

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 27 September 1978

The **SPEAKER (Hon. G. R. Langley)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

The **Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** presented a petition signed by 26 residents of South Australia praying that the House would pass legislation to provide for Ministerial responsibility adequately to control pornographic material.

The **Hon. HUGH HUDSON** presented a similar petition signed by 81 residents of South Australia.

The **Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL** presented a similar petition signed by 154 residents of South Australia.

Mr. DRURY presented a similar petition signed by 163 residents of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 13 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GROTH presented a similar petition signed by 48 residents of South Australia.

Mr. VENNING presented a similar petition signed by 45 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GROOM presented a similar petition signed by 22 residents of South Australia.

Mrs. BYRNE presented a similar petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia.

Mr. KLUNDER presented a similar petition signed by 55 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 68 residents of South Australia.

Mr. MATHWIN presented a similar petition signed by 528 residents of South Australia.

Mr. WELLS presented a similar petition signed by 40 residents of South Australia.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 14 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: VIOLENT OFFENCES

Mr. GROTH presented a petition signed by 189 residents of South Australia praying that the House would support proposed amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to increase maximum penalties for violent offences.

Mr. WELLS presented a similar petition signed by 74 residents of South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY presented a similar petition signed by 102 residents of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 141 residents of South Australia.

Mr. NANKIVELL presented a similar petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia.

Petitions received.

PETITION: SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GROOM presented a petition signed by 33 residents of South Australia praying that the House would urge the Government to amend the Succession Duties Act so that blood relations sharing a family property enjoyed at least the same benefits as those available to other recognised relationships.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

CITRUS INDUSTRY

Mr. TONKIN: Can the Deputy Premier say with what citrus industry organisations, if any, the Government consulted before deciding on its latest submission to the Industries Assistance Commission on tariff protection; how did it decide on the new figures; and whether it is satisfied that this will now be sufficient protection for the citrus industry?

The Premier yesterday gave reasons for the Government's revised submission from 6c a litre and 25 per cent *ad valorem* to 8c a litre and 35 per cent *ad valorem*. These have not been accepted by the industry. The Premier also suggested that there had been consultation with the industry, although this statement, too, has been disputed by members of the industry. Information from an organisation quoted in the Premier's statement yesterday indicates that there was no consultation either on the previous or the latest announcements, and that the new proposal will do little, if anything, to improve the potentially disastrous situation for the citrus industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In reply to a question yesterday subsequent to a Ministerial statement on the subject, the Premier listed consultations and meetings that have taken place with various organisations, including those with representatives of the Citrus Organisation Committee. He also indicated it was necessary to upgrade the figures that were previously given of 6c a litre and 25 per cent *ad valorem*, or whatever was the higher of the two. He indicated that, because the previous submission was made in October 1977, it was necessary to examine the submission and to update those figures, and he cited three reasons for the need to do so.

The first was increased costs, which he did not actually detail. The second was that countries exporting fruit juice to this country had devalued their currencies and that that devaluation had had some effect. The third point that he said had had a bearing on the need for an adjustment was brandy excise. He then referred to mixed farms, but I would call them mixed blocks, and the need to take into account the effect of the brandy excise on the figures that were submitted in October 1977.

As far as I know, there was no consultation between organisations involved on the variation of those figures. The important thing is that the basis on which the submission was made in October 1977 was not changed. The other important feature of the Premier's statement yesterday was that he was completely satisfied, after examination of the matter and having considered the alteration to the figures that were submitted previously, that this would provide adequate protection for the citrus industry in South Australia. Indeed, he said that it would be more adequate than the protection that now exists.

Mr. Tonkin: The growers don't believe that.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader has asked his question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: They may not believe it, but the Premier also pointed out that the view held by the Chairman of the Citrus Organisation Committee, Mr. Morphett, and other people in the industry did not agree with the type of submission that was made by the South Australian Government. They believe in fixing a quota system rather than in the suggestions made by the Premier. It is important to recognise that the present system (that is, the 65 per cent *ad valorem* tax) is not satisfactory, cannot be defended, and cannot therefore be continued by the Federal Government.

The alternative put forward by the South Australian

Government was the upgrading of the figure to 8c a litre and a 35 per cent *ad valorem* tax: that is satisfactory to the South Australian Government, and will give to the industry the sort of protection that is needed. Indeed, yesterday the Premier said that, in his belief, greater protection now exists than has been provided and that there is disagreement between certain elements of the industry and the Government about whether that is the most effective means of doing it. We will have to agree to disagree as to which is the most effective means.

I am not able, and I do not have the knowledge, to argue whether the quota system would be more effective than the alternative figures put forward yesterday by the Premier. I can only say that no doubt much consideration will be given to this matter on Friday, over the weekend and probably on Monday. After the report that the Premier gave to Cabinet on Monday, I was certainly satisfied about the basis on which the submission was made initially. Indeed, it set out to and would have in October 1977 provided the sort of protection the industry needed. With the upgrading of figures that has taken place, protection has been provided, and therefore the claims made by the member for Chaffey and the Leader, that we were placing the citrus industry in South Australia in dire jeopardy, are completely and utterly without foundation.

T.A.B. HOLDINGS

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Will the Chief Secretary obtain from the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Sport a report on the effects on Totalisator Agency Board holdings that may have occurred since the recent early closing decision was made by T.A.B., and will the Minister consider a return to a later closing time during summer months?

My question flows from complaints I have received from people who believe that the change in closing time from 8 o'clock until 7 o'clock made, I understand, because of hold-ups taking place in the last hour of business of the T.A.B., has made it difficult for people wishing to use that service. With the approach of daylight saving, and because it will still be light at 8 o'clock, perhaps the closing time could be moved back to 8 p.m.

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: I think that one of the factors leading to the decision to curtail the hours was that the volume of business in that last hour was not great. I appreciate that that closing time might be inconvenient for some people, and I shall be pleased to pass on the member's request to my colleague.

WATER SUPPLIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Works say why the Government has decided not to restrict water supplies to new plantings of grapes, when the Minister of Agriculture believes that this would solve the surplus grape problem? The Minister of Agriculture said earlier this year that "South Australia's wine-grape surplus could be resolved by restricting water supplies for any new plantings." I put a Question on Notice some time ago asking whether the Government intended to restrict new plantings. The answer I got was a bald "No". Therefore, I ask the Minister why the Government does not intend to do that when the Minister has said many times that the Murray River is over-committed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, I think the Government would like to have the power to restrict new

plantings. The honourable member would appreciate that the only effective means of doing that would probably involve land use legislation. Whilst that matter is being investigated, I do not think the Government is able at this time (certainly I am not) to make any recommendation as to whether or how that can be achieved.

I point out to the honourable member that since 1967 (I think it is: and I put that qualification) no new licences to divert water from the Murray River have been granted for any reason. There may have been a few in which special circumstances applied. In effect, we have restricted new plantings by not issuing new licences. Where licences have been issued for properties, which have changed hands, we have altered the allocation to that property when development has not taken place.

The honourable member would recall that I was reported to this House by the Ombudsman over a particular case when a person bought, I think, 40 acres only 19 acres of which had been developed, and an annual water licence was issued for 19 acres only. The Government has, over that period, taken back water licences from large areas. I do not know the exact areas, but it would be a fairly large area, and this has prevented new plantings. Licences were issued before 1967, before the Government took control of the river. I think it was in 1970 that the Government took control of the river from Mannum to Goolwa, which had not been controlled previously. The licences that were issued then and have remained in the same hands have not been fully developed.

The honourable member could certainly point to some fairly large producers who have not yet fully developed the entitlement that they were then granted, and there is nothing that we can do at this time without further legislation (something like land use legislation) to prevent those plantings. I point out to the honourable member that producers would want to look at this matter in the light of the current situation before planting further vines, but so far as I am aware there is nothing to prevent those people from doing it. There is no action a Government can take other than—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why did the Minister say—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister made the statement, and he was quite right in making it, in a general sense—if the Government could control it, that would be one way of doing it. He did not say that the Government could do it.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Yes, he did.

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

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If he did, I think he was mistaken. I think he said, if my memory serves me right, that if the Government could control further plantings that would relieve the pressure on the situation of excess grapes that would result from the Federal Government's imposing the excise on brandy.

JOB SECURITY

Mr. ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the special Ministerial meeting to consider the State Government's plan for a national approach on job security is still to take place next month in Melbourne?

As unemployment has emerged as the single most urgent social problem confronting Australia, I am concerned at reports that the Prime Minister has made clear that the Federal Government will not agree to A.C.T.U. demands for a conference with employers and the union movement on unemployment and economic

management, and that a move by the Federal Opposition to press the Federal Government to set up a wide-ranging public inquiry into the effects of technological change is to be rejected because the Prime Minister believes it would only provide opportunities for political point-scoring and grandstanding. Is the Minister confident that his proposals will get off the ground?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I think the first point that ought to be made clear is that the conference to be held in Melbourne on 24 November is not only about the paper that I presented to the conference in Brisbane. That paper was mainly concerned with job security and redundancy, and there is little doubt that it caused one of the most significant debates in which I have been involved at any conference of Ministers in my three years as Minister. In fact, the debate took almost two hours, receiving very general and firm support from all State Ministers, irrespective of their political persuasion.

It was the Federal Minister (Mr. Street) whose mind took some changing, because he told the conference that the Federal Government had no intention of changing its policies, that it was right, and that that was the end of the matter. At one stage I thought my paper would be brushed aside until next February. It was only following my insistence that the debate took place. As a consequence and as an acknowledgment of the position taken by South Australia, and the other States, it was agreed that a special Federal conference ought to be held on that date in Melbourne. I am confident that that conference will go ahead. I do not think that any side in this matter ought to be trying to score political points, because there is national concern about this matter. The fact that there was no great disagreement between all the State Ministers, Labor or Liberal, proved to me conclusively that there was a general concern about the matter throughout Australia, and that is how we ought to approach the subject, not on a political basis.

It is also significant that today, the Premier of Victoria, Mr. Hamer, has joined in concert with Bob Hawke and other people who are calling for a national conference. Personally, I am not opposed to that, but I do not want it to prejudice the conference that has been called for 24 November. I do not want anything to happen that will cause that conference not to go on, because it is the only foundation at the moment on which to build, with everyone in some agreement to meet, to consult, and to try to do something about this problem. If people are going to try to grandstand over the situation to score political points, as I think Mr. Hamer is doing, because he is leading up to an election, irreparable damage could be caused to the conference that is to be held.

I would support, as I am sure my Government would support, the widening of that conference. If it is thought proper and necessary at this stage that employer and employee organisations should be included in the conference on 24 November, I would be the first to support such an idea, but primarily my wish, that of my Government, and I am sure that of all thinking South Australian citizens, is first to get the conference in Melbourne off the ground to arrange a national plan as to where we go from there. Alternatively, we can include the bodies I have mentioned in the conference on 24 November.

"STOLEN" MOTOR VEHICLE

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question to the Minister of Community Welfare relates to a report on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser* concerning the theft of a car

owned by a Mr. Morcom. Following the theft of Mr. Morcom's car and its discovery two weeks later in the McNally Training Centre workshop, can the Minister say who was responsible for stealing the car; how the locked car was opened and started; whose car was supposed to have been picked up and whether that person was a staff member at McNally; what mechanical work has been carried out on that vehicle and what guarantees the Government gives for the quality of the mechanical workmanship; what were the qualifications of the persons who worked on this car; and whether the Government will fully compensate Mr. Morcom for all costs he has incurred as a result of this theft?

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member has asked about 10 questions, and he was to ask only one. It is an extremely long question, 10 questions in one. In future, I hope the honourable member will not incorporate so many questions in the one question.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: With your concurrence, Sir, and that of the House, I shall now explain that one question. The details of the theft are given on the front page of this morning's *Advertiser*. Yesterday, I sent a letter to the Minister, pointing out the circumstances relating to the theft of this motor vehicle and asking the Minister in that letter nine questions, most of which I have repeated today as part of one question. Several questions now remain unanswered, and I ask the Minister to answer them. The identity of the other car owner is still unknown, as was highlighted in the report in the *Advertiser*. In addition, Mr. Morcom's son has received two conflicting reports as to how Mr. Morcom's car was taken to McNally from Glen Stuart Road. One report from Mr. McClelland said that the car was towed, whilst the other, coming from the staff member who delivered the car back to Mr Morcom senior last Monday, said that the ignition had been hot-wired and the vehicle had been driven. My letter of yesterday to the Minister states:

I am absolutely amazed by these events. They raise many questions that need direct answers. As Minister of Community Welfare I hold you responsible for the actions of your department. Please give this matter your immediate attention and ensure that Mr. Morcom receives full compensation.

As the Minister has prior knowledge of this question and the circumstances of the case, I hope he can now inform the House fully on the various matters.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It is refreshing to receive a question on McNally from another direction in this House.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Mathwin: Don't hold your breath, Ron.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On that basis, I admit to receiving some small pleasure from watching the battle on the other side for the front bench position of the member for McNally.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable Minister will answer the question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: As you so rightly pointed out, Sir, I could be pardoned if I were somewhat confused, with so many questions directed to me in the rapid fire manner—

Mr. Gunn: Is it unusual for you to be confused?

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Eyre to order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —we have come to expect from the member for Davenport. The matters raised by the honourable member concern one of the most unusual sets of circumstances that has come across my bench for some time. In representing their districts, most members

occasionally hear stories which have much human interest and which often contain circumstances that try the imagination. With your permission, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I will recount a story rather than answer the questions, as this is a more appropriate way of dealing with the matter.

A normal procedure applying at McNally provides for the gainful instruction of inmates in trade training by a qualified motor mechanic on the staff at McNally. I have already answered one of the honourable member's questions in relation to the kind of people involved in carrying out the repairs to the vehicle. I hope that the honourable member will take note of the fact that a qualified mechanic was involved. In order to give the youth instruction, on occasion vehicles are brought into the centre. In this instance, the arrangement was for a broken-down Morris 1100 located near McNally—

Mr. Dean Brown: Whose car was that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has already asked his questions. During the reply to almost every question asked today there has been an interjection. Honourable members complain about the time available for questions. I hope that interjections will cease.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I think that was question No. 8, when the honourable member originally began. Now that he has interjected, I will talk about question No. 8, which referred to the identity of the owner of the vehicle. As of yesterday, the information I have received is that the owner of the vehicle is a gentleman in, I think, holy orders working in the normal way near McNally. The arrangement was that the vehicle be picked up in the manner I have outlined. As I understand it, the actual geographical location given was for the vehicle to be picked up on the road at the bottom gate of the Old Folks Home, at Magill, which is close to McNally, as the honourable member knows.

By sheer coincidence, a similar model car of the same age and colour was located at the top gate of the home at Magill. I think that members are already about two blocks ahead of me, because what happened was that the wrong vehicle was inadvertently taken into McNally for repairs. It may well be amusing to all of us now, and I confess to being slightly amused, but that does not mean that I do not have concern for the elderly gentleman who was deprived of his car by this mistake.

I refer to the honourable member's statement, both in his letter and in the House today, that the car was stolen. I am not the Attorney-General, so I hope that I am allowed, Mr. Speaker, to offer an offhand opinion, anyway, without transgressing the rules of the House. I suggest that "steal" includes intent, for it to be of real substance in law. As I understand it, there being no intent in this matter, the vehicle was mistakenly taken, not stolen.

The *Advertiser* reporter, showing more sense in this matter than has the honourable member, placed the word "stolen" in inverted commas in the headline, which stated " 'Stolen' car turned up at McNally". I suggest that he has had experience in these matters or that, alternatively, reporters in general show more concern about the meaning of such words than the honourable member has often demonstrated that he shows, as we all know and as I am sure that he knows.

I understand a suggestion was made that the car was "hot-wired". If a person with mechanical knowledge misplaces his car keys, he does not call a cab—he uses his brains and bridges the ignition wires to start the vehicle, but in press parlance that is "hot wiring". To the best of my knowledge, the vehicle in question, albeit the wrong vehicle, was towed to McNally, which was only a short distance away, and work commenced on it. I understand the head was taken off, it was faced (I would not mind

someone taking the head off my car and facing it, as long as I did not have to pay for it) and a valve grind was carried out. The press report suggested that the police had been hot on the trail of this one missing vehicle amongst all the others they had to find, and eventually found it at McNally. What happened was that when my officers detected that something was wrong, they informed the police. Once it was discovered that the car was on the missing list, efforts were made to return the vehicle. At that point I am informed that a qualified mechanic took over the full supervision and the work of the repairs. Mr. Morcom, whose name is in the newspaper report, has that reassurance at least.

I instructed a senior officer to visit Mr. Morcom and express the regret of the department and the Minister. The honourable member has called me to account in the matter. I did not actually go and help the inmates fix the cars but I do have the responsibility. I instructed that regrets be passed on and that the feelings about the matter of Mr. Morcom be ascertained. I also told the Director-General of my department that we have to meet reasonable requests of the gentleman concerned having regard to the fact that he was deprived of his car without warning and was forced for a time to use other methods of transport. Certain other requests have been made by him, including a request for a 90 days guarantee on the workmanship, a guarantee any qualified mechanic normally offers. I think that is a most reasonable requirement.

I have been informed that a sum of money has been requested in relation to travelling expenses incurred during that period. That seems fair to me. I do not want the department to be niggardly, and I also hope that if the matter appears in the Auditor-General's Report next year, the Opposition will be reasonable about the matter and not ask "Why was \$95 paid instead of \$72.61?" or some such question about it. There is an indefinable element in this incident, so that perhaps the accountants should come in afterwards and we should use a little common sense and compassion, and that is what community welfare is all about. I apologise if I have missed out replying to one of the questions but, as the honourable member has put questions in writing, I will undertake to give him a fuller report when I receive more information.

INTERSTATE OFFENDERS

Mr. DRURY: Can the Attorney-General say what proportion of armed hold-ups committed in South Australia during the last two years have been perpetrated by interstate offenders?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I understand that figures for the past year are not available. For the year before, the proportion was between one-fifth and one-quarter. That is a significant number of the offences.

Mr. Mathwin: He can get these figures but he can't get drunken driving offence figures.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The honourable member suggests that we cannot get drunken driving figures, but that is not the case. What the honourable member was after related to juvenile offences, whereas this matter relates to adult offences. The Government is seriously concerned about the number of persons from interstate who are coming into South Australia apparently with the intention of committing offences such as bank robberies and armed hold-ups generally.

