all private members' business in another place came to an end earlier than the last two sitting weeks in the last session because of the pressure of Government business in that House. The Government intends this session to introduce legislation that will deal with that right of appeal.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: Will you answer my question?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: The honourable member must remember that, if he raises matters in the statement that he has been given leave to make before asking his question, I have a right to respond to all the matters that he asserts as fact or as a basis for his question.

Other matters relating to parole and sentencing which are receiving the Government's attention will come before this Parliament during the current session. The honourable member made some assertions about the ready availability of parole, and there was some suggestion that it was to be extended to the juvenile system. The honourable member has obviously not understood the announcements that have been made by the Government through me, the Chief Secretary or the Minister of Community Welfare over the past few months.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: The public thinks that you will let them all go off.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: It does not think that. We are seeking to achieve what we would regard as a proper balance between punishment of the offender, protection of the community, and rehabilitation of the offender. They are desirable objectives in any penal system. The announcements made by the Chief Secretary, the Minister of Community Welfare and me are all directed towards ensuring that there is a proper balance and, at the same time, that the community is protected from further offenders.

The honourable member made some statement about advertising during the last State election. However, he forgets that many statements were made by citizens who were concerned about the attitude of the former Government, not by the Liberal Party.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That's rubbish. What about *Il Globo?*

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He's telling lies.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I do not want to have a lot of trouble with the Hon. Mr. Foster or the Hon. Mr. Sumner. Although I have asked that the Attorney-General be given a chance to reply, honourable members have not given him much of a go so far.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Some reference was made to an advertisement that appeared during the election campaign.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: What about *Il Globo?*

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I will come to that in a moment. The Opposition would want to control the media. It wants political Parties to be able to control anyone who wants to express his opinion, whether it is in support of or against a certain political Party. The Opposition is suggesting that statements, made in either the editorial column or in the advertisement column of newspapers, which reflected some criticism on the previous Government were the responsibility of the Liberal Party, but that is not so. To suggest that we are to be responsible for all those sorts of advertisement is indeed grave and reflects adversely on the Opposition.

Regarding the *Il Globo* advertisement, there were, as the honourable member would see if he read the transcript of the evidence taken by the Court of Disputed Returns, some disputes as to the translation of those advertisements. The translation to which the honourable member has referred is not, of course, consistent with other statements that were made to that Court of Disputed Returns.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: It's the one the judge found was correct.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: Her Honour indicated that it could be construed as defamatory of one of the candidates, but she placed no blame on either Mr. Webster or others. Rather, Her Honour indicated that it was unfortunate that it had appeared in that context.

I do not want to pursue in greater detail the wider implications of that decision and the reflection on that advertisement, as I think that there are some other serious matters which, if taken in context, raise issues that we really do not have time to pursue today.

Suffice to say, in conclusion, that the statements that the Government has made since it has been in office and the action that it will be taking in legislation this session demonstrate a real concern to ensure that a proper balance is achieved between punishment of the offender, protection of the community, and rehabilitation of the offender.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: In the absence of a reply to my question, I ask whether the Attorney-General is saying that the *Whyalla News* invented the views attributed to him in its article of 2 July 1980. If so, what action will the Attorney-General take against the *Whyalla News* in an attempt to set the record straight?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I do not intend to impugn any branch of the media.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: If the reporter chose to interpret my remarks with respect to justices in the way they have been reported, that is his responsibility. I have not seen that report but, if I had seen it earlier, I would have taken it up with the editors. I would not have taken any legal or other action, other than making contact with them.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I desire to ask a supplementary question. Does the Attorney-General believe that the measures he has outlined on behalf of the Liberal Party will reduce the crime rate?

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: There is every prospect not that those measures to which I have referred will reduce the crime rate but they will ensure that there is a proper balance between the punishment of the offender, rehabilitation of the offender, and protection of the community. We hope that those initiatives will have a deterrent effect because that, too, is an important ingredient. Those initiatives, together with others in the area of enforcement, protection and rehabilitation, on which the Minister of Community Welfare and the Chief Secretary have respectively made comment, will in our view lead towards achieving the objectives on which I have placed some emphasis.

WOMEN'S ADVISER

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to ask the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Education, a question about the Women's Adviser in the Education Department.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Last week the Myers Report on the effect of technology in Australia was published. It indicated that a number of jobs are to be lost as a result of increasing use of technology throughout Australia. In particular, technology disproportionately destroys jobs traditionally held by women. Already unemployment is much higher amongst women than amongst men and, with increasing technology, this disparity can be expected to increase. The only way to counteract this trend and to avoid proportionate disadvantage for women is to encourage them to undertake non-traditional areas of occupation.

Of course, this problem starts way back in the schools when girls choose or are traditionally guided into a limited range of subjects, which limits their options for future careers. As an example, last year in Matriculation chemistry over 75 per cent of the students were male and less than 25 per cent were female. Honourable members know that chemistry, maths and physics are extremely important in keeping open options for a broad range of careers. This problem has long concerned the Women's Adviser in the Education Department, and part of her function has been to attempt to counteract this trend. She has attempted to bring about changes in schools; indeed, these changes were recommended in the report from the Tertiary Education Committee a few years ago in the report "Girls, School and Society".

It would be tragic if this project were not continued for the sake of women and girls in the community who will be looking for jobs in a few years. I am sure that the Government will agree that this has been an extremely important part of the function of the Women's Adviser and that she has achieved a great deal already in this area. I am sure that the Government also agrees that this important aspect of her work would not be appropriately subsumed in the job of the Equal Opportunities Adviser in the department.

Will the Minister please reconsider the decision, if any, which has been taken of not replacing the current Women's Adviser in the Education Department and, if there is to be no Women's Adviser in the department, will the Minister consider appointing a person especially for this job of widening educational opportunities for girls in South Australian schools?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will bring all the matters that the honourable member has raised to the notice of the Minister of Education and bring down his reply.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I move:

> That for this session Standing Order 14 be suspended.

Standing Order 14 provides:

> Until the Address in Reply to the Governor's Opening Speech has been adopted, no business beyond what is of a formal or unopposed character shall be entertained.

The practice in recent years has been that this Standing Order has been suspended to enable Government and private members' Bills to be at least introduced and, in some cases, to be debated during the course of the Address in Reply debate, although during the period when the debate has been current it has always received priority on each sitting day.

On some occasions it has been postponed for urgent matters when they arise for consideration. In this session, as members will see from the Governor's Speech, we have a fairly heavy programme of legislation. I would like to see the Standing Order suspended so that we have the opportunity to introduce some legislation to at least minimise the pressures that will undoubtedly occur towards the end of each period of sitting.

In a sense, we want to try to even out the peaks and troughs in sitting time, yet we want to give an adequate opportunity to honourable members to consider legislation. It is important in the proceedings of the Council to ensure that the work load is reasonably constant and that we avoid, as much as possible, a hectic rush at the end of each sitting period. There is some legislation about which the Minister of Community Welfare and I have already given notice. We probably envisage some other legislation being introduced with a view to early consideration of it, but also with a view to giving as much opportunity as possible for members of the Council and members of the public to have some input into the consideration of that legislation.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER (Leader of the Opposition): The Opposition does not intend to oppose this motion, which has been moved by the Attorney-General to facilitate consideration of legislation in this session. However, we should not depart too far from the principle that, once the Governor has opened Parliament and delivered his Speech, members should have the opportunity of replying to that Speech at the earliest opportunity, it being one of the few times in Parliament when a member is able to speak at will.

Under the traditions of Parliament, a member does not have to confine his remarks to the Governor's Speech but can speak on any issue that he wishes to. That is something that we ought to bear in mind, but I do see the weight of the Attorney-General's argument to some extent in wanting to overcome the problems of not having much legislation early in the session.

I wrote to the Attorney recently about this matter to get his reasons for moving this motion. In his reply, the Attorney said that generally when this motion had been moved previously (although I am not sure on how many occasions it has been done) it was generally not confined to matters that were of an urgent or immediate nature but was applied by the previous Government on other occasions.

The important thing, for my purpose, in the Attorney-General's reply was that he said that the Address in Reply debate would take precedence over other business during the next two weeks. I assume that that means that, if there is any other time left during the sittings of the Council, we will proceed with Government Bills or any other Bills that are introduced. For those reasons I think there is some sense in trying to even out the ups and downs of the legislative programme and to proceed with some of the legislation at this stage, if possible, on the understanding that precedence is given to the Address in Reply.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General): I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for his concurrence with my motion. I want to reiterate the assurance that I have given him previously that it is certainly not the Government's intention to stifle Council members in their contributions to the Address in Reply debate. In fact, if they were prepared even today to

proceed expeditiously, we could compress even further the time in which the debate occurs. As I understand past practice, that is a freely given invitation to speed up the debate on the Address in Reply. However, as I understand it, members want a reasonably staged programme for speaking on the Address in Reply; the suspension of Standing Orders will not preclude that. Each sitting day, precedence will be given to the Address in Reply debate.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

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

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

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

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

It should be noted that the proposed amendment differs from the Mitchell Committee recommendations on the matter. That committee recommended that the current restriction of only one consecutive sentence in relation to felonies should be preserved, and extended to apply also in relation to misdemeanours. It is proposed that the operation of the amendment will be delayed until a similar amendment to the Justices Act is made in relation to summary offences. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 provides that the court may make any number of sentences of imprisonment cumulative upon any other sentence of imprisonment being served, or to be served, by a convicted person. Clause 4 removes an obsolete transitional provision. Clause 5 provides that the Attorney-General may delegate his power to appeal, or to apply for the reservation of a question of law, to any legal practitioner in the service of the Crown. Such a delegation may be proved by certificate of the Solicitor-General, Crown Solicitor or Crown Prosecutor.

Clause 6 provides that the Attorney-General may apply for reservation of a question of law, arising in proceedings leading to an acquittal, for the opinion of the Full Court. Clause 7 provides that the determination of the Full Court shall not disturb an acquittal. It provides also that the accused person is entitled to his taxed costs in any event in such proceedings, or, if he does not care to appear, the

Attorney-General must himself instruct counsel to submit arguments that might have been advanced on the question by the defendant.

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

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CHANGE OF NAME) BILL

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1966-1975; the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973; the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, and the Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its main object is to provide a single statutory procedure for the changing of names. At the present time there are two separate statutory procedures for this purpose, one provided by the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, and the other provided by the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973.

Section 24 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, provides, *inter alia,* that all persons over the age of 18 years or who have previously been married, and whose births are registered in the Register of Births, or for whom there is an entry in the Adopted Childrens Register, with the exception of married women, may deposit with the Principal Registrar an instrument changing any of their names. This section also sets out a corresponding procedure by which parents, or, in certain cases, one parent, may change the name of a child under the age of 18 years.

Section 35a of the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, enables any person over the age of 16 years to change any of his names by depositing in the Registry Office a deed poll or statutory declaration evidencing a change of name. This procedure is also available to either parent who wishes to change the name of a child under the age of 16 years.

It should be pointed out at this stage that nothing in this Bill affects the right every person has to adopt informally any name he chooses. However, it is considered desirable that there should be only one statutory method of changing names, to be effected through the office of the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages. It is proposed that all persons over the age of 18 years be capable of changing any of their names. Modified procedures for the changing of children's names by parents will be provided.

A further important object of the Bill is to do away with the assumption that underlies a number of the provisions of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act that a child will, as a matter of course, take the surname of its father. The Bill provides a more flexible scheme for assigning surnames to children.