We are considering the possibility of introducing a special crime of entering South Australia with the intention of committing a crime, or something of that sort,

to try to deter people from interstate from coming into South Australia to commit crimes of this type. As those investigations have not yet been completed, I cannot give the honourable member great detail about what action we will take. As soon as we have completed the study I will be taking steps to ensure that whatever arrangements the Government can make will be made to deter people from coming from the Eastern States in particular, to South Australia with the intention of undertaking armed hold-ups.

As the situation appears at the moment, it seems that some people are arriving (this has been the pattern in a couple of instances) from the Eastern States on morning planes, undertaking armed hold-ups during the day, and apparently flying out in the late afternoon or evening. That makes it tremendously difficult for the police and other authorities to track down such people. This is a problem which we well recognise and about which we are concerned. We will take every action we can to solve it as soon as the report to which I have referred is available.

FISHING LICENCES

Mr. CHAPMAN: I ask the Minister of Works whether the Government will furnish to the House a progress report on last evening's meeting between representatives of the State prawn fishing industry and the Premier, who has taken over the role of Minister on this licence fee issue, and also report on the situation regarding the earlier announced deadline date of 6 October 1978 for payment of interim prawn licences. The meeting to which I am referring took place in Parliament House last evening between industry representatives (Mr. Michael Thomas, Mr. DeLongville, Mr. Corrigliani, and the Executive Officer, Mr. Stevens), senior officers of the Agriculture and Fisheries Department, the Premier, the Hon. Mr. Chatterton and, of course, his wife, Mrs. Chatterton.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You don't have to be a mongrel—

The SPEAKER: I call the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy to order.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will make the decisions. I hope that the honourable member for Mitcham will not interject.

Mr. Millhouse: I was only supporting you.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Mitcham to order.

Mr. Mathwin: He's only talking to himself.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The principal reason why I raised this matter is that I am aware of the extreme personal distress at industry family level that is being caused by the effects of this whole drawn-out exercise, wherein husbands are fighting for a real principle. Likewise, there is the concern expressed by other sections of the primary industry about, as they describe it, the "heavy handed attitude" of the Minister of Fisheries in the general application of his job and, of course, the reported and consistent presence of Mrs. Chatterton wherever primary industry is discontented.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I withdraw leave.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Let him go, he's not—

The SPEAKER: Order! In the past two or three sentences, the honourable member has been commenting. I hope that he will not continue. Leave has been withdrawn by the Minister.

Mr. CHAPMAN: He said, "Let him go." On a point of order: I do not recall the Minister asking for a withdrawal of my explanation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I didn't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I withdrew leave because, for the second time, the honourable member saw fit to make completely uncalled for references to Mrs. Chatterton, and I stand by that withdrawal.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister did withdraw leave, so I call the honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I did not withdraw leave: the Minister of Mines and Energy withdrew it. I would not have withdrawn leave: I would have let the honourable member proceed with what he was saying, to damage the cause that he is supposed to be promoting in this place. The honourable member is trying to extract every ounce of political advantage he can extract out of this situation.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Alexandra to order. He has asked his question, and I hope he does not continue in that vein.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: In doing so he is not promoting the cause of the people he is supposed to be representing in this House on this question. If the honourable member thinks that he is, he is wrong. If I happened to be one of the prawn fishermen involved, or any one of the executive involved in presenting the case, I think I would muzzle the honourable member. He does himself no credit at all.

The first thing he was mistaken about was when he said that the Premier had taken over from the Minister involved. That is not true. The honourable member knows as well as I do that the fishermen sought to see the Premier. Is that correct or is it not?

Mr. Chapman: Because they couldn't get any satisfaction out of the Minister.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am asking the honourable member whether it is correct or not. Did the fishermen themselves seek to see the Premier?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister has asked a question of the member for Alexandra. It had been my intention, if the honourable member for Alexandra interjected again, to warn him, but on this occasion I will not, because the Minister was tempting the member for Alexandra.

Mr. Chapman: In all fairness, I certainly, on that occasion—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not think he deserves a second go. The honourable member admits that the fishermen sought the conference with the Premier, so how on earth can he stand in this place and say that the Premier took over from the Minister! What is more, the Premier insisted (and quite properly) that the Minister be present when he met the fishermen. The honourable member has referred to Mrs. Chatterton.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It is disgusting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is, but apart from it being disgusting, some of the things said in this House last night honourable members opposite would not dare say outside the House: they would not have the intestinal fortitude or the decency.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Or the bank account.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: No decency at all.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Nor the bank account, as the Minister of Mines and Energy said. I point out to

honourable members that Mrs. Chatterton was there in her own right as an officer of the Premier. If she was at the conference last night (and I do not know whether or not she was there) she would have been there in her own right, no doubt at the behest of the Premier. I do not think that she would push herself into the conference unless the Premier asked her to be present.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Ha, Ha!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member can cast reflections if he wants. So far as the discussions were concerned, I have not had time since the meeting took place to discuss the matter with the Premier or the Minister to find out what took place at that meeting, but so far as I am aware the discussions that took place were to be treated as confidential.

I do not want the honourable member to think that I am depriving him of information: I have not got that information. I understand the discussions were to be treated as confidential so that the fishermen and their organisation could go back to their members with any propositions that may have been made (whatever they may be) and put them to their members first hand, rather than the members getting that information through the press. That is the situation as I understand it. That is all I have to say, other than to repeat that, if the honourable member wants the fishermen's representations put to the Government and considered in a rational and reasonable way, he should stop attempting to play politics and take the fire out of the situation so that we can get down to sensible discussion and see whether some conclusion that is acceptable to both parties can be reached.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. OLSON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare tell the House what the likely consequences will be for unemployed persons of Federal Budget decisions on the payment of unemployment benefits? I understand that the Budget decisions effectively mean that, for the majority of unemployed beneficiaries (those without dependants), there will be one adjustment a year, instead of the two adjustments that have applied previously.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The short answer to the honourable member's question is that the results of those decisions are likely to be appalling for those people who are unfortunate enough to be unemployed and in that position. Unemployment benefit beneficiaries, who are already living below the poverty line (no-one has contested that in the House, to my knowledge, up to this time), are being forced to make a major contribution to reducing the Fraser Government's deficit. By removing the possibility of having unemployment benefits adjusted regularly to compensate for rises in the C.P.I., something not denied to those working, the Federal Government has made the unemployed second-class citizens by saying that they are not entitled to the same consideration, because they are not fortunate enough to have a job, presumably. That is the only reason one can assume. Jobless people without dependants make up 75 per cent of Australia's unemployed. The Budget ruling means that the benefit for those under 18 will remain at \$36 a week until the Fraser Government relents or backs down once again (as it has already done on other matters) under the weight of the concern and conscience of the Australian people.

Mr. Wotton: Why don't you comment!

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Hanson is out of order. I am sorry; I made an error. It was the honourable member for Murray who interjected. I hope he does not interject again.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The \$36 a week paid to single unemployed people under the age of 18 years has applied since 1975. By any calculation, that means that those people are already \$30 below the poverty line. The unemployment benefit for a single person over 18 years will remain at \$51.45 a week, according to the Budget, and this means that by the end of November people in this category are expected to be more than \$15 a week below the poverty line.

The new rate set for a married couple with two children is \$103.70, to apply from 1 November. On that date, the increase that will apply will mean that they will be \$12.30 under the poverty line. The poverty line is that line based on the requirements of income necessary for the basic commodities of food and shelter, not luxuries. I notice honourable members opposite are mostly silent about these important figures.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are you encouraging interjections?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: It has been my understanding in this House that the form and mode of address used by speakers on their feet is that which is applied by the Speaker and that, provided the Chair is addressed, the style adopted by the member is his affair and that of no-one else, and I cannot understand why members opposite—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister has had a wide chance to answer his question, and I hope he will stick to the question.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suggest that the expressions I am hearing from the Opposition benches are made because at least some members opposite have consciences in this matter, and I trust they will exercise them and use whatever influence they may have to see whether another mini mini Budget can be organised in relation to the payments now proposed for the unemployed.

POLITICS IN SCHOOLS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Education, if I can get him away from his departmental tasks.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the honourable member will ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister say whether it is proposed to encourage the teaching of the subject of government and politics in secondary schools, as is done already in Victoria and Western Australia? I am prompted to ask the question for two reasons: first, it is in line with the education policy of the Australian Democrats, the Party which I have the honour to represent in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting. I hope he will ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir. The second reason why I ask the question is that it is my own conviction that this subject should be taught. I realise that there are disadvantages or arguments against it, in that there is always the fear of Party politics, the Party politics of the instructor, intruding. On the other hand, the advantages are, I suggest, so great—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is the second occasion on which the honourable member has commented. If he continues to comment, I shall withdraw his leave.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am bewildered, Sir, if I may take a point of order—

Mr. Wells: You always are. What's different about that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am bewildered, Sir, as to what you

mean by "commenting". I thought I was giving facts in explanation of my question, but you call it a comment. If you could possibly define for me what you mean by "comment", I shall try to comply.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member knows that the Chair decides, and he knows what action to take if he disagrees with the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should not like to have to test you out on this, Sir. Let me go on, and I hope I will be all right. There is—and I am sure all members will support me in this—widespread ignorance in the community of the way in which government—legislative, executive, and judicial—works. Obviously, the best way of making up the gap in the knowledge of most people—and most people are pretty embarrassed about it—is to teach the subject in the schools.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I should like to thank the honourable member for the question, because it is a concern that I share with him. However, I would not anticipate that there would be radical departures in methodology from what happens at present in schools or what we are working towards, and that is to use the social science course as a means whereby an introduction to representative institutions generally and community decision-making can take place. I would see the social science approach as being the important way to go about this, because it means that political institutions generally are not introduced in a vacuum or from a Party-political viewpoint, but they are seen within the general broad context of decision-making.

That is what happens. Perhaps it does not happen to a sufficient extent in high schools. One of the problems is that there are demands on all sides for courses in this, that, and the other thing. Whilst I share the honourable member's concern as to this being a priority area in our schools, I think it is very much a professional decision, and it must be to a certain extent a school-by-school decision, depending on how the school community views the problem.

I share the honourable member's concern in this matter, and I will extend his remarks to my officers. I will obtain an up-to-date report on how we are going, particularly with the new Curriculum Directorate, which is concerned with servicing schools at this point. I remind the honourable member that he and I, at the invitation of schools, from time to time indulged in some educating of our own (I hope to some effect) so often that I hope that one might be forgiven for dubbing us as the "Robin and Don Show".

COLLEGIUM OF THE ARTS

Mr. BANNON: Has the Minister of Education examined the proposition, in the Anderson Committee Report on Post-Secondary Education, for a collegium of the arts and, if he has, will he inform the House of his views on it? In the section devoted to education in the arts at the post-secondary level, the Anderson Committee drew attention to a proposition it had received and a paper on the proposition for a collegium of the arts that would draw together the various institutions which provide courses and training in the performing arts, in particular, and which aid them in presenting their course more flexibly and across the nature of the various arts areas. As this radical proposition has been widely published and is under discussion at present, I seek the Minister's views on it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: From memory, three propositions, in effect, have been brought forward in relation to this matter. There was, first, an approach made to me some time ago, which was my first knowledge of the

discussion of this proposition. There was then the discussion paper, which was prepared and circulated by Elizabeth Silsbury on the matter, and, finally, the appropriate chapter of the Anderson Committee Report that was based in part on those earlier approaches. I am concerned to examine this matter closely.

It is the Government's decision that there should be no final decision on the matter until this Chamber and the Legislative Council have had a chance to process and do what they will with the Bill I will shortly be introducing on the setting up of a tertiary education committee in South Australia, and that authority would be competent to proffer advice to me on the matter. In the meantime, however, it is important that the idea not lose momentum. What I am considering doing is setting up a small Ministerial advisory committee to take the various approaches that have already been made and refine them, and prepare further material that would be available to the tertiary education authority, or whatever we chose to call it.

I stress that what is being considered is not a new institution (we have plenty of them) but a mechanism that will enable proper rationalisation of what is already offered and what might conceivably be offered in the future as between the various institutions, so that we can get the very best from the expertise already located at the two universities, the colleges of further education, the Further Education Department, or whatever. The present intention is that we should set up a committee to have the carriage of this matter until such time as a tertiary co-ordinating authority is established in this State.

PORNOGRAPHY

Mrs. ADAMSON: In view of the recently published findings of British psychiatrists, Professor Eysenck and Dr. Nias, that there is a direct link between media violence and crimes of violence, can the Deputy Premier say whether the Government will support action to require the Classification of Publications Board to prohibit the distribution of material that depicts sexual violence? The ready availability of pornography, including hard-core bondage material, has coincided with the rapid rise in the incidence of rape and sexual crimes in South Australia. The authors of the book *Sex, Violence and the Media* (Professor Eysenck and Dr. Nias) are reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 3 September as follows:

The authors believe most pornographic material is undesirable because it is based on a contempt for women, and they suggest the sexual activities most frequently displayed are likely to lead to exploitation and violence, and should be banned.

The Government has it in its power to prohibit this material and thereby decrease what has been scientifically proved to be one of the causes of crime involving sexual violence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Premier has given notice that he intends tomorrow to introduce three measures dealing with the subject raised by the honourable member. I can assure the honourable member that those measures will cover the aspects about which she has expressed concern this afternoon, because I know sadism and masochism are specifically mentioned.

SOCIAL WELFARE CHEQUES

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Community Welfare make urgent representations to the Federal Minister for Social Security (Senator Guilfoyle) that she disregard any advice from the Department of Social

Security that unemployment cheques be sent to the unemployed in green-edged envelopes? I read in the press today that the Government was considering sending the cheques in green-edged envelopes in an effort to crack down on dole bludgers. The article states:

The move is designed to stop dole cheats using false addresses. But the Opposition spokesman on social security, Senator Grimes, said today the scheme would increase the likelihood of cheques being stolen. The green-edged envelopes would let everyone know who was receiving the dole.

Senator Grimes said the scheme also would be a threat to the civil rights of people receiving benefits. The Government is believed to have instructed the Postal Commission not to redirect the green-edged letters to any address other than that originally stamped on the envelope.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I saw the report to which the honourable member refers. Having been a postman, I have followed such matters over the years. It was my understanding that the Department of Social Security made arrangements for its cheques for the aged, etc., to be placed in less prominent envelopes so that there was less likelihood of their being stolen after being placed in letter-boxes. It seems to me that the reported move would be a step backwards, apart from any humanitarian considerations such as I believe are also implicit in such a scheme where envelopes are so easily identifiable. I will be pleased to take up the matter with the Federal Minister. I think the article said that this was only a suggestion that was being considered, and it will not necessarily be implemented. However, I will take up the matter with the Federal Minister.

At 3.3 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

URANIUM

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

That this House believes it is safe to mine and treat uranium in South Australia, rescinds its decision taken on 30 March 1977, and urges the Government to proceed with plans for the development and treatment of the State's uranium resources as soon as possible.

On 30 March 1977, this House passed the following motion:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country and, unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

At that time, in common with many other people in the community, the Opposition was awaiting the release of the second report by Mr. Justice Fox, and the outcome of the Federal Government's negotiations with the International Atomic Energy Commission on proper safeguards.

On the previous day, the Federal Leader of the Labor Party at that time, Mr. E. G. Whitlam, had announced his support for the use of uranium with certain qualifications which were being considered by the Federal Government. The Federal Government, through the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr. Anthony, had also given qualified support for uranium mining, the qualification being that there were legitimate concerns regarding safety which needed to be answered before final approval was given.

Of course, the whole attitude of the South Australian

Government up until 30 March 1977 was one of unqualified enthusiasm for the mining and treatment of uranium. On 16 October 1972 the Premier announced that the South Australian Government had put a submission to the Commonwealth aimed at obtaining a uranium enrichment plant. He set out the advantages for South Australia quite clearly: a decentralised region, but with access to a labour force; large quantities of seawater; and natural gas. Overseas interests had been told, he said, they would achieve significant economies in establishing a plant in South Australia.

October 1973, 12 months later, saw a value of \$200 000 000 placed on the project and confirmation that studies into the possible establishment of the plant had been going on for some time. May 1974 saw a joint announcement of a feasibility study into the establishment of a major uranium enrichment plant in the northern Spencer Gulf region. The value then was estimated to be as high as \$2 000 000 000. Research and investigation went on, with the support of the Prime Minister of the day, Mr. Whitlam, and the present Minister of Education. Mr. Connor was awfully keen on letting us have the Redcliff petro-chemical plant as well as the uranium enrichment plant, we were told by the present Minister of Education.

On the hustings in June 1975 the Premier said that it was inevitable that Australia would have to provide enriched uranium to Japan, and in July 1976 he released the two-year feasibility study for the Redcliff plant, while the present Minister of Mines and Energy was travelling overseas. The Premier received general approbation for this. The *Australian* said the following about the Premier's move:

Mr. Dunstan is a very enterprising Premier. His move to send his Mines and Energy Minister overseas to seek finance for a proposed \$1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment plant at Redcliff, near Port Augusta, reflects the panache with which the South Australian leader approaches the job of helping his State get on in the world.

Far from seeking to keep the uranium in the ground, he wants not only to get it out but also to have it transported to his State and there processed to make it more profitable for Australia when exported. Nor is Mr. Dunstan fencing around this plan with needless ifs and buts, although, like the Federal Government, he says that he will pay due regard to the Ranger uranium inquiry report when it is presented.

He sees no environmental danger to South Australia from the enrichment process ("less danger than from a normal chemical plant," he says) and has no qualms about the morality of using uranium as a world energy fuel (he told a recent A.L.P. conference that with coal running out and solar energy not a proposition nuclear power was the world's only hope as a future energy source).

Western Australia and Queensland are the other two States in the running for an enrichment plant, and Mr. Dunstan is well aware of this. So his move in going out and trying to get overseas finance for a South Australian plant has put his State ahead of its rivals in the race. Full marks to Mr. Dunstan.

There was just one warning signal on the horizon, by way of a footnote to the story, as follows:

The State Secretary of the A.R.U., Mr. W. Marshall, said his union was firmly opposed to uranium enrichment and would refuse to handle materials for any plant in South Australia.

A first note of warning, but a significant one. The features and reports built up steadily at about this time, but the activities of the left wing, spearheaded by the Attorney-General, began to show through and resulted in a slightly less positive attitude on the part of the Premier.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: What was the Liberal Party doing at that time?

Mr. TONKIN: Nevertheless, he said:

It would be possible for us to establish, and it is safe for us to do so, a uranium enrichment plant here.

In answer to the honourable member's interjection, I point out that in late July 1976 the Opposition stated in this House its view that detailed inquiries should be held into all possible environmental health, safety, and other effects of uranium processing and I said at that time that South Australia was poised on the brink of the nuclear age, and no-one was quite sure whether it was safe to move in. The Government was urged to take the people fully into its confidence and to make the second interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee widely available to the public, and this it finally did.

In October 1976 that celebrated columnist, Mr. Peter Ward, who was once associated with the Premier, made the following comment:

Whenever it comes out, the Ranger uranium report is going to cause the Dunstan Government, the South Australian A.L.P. and Don Dunstan himself considerable trouble. The Dunstan Government is locked into a policy that requires major industrial development in the Mid North of the State adjacent to what is known as the "iron triangle", that is, the three industrial cities of Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie . . . But it is the \$1 400 000 000 uranium enrichment deal that Dunstan would now most like to see established in the area to strengthen the State's economy overall. The problem is that both projects have been opposed within the State A.L.P. on environmental grounds, and in respect of uranium enrichment, the issue is regarded by senior Party members as "tense, sensitive and potentially explosive".

At the moment, Premier Dunstan says that the State's policy will be determined by the Ranger inquiry report. He is bound by a resolution passed at the last State A.L.P. convention in which "all levels of the A.L.P." oppose the "mining, treatment and export of uranium and its by-products" until an independent public inquiry can show that waste disposal and transport of material can be "clearly established and guaranteed" to be safe. In this, the Ranger report may give him the out.

He is on record as saying that environmentally a uranium enrichment plant would cause South Australia less trouble than a small Adelaide chemical works run by I.C.I. and tends to regard hard-line environmentalists as irrational "doom watchers".

In the meantime, the excellent work that had been conducted by the South Australian Mines and Energy Department and the Uranium Enrichment Committee that had been set up by the Government was continuing. The Minister of Mines and Energy paid a tribute to that work when he returned from overseas. A report stated:

When Mr. Hudson returned from his six-country European tour in July he said all six countries visited had expressed interest in Australia's uranium. At that time, Mr. Hudson had said an enrichment plant was not inevitable. The Ranger inquiry had to be looked at, and effective support had to come from the Federal Government. He said then the people with whom he had discussed the enrichment plant had been impressed by the preparation by the South Australian Government. This research had gone far beyond that of any other State.

Great emphasis has been placed on those statements of the Premier and the Minister of Mines and Energy that regard would be given to the report of the Ranger inquiry and that a decision would be made that would depend on that report. The first Ranger report was released in late October 1976 and it immediately precipitated problems

from the State Government. A report by Rex Jory in the *News* of 29 October of that year stated:

The Ranger inquiry findings will create a deep division in the South Australian Cabinet. The report has cleared the way for the State Government to press ahead cautiously with plans to attract a uranium enrichment plant to South Australia.

The report outlines the split between the Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister of Education on the one hand, and the Attorney-General and the Chief Secretary on the other hand. It states clearly that the South Australian Cabinet is divided on the establishment of an enrichment plant in South Australia. Clearly, the agreement to take the Ranger report as a guide was made only on the assumption that the report would come down against the mining and enrichment of uranium. Obviously, when it did not, the situation changed considerably and the whole Party was placed under pressure. Understandably, the Government at that time kept a low public profile, but that is not to say that the debate did not continue with some heat within the Labor Party.

In February 1977, just one month before the motion was passed, Western Mining Corporation announced that the rich copper deposit at Roxby Downs also contained uranium in valuable quantities. This was a most significant find since it promised to provide the means for making viable the future of mining at Roxby Downs far sooner than would otherwise have been the case if it was just a question of mining copper.

That was the situation just before 30 March 1977; there was qualified enthusiasm and approval by the Federal Government, the Federal Opposition, and the State Government (which had taken active measures to prepare for mining and enrichment of uranium and whose officers have been most successful in keeping South Australia in the front running for the establishment of such a plant); and qualified support by the State Opposition.

Naturally, reservations existed. Everyone seemed to be awaiting the second Ranger report and the negotiations being conducted by the Federal Government regarding safeguards. I can certainly speak for the Opposition and say that that was entirely our position. We had qualified support for the mining and enrichment of uranium but we insisted on waiting to hear what the second report of the Ranger Commission had to say and what was the outcome of the Federal Government's negotiations regarding safeguards.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, the second Ranger report was on the specific—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): Order!

Mr. TONKIN: In that climate, on 30 March 1977, the Government introduced the motion that I have already read. This was the climate of qualified approval on the part of all parties until the Government introduced its motion into the House. The motion was introduced because the Premier said that he had given an undertaking in the House that there would be a debate after the first report of the Ranger Commission. In other words, he said (and I can recall in the debate at the time that the Deputy Leader made specific reference to this point) that he had introduced the motion for the purpose of discussion. As far as the Opposition and, I think, everyone listening to that motion when it came into the House was concerned the key words of it were "not yet" in relation to "not yet been demonstrated".

Everyone had already indicated that this matter had not yet been demonstrated to their satisfaction. It did not matter whether it was the Federal Government, the Federal Opposition, the State Government or the State Opposition; everyone had indicated that they were not yet

convinced. That was the most appropriate wording at that stage. Whilst we were awaiting further developments, the further report and the reports from the Federal Government, it would have been totally irresponsible, in the absence of those important details, not to agree with such a motion. The motion was passed with an additional amendment supporting research into alternative energy sources.

The events on that day prove that there were far deeper reasons than those that were revealed in the debate by the Premier and other speakers. On that day, 30 March 1977, the following report appeared in the *News*:

A hard-line policy on the mining, treatment and export of uranium has been adopted by the State Parliamentary Labor Party. The policy approved by Cabinet on Monday, demands a ban on the mining, treatment and export of uranium. The tough-line policy is seen as a rebuff to the Mines and Energy Minister, Mr. Hudson, a strong advocate for an enrichment plant in South Australia.

Mr. Hudson last year made a world tour trying to attract investment in the multi-million dollar project. The new policy would not enhance South Australia's hopes of attracting a uranium enrichment plant to the State. The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, is understood to have supported the new policy—which ensured its acceptance. The strongest Cabinet advocates for a "leave-it-in-the-ground" policy were the Attorney General, Mr. Duncan, and the Environment Minister, Mr. Simmons.

Mr. Duncan, particularly, has been an outspoken critic of uranium mining in Australia. If the policy is approved by Labor Caucus—a step which appears to be nothing more than a formality—South Australia will have the most uncompromising policy on uranium of any State. The hard-line policy is in conflict with the "limited export" uranium policy outlined by the Federal Labor Leader, Mr. Whitlam, last night.

That report appeared on the same day that the motion was introduced on dubious grounds and passed in his House.

The Premier indicated on television that he doubted whether it would ever be possible to find satisfactory safeguards. It became apparent that the motion was not intended to bring the matter forward for discussion but that it was the result of a hard-line decision which was, virtually, to be a permanent decision of this House.

The expected results of that about-face were set down by many concerned people. They were, that exploration would cease, that all the work and expense in preparing for the enrichment plant at Redcliff would go down the drain, that we would lose our advantages over other States, and that we would leave the Iron Triangle, once again, without any firm prospects for the future. All of these matters heightened concern about the question "Why was this action taken?"—not "Why" in terms of the motion, because there is a satisfactory answer to that, if it is simply interpreted as a motion for further discussion while we are waiting on further information. That was our position at the time. The question is "Why adopt a virtually permanent 'leave-it-in-the-ground' policy?" That query is made with grave concern. There is no doubt in my mind, or in the minds of members on this side of the House (or, I believe, in the mind of members of the public), that that hard-line decision was the fundamental intention of the motion. That it was not a realistic or rational decision is evidenced by the timing of the motion. In the context in which it was really introduced, its true purpose was totally inept and quite irrational.

It came hard on the heels of Mr. Whitlam's qualified support for uranium export. It came before the second Fox report, and before the matter could be discussed at an A.L.P. conference. It came before the results of the

Federal Government's negotiations with the International Atomic Energy Commission on Safeguards could be made known. Finally, it came in the face of the Government's recognition that a project of this nature was vital for South Australia's continued prosperity.

Obviously, such an irrational, hard-line approach could only be the result of an ideological decision. Ideological decisions do not have to be rational; quite obviously, this decision was not. The Opposition believed, when it was dealing with the motion, that it was dealing with a rational and responsible Government prepared to consider and adapt its attitude when further information became available. Obviously it was not; it was dealing with an ideological commitment, not with reason. That, in my view, is a major reason for rescinding the motion that was passed on 30 March 1977. In other words, the passage of that motion was not based on reason; it was passed and supported by the Opposition on what might be termed "false pretences". I believe that it did not reflect the long-term view of the Opposition in any way.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you say so at the time?

Mr. TONKIN: I can see that the honourable member for Mitcham has not really been following what I have been saying. There are other grounds for rescinding the motion, and they are based on subsequent developments that have transpired since that time. Let me briefly outline them. The Fraser Government respected the action of the Whitlam Government is setting up the environmental study to establish the safeguards for mining uranium in the Ranger leases in the Northern Territory. That study became known as the Fox Commission.

When the first Fox report was presented to the Government, it was announced that an adequate period of time would be allowed for public debate as well as an opportunity for a full Parliamentary debate before the report was adopted. The Fraser Government undertook to respect the safeguards recommended in the first Fox report, which it has done. When the second (and this is after this motion was passed through the House) Fox report was presented it was made available to the Parliament and the public for proper scrutiny and comment.

In addition to the recommended safeguards of the Fox Commission, the Federal Government imposed much more stringent requirements of its own. Those safeguards meet the requirements of the non-proliferation treaty (the Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons). The safeguards meet the needs of the International Atomic Energy Agency. The Federal Government has taken the advice of its expert advisers on these matters. It has appointed Mr. Justice Fox to a position of roving ambassador to keep the Government informed on the latest advances in technology and legal obligations and to review the whole question of safeguards on a continuing basis. It has entered into wide-ranging discussions with the United States and the European Economic Community, and it has fought two successful elections since announcing publicly its attitude towards the mining and sale of Australian uranium. In my view, there can be no question at all about the adequacy of the safeguards which are currently known and which currently apply.

These are all good reasons for rescinding the motion, if it is assessed on reasonable grounds. But, in spite of this, the South Australian Government continues to hold to its hard-line, irrational, ideological attitude on the matter. I suspect that no matter what developments, agreements, safeguards or reassurances might become available in the future, or are available now, the Government is not going to change its mind, because it is an ideological stance which it has adopted. The Government's attitude reflects

double standards, and that is a matter for particular concern—not only double standards, but double dealing in the matter.

This has already been the subject of debate in this House, nearly 12 months ago. The Premier campaigned Federally in the last election on the basis of the motion passed on 30 March 1977 and was totally discredited. While he was advocating the "leave-it-in-the-ground" attitude for the A.L.P., his Government was allowing further exploration, was keeping up with uranium enrichment technology, and was holding discussions with overseas firms concerned with uranium enrichment. His Government's Uranium Enrichment Committee continued with its investigations, in spite of the fact that the Government tried to suppress its third interim report, and the Mines Department kept up to date with mining developments, as it properly and rationally should have done, but not for a Government which espoused a total "leave-it-in-the-ground" policy.

The only thing which distinguished the South Australian Government from any other Government actively working to promote and develop uranium mining and enrichment in its State was the public stance widely advertised by the Premier on television (in commercials which it withdrew fairly rapidly) of total opposition to uranium mining and enrichment in South Australia. No wonder such hypocrisy showed through so clearly. It was typical of the hypocritical attitude adopted by this Government on so many issues of public concern.

The Premier now shows some sign of modifying his attitude. Recently, I think in Canberra, he said that he could possibly change his mind about uranium. I suspect that he is preparing the ground for another about-face. He has said that it is safe to mine and enrich uranium and that there is no environmental problem. He still pins his entire explanation on its being safe to supply uranium to a customer country. His objections may well have been valid when the original motion was introduced into and passed through this House, but in the light of subsequent developments it is no longer reasonable or rational to hold this view. Those subsequent developments, particularly those relating to safeguards, have been outlined.

South Australian's decision in this matter must be made with every care. We cannot in any way allow the advantages of the mining and enrichment of uranium and the benefits it would bring to South Australia to influence us in making our decision as to whether or not it is safe to mine and enrich uranium in this State. We cannot ignore these factors in the general overall considerations of the welfare of South Australia, but we cannot allow that to be the only consideration. I put it on record that the Opposition would never at any time agree to the mining and enrichment of uranium simply for commercial and financial considerations. I believe that the responsible and reasonable view is that we should insist on the best possible safeguards. That means the best available statistics, and I believe that those safeguards which have now been negotiated by the Federal Government and which have been strengthened by the Opposition's own requirements for mining and enrichment of uranium in this State, which I believe could be strengthened by the Government's reasonable and rational requirements, make it possible and safe for uranium to be mined and enriched.

We still have, I suspect, a small advantage over the other States. It will only be small and a decision will have to be taken soon. It is important for the State that, if we decide that it is safe, we get on with the job. South Australia has large and valuable deposits of uranium, as well as other minerals.

I have a table which sets out the names of the deposits, their location, the approximate tonnage, the grade of ore, the approximate dimensions and the worth of such deposits. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

URANIUM IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

There are three major and six minor deposits announced as at December, 1977.

Name of Deposit	Approximate Tonnage	Grade
Lake Namba	Contained oxide	
Goulds Dam	1 400 tonnes U ₃ O ₈	at 0.13 p.c.
Curnamona		
Billeroo		
Yarramba	Smaller than East Kalkaroo	
Beefstead		
Honeymoon	2 000 tonnes	
East Kalkaroo	1 000 tonnes	0.15 p.c.
Beverley	13 500 tonnes	
Gunsight		
Approximate Total 20 000 tonnes		at 80 p.c. recovery

U₃O₈ worth \$1 700 000 000.

APPROXIMATE FIGURES

Roxby Downs	More than 1 500 metres long 400 metres wide 70 000 000 tonnes
Approx grade	1.2 per cent Cu 0.03 per cent U ₃ O ₈ = 0.66 lb
Gross	
Copper worth	\$15.84/tonne = \$1 108 000 000
Uranium worth	\$26.40/tonne = \$1 837 000 000
Total value per tonne	\$42.24/tonne = \$2 945 000 000
Gross metal value	\$2 945 000 000

Recovered metal gross value approximately 90 per cent recovery rate per annum at production rate.

70 000 000 tonnes over 15 years—approximately 4 500 000 tonnes per annum = \$171 000 000 gross metal production per annum.

Mr. TONKIN: The table shows quite clearly that there is an approximate total of deposits of some 20 000 tonnes of uranium oxide, worth, at 80 per cent recovery, about \$1 700 000 000. Roxby Downs, which is still in the process of being proved and which looks to be one of the biggest areas of mineralisation anywhere in the world, at present is thought to have copper, uranium and other minerals present.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: But it is not one of the biggest areas of mineralisation in the world generally; it is only one of the biggest areas of copper.

Mr. TONKIN: I think the Attorney-General is speaking about something of which he is not entirely sure. It is about 1 500 metres long and 400 metres wide, and it has 70 000 000 tonnes of copper of an approximate grade of 1.2 per cent. Adding together the copper worth and uranium worth of Roxby Downs, we get a figure of \$2 945 000 000 worth of minerals. That represents, at a rate of 70 000 000 tonnes over 15 years, approximately 4 500 000 tonnes per annum—\$171 000 000 worth of gross metal production a year, and that is an enormous advantage for South Australia.

The Redcliff uranium enrichment plant is a potential source of great employment. The known ready-to-mine uranium deposits in South Australia could be developed quickly and provide immediate employment for a large work force. The establishment of a uranium enrichment plant would provide contract work worth more than

\$100 000 000 to Australian industries.

Using the Government's own figures, the build up of new employment possibilities could conservatively amount to 20 000. Overall direct employment of 20 000 will support about another 80 000. But the general impact on Australian industry, transportation and community services could well amount to employment benefits for up to 500 000 people having gainful income or being dependent on the industry in some way for their living. South Australia's share of those benefits would be considerable.

Roxby Downs has been likened to Mount Isa, and it is the most significant decentralising project available in Australia today. Mount Isa supports a population on site of some 30 000 people. There is no reason why Roxby Downs could not do the same. We have an employment problem in this State: here is an opportunity to help solve that problem. We have the highest rate of unemployment—as the member for Davenport has pointed out, more is the pity.

Mount Isa mines provides direct work for 7 000 people. It is estimated that over 80 000 people in Queensland derive their living in some form from the operation at Mount Isa. Of course, the matter of mineral royalties to South Australia is considerable, too. But uranium mining is an essential ingredient in the whole project if it is to be economically viable, as has been shown quite clearly.

The two essential products of these and other projects are jobs and income generated for the State. I have pointed out many times in this House that, with the mineral royalties that are being presently received by Queensland and Western Australia (something like \$50 000 000 a year each compared with ours of something over \$2 000 000 a year), the burden on the taxpayers of those States is far less than is the burden on the taxpayers of South Australia.

We can open up the options available to the Government again without any question of increasing taxation on individuals. The entire business community will expand and lift, given the stimulus the Government would be able to provide, and we could all share in South Australia's prosperity again. I repeat: because I have emphasised the benefits to come to South Australia, it must not in any way be interpreted that this is the Opposition's only reason for supporting and advocating the mining and treatment of uranium in South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: That is how it looks to me, anyway.

Mr. Tonkin: That is how it would look to any mean-minded person who had strong convictions on the opposite view. We believe that the safeguards which exist are adequate. We believe it is safe to mine and enrich uranium in this State; we believe therefore that, the sooner we rescind the motion passed on 30 March 1977, adopt a sensible attitude to uranium, and get on with the job of developing South Australia, the better it will be for South Australians.

I urge members opposite to put aside their Party commitments, accept the safeguards that are now accepted as being totally satisfactory by many authorities, not only in Australia but throughout the world, and let South Australia go forward again. I urge all members to support South Australia by supporting this motion.