The changes outlined above necessitate extensive amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, 1966-1975, and consequential amendments to the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, and the Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978. Provision is also to be made for certain formal matters previously dealt with in schedules to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act to be prescribed by regulation. Clauses 4 to 35 of the Bill relate to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act, clauses 36 to 37 to the Registration of Deeds Act, clauses 38 to 39 to the Electoral Act and clauses 40 to 41 to the Adoption of Children Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1, 2, 3 and 4 are formal. Clauses 5, 6 and 8 incorporate essentially formal references to the registration of changes of name in the long title, section 4 and section 7 of the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. Clause 7 deletes the definition of "Christian name" from section 5 of the principal Act, as this term will no longer appear in the Act. Clause 9 repeals section 11 of the principal Act, which sets out the duties of the principal and district registrars. These, it is felt, need not be spelt out in the Act, but rather left to administrative direction.

Clauses 10 and 11 remove section 13 and subsection (3) of section 14 of the principal Act. Both of these provisions referred to forms previously set out in schedules to the Act. Clause 12 amends section 15 of the principal Act by providing that the particulars to be furnished for the registration of a birth shall be as prescribed by regulation. A reference to the former fifth schedule is also deleted. Clauses 13 and 14 effect amendments to sections 16 and 17 of the principal Act consequential on the amendment to section 15. Clause 15 removes references to the former sixth and nineteenth schedules in section 20 of the principal Act, and substitutes, where appropriate, reference to prescribed forms and particulars.

Clause 16, which amends section 21 of the principal Act, provides new criteria for determining a child's surname for the register of births. Previously, where a child was born legitimate, or legitimated subsequent to birth in pursuance of the Commonwealth Marriage Act, 1961, or where the paternity of an illegitimate child was either acknowledged or established by a court order, the child took the surname of its father, and in any other case, the surname of its mother. A new section provides that the surname of any child may be that of either parent, or a combined form of the surnames of both parents, whichever the parents nominate, and in default of a nomination, the surname of the father for a child born inside marriage, and the surname of the mother for a child born outside marriage. Of course, where the father of a child born outside marriage does not acknowledge paternity or is not adjudged the father, the child will take the mother's name.

Clause 17 repeals sections 22, 23 and 24 of the principal Act. Sections 22 and 23 related to the alteration or addition of Christian names in the register, and section 24 to the change of names. The new procedures for changing names render these provisions unnecessary or inconsistent. Clause 18 removes reference to schedules from section 25 of the principal Act and substitutes reference to prescribed forms. Clause 19 repeals section 27 of the principal Act. This section provided for the noting of changed names of married persons in the register of

marriages. Such a provision is unnecessary having regard to the new procedures for changing names. Clauses 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26 delete reference to various former schedules of the principal Act in sections 29, 31, 39, 40, 44, 47 and 51, respectively. Where appropriate, reference to prescribed particulars or forms has been substituted.

Clause 27 enacts a new Part IX to the principal Act, comprising sections 53-55. These contain the main substance of the new procedures for changing names. Section 53 provides that a person who has attained the age of 18 years, or who has been married, may change his or her name in the prescribed manner. A parent is also empowered to change the name of his or her child. If there is another living parent of the child, the child's name cannot be changed without the consent of that parent, unless a local court of limited jurisdiction authorises the change of name, and in any case, if the child has attained the age of 12 years, his or her consent must be obtained to any change of name. A court, in authorising a child's name, must do whatever is in the best interests of the child. The section also sets out certain procedural matters relating to the registration of the change of name. Sections 54 and 55 provide for the maintenance of a register of changes of name, and the notation or changes of name to be made in registers relating to birth and marriage.

Clause 28 deletes reference to the nineteenth schedule from section 66 of the principal Act and substitutes reference to prescribed fees. Clauses 29 and 30 insert reference to changes of name in sections 67 and 68, respectively, of the principal Act. These sections relate to certified copies of entries in registers and the correction of errors in registers.

Clause 31 enacts a new section 68a which empowers the principal registrar to refuse to enter in the register of births any forename, or any surname that is a combination of the parents' surnames, that is obscene or frivolous. Similarly, the principal registrar may refuse to enter in the register of changes of name any forename or surname that is obscene or frivolous. Provision is made for appeal to a local court of limited jurisdiction against any such refusal by the registrar. Again, where the appeal is in relation to a child's name, the court must act in the best interests of the child.

Clauses 32, 33 and 34 insert reference to change of name in sections 71, 74 and 75 of the principal Act, which create offences of (1) failing to register births, deaths and marriages, (2) refusal by the Registrar to register any birth, death or marriage, and (3) destruction, alteration or forgery of any register, respectively. Clause 35 deletes reference to schedules in section 76 of the principal Act, which empowers the Governor to make regulations under the Act. Clause 36 repeals all schedules other than the first schedule. The first schedule contains a list of Acts repealed by the principal Act.

Clause 37 is formal. Clause 38 repeals section 35a of the Registration of Deeds Act, 1935-1973, thus abolishing the alternative statutory procedure for changing names by deed poll. Clause 39 is formal. Clause 40 makes consequential amendments to section 40 of the Electoral Act, 1929-1976, whereby the Principal Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages is now obliged to forward particulars of change of name of adult persons to the Electoral Commissioner. Clause 41 is formal. Clause 42 amends section 32 of the Adoption of Children Act, 1966-1978, by providing a new procedure for determining the surnames of adopted children substantially the same as that now provided for the purposes of registering names on birth.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The House of Assembly notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. K. T. GRIFFIN (Attorney-General) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which you have been pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I thank His Excellency the Governor for his Opening Speech, in which he gave a comprehensive account of the legislative programme of the Government for the coming session. I shall confine my remarks to four issues, namely, the improvement of our railway system, the promotion of tourism, salinity control in the Murray River valley, and the use of part of the soccer pool fund to construct a new 18-hole public golf course in the north-eastern suburbs.

The Governor named several companies which intend to expand or set up new factories in this State and I am aware, as Chairman of the Industries Development Committee, of others which are planning expansion, but, because of the confidential nature of the committee's inquiries, I will not elaborate. It is particularly pleasing that John Shearer Limited should decide to close its plant in Toowoomba in order to concentrate its manufacturing activities at Kilkenny, even though probably its main market for agricultural implements is in northern New South Wales and Queensland.