Mr. Millhouse (Mitcham): I oppose this motion as strongly as I possibly can oppose any motion. I do so for two reasons: first, out of my own conviction, and secondly, because my opposition to this motion is right in line with the policy of my Party, the Australian Democrats, which is against the mining and export of uranium until the problems inherent in so doing are solved. It was only last

week, knowing that the Leader of the Opposition intended to move this motion in the House, that the State Council of the Australian Democrats passed the following motion:

That the State Council of the Australian Democrats notes with displeasure the proposed motion, concerning uranium mining, to be put by the Leader of the Opposition to the House of Assembly, and strongly opposes any move to rescind the decision of the House taken on 30 March 1977.

There is a footnote to say:

This motion is in accordance with our approved national policy on uranium.

As I had mentioned, this is absolutely in line with my own conviction on this. The motion itself is not even to the point. Let us look and see again what the terms of the motion on 30 March 1977 were, when the Premier introduced them:

That this House believes that it has not yet been demonstrated to its satisfaction that it is safe to provide uranium to a customer country—

I ask members of the Liberal Party to note the phrase "to provide uranium to a customer country"—

and unless and until it is so demonstrated, no mining or treatment of uranium should occur in South Australia.

The crux of that motion was "safe to provide uranium to a customer country"—not the mining and milling of uranium. It is extraordinary, in the light of what the Leader of the Opposition has just said, that when that motion was introduced into this House his first words in the debate on it were, "It is difficult to find fault with this motion." He and all his colleagues supported that motion on the day it was moved.

Mr. Chapman: Let's rake it up, pack it up, and get some money.

Mr. Millhouse: I hope *Hansard* caught that interjection, because, consciously or unconsciously, the member for Alexandra is summing up the whole case of the Liberal Party for the mining of uranium, whatever the Leader of the Opposition might have said about my being mean-minded, and so on, when I interjected to that effect. The member for Alexandra has just said, "Come on, let's get on with raking up a bit of money by mining uranium." Is that what the honourable member said?

Mr. Chapman: That's close enough.

Mr. Millhouse: There is the natural Leader of the Liberal Party saying, quite naturally, what is in fact the outlook of all members of the Liberal Party on this matter; in other words, it is sheer greed. They are prepared, for a short-term advantage to this State and to this country (and no-one can deny that there would be a short-term advantage to this country), to take enormous long-term risks—and I am grateful on this occasion to the member for Alexandra for spouting out the truth by way of that interjection. It proves my point.

But let me get back to the matter I have raised, that the motion passed in this House on 30 March had as its crux the safety of supply to a customer country. What do we find in the motion before the House today? It does not deal with that question. It says:

That this House believes it is safe to mine and treat uranium in South Australia—

and therefore the motion should be rescinded. There are very few people, and I am not one of them, who nowadays suggest, nor have I ever suggested, that the actual mining and milling of uranium and treating of it are dangerous. Certainly, the safeguards for that process are pretty good. There is no worry about that, but that is not the point at all.

There are three problems regarding uranium mining, and not one of them has been solved. There has been no discernible progress on these three matters since 30 March

1977. They are: the problem of the disposal of waste, the question of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, and the question of terrorism. I do not want to go over all the material that has been put before Parliament and that has been debated in the community on this matter, but let me deal with some of it.

Only yesterday, I received a news release from the British High Commission headed, "Nuclear power leads in cheaper electricity", and it is a quote from the annual report of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority. In part, it quotes the Chairman, Sir John Hill, and he admits, as late as 15 September, which is the date of the news release, that the problem of the disposal of waste has not been solved. The news release quotes Sir John as saying:

I have no doubt that the next 25 years will see nuclear power as the dominant form of electricity generation in this country—

he has said it has gone rather more slowly in the last 20 years than they had expected—

that fast reactors will be introduced on a commercial scale—

and note the next phrase—

and that the waste question will be resolved.

He does not say that it has been resolved, but that it will be resolved.

Mr. Max Brown: He doesn't say how it will be resolved.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Certainly not, but it has not yet been resolved, and proponents of the use of nuclear power have been saying, ever since I became interested in this debate and long before that, that the disposal of waste will be solved, or sometimes they say, "It has been solved, you know. We are going to put it in glass and bury it in salt mines." That has not been tested, and here we have one of the leading proponents of the use of nuclear power admitting within the last few weeks that the question of the disposal of waste has not been solved. If the Leader of the Opposition believes that it has, I pity him now more than I did previously.

What about the question of proliferation? The Leader talked about safeguards and said that the question had been solved and that all the safeguards Australia was going to impose on the export of uranium were good and effective. I do not believe that, and fortuitously I have been given an extract from the *Sydney Morning Herald* of as late as yesterday. This is a column written by Sir Mark Oliphant, a former Governor of South Australia. He does not believe that this question has been solved and that the safeguards are any good. Let the Leader, who has just brought forth what he has, listen to this, written by Sir Mark Oliphant in yesterday's *Sydney Morning Herald*. He is talking about the recent conference in Vienna of the International Atomic Energy Agency. I will not read it all, because I know the Liberals want to get on with some of their other business, but the report states:

Subject to Congressional approval, it was proposed to spend \$5 000 000 on the exchange of technical experts, and to provide technical training in nuclear power technology to those nations which adhered to the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty. At the same time, he warned that the unchecked growth of nuclear power stations could threaten world security.

"He" is Mr. Myers, the American Under-Secretary for Energy. Sir Mark goes on:

This is a further example of the fact that awareness of the dangers of misuse of nuclear energy in warfare does not deter the United States—

and, I may add, although it is going from the sublime to the ridiculous, I suppose, the Leader of the Opposition in this State—

from providing the knowledge which will enable other countries to become nuclear powers, if they wish.

Now comes the sentence I quote to the honourable gentleman:

It is a situation analogous with Australia's readiness to sell uranium, subject to the same unreal and unenforceable restrictions.

Here is the Leader of the Opposition in this place saying that these safeguards are good, and lauding his own colleagues in Canberra for that. Personally, I doubt very much whether they are worth anything, and that is not my opinion alone. As that extract shows, it is the opinion of one to whom I believe I have heard the Leader pay deference in the past, Sir Mark Oliphant. Let him or his Deputy, who is going to speak after me, answer that if he can.

The other problem which remains absolutely unsolved is the question of terrorism, the danger of this substance falling into the hands of terrorists and being used to blackmail a community, a country, or perhaps the whole world. Of course, it could be said that there are plenty of weapons which terrorists can use already, so what if there is another one? Those who are attracted to that argument can use it if they wish, but nuclear substances constitute the most appalling and most dangerous weapon which could be used in this way. I would never be prepared, unless human nature changed in some way, to take the risk of its falling into the hands of terrorists and being used for that purpose.

Those three problems remain. The Leader had the gall to say that his Party was waiting for the second Ranger report before forming its opinion on this. He knows as well as I know, and every member in this House knows, that the second Ranger report deals specifically with the question of mining uranium in the Northern Territory.

The first report, which had already appeared before that debate took place, dealt with the general principles and general considerations concerning the use of nuclear power. That is a dishonest thing for the honourable gentleman to have said. It is extraordinary that there has been such a change of mind by the Opposition in this matter. I have in my possession a copy of a letter that the Leader wrote on 5 April 1977. The letter is addressed to Mr. Ian Fraser, the South Australian Co-ordinator for the Uranium Moratorium. Members may recall that, at that time, there was a move for a five-year moratorium on this question so that there could be proper discussion on it. The Leader's letter states:

Dear Mr. Fraser: I am grateful for your letter of 31 March 1977—

the day after the resolution was passed (and no doubt the letter congratulated the Leader on supporting the motion)—

and your acknowledgment of the responsible position taken by the Opposition. We share your concern that there should be adequate safeguards in all respects—

I have already dealt with three matters in which the safeguards are not adequate—

before South Australia commits itself to the mining, enrichment and sale of uranium, and therefore believe that these developments should be suspended until satisfactory inquiries are concluded.

He does not say what the satisfactory inquiries are. He does not mention the second Ranger report. He has not told us this afternoon what satisfactory inquiries have been concluded since 5 April 1977. The letter continues:

At the same time, we do not believe that any form of time

limit should be placed on these considerations, and so are not able to support the concept of a five-year moratorium.

With my very best regards,

Yours sincerely,

David Tonkin, Leader of
the Opposition

The irony of it is that we all know that at a shopping centre one morning during the election campaign he personally signed a petition for a five-year moratorium. Presumably he is speaking there not for himself but for his Party.

Mr. Tonkin: On an occasion before, if you remember, you were wrong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No doubt, if I am wrong, the Leader will say that I am wrong and give the reasons for it. That is my information. I believe that he and members of his staff signed it, if my recollection is accurate. The letter states that the Opposition was waiting until satisfactory inquiries had been concluded. They have not been concluded, and he knows it.

What is the reason for the motion? It is a purely political motion. The fact is that the Parliamentary Liberal Party in this State is just dragged at the chariot wheels of the Federal Government. The Federal Government has made a decision contrary to the motion that the Liberals supported on 30 March 1977, and they now have to try to crawl out of it in some way if they can. Here, we see the influence particularly of the Country Party on the Liberal Party, because the greatest proponent of the mining and export of uranium among those in the Federal Government is Mr. Doug Anthony, the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the Country Party. Here, we see the Liberals, as the member for Alexandra showed only too eloquently by his interjection a short while ago, in their true Country Party colours. It is sheer greed. The only reason these people can bring forward for the export of uranium is the short-term economic advantage there would be to Australia. No-one would deny that. I believe that it is absolutely immoral for a short-term advantage to prejudice the long-term future of mankind; that is what the motion would do if it were passed and if it were acted on.

That is my position on the matter. I am opposed to the motion. I believe that, in South Australia, we should test the opinion of the people. I should be happy to have a referendum on this subject. That, too, is in line with my Party, which has recently launched a proposal at the national level for citizen initiative, whereby, if 2 per cent of the people of this country ask for a referendum on a topic (and an example given was the question of mining and exporting uranium), there should be a national debate followed by a referendum on the matter.

Mr. Mathwin: In Switzerland they have them often, but not much notice of them is taken.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg may say that, in Switzerland, the people do not take much notice of them, but I am prepared to test this question in South Australia by way of referendum, and I would like to see that take place in this State. I hope that the Liberals, with their lip service, anyway, to democracy and freedom of expression, will support that. If they are confident that they are right and will get a majority of the people, after debate, they will not have any fear about supporting my suggestion for a referendum on the uranium question. If they are not confident that they have a majority, they will shut up about it; it will be interesting to see what happens. In the meantime, I absolutely oppose the motion, on principle and because it is completely beside the point. It avoids altogether the point of the motion passed on 30 March 1977, the motion it proposes to rescind.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I do not get very excited when the member for Mitcham says that he opposes some measure as strongly as he possibly can. We hear that phrase churned out in this place by him from time to time. He spoke, with something of his usual vehemence today, on the question of uranium. I think that only a week or two ago he said, "I oppose the appointment of the thirteenth Minister as strongly as I can." He says that he opposes this motion on a matter of principle. I find that strangely at variance with his attitude to the question of prostitution, which I see as a matter of principle. He says, "It's with us. We can't control it, so we've got to accept it."

If we argue at that level (and I do not), let us face it, the uranium world is with us, and there is nothing the member for Mitcham can do to change that world situation. If he wants to argue at one level on a matter of principle, let him at least be consistent and carry his question of principle into all of his debates. I do not get very carried away when he speaks to oppose something as strongly as he can, because that happens frequently.

He referred to three problems, with which I will deal before I raise my own points. He referred to the disposal of waste, safeguards, and terrorism. As we live in the real world, let us deal with terrorism first. Are we going to ground all aircraft because terrorists can hijack them and blow them up? If we support his argument through to its logical conclusion, we must do that. We live in a world with terrorists, who will take whatever means are at their disposal, and could kill millions of people one way or another. They could poison water supplies, and all kinds of appalling weapons are available to them. It is the task of mankind to see that he contains this as best he can.

Mr. Groom: What about solar energy?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I might refer to that later. I refer the honourable member to a report in the Parliamentary Library that was referred to in the Librarian's list. Regarding alternative sources of energy, that scientist takes up the question of solar energy, a so-called benign source of power, but, technologically, it may not be quite as benign as one might think.

The same argument applies to the production, utilisation and exploitation of coal. The supply of power by the burning of coal is not a benign source of energy. The safety record in relation to the exploitation of coal is appalling. No-one denies the fact that a problem existed in relation to the disposal of waste, but that situation has obtained in Great Britain for more than 20 years and the problem has not been recognised as being particularly significant, because of the volume of material that has to be dealt with.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: It is still stored.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I know it is stored. I went to Great Britain in July this year to investigate the problem. It is acknowledged by the scientists in Great Britain that perhaps they should have involved themselves years ago on the solution of this technical problem, but it was not recognised then as a pressing problem because the magnitude of material was not considered to be significant. The member for Mitcham quoted selectively from something that appeared yesterday in relation to Sir Mark Oliphant. Sir Mark Oliphant has said publicly in a radio broadcast that he was convinced that the waste problem could be and was solved. His fear was the fear of nuclear warfare and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We know that over the years Sir Mark Oliphant has been a great proponent of the control of warfare of any kind. He has an abhorrence of warfare. His opposition to nuclear energy is caused by his hatred of warfare. Sir Mark Oliphant is satisfied that the waste disposal problem is not

a long-term problem.

The member for Mitcham states that he has taken his stance because his Party has passed a resolution supporting it. I would state that the State Council of the Liberal Party has also conducted an informed debate since that resolution was passed 12 months ago in this House, and came out in support of mining and exporting uranium, with adequate safeguards. We know the member for Mitcham has adopted a doctrinaire stance. Earlier this year, when I referred to the member for Mitcham an article by Sir Macfarlane Burnet, the only response I got from the member for Mitcham was that he was getting old. He may be, but his views are still revered. We know the Labor Party has adopted its stance for a variety of reasons. We know the Chief Secretary and the Attorney-General are probably the two major protagonists in the Labor Party for the hard-line stance adopted in relation to uranium.

The Hon. D. W. Simmons: We are for the future of the world.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is all very fine. The future of the world relies in no small measure on the provision of energy for the under-developed and developing countries. The Labor Party will do more for the future of the world by providing energy for the under-developed countries than by adopting an ostrich head-in-the-sand attitude which will do nothing to control the existing world situation. They do not live in the real world; nuclear energy is a fact of life. The Attorney-General, who is keen on espousing way-out causes such as the P.L.O. and Fretelin, well knows that Russia and East Germany are well to the fore in the use of nuclear reactors.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: On numerous occasions I have written to the press dissociating myself from that sort of—

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I simply point out to the Attorney-General that nuclear energy plants exist on a global scale. Nothing the Attorney-General can do will alter that situation. I believe it would be strange if within the Labor Party there was not the difference of opinion on the subject that exists within the community. I believe some members of the Labor Party are in favour of uranium mining. I believe the Minister of Mines and Energy and others in the Party are strongly in favour of uranium mining, while others adopt a doctrinaire and left-wing attitude, and I put the Attorney-General in that category. I believe many members of the Labor Party are ill informed and have not taken the trouble to inform themselves of the facts about uranium mining. On 13 July 1977 the radio programme *P.M.* broadcast a speech to one of the universities in Victoria made by the then President of the Australian Labor Party, Mr. Bob Hawke, in which he said the following:

Now coming from that point, let me say why at this stage my view is that we should mine and export it [uranium] . . . But unfortunately no-one, and I repeat no-one has yet shown that by keeping Australian uranium in the ground we in fact do anything about those dangers. And in fact all that has been shown so far is that if we in fact, with what represents about, according to what dollar equivalent to use, but the general agreement would be you could say our reserves represent about 20 per cent of world reserves.

If we keep ours in the ground, all that happens is that alternative suppliers fill the requirements of those countries which into the future are not going to take the decisions but who are already fundamentally committed to this as a source of power. Other suppliers fill the contracts and then what happens as a result of keeping ours in the ground, is that the cost of energy is increased in those rich countries which are now using this as a source of power, and to the extent that

their energy is costing more by not only making an impact upon them but immediately it also makes an impact upon the under-developed world in terms of increasing the cost structure of the rest of the world. Now, that is the fact which as they say no-one has yet disputed.

This was the boss talking, and I have not heard any of them dispute it. Mr. Hawke continued:

If, therefore, you believe that all in answer to that that you do is to say, well we can have a lower moral satisfaction in saying all right well we haven't done anything about the problems in the rest of the world, but they are still there, the only thing we have gone and done is to make the world more expensive, but we are not in fact going to have contributed to those dangers. If you believe that is a reason, then I'm sorry I can't follow, because if that's the case do we close down our ore mines and we close down our coal mines because some of the things that are going to be done with our iron ore which is converted into steel, some of the things which are going to be done without are going to involve the creation of armaments which are going to be used in wars to kill people, do we close them down because we don't want to have anything to do with that sort of thing? I just can't understand where you draw the line in terms of an issue like this, where there is nothing that you can do about the issues involved.

He was dragged into line at the A.L.P. conference in Perth that followed shortly afterwards. By adopting this A.L.P. attitude, energy will become more expensive and the development of the poorer nations of the world will be inhibited. What sort of moral stance is that to take? It is a fact of life that we live in the nuclear age. I had some doubts about this matter and I went to some trouble to inform myself about the question of nuclear energy.

Mr. Groom: Of what have you been informed?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have studied what is happening overseas, and have had discussions with people in London who were concerned about environmental protection. I also had discussions with scientists who were charged with the provision of power to Great Britain. I visited the Hinkley Point nuclear reactor, which generates power for the western side of Great Britain, and I went over and into the reactor, and talked to these people. I am convinced that nothing we can do in Australia will shut down reactors in Great Britain. If we should shut them down, many people in Britain would be cold and probably hungry.

As I said earlier, we live in the real world, not in the dream world of the Attorney-General and the member for Mitcham. Nuclear fission will be a short-term alternative for the supply of energy. If that energy supply were cut out, and we cannot do so, the situation would be disastrous on a global scale and repercussions would be felt not only in the developed world but also in the under-developed world. Alternative energy sources will be found. Britain leads the field in the development of wave power.

Mr. McRae: And nuclear fusion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I thank the honourable member for that interjection. Initially, nuclear fusion, which is power from the sun, will probably provide the long-term answer to the supply of energy on a global scale. However, the supply of that energy is many years away, and I do not believe that it will happen before the turn of the century.

In recent weeks a major breakthrough has been made in that form of energy where the sort of temperature needed to initiate nuclear fusion have been obtained experimentally. I would welcome the day when an alternative energy source could be found and nuclear power stations could be decommissioned. In the short term there is no answer. The answer provided by members opposite does not exist.

The Government's position is hypocritical on two counts. First, the Government is allowing expensive exploration for uranium in the State. Uranerz has had exploration leases over large areas of South Australia. Remember the fuss that was made when these leases came to public attention because this company was exploring actively in the Adelaide Hills and surrounding areas.

It is a fact of life that much uranium exploration is occurring in South Australia with the blessing of this Government. If the Government believes that safeguards are not available and that they are not possible in the foreseeable future, how on earth can it allow people to explore for uranium in South Australia? That is a completely hypocritical stance.

It is clear from the Mines and Energy Department annual report, which was tabled in the House at the start of this session, that the Director-General considers that the most significant development in South Australia has been the finding of ore bodies at Roxby Downs. That matter is repeated in the report by the Chief Geologist.

The second count on which the Government is hypocritical is that it has allowed the Uranium Enrichment Committee to continue its operations. That committee reported to the Government, and one of its reports was released. Since then the Government has changed its policy and the committee's most recent report has been withheld because, as the Premier states, it does not accord with Government policy.

What sort of political stance is that from a Government that espouses open Government? It is trying to hide facts from the public because they do not line up with its present policy which, as pointed out by the Leader, is not the policy that was espoused two years ago. Because the facts contained in the report do not line up with Government policy, the report was withheld. Withholding the report makes a complete mockery of open Government or any wish that the South Australian public should be informed of the relevant facts in relation to this debate.

The public needs to be informed on this matter because, naturally, the hazards in relation to mining, exploitation, and use of uranium have been well and truly aired publicly by conservationists, environmentalists, and others. In an almost hysterical fashion, fears have been generated in the mind of the public.

I quote from the second report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee: this report was not suppressed. It is a Government committee, and reported in the following terms:

1. Australia has the largest and richest reserves of uranium in the Southern Hemisphere.
2. Owing to the very high uranium prices on overseas markets, these reserves can now be developed to become Australia's most valuable mineral resource and can provide substantial overseas credit, revenue for the Commonwealth and State Governments, substantial returns for shareholders in the mining companies, and employment opportunities in mining and treatment plants.
5. South Australia's claims for the establishment of the proposed uranium refinery centre in the Spencer Gulf region are based on the centralised geographical and seaboard location of the proposed site, its proximity to associated industries and services, and a stable work force capable of supplying construction and operational requirements. The site appears to require a minimum of investment in infrastructure and is probably the most economic available.

I will not labour the economic argument because, basically, I would not buy it if I was not convinced that uranium ores could be mined, milled, handled and used with a greater degree of safety than that which exists in providing most other forms of energy. The record of

uranium is second to none.

The third report, which has been suppressed, deals in more detail with the enrichment proposal, and outlines clearly the tremendous advantages flowing from its enrichment. The Premier himself states that there is no hazard at all in establishing the plant. In reply to a question in the House he said:

That is, a uranium enrichment plant itself would not create an environmental hazard. There is no problem of waste from a uranium enrichment plant, a centrifuge system would require not a great deal of water, and it is within the power capacity of the State.

The expertise of the enrichment committee is not in question, yet the Premier states that its latest report is inappropriate because it does not conform to Government policy. That is political humbug. Recent commentary and investigation indicate that many who were opposed initially have now modified their initial judgment. Sir Macfarlane Burnet, writing in *Quadrant* in February this year, stated (and it is almost a year since the motion passed in this House):

As one who has been concerned with the problem for over 20 years, I have oscillated from early enthusiasm for "atoms for peace" to a firm recommendation to keep Australia's uranium in the ground, and then to a conviction that the use of nuclear power as at least an interim solution of the world's problems is inevitable and justifiable.

However sympathetic one may be to the arguments of Friends of the Earth at economic and social levels, they do not justify the hysterical tone of most anti-nuclear propaganda. The provision of energy for the future is a highly technical matter that just has to be left to the experts and the administrators who have the intelligence and character to assess and utilise expert opinion. The current political shibboleth, that time must be allowed for discussion by the community before a decision is made, means no more than exposing the community to emotionally-slanted propaganda that has little touch with reality.

Sir Macfarlane Burnet is one for whom I have a profound respect. His is an opinion worth listening to, in my book. The point is that it is the duty of Government to be informed properly by experts such as Sir Macfarlane Burnet, and it is also the Government's duty to inform the public. The Fox inquiry recommends mining.

The most recent report in England is the Windscale inquiry. I had a copy of that report, which I obtained in Britain. The report deals with the question of nuclear reprocessing, which is another argument in itself. The inquiry was concluded in January of this year and the report recommends reprocessing, after extensive and expert inquiry. In the conclusions, the Hon. Mr. Justice Parker states:

I conclude that a new plant for reprocessing oxide-spent fuel from United Kingdom reactors is desirable and that a start upon such a project should be made without delay.

Who are we to believe in this argument? Are we to believe the doctrinaire left-wingers of the Labor Party, or are we to believe scientists and other experts who have taken the trouble to consider this matter and express their views?

This Government makes a mockery of open Government and informed debate by suppressing the latest report of the uranium enrichment committee. The South Australian Government has slammed the door on the only real prospect we have seen that could help to overcome the present malaise in South Australia.

Mr. Groom: What sort of profits will be made from the mining of uranium?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Significant benefits would flow to the community if an enrichment plant were established

in this State. Honourable members would be fools if they closed their eyes to the benefits at that level. I want to make perfectly clear that my judgment in this issue goes a little deeper than that. If I were convinced that no solution to these problems was possible and that, in fact, we could have any significant influence on the world scene, then maybe my attitude would be different. Having satisfied myself on those questions, I think we would be absolute idiots if we did introduce the enrichment plant and there was nothing in it for us.

Of course, we have to come back to the question of economics sooner or later, and we would be absolute idiots if we did not. I hope that satisfies the interjection from the member opposite. I stress that that is not my prime argument, nor, I believe that of my colleagues in coming down on this side in this argument. If Government members think that evidence is not being produced in a continuum in relation to this matter, then indeed they have closed their minds. The door is slammed shut at present, but the Premier said he could change his mind about this matter. All we need is an A.L.P. conference, or the masters who dictate how every member of that Party shall snap his heels and snap into line—

Members interjecting:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have had no conversations with Mr. Anthony, none whatsoever. Members of the Liberal Party do not sign any pledge that we will toe the Party line as—I was going to say our “friends”. We have a degree of independence in this Party that is obviously not available to members opposite. I could quote numerous examples of that. It seemed strange to me that, when there was a free vote, every Government member voted for the Bill relating to homosexuals. I thought that was odd when, within the community, there are a whole range of opinions relating to that question, yet every member opposite voted for it, including the member for Tea Tree Gully (as she was then), who said that it was against the dictates of her conscience and the teaching of her religion, but that she had no option but to vote for it. What sort of a free vote is that?

We know perfectly well how much freedom and latitude is allowed to members opposite. The Party machine says “fall in” and, boy, they fall in. I would not have taken the trouble to visit these power plants overseas unless I had wanted to ascertain for myself the answers to these questions. Nobody has twisted my arm in relation to this matter, nobody at all.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: The power plant in relation to you is the headquarters of the Liberal Party.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not care how much members opposite shout. If any member of my Party feels strongly about a question he can vote how he likes, but that freedom is not available to members opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Attorney-General is out of order.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That freedom is not available to members of the Labor Party who, when they come into this place, sign a pledge to toe the line. I refer to the point raised by the member for Mitcham that this motion has nothing to do with the former motion. If he had read the whole text of what is before the House today, he would know that it concerns the former motion because the wording of today's motion “rescinds” the motion that was before the House in March last year. If he does not believe that it has anything to do with the former motion, he is dopier than I think he is. I support the motion.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PRAWN FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr. CHAPMAN (Alexandra): I move:

That regulations under the Fisheries Act, 1971-1976, relating to fees for prawn fishermen made on the 21 September 1978, and laid on the table of this House on 26 September 1978 be disallowed.

My decision to move this disallowance is in no way flippant. Indeed, with my Party's full support, the move is based on a real principle. The true intent of the Fisheries Act is to develop, manage, protect, and research the resources, and to properly police the activities of those participating. We on this side place paramount importance on the matter of development and encouragement within that industry, particularly as it relates to the maximisation of profit while appreciating all of the other protective factors.

The regulations before the House this afternoon aggravate that intent and, if proceeded with, will continue to distress not only the prawn fishery but also those participating in all managed fisheries in South Australia. It will destroy any effort to re-establish confidence between the Government and industry.

The very basis on which the new prawn fees are fixed is wrong. The formula used is based on mechanical factors and not on productivity. For example, as a criteria for fixing the proposed fee, the Government has used ingredients such as the length of the vessel, horse-power and other structural attachments, when those features, in fact, have little or no specific influence upon the capacity to improve the catch. When we think about it and realise that the prawn fishing industry operates by night and by day, there can be no reflection of the style, colour, size, or type of vessel that is used or in the vessel's features that will attract the catch. There is nothing about a vessel's features that ensure that the catch will be greater if those features are greater.

In fact, it does not matter a damn whether it is a stylish yacht, an ex-lobster vessel or a tug boat; as long as it is a vessel that is able to tow the appropriate nets, one can trawl for prawns—that is, of course, if the expertise is on board. While boat registration fees, or for that matter motor vehicle registration fees, can quite properly take into account those mechanical ingredients that I mentioned, it is quite improper, I claim, to use them as a formula to fix fees in the fishing industry, particularly relating to the licence fee area. It has nothing to do with the registration of the boat or with other marine and harbors requirements that are involved, but, as far as the licence fee portion of the operation is concerned, the mechanical ingredients have no significant effect upon them.

All licence fees throughout the fishing industry should be based on a productivity formula, as in the case of Western Australia where, I might add, the Government/industry relationship is excellent. The regulations before this House this afternoon, if ever adopted, will destroy confidence within the industry, destroy interest in the long term, and drive even more of our fishing expertise to other States of the Commonwealth where their effort

and their contributions are recognised and appreciated.

The schedule of fees, currently under consideration by agreement between the industry and the Premier, are basically crook. Whether or not the industry is ultimately forced into accepting a compromise of a portion of the originally announced fees of \$5 000 and \$9 000 in the respective gulfs, the interim fee, about which we have heard so much in recent days and which is based on 40 per cent of the original proposal announced by the Minister, is also quite wrong. In no circumstances can we, as a responsible Opposition, accept this type of heavy-handed administration, particularly in this case, where the long-standing agreement of consultation between Government and industry has been blatantly disregarded and ignored by the Minister.

Throughout this exercise there has been no question about the need for all participants in the fishing industry to contribute towards the industry's management and its research activities, in line with what was promised by the Government. There has been no question about the Government's right to adjust its actual fees payable, but to proceed with an improper formula for the purposes of fixing those fees is not currently acceptable to the industry, nor should it ever be.

Despite the incredible impact on the community that this whole exercise has recently had, I am reliably informed that the original \$5 000 and \$9 000 fees were intended to be fees for only the next two or three years. In fact, the report received today indicates that the Assistant Director of Fisheries, Mr. Kirkegaard, recently told a senior principal of the industry that the Government intended to double those fees within the next two or three years. This type of blackmail (and I regard it as blackmail, a blatant threat to the industry, and to the livelihoods of those people, as has been demonstrated recently) is beyond comprehension, and certainly outside the realms of good harmony and industrial progress in an important industry in this State.

The regulations before Parliament should be withdrawn forthwith. They should be redrawn equally as swiftly, taking seriously into account the actual rates determined by the Government, but those rates should be based on a productivity formula and not on the mechanical features of the fishing vessels involved. The productivity formula basis should be decided only after full and proper consultation with the industry, and so uphold that long-standing agreement between government and industry which is currently being ignored.

The Minister's recent bungling of this whole issue, and his Government's condoning of his action, constitutes, in my view, a grave injustice to this important primary industry. It is indeed a serious breach of the very real principle involved. It demonstrates the heavy hand of government, without regard for the healthy progress of the industry or the feelings of those who have chosen that industry from which to draw their respective livelihood. It also shows the public of South Australia that this Government regards profit in industry as a dirty word.

Indeed, the action taken recently, regarding the fishing industry licence fee issue and the citrus industry, is a basis for concern over a wide section of the community. Areas of primary industry throughout the State are concerned about the effects that are being blasted on to this industry in the practice of farming the sea. They feel that they will be in the barrel as farmers of the land.

The fishing industry is desperate to obtain some important assurances of licence tenure and other associated matters pertaining to that industry, in order to protect its assets and its future and the future of its

families. These specific matters are currently being negotiated with the Premier, who appears to have taken the fisheries management on this issue out of his Minister's hands; it is not before time.

I noted with interest this afternoon in Question Time that the Deputy Premier, in replying to a question, explained to the House that that was not the case, but, regardless of whether or not the fishermen sought audience with the Premier, that is how it appears. It is not what might be happening behind the closed doors; it is what appears to be the case. I assure the House that the manner in which this Minister has handled this issue demands intervention by someone else. I support the fishing industry's attempt to see the Premier. It was the last straw; it was the last opportunity that fishermen had to talk a bit of common sense into the Government via that senior avenue. I hope that the Premier will see reason, if he has not already done so, in the arguments put forward by the fishing industry representatives last night.

I have no doubt that in the long term the Government will realise that it cannot continue to dictate to industry in the manner that it has done, and it cannot seek to take away its profit in the fashion it has adopted over this issue.

There is no question about the Government's right to apply appropriate fees, but I appeal to it, on behalf of the prawn industry of South Australia, to remove forthwith the regulations that are on the table, to repair the damage that it has done within the industry as quickly as it can to restore confidence, and to return to this House a schedule of regulations that takes into account the factors that I have raised this afternoon, giving full opportunity and right to the Government to proceed to fix the proportion of productivity tax or the proportion of productivity fee that it believes is appropriate, not just for the prawn industry, but on the basis of a formula that applies throughout the industry.

The Western Australian Government, in seeking to set appropriate fees within the prawn fishing area, has done just that, and done it successfully. That Government, in fixing a fee in the three bays that are limited fishing areas in that State (Shark Bay, Exmouth Gulf and Nicol Bay), measured the return of the resource from each area by the numbers of fishermen in them, and determined a fee based on three-quarters of a per cent of the total catch returned to its respective people.

It is not adjustable day by day or year by year, but that State has used a productivity basis as a formula for fixing realistic rates. I should like to have inserted in *Hansard* without reading them some figures on prawn fishing licence fees. I sought the permission of the Speaker to do so before you took the Chair, Mr. Acting Speaker. It is a short summary of statistical detail of the licence fee charges applicable to the fishing industry generally, and the prawn fishing industry in particular, in Western Australia, Queensland, Victoria, and New South Wales. At the bottom of the schedule is a short reference to the Commonwealth fishing licensing fees.

Leave granted.

PRAWN FISHERY LICENCE FEES—26-9-78
WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Shark Bay (richest prawn resource in Australia)	(35)	1978—1 500	1977—1 000
Exmouth Gulf	(24)	1978—1 250	1977— 750
Nicol Bay	(16)	1978— 200	1977— 150

Based on a formula—Productivity—no regard for Boat Weight, Length, Equipment, Engine Horsepower, Deck Hands Employed, etc.

QUEENSLAND

Fisheries Act, 1976, in force 1-1-78

	\$	\$
Master Fisherman's Licence	25 p.a.*	
Commercial Fishing Vessel—		
Unpowered	10 p.a.	
Powered to 20 m	15 p.a.	
Powered over 20 m	25 p.a.*	
Each assistant fisherman	6 p.a.*	
	* =	25
	* =	25
Say, 3 assistants		18
		—
Total licence fee		\$68

CATCH ANYTHING

		Sept	
VICTORIA	1977-78	1978-79	
	\$	\$	
Trawl net licence	100	125	. . Total
Boat registration	10	10	prawn fees
Master Fisherman's			with, say,
Licence All skippers	25	35	crew =
Per Crew man	5	5	\$185

NEW SOUTH WALES—

Licence all fishermen \$2 p.a.

Register each net \$1 payable once only

Boat Licence—

trawling or net fishing—

Under 200 tons gross \$40 p.a.

Exceeding 200 tons gross \$50 p.a.

Maximum trawling prawn fees = \$52 plus net fees of \$1 each.

COMMONWEALTH

Trawling fees—All incorporated in one Commonwealth fishing licence fee of \$20

Mr. CHAPMAN: I conclude on the note of an appeal to the Government seriously to consider the proposal that has been put to it this afternoon in the motion. The seconder of the motion, the member for Flinders, whose support I am proud to have on this occasion, is absent, but another colleague will support it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I do not want to take up too much time of the House now, but I indicate the Government's opposition to the move made by the member for Alexandra, and I do that on the simple ground that the Government saw fit to strike this regulation to give legal backing to the statement made by the Minister in relation to the payment of interim fees for 1977-78. The honourable member would be aware that the Minister has stated that the fees laid down in the regulations will not be the fees that the people involved in the prawn industry will be charged for this financial year.

The Minister said, I think yesterday morning, clearly and definitely that the Government would require that an interim fee be paid, and that interim fee was 40 per cent of the formula used in the regulations that have been placed before the House. In effect, that will mean that for this licensing year (I say that because I believe it will date from 6 October) about 60 per cent of all prawn fishermen will pay less than \$2 000, I think about 40 per cent will pay between \$2 000 and \$4 000, and one person will pay more than \$4 000.

That is the present situation so far as the Government is concerned and, if the Government allowed the move by the member for Alexandra to succeed, it would not have any legal base for the formula. I point out to the honourable member (and he is well aware of this) that consultations are proceeding and, if it is necessary (I am not suggesting that it will be necessary) to vary the

regulations, the Government will do that. The honourable member has again given his view that the Premier has taken the matter out of the Minister's hands. I repeat what I told him this afternoon during Question Time, namely, that that is not the case. The prawn fishermen sought an audience with the Premier, and he agreed to see them, because, after all, he is the Premier of this State. He agreed to do that, provided they were prepared to see him with the Minister responsible for fisheries.

That meeting took place. As I have pointed out to the honourable member, I am not privy to what happened at the meeting. Until this time, I have not had the time or the inclination to speak to the Premier or the Minister, but evidently agreement was reached by the prawn fishermen, the Premier and the Minister that the details would be kept confidential until the prawn fishermen's representatives were able to meet their members and put to them whatever propositions were arrived at last night.