In the short time that this Government has been in office, it has striven to impress upon manufacturers and merchants that they really are welcome in South Australia, and in my judgment this effort is beginning to produce worthwhile results. The number of days lost through industrial disputes in the Adelaide area continues to be about half the national average and, most important of all, we do have in Adelaide thousands of highly skilled tradesmen. We must never forget that financial resources, new factories and new plant are of little use without the skilled people to supervise and operate them.

The Governor mentioned that the long-awaited construction of a standard gauge railway line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook is to take place. Agreement has been reached with the Commonwealth Government, and legislation to ratify this will be introduced into the State and Federal Parliaments in the near future. It is hoped to complete construction in the latter half of 1982, after which it will be possible to ship goods by rail from Adelaide to Perth, Alice Springs, Sydney and Brisbane without change of gauge.

The announcement that the standard gauge line will be extended from Gepps Cross to Mile End, Port Adelaide and later to Outer Harbor will be of real benefit to industry in these areas. If the rail link stopped at Gepps Cross there would be considerable cost in moving goods, especially heavy material, by rail or road from plants or warehouses in the industrial areas around Port Adelaide and Mile End.

One factor which concerns all manufacturers who depend upon the main markets of Sydney and Melbourne for the bulk of their sales, is the ever-increasing cost of shipping goods to these markets. That is why the announcement of our early start on the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standard gauge railway line is so opportune.

As members know, the Adelaide area is very dependent upon the motor industry and makers of sub-components to maintain employment, and about 90 per cent of the finished vehicles are shipped to other States. A proportion is shipped by rail and, because of spiralling fuel costs which affect road carriers, the more it is likely that the percentage moved by rail will increase. Since the sale of the South Australian country railway system to the A.N.R., which is under instruction to minimise its operating deficit, there has been a rapid escalation in rail freight rates. In 1979 the rail freight rates for carrying motor vehicles on the Adelaide, Sydney, Brisbane sector increased by 30 per cent, and the motor industry expects rates to rise by a further 35 per cent during this financial year. This factor is particularly disturbing to Chrysler, which manufactures only in Adelaide.

One method of reducing freight costs of motor vehicles is to ship more vehicles on each rail wagon. At present two tiers of motor vehicles are carried, and this could be increased to three tiers, as occurs in the United States, if rail clearances were raised, either by raising overhead road bridges or lowering rail levels at the points of intersection, and freight trains were despatched on routes without tunnels. The Federal Government has announced plans to electrify the Sydney-Melbourne rail link with the object of completing this project by 1985, and I am informed that clearances on this line will be increased significantly to permit carriage of semi-trailers on piggy-back rail cars. If rail traffic from Adelaide went via Broken Hill and was then diverted through Junee to join the electrified rail line to Sydney and, if the A.N.R. could be persuaded to raise any clearances between here and Junee, it would then be feasible to send piggy-back semi-trailers and three tiers of motor vehicles to Sydney by rail at greatly reduced freight cost. Semi-trailers already travel by piggy-back on the east-west railway to the Perth area and it seems logical to extend that concept to the Eastern States.

I wish to refer briefly to the need for a south-north transcontinental rail link. In October next the Tarcoola to Alice Springs standard gauge all-weather railway will be completed, and this is a great advance, because no longer will Central Australia be isolated when the old Marree line is flooded. The Government is promoting South Australia as the central State, and in pursuing this theme it must press in association with the Northern Territory Administration for continuation of this line over the next 1 350 kilometres from Alice Springs to Darwin.

Mr. Paul Everingham, the Northern Territory Chief Minister, has stated that the trading loss to South Australia caused by the lack of adequate transport links to the Northern Territory is at least $70 000 000 per year. Initial surveys for the completion of this rail link have been carried out, and the project has been costed at $380 000 000. The Chairman of the A.N.R. said last year that the undertaking of this development, which would be the longest rail project in Australia in more than 60 years, makes sense but it would require "a national act of faith". Perhaps the Federal Government can be persuaded to fund this project as part of its build-up in defence preparations. Although $380 000 000 is a lot of money, it is no more than the cost of one frigate, and which would be of more benefit?

I refer now to the second issue, which is tourism. Augmenting tourism is just as important a factor in State development as is building new factories. The Governor pointed out that there will be a review of the Department of Tourism so that the potential of the State as a centre of tourist activity can be realized.

It is said that the most likely source from where to attract tourists is New Zealand. In the year to October 1979, 765 000 short-term tourists visited Australia. Of these 265 000 came from New Zealand but it is estimated that only 13 000 or about 5 per cent, spent time in this State.

It is pleasing to note that the Department of Tourism during the past year joined with Victoria and Tasmania to promote a campaign run to attract New Zealanders to come to these States, but still more promotion is required. Sydney and the Brisbane area, including the Gold and Sunshine Coasts, have the advantage of 30 years start in advertising, direct connecting flights and cheap promotional fares.

My wife and I spent some weeks in New Zealand this year, and we were struck by the limited range and high price of goods for sale in retail stores in the main cities. This applied particularly to clothing. On occasions people told me, and they were mainly working people, that they were saving up to go to Australia to shop.

In contrast, Adelaide has very fine shops, and we are told that Rundle Mall is the most concentrated retail centre in the world. I suggest, therefore, that the Retail Traders Association should prevail upon the Minister to stress the importance of Adelaide as a retail centre with reasonable prices, when promoting tourism in New Zealand.

The assistance to be given by the Government to a consortium of South Australians who propose to build a 400-room hotel in Victoria Square is, of course, part of its policy to promote tourism. I can appreciate that the proprietors of existing first-class hotels such as the Gateway, Oberoi, Town House and Park Royal may object to the Government giving special concessions to the Victoria Square hotel.