In the light of those events, the Government is not prepared at this stage to allow the motion to succeed. Therefore, so far as the Government is concerned, the regulations will stand until it is necessary to change them. I do not think it necessary to give further reasons at this stage. It would be foolish for the Government to lose the regulations now. Regarding the method by which the fees were arrived at, I do not intend to enter into debate again at this stage on the formula used.

Another matter that the honourable member has lost sight of completely is that comparisons between these fees and other fees are completely specious, and he knows that. The earlier fees were based on a fishery that had not been investigated and was unknown, and therefore the licence fee was virtually a fee to allow for exploration and confirmation that a fishery existed.

That has been done and the honourable member knows that. He will not dispute that very sizeable incomes are made by fishermen annually. I will not go into the size of them at this stage, because the honourable member appreciates as well as I do that they vary from person to person, as do costs. What I point out is that, for the reasons I have mentioned, the Government is not prepared to accept the motion.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

CLASSIFICATION OF PUBLICATIONS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 1052.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Last week we listened to a diatribe of abuse from the Premier about this measure, which was first introduced in another place and which was explained in this House by the member for Torrens. However, in the confusion in the Premier's mind, he sought out the member for Coles and abused her contribution in a complete back-off from the reality of the Bill. We have had from the Premier quite illogical statements about this matter.

He attacked the Festival of Light, the Hon. Mr. Burdett from another place, and any person who had had the audacity to question the Government's actions in relation to the classification of publications. The Premier wanted to sweep this Bill under the carpet, and he asked members to stick their head in the sand, as he had done, and take no further part in the debate. Opposition members will continue to take part in the debate, because it is a matter which is causing a considerable amount of continuing community concern. Many petitions followed the recent visit of Mrs. Mary Whitehouse. The interest evinced in this

matter is highlighted by the front-page article in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "South Australian permissiveness battleground: Rayner". In that article the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide gave details of the problems existing in the permissive society.

The Archbishop did not go all the way with the actions that have been taken, but he clearly indicated his concern and that of the Church of England Synod about this vital matter. People from other denominations and other places have also taken up the matter. Subsequent to raving on in this place last Wednesday, the Premier gave notice that he would introduce measures dealing with classifications; they were listed for yesterday but, when yesterday came, they were put off until tomorrow. Will we see them tomorrow, next week, the week after, or sometime never?

Last week, the Premier indicated that he would introduce measures along the lines of the English Act, which he said would be a great improvement on this Bill. He did not point out that the penal provisions in the English Act are far greater than those in this Bill. To suggest that it was reprehensible of the Hon. Mr. Burdett to include a number of issues in this Bill and that they went beyond the scope of the English Act is a blatant untruth. The actions taken by the Premier last week have called into question the integrity of a number of people in the community, not the least of them being Dr. John Court, a world-renowned authority on these matters.

The Premier spoke at length about the graph that appeared in a document circulating in South Australia. He suggested that it was a trumped-up piece of material to put a point of view that could not be substantiated by evidence. Actually, the graph could have been taken further and would have indicated that the present position in South Australia is about four times as serious as the position in Queensland. The Premier said that the proponents of this graph had not taken heed of the fact that South Australia's Classification of Publications Act took effect in 1974 and therefore the figures were unreal.

The real position is that, following the introduction of the South Australian Act, there was a minimal decrease in reports to the police of rape and attempted rape. After that minimal decrease, which was concurrent in Queensland, there has been a marked and rapid increase in the number of reports. The decrease in Queensland has continued until recently, when there was a minor increase in the number of reports. On comparing the graphic material available, which has been distributed to all members, it is quite clear that the problem in South Australia is almost four times as serious as that which exists in Queensland. I now refer to a State-by-State comparison of legislation dealing with classification of publications (prohibited category). The comparison, prepared for the Hon. Mr. Burdett by the Parliamentary Library Research Service, states:

New South Wales:

Indecent Articles and Classified Publications Act, 1975 (as amended).

By section 13A (added by Act No. 53 of 1977), a classifying authority shall classify certain publications as child pornography publications.

Under section 18A (also added by Act No. 53 of 1977), a person who publishes a child pornography publication or has a child pornography publication in his possession apparently for the purpose of publishing it is liable to a penalty. Penalty for a first offence: corporation—\$2 000; any other case—\$1 000 or six months imprisonment. For a subsequent offence, double the first offence penalty.

Queensland:

Objectional Literature Acts, 1954, as amended.

Under section 10 (1), the Literature Board of Review may

prohibit the distribution in Queensland of any literature which is, in the board's opinion, objectionable.

Tasmania:

Restricted Publications Act, 1974.

By section 8 (a), the Restricted Publications Board may, at the time when it classifies a restricted publication or at any time thereafter, impose a condition prohibiting the sale, delivery, exhibition or display of the publication.

Western Australia:

Indecent Publications and Articles Act, 1902, as amended.

Under section 9 (1), the State Advisory Committee on Publications shall consider and report on any publication referred to it by the Minister, as to whether or not in the committee's opinion the publication should be classified as a restricted publication or should be the subject of proceedings under section 2 of the Act. Section 2 makes provision for punishing offences of printing and publishing indecent books, articles, etc.

Victoria:

Police Offences Act, 1958, as amended. Part V—Obscene and Indecent Publications.

Division 1 of Part V includes provision for punishment of various offences in the nature of selling, publishing or exhibiting obscene articles, material, etc. (see sections 166, 168, 172ff). Section 165 provides for the seizure and destruction of obscene articles.

Act No. 9012 (17 May 1977) amended Part V of the Act by providing heavy penalties (maximum fine \$5 000 or up to two years imprisonment) in respect of offences which amount to publication of child pornography (new sections 168A, 168B, 168C).

Division IA of Part V provides for the State Advisory Board on Publications, on whose recommendation the Minister may declare a publication to be a restricted publication (section 180H). There does not appear to be provision for the board to recommend that a publication be prohibited.

That shows the situation of comparison with the other Australian States. We have had a public announcement by Mr. Hamer, in Victoria, indicating that, during the present session of Parliament, the Victorian Government will look more closely at various aspects of the publications legislation, and that it will be making significant changes in the distribution and availability of pornography generally, and more particularly in relation to children. Details are given in the *Age* on Tuesday 12 September 1978, under the heading "Hamer faces cudgels", as follows:

Mr. Hamer said that additional controls on pornography would affect the display, sale, and publication of offensive material.

All strength to Mr. Hamer's hand! Similar comments appeared in the *Herald* on Monday 11 September, under the major heading "Government crackdown on porn", as follows:

The State Government will tighten up on the sale and display of pornography, the Premier, Mr. Hamer, said today. He said additional controls on "indecent publications" would be among more than 20 new laws to be introduced in the spring session of State Parliament.

Here, we have a statement by yet another Premier who recognises his responsibility to the people he represents, and who recognises the public demand for a proper and just consideration of this issue.

Looking through a whole host of material which is available to members, I came across a document under the heading of the Attorney-General's Department, a statement by the Attorney-General of Australia, Senator Lionel Murphy, Q.C. The subheading was, "Censorship—A Question of Balancing Individual Rights". The document is dated 26 February 1973 at Canberra, and states:

The freedom of people to read, hear and view what they wish in private or in public is a fundamental human right. But it is a right which must be balanced against the right of the people not to be exposed to unsolicited material offensive to them.

That is an attitude expressed by the Premier last week and expressed by members on this side of the House for a long time past. The king hit follows in the next sentence, and it is the one I promote, on my own behalf, on behalf of many other members in this House, and certainly on behalf of many people in the community. It states:

This right must be extended to those in their care.

The parents and grandparents of today are concerned at the way in which children are being exploited in the production of child pornography, and at the way in which pornographic material is being displayed. The publication *Just Boys* has been completely banned in New South Wales as a product registered as portraying child pornography. In Adelaide, it is available for sale alongside the *Women's Weekly*, the *Woman's Day*, and the comics.

Mrs. Adamson: Unrestricted in South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK: Unrestricted sale in South Australia. The present New South Wales Government has recently gazetted *Just Boys* as being prohibited, yet under our South Australian system it can be put up for public display. It is little wonder that many in the South Australian community looked at the statement made by the then Senator Murphy, a person who, regrettably, did not really sell himself to the Australian people because of some of his outlandish and way-out ideas, but certainly a person who said, on 26 February 1973, "The right must be extended to those in their care."

So the parents and the grandparents of today want to see some positive action concerning the wild and woolly distribution of the pornographic material which is available. Most abhorrent of all of them is the distribution of child pornography produced and filmed in Australia, using Australian children. Some members opposite may think that this has been beaten up as an emotive issue. The Premier said that it had become a political issue. It is a political issue for a real purpose: it involves many people of all political views, of all creeds, and certainly of all ethnic backgrounds. The matter has caused them concern. Obviously, it is a community issue, which makes it a political issue.

Members on this side of the House have no hesitation in raising the matter here again, and they will continue to raise it if the Premier and his colleagues want to sweep it under the carpet. The Premier said last week, "We believe it is necessary to maintain the principle of the rule of law." He said that that would be the method of approach he would adopt. I was interested in the meaning of the phrase "rule of law". *The Law and the Constitution*, by Jennings, at page 47 under the heading "English Constitutional Law", states:

Expressed in English terms, the rule of law in this liberal sense requires that the powers of the Crown and of its servants shall be derived from and limited by either legislation enacted by Parliament or judicial decisions taken by independent courts. It is not enough to say with Dicey that "Englishmen are ruled by the law, and by the law alone" . . .

A great deal more could be read into that definition but, if the Premier wants to talk about the principle of the rule of law, obviously it can be written into legislation for the benefit of the community. Members on this side want to see that done very quickly. We want to see positive action taken without any more of the dilly-dallying that has been the custom of the Premier and some of his colleagues for too long.

There has been a slight upon Dr. John Court. I have no doubt that some of my colleagues will take up that point and it may well be, as the member for Kavel says, that Dr. Court may test the issue in another place. Certainly, he has offered the Premier an opportunity to defend his position.

Mr. Goldsworthy: He's refused.

Dr. EASTICK: Head in the sand again! The Premier will not back up his comments. He will not debate this important issue with a person who has shown competence and who has the background knowledge to establish a very real relationship between the distribution of this abhorrent material and many acts of depravity, vice, rape, sexual interference, and other grievous actions. The material last week inserted by me in *Hansard* in relation to section 33 of the Police Offences Act has been difficult to track down. However, a letter dated 26 October 1977 from the Attorney-General to certain Adelaide solicitors states:

You ask that I take action under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act, 1913-1972, or, alternatively, that I grant your clients my fiat to institute proceedings in my name to seek an injunction restraining the performance of *Oh! Calcutta!*

Having considered the reasons advanced in your letter and taking into account the public interest, I have come to the conclusion that I should not take action under section 25 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act or give my consent to an application for an injunction.

This matter was referred to in the debate. It does not relate to section 33, and I have no doubt that other members will take up that matter.

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

Mr. McRAE (Playford): I oppose the Bill for the reasons basically announced by the Premier last week. I agree with the member for Light that a conflict of rights is involved. On the one hand, there is the right of adults to read and see what they will, provided that in so doing they do not offend others.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Your heart's not in this.

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member will see where it is if he waits. On the other hand, there is the right of all people, men, women and children, not to be degraded by being made the object of pornographic publications. The difficulty confronting this House is to rationalise those two sets of rights. Like the member for Light, I was most impressed with the report in this morning's *Advertiser* of comments by His Grace, the Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide, Dr. Rayner. I agree with several comments he made, and towards the end of the article he stated:

One of the most harmful things [in modern society] was the bulk of sex-orientated material which was creating a social climate of obsession with sex, trivialising the sexual relationship and making people sexual objects.

I agree with all of that, and I said in this place long before this latest furore that I absolutely abhor anything in the nature of child pornography, and I go much further than that: I absolutely abhor pornography. I regard it as a dreadful industry, which degrades human beings and which makes enormous profits through the suffering and brutality that it imposes on others, particularly women. Those points have all been made two years before this latest furore arose. Dr. Rayner further stated:

The long-term answer to the problem was not censorship but a change in public attitudes, fostered by community leaders.

I agree with that, but I will put an addendum to it: other things have to occur as well as a change of public attitudes. Certainly, changing the law is one of the things wrong with Western society; people think that by changing the law we

can change attitudes, but I do not think that happens. I believe that we have to change attitudes, so that we can, in effect, change the law. I support what His Grace said.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Political leaders often do both.

Members interjecting:

Mr. McRAE: Yes. If members are patient, I am going to state what my beliefs are.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that the last speaker was heard in silence.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Not quite.

Mr. McRAE: Certainly there were no interjections. The report dealing with Dr. Rayner's comments continued:

The sex industry, of which pornography and organised prostitution were the most explicit examples, was one of the worst manifestations of decadence in Western capitalism. Its motive was profit and, like its counterpart the hard drug industry, it thrived by creating addiction for its product.

I agree with all that, too. I believe it is a sane and balanced attitude. The difficulty confronting us in this situation was well explained last week by the Premier: the Bill simply does not do what it is said it will do. The pamphlets that were produced to me by those supporting the Bill claim, as the Premier stated, that this was simply introducing the British legislation into South Australia, but it is not doing that. This Bill changes the system of classification of publications and will reintroduce (if it is successful) a system of censorship. Certainly, I believe that there must be some system of censorship, but to reintroduce a censorship system—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You're on your own over there.

Mr. McRAE: I am not on my own over here. The Bill seeks to reintroduce a system whereby it will be the Minister who will be determining the matter rather than the law courts. Honourable members should have understood, as people in the community should have understood last week, that the whole basis of the introduction of the Classification of Publications Board (in many cases I do not agree with the board's opinions) was to provide a defence and a set of circumstances whereby a person, who complied with the Act in producing and selling the material, would have a defence to a charge that might otherwise have been brought against him under the Police Offences Act. The matter is as simple as that. What honourable members—

Mr. Becker: You're speaking as a lawyer.

Mr. McRAE: No, I am not speaking as a lawyer: I am speaking as a concerned citizen and as the father of three young children who has spoken out long before this existing furore. I am becoming cross by some of the derogatory remarks that are being made about me from the other side of the House. They are unnecessary. What I set out to achieve about two years ago before Mr. Burdett introduced his Bill, or at about the same time (I am not claiming any greater credit than him), was that at least we would eliminate the evil of child pornography and, hopefully, we would eliminate also the evil of sexual violence appearing in pornographic material.

The situation before the introduction of the Hon. Mr. Burdett's latest Bill (and before the introduction of the Government legislation, which will be introduced this week, I can reassure members) was that, after discussions with the Premier some time ago, classification had been refused by the board in respect of paedophilia and child pornography, which was defined as follows:

Sexual activity involving prepubescent children with adults.

Sexual activity involving prepubescent children with prepubescent children.

Sexual activity associated with significant violence was also

refused classification. This meant that, for a purveyor of pornography (to give him some sort of honourable title, although he is not worthy of it), a defence of classification that might otherwise have been open to him was now not open to him. Several people have come to me to complain about the continued existence of child pornography. One person, a Mrs. Tapp, I think, referred to the book to which the member for Light referred called *Just Boys*. Certainly, I regard that publication as if not blatantly pornographic then certainly degrading towards young boys, and something that absolutely disgusts me. She claimed that she was unable to have a police prosecution launched in respect of that book, and a further complaint was that for some reason, which I did not quite follow, it could be sold alongside the *Women's Weekly*. There was then a chase around Adelaide with various newspaper reporters and this lady trying to obtain evidence for a prosecution.

Last week the Premier stated that if this material is being sold, then there should be prosecutions; there will be prosecutions, and consent will not be refused. Surely that deals with that aspect. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Burdett, and I have always agreed with him, that another aspect of this matter has to be tidied up concerning child pornography, and I will deal with that group by group. The punishment available to the courts to impose on a person who degrades children in this way should be severe, and the Act should be redrafted so as to catch people who are performing acts of corruption and degradation like this, and not allow them, through the loopholes of the law, to escape their just deserts.

The Government legislation (and I am the Secretary of the Premier's Committee) has been approved by Caucus. It has been delayed only by certain redrafting requirements on the advice of the law officers. I am assured that that legislation will be introduced this week (if the Premier is here), but certainly it will be introduced swiftly.

Mr. Mathwin: Is it the same Bill as the British one?

Mr. McRAE: It is basically in line with the British legislation, but there are certain parts of that legislation which cannot be accommodated in our legislation. Certain parts of the British legislation were withdrawn in the House of Commons. Again, I and other Government members resent that sort of sneer from the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What is he trying to prove?

Mr. McRAE: I do not know, but he is doing a poor job of it. What the Bill provides is that any person involved in activities of this kind, whether by touching a child, taking a photograph of a child, by in any way procuring a child, or encouraging a child, or aiding and abetting the committing of an offence, will be subject to the maximum penalty under the main section of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which is five years imprisonment. If that does not demonstrate the good faith of the Government, I do not know what does. That is the Premier's and the Government's intention. I have no reason to doubt that the Bill will come into force and will be enforced by the police in the same way that they enforce the laws against prostitution, etc. If publications are refused classification by the board, and if they are sold in blatant defiance of the Government, the Government will not tolerate it but will see that prosecutions are carried out: that is the assurance which all Labor Party members have been given.

I go further than that again, and say that I am not happy with the attitude adopted by the Classification of Publications Board. There are certain matters the board lists under particular headings. Late last week, I wrote the following letter to the Premier:

I refer to the recent meeting of the Premier's Committee

concerning the various Bills to be introduced relating to the Classification of Publications Act. I also refer to the material produced by your department concerning various aspects of pornography and relating to Mr. Burdett's Bill. I should like to make it clear that I support in general terms the Party policy on the question of censorship and the right of adults to read what they want provided that in the process other persons are not offended.

I must, however, put to you my very sincere belief that the board is incorrect in relation to community standards in the way it currently classifies its material. Deliberately taking into account the fact that my views may be too conservative, just as I would comment that it (the board) may be too libertarian, I say nothing about the categories now "unrestricted", "not available to minors", "not to be available to minors and not for public display".

Those are the categories A, A, B, and A, B, C. The letter continues:

However, in relation to categories A, B, C, D, and A, B, C, D, E, I must strongly state my belief that all of these matters should be under the category "classification refused".

Those categories include bestiality. I cannot for the life of me accept that it is a breach of a person's right to see and read what he wants if bestiality is removed. The next category is bondage without cruelty; it may be mild compared to some of the ones to come.

Mr. Goldsworthy: That's a breach of the fundamental principle espoused in the Act.

Mr. McRAE: I do not follow what the honourable member is saying.

Mr. Goldsworthy: "See or hear what you want" unrestricted; that is the principle.

Mr. McRAE: Members are being notably obtuse and, in some cases, notably unpleasant, when it is unnecessary for them to be so. I am saying that the first category is bestiality. The next category is bondage without cruelty. The next category is urolagnia, which is urinating on another person. The next category is necrophilia, which relates to sexual relations with the dead, and coprophilia, which I do not intend to define in the House. All of those matters, with the possible exception of bondage without cruelty, should be denied classification.

The final one under the classification A, B, C, D, E, is masochism, mild sadism, and sexual activity associated with some violence. I make clear to members that the Government legislation not only deals with the question of child pornography, but it also deals with sadism and masochism, and will place those categories also in the punishable list. In those circumstances, I think that that is as good a balance as one can achieve between the right of adult persons to see and read what they wish, without offending others, in this year of the child and in this decade of women (as announced by the United Nations), and the right of all people not to be degraded by this particularly pernicious and vicious industry. I go back for a moment to His Grace Dr. Rayner's remarks. In summarising his views on this matter, he said:

On the one hand there was the State Government which prided itself on its "progressive policy for the removal of censorship and other restraints on personal freedom of expression". On the other hand, a well-organised and articulate body, the Festival of Light, campaigns vigorously against permissive policies which it claims are leading to a general lowering of the moral standards of the community. South Australia appears to have become the chief Australian battle-ground in relation to what is commonly called "moral permissiveness" in our society. The degree of polarisation which has occurred was graphically revealed recently in the strangely apocalyptic language used by the Attorney-General

to describe the visiting English moral campaigner, Mrs. Mary Whitehouse, as an "agent of darkness".

His Grace, in setting the matter out in that way, has, I think, really hit the crux of the problem. I do not think that any honourable member would really want (and this is the effect of the Bill the Opposition is supporting) to revert to a situation whereby, in respect of reading material and other material, it would be at the unfettered discretion of a Government Minister to decide what the people of this State may read. As the Premier pointed out last week, the Bill could be interpreted more widely again to include political or other material. On the other hand, I believe that the Festival of Light (while not agreeing with all of its public statements, actions, or expressed views) has nonetheless performed a useful function in pointing out some of the evils confronting our society. The difficulty that confronts and will continue to confront the Festival of Light is one that confronts the House and the community, namely, how do we rationalise these conflicting rights in a way that is reasonable, sensible, and decent to all concerned?

I am confident that, from the introduction and passage of the Government's legislation, there will be a marked improvement in an area where improvement was needed, and I say that unequivocally. I also believe that, if the board, which must remain the arbiter on many of these things, were to consider some of the things I stated in my letter that I have read to the House, that, too, would be an improvement. I trust that some of the heat which has been generated throughout this public debate will be allowed to die down a little so as to allow light to intrude into the darkness. After all, I suppose (and I am only guessing, because I do not know much about the Festival of Light) that, as a Christian organisation and in choosing its name, it had particular regard, as His Grace indicated, to John the writer of Revelations and John the writer of the Gospel, whose constant theme was the light of Christianity dispelling the darkness of evil and ignorance. I trust that the members of the Festival of Light, in waging their various campaigns (which they have a perfect right to do, a right that I most strongly support), will—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you support that right?

Mr. McRAE: I strongly support their right to conduct, within the law, whatever campaigns they like.

Mr. Mathwin: Mrs. Whitehouse was called an arch agent of darkness.

Mr. McRAE: I will deal with that soon. I trust also that, in waging their various campaigns, members of the Festival of Light will try to follow the principle of illuminating the darkness upon which their title is apparently based. My colleague, the Attorney-General, in his collision with Mrs. Whitehouse, referred to her as an arch agent of darkness. It should be made clear that that was his view. The Attorney is perfectly entitled to his attitude in these matters, in the same way that supporters of the Festival of Light are entitled to their attitude.

Mr. Mathwin: He called her "that notorious pom".

Mr. McRAE: If the member for Glenelg would permit me, I should like to continue. I do not support the Attorney-General's statement that Mrs. Whitehouse was an agent of darkness. Perhaps in many ways it was more unfortunate than the reference to her nationality, because no doubt many of her followers would see some sinister implications in the use of the word "darkness". However, basically I should like to see that heat reduced and the light increased and, if that was to occur and the light was to shine in the surrounding darkness, I am sure that we could solve many more of these problems.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill, which

limits pornography in this State and contains powers of prohibition. The Bill is not unique, as the Premier said it was last week, because similar legislation, particularly in relation to child pornography, applies in Queensland and New South Wales. Also, Tasmania, another Labor Government State, has the same prohibition. So, one sees that the Premier was stretching the point when he referred last week to some aspects of this Bill.

There is no specific power in Western Australia, although in the end result they are able to legislate and to administer that legislation, something which the Premier said they could not do. The Premier made great play about Ministers being responsible in this area. Members will remember well the antics of the former Attorney-General (Hon. Len King) in relation to the show *Oh! Calcutta!*, a matter on which he did some neat footwork many times in this House. Although the Premier seems to be opposed to giving this power to Ministers, I remind him that, under section 4 of the Film Classification Act, which this Government introduced, the Minister is given power that the Premier does not want him to have under this Bill.

Those listening to the Premier last week were delighted to hear him say that he supported the legislation that was in force in the United Kingdom. When I asked the member for Playford whether the new Bill drafted by the Government was a rewrite of the British Bill, he was evasive in his reply and would not answer my question. The Premier said in this place that he supported the British legislation and that he intended to introduce a similar Bill here. If one reads parts of the English legislation, one sees that section 1, for example, provides:

(1) Any person—

- (a) who takes any indecent photograph of or including, or who procures, incites, causes, allows or assists any such photograph to be taken of or including, any child; or
- (b) who makes any indecent film of or including, or who procures, incites, causes, allows or assists any such film to be made of or including, any child; or
- (c) who possesses with a view to production, or who produces, any indecent photograph or film of or including any child or a copy thereof

is guilty of an offence under this Act.

A person convicted on indictment of any offence under that Act is liable, under section 6 (2), to a fine not exceeding £10 000 (which is about \$16 000) and imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years, or both. It is therefore interesting to note that the Premier supports that legislation. It will be interesting to see whether, if the Bill the Premier introduces is not quite the same as the British legislation, the Premier will accept amendments moved by members on either side of the House to make it similar to the English legislation.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: It will be interesting to see whether the member for Henley Beach will support such amendments if they are moved by Opposition members.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You will be displeased because the Bill will be too good.

Mr. MATHWIN: We will see about that. The Premier displeases me many times, and this is one of those times. Indeed, his attack last week on the Festival of Light also displeased me. The Premier objected to the pamphlet produced by the Festival of Light. This was probably the best performance that members have seen from the Premier since he read poetry outside of George's cage at the zoo. Referring to the pamphlet, the Premier said:

It is one of the most untruthful pieces of work that I have ever come across.

Obviously, the Premier does not read much of his own

work. Let us see what he was referring to. Was the Premier referring to pornographic material which shows cruel and perverted exploitation of women and children and which has been sold in Adelaide with the full approval of the Classification of Publications Board and the Government?

Does the Premier say that that is a lie? Is that what the Premier was referring to when he said that the pamphlet put out by the Festival of Light was grossly untrue? In fact, he said that it was one of the most untruthful pieces of work that he had ever seen. Last week, in the debate on this Bill, the Premier went on to say (*Hansard*, page 1048):

It gives a graph of rapes reported to the police in South Australia and Queensland from 1964 to 1974-75, and then states:

End the South Australian rape menace. Support the Bill to ban sadistic pornography.

One would be led to believe by simply reading that pamphlet that the graph on the front of it, the illustration, is intended to portray (that is the implication of the wording of the pamphlet) that the number of rapes taking place in South Australia and Queensland is evidence of the influence on society towards rape activity by the existence in South Australia of publications which are permitted under the Classification of Publications Act as it stands at the moment.

That is the only conclusion one can reach from this statement, and it is an outright untruth.

Of course, the Premier should know, because he has spoken on this matter many times. The Premier said that it was untrue and baseless to refer to these figures as having any relationship to pornography. He was referring to the rape figures.

I remind the Premier of what he said in a lecture delivered in June 1970 to the Australian Humanist Society. He said that the laws were changed in Denmark and that people were then able to be more outgoing and permissive. He said that people should be allowed to read and see what they wished. He continued:

Then the great day came and the forbidden fruit was suddenly available. The average sale of each hard-core pornographic imprint was a third less than under censorship. One can understand why the publishers of pornography in Denmark had so rapidly to create an export market in countries where their products could still take advantage of the allure of the forbidden *frisson*.

I suppose there he was referring to his own State, which he refers to quite often as "the Sweden of the Southern Hemisphere".

The Hon. Peter Duncan: He refers to it as "the Athens of the South".

Mr. MATHWIN: Maybe he is talking about the Sweden of the North; you can have it whichever way you want. The Premier continued:

But perhaps more socially significant was the sudden fall-off in sex crimes and crimes of sexual violence that came with the new freedom, and since rape is perhaps one of the most violent of assaults on individual freedom and choice, it can be argued that really both the protectors of public morality and libertarians won all round. There is only one restriction that applies in Denmark's situation, and I think it is the only one that should apply in a similar situation here.

Let us see what the Assistant Chief Commissioner of the Danish State Police said about this matter. He said, in relation to serious sex crimes:

Since pornography has been on open sale the number of reported serious sex attacks has risen. The exporters of pornography are now the importers of narcotics.

So much for the Premier and his talk of the great benefits derived because of the permissive attitude that now applies in Denmark. I have not been to Denmark, but I

know a number of people who have and they were not inspired by what they saw.

What do people do with this type of material when they are finished with it? I have had examples in my area of young children going along the beach and, while rummaging in rubbish bins for cans to get the returnable deposit (and these were children from the Seaforth Home), they found a number of copies of this shocking type of literature. That is the great problem about pornography. It is all right to support the argument that everybody should be able to read what they wish, but the problem is what happens to that literature when people have finished with it.

If I take my wife and family to a park or on to the beach why should they be confronted by this filth and rubbish? It is degrading for everybody concerned. Most of this literature relates to women, and it is more than degrading for that sex. It is surprising that the Premier and the Labor Party, which so willingly followed the lead of the Leader some years ago in relation to the equality of the sexes and saw fit to bring in a Bill about that matter, have such different thoughts about pornography. The Premier is reported in *Hansard* as follows:

... it is easier to prove and to report rape without the unpleasant consequences which obtained previously for women making complaints.

He refers to new legislation brought in by the Government. He continued:

... the comparable figures are prosecutions and convictions for rape. That is the proof of the rate within the community because that is the only way in which one can establish the incidence of rape.

In other words, the Premier is saying that the only yardstick that he and members of the Government have relating to rape is the number of prosecutions and convictions. If that is the yardstick that the Premier uses, I am sorry for him. What about the people who report rape? A conservative estimate is that only one in four rapes is reported. It is well known in the crisis centres throughout the State that only one in three rapes reported to a crisis centre is reported to the police. There is a long trail to follow before a case comes before a court. A woman can take a number of options before she gets to court. She must go through all this turmoil before she gets to court. So far as the Premier is concerned the number of rapes reported does not mean anything. He says, in effect, that women who report rapes are generally liars, because he says that the only figures that we can rely on are the conviction figures.

I have figures here to refresh the Attorney's memory. In relation to juveniles, for the year ended June 1977, there were 17 rapes. Seven persons were committed for trial or sentence; one was fined; one was placed on a bond without supervision; one was placed on a bond with supervision; one was placed on a care and control order for 21 days; two cases were dismissed with no effective order made; and, associated with care and control complaints, were two males and two females. One can see how many convictions there were and what happened to those young people.

We know from the figures the single rape of the young or old is usually committed by people in their mid-20's. Pack rapes usually involve juveniles and young girls who are picked up at milk bars and the like and taken away in a motor car. The modern terminology for pack rape is a "gang bang". The Premier says that the only figures we can go on are convictions. I ask the Attorney in his reply to say whether he believes that all the people who report a rape that does not result in a conviction are liars. Does he think reporting rape is a complete waste of time so far as

women are concerned?

We all know the long-term effects of a rape attack on a female; many problems stay with these women for the rest of their lives. The victim virtually becomes a second-class citizen, and it seems that she gets less consideration than the law breaker. The Premier said that there was a sizable fine of \$2 600 for pornography. Not long ago we debated a Bill in this place which considered a small debt to be \$1 500. Pornography is a multi-million dollar business. The cost of producing one of these books is about 40c or 50c, yet they are sold for \$5, \$10 or more. Not only that, but the people who, for one reason or another, wish to buy them do not really know what they are getting because the books are sealed. When they open them, they may find that they do not depict what they wanted, anyway. Do they go to the Public and Consumer Affairs Department and say that they have been taken down, that they wanted a book on homosexuality and that there is very little on this subject in their purchase? How does the Government protect these members of the public?

I understand that in America the industry is worth \$2.2 billion a year, and of that sum the profit margin is \$1.7 billion. We see where the vested interests are. We can see why it is hard to get support and why one seems to be kicking against the wind in matters of public dignity, about which so many people are concerned.

I support the Bill, which is good legislation. A massive majority of my constituents also support it; many people have written to me, telephoned me, and been to see me about this matter. It is of great public concern, irrespective of what the Government may think. It is about time it woke up to itself and found out what the people outside feel about this problem. If it does so, it will find that people are concerned about the permissive society in this State, about the effects on their families, and about the future of their children and grandchildren. This is a matter of great concern to our society, which is based on family life, the welfare of which is paramount.

In relation to the Classification of Publications Board, the Premier did not want to have included on the board a woman from the National Council of Women, nor did he want the board to report to Parliament each year. At least in regard to pornography, particularly child pornography, the Opposition has done something to inform society about what is happening. It is obvious that the Government will not support this Bill, but we have been told that the Government will bring in its own Bill shortly. We were told last week by the Premier that he supports the British type of legislation. We will be watching with great interest to see the Bill that the Government plans to present to the House. If it is not as good as the British legislation, we know that the Government will accept some amendments. I support the Bill.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): I should like to make a couple of points, principally relating to the debate this afternoon, because, as members have obviously recognised, the introduction of the Government's Bill by the Premier tomorrow will inevitably lead to the demise of the Opposition measure, and therefore to the demise of this debate. It was rather surprising, if not amazing, that the member for Light should have suggested that this was not, in his view, a political issue. The fact that the Opposition knew full well that the Government intended to introduce—

Dr. Eastick: I acknowledged it was political, but—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the honourable member acknowledged it was political, I suggest that the political issue involved is what he sees as a few votes to the Liberal Party, because the Opposition knew full well before it

decided to bring on this matter for debate this afternoon that the Government's measure was on the Notice Paper, and was due for introduction tomorrow.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: That is the case, and members opposite well know that, yet the member for Light has the cheek to get up in this House this afternoon and laud the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Hamer) in terms such as, "All strength to Mr. Hamer's hand". In fact, Mr. Hamer has simply announced that he will introduce amendments to the legislation in Victoria dealing with this matter. That legislation is not on the Notice Paper of the Victorian Parliament, and has only been foreshadowed in the most general fashion in the press. No-one knows its contents. On the other hand, this Government's intention to move in this matter has already been well flagged, yet for our trouble we are criticised in this place, with the member for Light coming on strong in praise of the Premier of Victoria for indicating that he will do something about it some time before the end of the year. As time has run out, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

HAIRDRESSERS REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Hairdressers Registration Act, 1939-1951. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Over recent years requests have been received from the Hairdressers' Registration Board for amendments to be made to this Act but, mainly because of the priority of other Bills, it has not been possible to proceed with the proposed amendments until now. I record with appreciation the continued co-operation of the Hairdressers' Registration Board in the preparation of this measure.

The principal amendment to be effected by this Bill will require the compulsory registration of persons practising hairdressing in certain prescribed areas of the State. At present, any person not registered under the legislation is prevented from using the name of "hairdresser" or any other name that implies that that person is a registered hairdresser. In effect, registration is regarded as an indication that a person has attained a certain standard of proficiency, but the legislation does not prohibit an unregistered person from practising hairdressing and calling himself a barber, beautician or a cosmetician.

In requesting the compulsory registration of hairdressers, the Hairdressers' Registration Board has alleged that "backyard" or unregistered hairdressers, whose skills in their trade have not been assessed by the board, nor have they passed any recognised examination, are often unhygienic and may sometimes damage the hair and skin of clients by the misuse of lotions and other unskilled practices. The Government has accepted that the introduction of a system of compulsory registration of persons practising hairdressing will close that existing loophole and do much to eliminate the undesirable practices in the industry.

However, in order to protect the livelihood of those persons currently carrying on business as hairdressers, although not registered as such, it is intended that the new compulsory registration provisions will come into effect six

months after the proclamation of the amending legislation. This will enable such people in the initially prescribed areas to apply and be eligible for registration until the expiration of the six-month period. A similar period is provided for the registration of other such persons in areas prescribed after that time.

Members will note that the compulsory registration provisions of the Bill are to apply only in certain prescribed areas. Although the original request from the Hairdressers' Registration Board extended to all persons practising hairdressing in South Australia, the imposition of such a blanket provision throughout the State would not only create many administrative difficulties but would be socially undesirable in those country areas where there is a shortage of suitably qualified persons. The Government is aware that it is not uncommon in country towns for the local barber to be a resident (who works at some other occupation) performing a service that a fully qualified hairdresser would find financially unattractive, and it does not intend to deprive some country inhabitants of the benefit of this practice.

Accordingly, the Government intends that, by prescribing certain areas by regulation for the purposes of the compulsory registration provisions, those requirements will operate in the first instance within the metropolitan area of Adelaide and then be extended to cover all country cities where hairdressing facilities are readily available. In all areas outside the prescribed areas, the provisions relating to the practice of hairdressing remain unchanged. The Bill seeks to make several other amendments to improve the operation of the Act and to update its approach by reducing its inflexibility in certain respects.

The attention of members is drawn to the definition of "hairdressing". This definition includes work currently carried out by cosmeticians, and several cases of hardship have come to notice, particularly with respect to the proposed establishment of beautician's schools and training courses. The Government considers that, where cosmetic or depilatory treatments are not carried out in conjunction with hairdressing, it is unnecessary to require compliance with the provisions of the Act. The Bill therefore, seeks to remove these restrictions by deleting all reference to cosmetic work and depilatory work from the definition of "hairdressing" in the legislation.