However, as the Government pointed out, tourism is one of the fastest growing industries and Adelaide must provide more first-class accommodation in order to handle large conventions. I believe that the existing hotels will in time gain a higher occupancy by the construction of this new hotel and the ability to promote Adelaide as a convention centre than would be the case if it is not built. Some critics say that a 400-room hotel on this site will be a white elephant. I am not competent to judge but I am prepared to rely on the judgment of the Hilton Group which intends to operate the hotel. That organisation is prepared to offer a fixed rate of return for a long period to the Commonwealth Employees Superannuation Trust, which is to be the principal lessee, based no doubt on its experience of running hotels of similar size in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth. The previous Labor Administration spent much time in trying to attract various groups to build on the Victoria Square site and I commend the present Government for pursuing this goal.

The Hon. Frank Blevins: How would you feel about a casino?

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I am not interested in a casino. Anyway, they probably do not need a casino in order to make a profit.

The third matter to which I refer is the action being taken by the Government to reduce salinity levels in the Murray River. It is pleasing to note that the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have at last decided to amend the River Murray Waters Agreement so that the commission can take water quality into account in its planning. It is to be hoped that

legislation will be introduced into the four Parliaments as quickly as possible.

On average, about 1 100 000 tonnes of salt flows annually into South Australia from the upper reaches of the Murray River and its tributaries, and it is estimated that an additional 500 000 tonnes of salt seeps into the river from within South Australia. This salinity can have a devastating effect upon orchards and vineyards in the Murray Valley in times of low river flow when salinity levels build up, and to a lesser extent upon industrial and domestic users in Adelaide, Whyalla and other country towns which depend upon water pumped from Morgan and Mannum for all or part of their supplies. Although we tend to blame the careless habits of the river communities in New South Wales and Victoria for most of our salinity problems, it is clear from the figures quoted that we have much to do in this State to put our own house in order.

About two years ago Maunsell and Partners, a firm of well qualified consulting engineers, was commissioned by the Murray Valley Salinity Standing Steering Committee, based in Canberra, to draw up a co-ordinated plan of action to reduce salinity. Its report is far reaching and should have been given wider publicity in this State than has happened so far. It envisages a series of measures in the three States concerned to intercept saline drainage and groundwater flows, to institute drainage works to reduce water logging and higher water tables, to improve on-farm irrigation practices, and to regulate river flows more effectively.

These schemes would be implemented over a 25-year period at an estimated cost of $123 000 000 at present-day values. The salt interception component of these schemes, in terms of an annual salt flow to South Australia, would more than double the total halted to 320 000 tonnes. It would reduce by about 16 per cent the salt load in the lower reaches of the Murray during periods of low flow and improve by about 170 parts per million the salinity content of water taken by the Morgan pumping station. This is all in addition to salt to be removed by drainage works recommended in the Maunsell Report.

The Governor made specific mention of two projects that are currently under way, namely, the Noora Scheme and the Rufus River Groundwater Interception Scheme, and both of these were considered in the Maunsell Report as being worthy of priority. The Noora Scheme consists of pumping excess drainage effluent through underground pipelines from the Renmark and Berri-Cobdogla irrigation areas to an evaporation area at Noora, 20 kilometres east of Loxton. About 60 kilometres of pipe will be needed. At Noora, the drainage effluent will be disposed of by evaporation and infiltration into the upper aquifer. After about 20 000 years this salt flow may seep into the Murray but, during the lifetime of the scheme (which is unlikely to go that long), there should be no significant effects upon the environment.

The Rufus River Groundwater Interception Scheme is being carried out in the south-western corner of New South Wales by our Water Resources Department on behalf of the River Murray Commission. The first stage, which is complete, consists of a series of small dams and embankments to isolate and evaporate intercepted saline groundwater from the Rufus River and Brilka Creek system. The second stage, which is to commence this year, will include tube wells, more small dams, two pumping stations, and an evaporation basin.

These works intercept large saline groundwater flows caused by the storage of fresh water in Lake Victoria, several metres above Lock 6 and Lock 7 pool levels. The flows that have been intercepted this far adjacent to the Rufus River and Brilka Creek used to discharge up to 50 000 tonnes of salt a year into the Murray, and at least this has been stopped.

I commend the Government for giving priority to these projects. There is a good deal more money to be spent, but it will prove of inestimable value to future generations of South Australians.

The fourth and last issue to which I refer is the proposed introduction of a system of locally-based soccer pools. There is evidence that a great deal of money is invested each week by South Australians in soccer pools administered outside of this State. It seems sensible therefore to introduce a locally based scheme so that some of the profits can be channelled to State revenue, and I am particularly pleased that the Government proposes to pay these into a special fund for the development of recreational and sports programmes.

With the aid of this fund, I ask the Government to consider the construction of an 18-hole public golf course and other recreational activities, such as tennis courts, riding tracks, etc., in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. There are no golfing facilities in the north or north-eastern suburbs between Tea Tree Gully, a private club, North Adelaide, and Regency Park. Most of our courses are located along the coast or in the south near Morphett Vale. I understand that the State owns several hundred acres of land bounded by Fosters, Redwood and Hampstead Roads, Hillcrest, which is used at present by the Department of Agriculture as a farming research centre, and part of this would be most suitable.

I understand that some years ago the Housing Trust announced plans to develop this area for housing. The local residents protested that it should be preserved as a green belt. By constructing a golf course and planting several thousand trees around the boundary of an area of, say, 150 acres the public objection surely would be overcome and the balance of several hundred acres presumably still could be used for new housing. The land is far too valuable to be used for agricultural research projects.

Adelaide has far too few golf courses to meet the needs of many people who wish to play golf. There are 23 courses in the metropolitan area, but 15 of these belong to private clubs and the public has limited access to them. By contrast, Auckland, with a population of 800 000, has 29 courses, and while visiting there recently—

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: We play different sports here. Not everyone plays golf.

The Hon. D. H. LAIDLAW: I ask the Leader to wait for just a minute. While visiting there recently, I read in the press of public demand for the authorities to build more golf courses.

At present, 11 000 male golfers in the Adelaide area belong to clubs associated with the South Australian Golf Association, while there are many more female golfers and others who play on public courses. Measuring golf against other sports, I am informed that about 25 000 people regularly read the racing pages in the *Advertiser,* while 10 000 to 12 000 attend ordinary Saturday race meetings, and 30 000 to 40 000 people go during weekends to watch league football matches. So, of the three sports, they are very much the same order of magnitude in the Adelaide area. If the Government decides to sponsor an 18-hole public golf course in the Hillcrest area, it should be designed to high standards because there is no reason why the public should use a cow paddock.

It is interesting to note that at Wairakei, in New Zealand, Peter Thomson and his partners have designed for the New Zealand Tourist Authority a magnificent 18-hole public golf course and that British Petroleum has offered to subsidise the New Zealand Open if its venue is

Wairakei. So, why should public golf courses be put down on any land? They should be designed as well as any private golf course is designed.

Once a public course is established it is common for local residents to form a club and have some reserved starting times on the course, This has happened at North Adelaide, and I understand that it is proposed at the new public courses at North Haven and Marion Park. I hope that the Government will listen to my pleas in relation to this matter.

Some years ago I promoted the idea that a nine-hole public course should be constructed on 130 acres on vacant land owned by Quarry Industries near Seacliff. After some delay, the course was built under the direction of a working party, consisting of representatives of several Government Departments, Marion council and the company. The Federal Government made a grant from its sporting fund allocation, and the State Government and Marion council also made a financial contribution. Because of the interest of Quarry Industries in the project, it leased the land to the council for 99 years at a peppercorn rental and moved 1 000 000 tonnes of soil to be used for mounding.

The course, named City of Marion Golf Park, was opened in 1979 and has proved to be a success. Incidentally, the local council has just planted 8 000 trees around the perimeter of that golf course. The trees have been watered and, just as this Marion Park golf course in the south-western suburbs is proving a success, I hope that the Government will see fit similarly to sponsor another public golf course in the north-eastern suburbs using funds from the soccer pools. I am pleased to move the motion to adopt the Address in Reply.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I second the motion. The Governor's Speech in opening this session last week pointed out clearly the success of this Government in the short time it has been in office. As His Excellency said, the importance that the Government attaches to careful planning and financial control has resulted in a surplus of the State's finances of $37 200 000. It is obvious to those who listened to the Opening Speech, or to those who have subsequently read it, that the Government will continue to be a responsible one, exercising proper financial control at all times while at the same time seeing that the needs of the people of South Australia are met.

It is also obvious that with the programme outlined by His Excellency we are in for a busy session. I look forward to some serious and well-informed debate on measures outlined by the Governor. Certainly, I do not intend to deal at length with all the proposals outlined in his Speech, because the appropriate time to do that is when the legislation and the Bills are before us, but I want to refer to one or two. In paragraph 8 of his Speech the Governor stated:

> Inter-governmental approval has recently been obtained for the drafting of legislation to amend the River Murray Waters Agreement to enable the River Murray Commission to take water quality into account in its planning. My Government gives a very high priority to the management of the River Murray, which is in effect South Australia's lifeline, and will be seeking an early agreement to enable the legislation to be brought before Parliament.

As the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw said, this vital matter is long overdue. I hope there is an early agreement between the four Governments concerned in this matter to enable the legislation to be enacted as soon as possible.

Some years ago when I was a member in another place, a group of us, including the present Premier (Hon. D. O. Tonkin) made a tour of the Murray River from the site of the Dartmouth dam down river to Murray Bridge. We had the company and guidance of Mr. Vern Lawrence, the Director of the Murray Valley League, a man who knows, better than anyone else, the whole length of the Murray River and the towns and industries along its banks. He was able to show us many areas of concern at that time, not only where pollution had occurred but where he could see a danger of it occurring in the future.

The whole problem seems to be that the River Murray Commission lacks proper teeth, and the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria have not always been as co-operative as they might have been. It is fair to say that South Australia has always shown far more responsibility in water quality control than have the other States but, being on the tail end of the river, it is perhaps understandable because we are more concerned with matters of water pollution.

Murray River water is used for irrigation, as all members know, and the Hon. Mr. Laidlaw referred to the times when crops were killed by the high salinity content of that water. Further, Murray River water is pumped to city reservoirs, and it is vital that a high degree of water purity is maintained. I emphasise that I hope that early agreement is reached between the Governments, because such legislation is vital and will benefit not only South Australia but also Victoria and New South Wales.

The other matter foreshadowed in the Governor's Speech to which I wish to refer concerns the connection of Adelaide with the standard gauge railway system. Again, this measure is long overdue, and I am sure that all honourable members were pleased to hear that agreement was finally reached with the Commonwealth Government for the construction of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook link. Our forefathers have much to answer for about their lack of forethought, which led to Australia having so many different rail gauges. The cost over the years has been immeasureable not only in direct freight charges caused by bogey exchange and transfer of goods and passengers but also in the actual cost of standardisation when it was ultimately decided that that was the only sensible course of action to adopt.

However, whether we like it or not and whether the cost is borne by the Federal Government or the State, what South Australia did not like was the fact that it has missed out for so long. The cost to South Australia can probably never be measured, but it must be enormous in lost contracts and consequent lost jobs as a result of a lack of easy access to the major markets of the Eastern States. The fact that the Adelaide to Crystal Brook link is to proceed (and one hopes that it will proceed as quickly as possible) must be of major benefit to South Australia.

Earlier I mentioned the heavy legislative programme before us, and this does cause me some concern, not because of the work that will be involved but because I wonder whether all the legislation that will come before us is necessary. One will be able to tell that only when the legislation is before us, but over the years we have become a society that is over-controlled. In his maiden speech last year the Hon. Dr. Ritson referred to this and cited specific examples of ridiculous legislation in the Boating Act and Firearms Act. If one had time to do the research I am sure that it would be possible to continue for hours quoting similar examples to those quoted by the Hon. Dr. Ritson last year.

I refer to the probationary licence plates legislation passed at the end of the last session. True, I supported it or, to put it another way, I did not oppose it. It was a relatively minor matter, but it is still a further measure of control for what I believe is no real purpose. Some years ago I looked into this matter with the idea then, if there

was any merit in it, of introducing a private member's Bill, but my findings at that time made me drop the idea.

The highest proportion of accidents or traffic offences does not occur in the first year of driving. The 20-25 year age group provides the worst offenders. Certainly, it is not the 16 to 17 year olders. No State with P plate legislation that I contacted could provide me then with any statistics concerning accident rates in the first year of driving either before or after the introduction of P plates. Whether accidents have increased or decreased or remained the same I do not know, but the general feeling among the people I spoke to was that it probably had no significant effect, and it certainly was not capable of ever being measured.

We have now introduced yet another control for no real purpose. As I stated, it is a relatively minor matter that does, I admit, bring us into line with the other States, not that that is always necessarily a good thing, but it still has to be administered and policed, so there will be costs involved, but for what purpose? I know that there must be a natural tendency for a new Government and a new Minister to want to institute changes, and I know that many changes are necessary because of the difficult politics of a new Government, but I believe that one reason for the change of Government last year was that the people were getting sick of being over-governed and were looking for a Government that would not legislate just for the sake of it; perhaps they were looking for a Government that might even get around to repealing a few laws and regulations. I have not seen any signs of that yet, but I am still hopeful. I point out to the Government that this is not a necessarily new view. In 1584, when opening a session of Parliament, Elizabeth I instructed Speaker Puckering that no laws were to be passed in that Parliament, "there being many more than be well executed".

I still believe and hope that this Government will be very careful not to introduce legislation simply for the sake of it and that any legislation that is introduced is necessary and worth while.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What about Mr. Hill's Ethnic Affairs Commission? I thought you were opposed to creating more commissions and boards.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I was stating a principle. The Hon. Mr. Sumner knows that I sometimes get into trouble for not always agreeing with what my own Party does. I have recently had the privilege of travelling overseas on a Parliamentary study tour. My particular area of interest was public transport. I will deal briefly and in a general way with some aspects of this as I saw it. I will be doing a full report, as required, a little later and that will be tabled in this Council.

First, Adelaide is sadly lagging in public transport compared with most cities that I visited. On the other side of the coin, there is a much greater acceptance and usage of public transport overseas, particularly in Europe. We in Australia tend to stick to our cars and do not use public transport to the extent that we could or should. I am guilty of it, and I am sure that every member of this Council is guilty of it. That does not say that it cannot be altered. It is no good spending millions of dollars on any system if people will not use it. In those cities where I spoke to transport authorities, the percentage of people who regularly use public transport was always in excess of 50 per cent. In Newcastle in England it was over 60 per cent. In Adelaide I believe that the figure is less than half of that. Along with whatever system is adopted for Adelaide, an education programme must be implemented to ensure that the maximum number of people use that system and make it worth while. Having made that statement, I add that I do not know how that can be done. If fuel costs continue to rise, it may solve the problem to some extent, as people may look for an alternative to their motor cars.

In Europe, where petrol is double the Australian price, it is noticeable that more people are turning to public transport. Of the cities I visited, Vancouver and Singapore had different but what I consider to be harsh methods of ensuring that the majority of people use public transport. Vancouver does it by the simple expedient of not providing any reasonable parking spaces in the main business and shopping centres, and the ones available are very expensive. Anybody who has business to do in those parts of the city has little alternative to using public transport. I believe that the usage of public transport in Vancouver is about the 60 per cent. Singapore has a different approach in that it charges four Singapore dollars to enter certain prescribed business and shopping areas at certain times of the day. While that sum is only $1.30 in Australian currency, it is still a significant amount in Singapore and has the effect of turning people to buses. Even taxis have to pay $2 instead of $4. Therefore, if one took a taxi into those areas, $2 would be added to the taxi fare. It therefore encourages people to use public transport.

I am in no way suggesting that we should do that in Adelaide. For one thing, it is not the sort of thing that we as Australians like to do and, secondly, I believe that one of the principal objects of any system must be to maintain and increase the vitality of the central area of metropolitan Adelaide. Either of those methods would have the effect of driving people away. I have been discussing public transport generally, but the main concern at the moment in Adelaide is the north-east area.

While I was away, the Minister of Transport released a report concerning public transport for this area. This report listed four options, and I understand that public submissions were invited, and those submissions are currently being evaluated. It would be very interesting to learn the results of that study and ascertain public opinion and public requirements. My personal view is that there are really only two options.

I do not believe that option 1, which is continued development of the present bus system as need demands, is reasonable at all. It will simply add to congestion on the roads and would not result in any saving in time. Over a period I believe that it would turn out to be more expensive than or at least as expensive as the alternatives offered. With that option there would be greater congestion on the roads.

Option 2, which is the extension of the Northfield rail line, has the advantage that there would be no intrusion on the inner suburbs, because it would use existing rail tracks and the existing North Terrace railway station. However, there would be little saving in time over the present bus system, because it would be a longer trip. It would also be relatively expensive in terms of capital expenditure and much more so than any bus system which is put forward in the report but less than l.r.t. For most bus users it would be a less convenient trip, and I cannot see that it would attract any new business to the public transport system as a new venture should. This leads to the final two options, both of which use the Modbury corridor. One is to have a busway or guided busway, and the other is for light rail. I was privileged to be able to examine both of these systems while overseas. Newcastle-on-Tyne has just completed a most elaborate light rail system of which the central part is underground. It was due to be opened on 1 August, a few days ago. When I was there in late May it was largely finished and tests were being conducted. I was taken over the whole system by Mr. David Howard, the Director of

Engineering of Tyne and Wear Transport. I would like to record my appreciation for the time, effort and generosity that Mr. Howard showed to me.

The system, as has been built there, is fast, modern and efficient. It is integrated into a total transport system with feeder buses serving areas away from the line. I raised the question of whether the public would accept the idea of having to change their mode of transport rather than ride on a bus the full distance.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Which are you opting for, the O'Bahn or l.r.t.?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Leader will find out in a moment. There is merit in all and there are disadvantages in all. I was discussing whether the public would accept having to change from bus to train and back again, rather than riding on a bus for the full distance; that applied in Newcastle before this system was built. Apparently, surveys done by Tyne and Wear Transport have shown that public acceptance of the idea is very high, as the present bus trip from the outer suburbs is very long and uncomfortable.

It remains to be seen whether these surveys are accurate, and my own feeling, which is perhaps presumptuous of me, having made only a short visit there, is that they probably would be acceptable because of the high acceptance of public transport in the United Kingdom and Europe, where people seem to accept things that people here would not accept or feel that they could accept.

Certainly, the interchange stations that I saw in Newcastle were designed most efficiently. The buses can pull in and, with their wide doors, discharge passengers virtually straight on to the platform. The claim is that a changeover will take two minutes, but again this remains to be seen. With automatic ticketing, the system is, as I have said, fast, modern and efficient. The rolling stock is extremely comfortable and incredibly quiet, and there is no doubt that it is a system of which Newcastle should be very proud.

Of course, anything like this does not come cheaply, and I understand that the total cost has been about $500 000 000. Speaking of costs, the estimate to put a light rail rapid transit down the Modbury corridor, with the final section going underground, is about $115 000 000, but the Newcastle scheme is a much bigger scheme, involving about 34 miles of track, some of which was already there.

However, in Vancouver, they are about to start construction of a light rail transport system, the first stage of the line fairly similar to what we have here, namely, six or seven miles with about the first mile going underground. The costs they are looking at are between $210 000 000 and $260 000 000, so perhaps a cost of $115 000 000 is not excessive.

In Ratstatt, near Stuttgart, Daimler-Benz demonstrated for me the O'Bahn, or guided bus, system, and I should also like to record my grateful thanks to Mr. Karl Fander and the staff of Daimler-Benz. The guided bus is a most impressive concept, and there is no doubt that it is feasible. I am sure that all members are familiar with the principle, whereby an ordinary bus, most likely an articulated bus, is fitted with horizontal guidewheels attached to the front wheels. These are then held within L-shape concrete sections so that no steering is necessary. There is no doubt that the system would be fast, efficient and safe, and it should be cheaper than l.r.t., although I warn that we must be very careful, because the O'Bahn system is untried. No track has yet been put down.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Anywhere in the world?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: There is one that should be almost finished now. It is very hard to estimate the cost of something that has not yet been constructed, and I say seriously that we should look at this matter closely before coming to any final decision. The big advantage of the O'Bahn system is that the buses can leave the special track and operate normally on ordinary roads, obviating the need for feeder bus services that would be necessary with a light rail system.

The question arises whether there is any real advantage over having an exclusive busway, and the only advantage that I can see is that the road width can be narrower, which could result in a saving in cost, because room for movement that is necessary with an ordinary bus is not needed in this case. Apart from that, it is not a major factor, because there is ample space in the Modbury corridor. Although there is no doubt in my mind that the O'Bahn system is technically feasible, it is untried in practical application.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Isn't it it in operation anywhere in the world?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: I was about to come to that, and I am sure the Leader will be pleased at what I am about to say.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: The other thing you could tell us about is the speed. Does it travel at the same speed as l.r.t.?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Leader is anticipating. Apart from the 500 metre to 600 metre test track at Ratstatt, which is owned by Daimler-Benz and which I saw, there is a 1 300 metre track at Munich owned by the Federal Government and used by both Daimler-Benz and MAN that I did not see. At present, about 1½ to two kilometres of track is being installed at Essen as part of that city's bus system. I was told that it should be in operation in September. It should be possible, after a short time, to evaluate the O'Bahn system in commercial operation and to see how it operates in practical application. In answer to the Leader, I say that it is not in operation yet but soon will be.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: That is more or less a pilot programme.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: It is. The Leader asked a question about speed, and it is envisaged that the operating speed will be 80 kilometres an hour but, again, this has not been tested, because no track is long enough.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: How does this compare to l.r.t.?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: Nowhere near, and that is fairly obvious. At present, if Adelaide were to decide on this system, we would be in the nature of pioneers, and the matter of whether we can afford to be guinea pigs is a decision that the Government must take. There are three options, namely, l.r.t., O'Bahn, or a bus line, although the options have been lumped together as two in the report. All have advantages and disadvantages, and the Minister will have to weigh all these and decide. Regardless of whichever one he decides on, some people from the Opposition and the community will say that it is the wrong decision, but that is in the nature of decisions and I will have no say in the decision that the Government has to make.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What is your opinion, having carried out this investigation?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader is asking searching questions. I hope he is not trying to disconcert the Hon. Mr. Carnie.

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: The Leader can wait until I prepare my report, which I am obliged to do, and it will be tabled in this Council. Another aspect of my overseas trip, which has nothing to do with public transport but which is

a particular hobby horse of mine and has been for some time, is the question of shopping hours. I want to make a point about that. Members who have been overseas know that other countries have far less trouble working that matter out than we have.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: Why did you not go along with the Bill back in March?

The Hon. J. A. CARNIE: As the Leader well knows, that Bill did not receive a lot of support from either side of the Council. One of the reasons put forward by the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association against an extension of shopping hours is that it is exploitation of the workers, that they will not get any free time, and so on. Whilst overseas, I spent several days in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, where there are two State-owned supermarkets cum department stores. I am sure that honourable members opposite believe that Yugoslavia is a worker's paradise where there should be no exploitation of workers. However, those two shops open at 7 a.m. and close at 8 p.m. six days a week. On Sundays they do not open until 10 a.m. and they are allowed to close at 5 p.m. I support the motion.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.32 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday 6 August at 2.15 p.m.