An amendment is proposed in connection with the prohibition outlined in section 32. While it is acknowledged that the teaching of hairdressing for fee or reward to unregistered persons (otherwise than through recognised schools of instruction) should be prohibited, the Government considers it desirable to encourage the enhancement of existing skills through the continued tuition of registered hairdressers by registered hairdressers. To give effect to this principle, the Bill provides for the exclusion from the prohibition of those courses of instruction approved by the Hairdressers' Registration Board.

Several changes are proposed to make the board's existing authority under the principal Act to grant registration to suitable applicants more appropriate to modern conditions. A new section 19 has been drafted which gives an entitlement to registration if the Hairdressers' Registration Board is satisfied that the applicant holds certain prescribed qualifications or has some other suitable qualifications or experience. In addition, the Bill provides a six-month transitional period of eligibility for those persons practising hairdressing in a given area at the time that area became prescribed for the purposes of the legislation.

This provision will not only make for consistency between the minimum period required for qualification as

hairdressers and the shorter period for apprenticeship prescribed by the Apprentices Act, but will also give the board greater discretion to recognise qualifications from interstate and overseas.

The opportunity has also been taken to include in the Bill provision for the fees pertaining to the operation of the legislation to be prescribed by regulation, instead of being specified in the legislation. Such an amendment is in line with current practice and permits a greater degree of flexibility to enable fees to reflect more readily community standards. 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. The intention is that the amended section 29 of the principal Act, which introduces compulsory registration, will come into effect six months after the amending legislation comes into operation. This is to ensure that unregistered persons receive ample opportunity to ascertain the new requirements and to take appropriate measures.

Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act, which defines certain expressions used therein. The definition of "hairdressing" is modified by deleting all reference to the removing and destroying of hair, the treatment and beautification of the face, neck and scalp, and wig-making. This clause also inserts a definition of "prescribed area" in section 4.

Clause 4 amends section 17 of the principal Act which sets out certain general powers and duties of the board. The power to issue certificates of registration provided in subsection (1) (a) (iii) is recast in more comprehensive terms incorporating authority to register duly qualified applicants.

Clause 5 repeals sections 19, 19a, 20 and 21 of the principal Act. These, in their turn, deal with the qualifications for registration, reciprocal arrangements for registration, and fees payable on registration and the issue of certificates. The amendment also enacts new sections 19 and 20, dealing with substantially the same areas, although in more concise terms. An applicant is to be entitled to registration under the new section 19 if the board is satisfied that he holds the prescribed qualifications or that he has other qualifications and experience that justify his registration. The new section is wide enough to facilitate the registration of persons who may have trained and practised outside South Australia. A provision is inserted to protect the livelihood of unregistered persons who may at present be carrying on the trade of hairdressing without infringing the principal Act. If such a person applies for registration within six months after the commencement of the amending Act, he will be entitled to registration.

Section 20 provides for annual registration fees. If these are not remitted as required, registration will be suspended until the fee is paid. The new provisions delete material in the existing sections that has become obsolete. This comprises special provisions for initial registration when the principal Act first became law, and also for the registration of persons who were trained by the Commonwealth Government while serving in the forces during the Second World War.

Clause 6 sets out what might be regarded as the central amendment in the Bill. Section 29 of the principal Act is amended so that registration will be compulsory for all persons carrying on the practice of hairdressing in a prescribed area. The Government intends that the entire metropolitan area be prescribed initially, and larger coun-

try centres at a later date. A hairdresser working in a prescribed area who remains unregistered after the proposed amendments come into operation will be liable to a penalty of up to \$100.

Clause 7 removes an anomaly in the existing legislation by providing that courses of instruction approved by the board shall not be subject to the general prohibition on the teaching of hairdressing for reward contained in section 32 of the principal Act.

Clause 8 modifies five of the specified areas in which the Governor may make regulations. First, an upper limit of \$200 applicable to the annual fees which may be prescribed for members of the board contained in paragraph (c), is removed. Secondly, the amendment modifies the terms of paragraph (e) which relates to prescribed training courses, so that they stand more consistently with the wording of the new section 19. Next, the existing paragraph (f), which deals with the registration of persons practising hairdressing when the principal Act first came into operation, is deleted, as it is clearly obsolete. There is now a new paragraph (f), giving power to prescribe areas in which registration is to be compulsory.

Fourthly, the amendment rephrases paragraph (g) in more concise terms. This paragraph is concerned with the conduct of examinations by the board. Finally, paragraph (h), which relates to the prescribing of fees for certificates, examinations and registrations, is expanded to cover any fees payable under the principal Act.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

SELECT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY INTO PROSTITUTION

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Select Committee of Inquiry into Prostitution to have power to appoint Ms. Mary MacLeod, of the Women's Advisory Unit, as a research assistant, to attend any of its meetings in an advisory capacity, and to examine the evidence submitted confidentially, subject to the control and direction of the committee.

The committee believes it is necessary to have expert, full-time assistance. The purpose of moving the motion is to make available to the Select Committee some extra assistance to enable it to analyse the great mass of literature and material that is available or will be available to it in the course of its inquiry. One person, who has done some research on this matter, has indicated that he has several cartons of accumulated material which he is prepared to make available to the committee to assist in its deliberations. Obviously, it is beyond the capacity of the committee to go through this material.

Mr. Millhouse: Why do you say that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. W. SIMMONS: It may well be that that material is not particularly helpful, but the offer has been made and it is one indication of why it is desirable to have some outside help. There are precedents for this. The local government Select Committee, for example, appointed Mr. Hockridge in similar terms to act as an expert available to it. As Minister for the Environment, when a Select Committee was set up to inquire into the noise control legislation, I had a technical officer from the Environment Department to provide technical advice to the committee on matters referred to it.

Some special problems are associated with this Select Committee. It must conduct its work confidentially and

run its meetings in camera if it is to abide by the terms of its appointment, and if it is to get the witnesses it wants to come forward. Perhaps some of those witnesses will have to be sought out if we are to get effective coverage of the topic. For those reasons, I have moved for the appointment of Ms. MacLeod. She is well qualified, with an honors degree in economics from the Sydney University, with considerable research experience, and I am sure she will be an asset to the operations of the committee.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. Millhouse: Mr.—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is known to members on both sides that I am opposed to this motion. There are, as I understand it—and I may be wrong—only two—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows that he cannot debate. I want to know the point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that if you call the honourable member for Torrens before me there will be two speakers in favour of the motion, and no opportunity for anyone to speak in opposition to it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already called the honourable member for Torrens, and I intend to stand by the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I raise a further point of order, Sir. I do my own whipping. I came up to you and told you that I wanted to speak, and you said I would get a chance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows I did not say that. I have called the honourable member for Torrens, and I intend that he will speak.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a further point of order, Sir. That is precisely what you said to me, and I then reminded you that there were only two speakers—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the question. I have called the honourable member for Torrens, and I intend that he will speak.

Mr. WILSON (Torrens): I second the motion, which has the support of the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not continue in this vein. I shall call him to order at this stage.

Mr. WILSON: We were concerned that the motion may have been too all-embracing, but, now that Ms. MacLeod has been named as a specific person, we are prepared to accept the motion on those terms. If at some later stage she became unavailable to the committee, she would have to be replaced through a motion in this House, which is right and proper, especially in dealing with a committee with special provisions. Ms. MacLeod will not be an added cost to the committee, because she is being seconded from the department.

Mr. Millhouse: Whose job is it to do the work?

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham. I have given him every opportunity. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. WILSON: She will not be an added cost to the committee. From the Minister's remarks and from other information I have gained, I understand that this type of research assistance has been made available for many other Select Committees, and I believe it has been effective.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to speak to this motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will

not have an opportunity. Under Standing Orders, he is unable to speak. The question is "That the motion be agreed to." Those in favour say "Aye"; against say "No".

Mr. Millhouse: No.

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

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: There being only one member in favour of the Noes, the motion therefore passes in the affirmative.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2)

In Committee.

(Continued from 26 September. Page 1184.)

Schedule.

Parliamentary Library, \$177 000.

Mr. TONKIN (Leader of the Opposition): At the close of proceedings last evening, when the Premier moved so carefully that progress be reported, he had chosen to misunderstand my comments. I was querying the increase from \$109 219 to \$126 699 for library staff. I was concerned that additional staff might be appointed, and that that could account for that increase. It has subsequently been explained that that is not so and that terminal leave payments and so forth have applied.

I raised the subject of the staff available to the Opposition, and I made the point that we had requested additional staff about two years ago but that that request had been denied and that, instead, extra staff had been appointed as research officers in the library. The Premier was in error when he said that we had renewed our call for additional staff for the Opposition. Indeed, there has been no change in that establishment. I make that point clear because the Premier, having talked about savings, accused the Opposition of asking for extra staff in this time of financial stringency. He also praised his own generosity towards the Opposition in stark contrast, so he said, to the treatment that he received, so I thought I should put the record straight on that matter.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader has lamentably failed to put the record straight, because no straightening was required. It was perfectly obvious from what he said last night that he was bleating about the fact that he could not get extra staff. I have the *Hansard* report of what he said, as follows:

The research staff situation, and I recall this vividly, is not as good as it should be.

He continued:

It seems we have no additional research staff, even though there was a suggestion last year that we were going to get additional research staff.

The whole tenor of what he said was that the Opposition (the Liberal Party, to be more correct) did not have enough staff to assist it with its tasks. I do not believe that is the case. I agree entirely with what the Premier said last night about this.

In my view (although this is no reflection on any member of the library staff, either the researchers or the librarians and their assistants), the library staff is far too large and costs us far too much for the work that members give it. That work includes research. If we saw any result in the speeches of members because of the research assistance that they say they get, it would be a tolerable situation. However, I suggest that there has been no improvement in the standard of debate in this place since we had researchers: heaven knows that the so-called

shadow Ministers do not show any promise in the speeches that they make.

I believe (although I do not know whether it is true, because the Librarian is properly reticent about it) that overall only a small proportion of members use the library at all for research or any other purpose. I guess that only about a quarter of the members of this place actually use the library facilities.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a bit strong.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have said that I am guessing, but that is my observation over many years as to how many members use the place, and I believe that estimate to be about right. As for the research, I am afraid that is a lamentable farce so far as members are concerned. Members do not make proper use of the research staff because they do not have the capacity themselves to make use of it.

The Library is an expensive part of the organisation of Parliament. We are now to vote a sum of \$177 000 for the library, which includes the researchers and, if the Liberal Party, which is always anxious to get a bit more for itself, had its way, it would be even more. Last night I reminded honourable members of how the expenditures on these lines had grown. For the year ended 30 June 1956 the actual payments for the library amounted to £4 241.

Mr. Tonkin: You're living in the past.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Leader claims that I am living in the past. When it suits him he criticises the Government for extravagance, but when it does not suit him and when he is going to get something for himself, the boot is on the other foot. I know it is the deliberate policy of the Government—Sir Thomas Playford did it when old Mick O'Halloran was Leader of the Opposition to keep the Opposition Party fat and contented in its role so that it will be a less effective Opposition. The Government does it pretty well, but even the Premier revolted against giving the Liberal Party any further research staff. I should think that he would. How many staff members has the so-called Leader of the Opposition got now, and what result do we get from them? The public purse pays for, I think, seven members of his staff. God knows what they do.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The number of staff of the Leader of the Opposition is not a matter for discussion under this line. This relates to the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I might get a chance to say something about that later. In 1956 the total allocation to the library was £4 241 (about \$8 500), yet now we are to spend \$177 000 on it. It might be said that the value of money has decreased in that time, but it has not decreased as much as that. Some of the mathematicians here, or perhaps some of the researchers in the library, can work out what is the increase in expenditure on the library.

Mr. Bannon: There are more members now.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Ross Smith, who is about to cost the taxpayers an extra \$150 000 when he becomes a Minister, claims that there are now more members. The number has increased from 39 to 47 in this House and from 20 to 21 in another place. Even the honourable member could not justify an increase in expenditure because of that. Does he seriously suggest that? Of course not, and there is stunning silence from him now!

Mr. Bannon: I meant to say a "significant" increase.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not believe it is significant. The only significance is that members of this place on both sides are ripping off the people of this State, and this is a jolly good example of it. When I first came into Parliament in 1955, there were two officers on the library staff. There was the Librarian, Mr. Eric Lanyon—

Mr. Bannon: That shows how much research used to be

done.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was always in the habit in those days, until there were researchers, of doing my own research, and I do not know that my speeches have suffered from that, in much the same way as I have done the work myself when a member of a Select Committee.

Mr. Bannon: You'd be lost without them.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Nonsense! What are we paid to do? Just sit about in our districts or make speeches that have little or no content? The question of research is an absolute farce. When I first came here, there were two members on the library staff, the second of whom was Peter Host, who is the survivor now. Jim Bald, who has now retired, came within a few months, and that made it three staff members. I do not know how many staff there are now. Perhaps the Minister who is enjoying acting as Leader of the House will be able to tell us. I think that there are about 10 of them. The people of South Australia are not getting any value for the money spent. I have referred to the \$8 500 in 1956; it increased to \$29 212 in 1970-71. What has been the increase in the past seven years? From about \$30 000, it has risen to \$177 000. How on earth can that possibly be justified? If any members on either side really believe that we are trustees, as I believe and try to put into effect, of public moneys contributed compulsorily by the people of this State and are spending the money wisely, when one sees that expenditure, I pity them. I challenge any honourable member to defend this enormously increased expenditure.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think we ought to go to the Public Library?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Parliamentary Library is for the use of members. Last evening, the Leader of the Opposition, who is grinning in such an inane way, bleated for more staff for the library.

Mr. Nankivell: Whom are you kidding?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let us see for the benefit of the retiring member for Mallee what the Leader said.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There are far too many interjections. The honourable member's speech is more in reply to interjections than to the line under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last evening, the Leader said that the research staff situation was not as good as it should be, and that it seemed we had no additional research staff, even though last year there was a suggestion that we were going to get additional research staff. He said shadow Ministers could not do their job, because there was not sufficient research assistance available to them. The Leader also said he recalled applying to the Premier for additional staff for his office.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member's reference to the Leader of the Opposition's staff is irrelevant to the line under discussion. Even though it was allowed to be referred to in Committee last evening, I do not believe that it should be allowed to be discussed now.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order, and point out that the Committee should be discussing the staff of the Parliamentary Library.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have been furnished with information which shows not only that the Leader wants more research staff but also that he wants a larger office outside Parliament House. What a greedy fellow he is!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member's remark is out of order.

Mr. Chapman: Needy, not greedy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If you fellows were worth your salt, you would do your own work and be 20 times more efficient, without—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member knows that he is not allowed to address members as "you" or "you fellows". He should say "honourable member".

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy): First, I will deal with the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition, because some incorrect information was inadvertently given last evening. Regarding the allocation of \$126 699 in connection with the library staff, the increase is due to increases in salaries awarded by the Public Service Board to the two research assistants in the library during the previous financial year, but last year's vote does not reflect the full year's effect of that. In addition, last year's staff changes necessitated the creation of a temporary position of library assistant, in February 1978, and the probable retirement of the Assistant Parliamentary Librarian early in 1979-80 has necessitated the continuation of this position until that time, when it will be reviewed.

I do not think that we should permit the troglodytic speech by the member for Mitcham to go unanswered. I am prepared to wager London to a brick that at no stage during the Budget Estimates debate in any of the previous years in which he has been a member has he ever complained about the money spent on the library. He has chosen to do it this year, for reasons known presumably to himself. I do not know what he is desperate about. He reverts to the situation in 1956, when a small sum was provided for the library and when only two people were on the staff.

Mr. Millhouse: The sum of \$8 500.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If he had been a decent member then, he would have lambasted the Playford Government for its rotten expenditure on the library.

Mr. Millhouse: None of your colleagues did.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That does not excuse the honourable member's lack of judgment in this matter for 20 years.

Mr. Millhouse: Fiddlesticks!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Never has the honourable member come into the House and dealt properly with the library. He has chosen to make an attack, presumably on the Opposition but indirectly on the library staff. He is really trying to tell us that their services are not required and that what they are doing is not worth while. For his benefit, I point out that there are seven librarian positions in the library at present, one of which is vacant. There are two research officers and two typists. The library, which is large, services not only Parliament, but other people as well. The Parliamentary Library has an exchange arrangement with other libraries, and it deals with many requests from Government departments, from the Governor, from the Public Library, and elsewhere, as well as providing services to members. It may well be that the honourable member never bothers to use the services of the library these days. He is so much living in fairyland that he can make up his own fairy tales. He does not have to go and read Hans Christian Andersen any more. I can speak on this matter as one of those members who use the library extensively.

Mr. Millhouse: Novels all the time!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The member for Mitcham is not capable of telling the truth, either. As someone who has used the library's services extensively and who is aware of the amount of material that is now made available to members that previously was not made available, in the ordinary course of events, apart from special requests being made by members, I would testify that the service provided by the library now is many times better than that which was provided in 1965, when I first came into this place. Indeed, many members would testify to that, and it

ill behoves the member for Mitcham to express such a mean-minded, rotten and anti attitude. The honourable member is really saying to the people of South Australia, "If members cannot do the work themselves, no provision should be made to inform them better." This is a reactionary, rotten and stinking attitude towards the Parliamentary Library staff and the library.

I have heard the member for Mitcham say many things in my time, but I have never heard him more reactionary, right-wing or almost fascist in his attitude. Next, he will tell us that he wants to burn the books because they are taking up space. What about the requests that the member for Mitcham has made to the Government for staff? However, I would be out of order in referring further to that. The member for Mitcham (the leader of a Party, he says) wants a Government car and a press secretary.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, the Minister knows that that is untrue. I have never asked for a Government car. When there were four members of the Liberal Movement in this place, we asked for one secretary, and that is the extent of the requests that I have made. That happened about four years ago. The Minister knows that, and what he said was a deliberate untruth.

The CHAIRMAN: I will not uphold the point of order, although I remind the Minister for Mines and Energy that staff cars, facilities, and so on, for members of Parliament are not matters for discussion under the line that the Committee is now debating.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member can save this Government money, if he so desires and if he thinks it is important, without attacking our good Parliamentary Library. I do not suppose the honourable member would care to contemplate the increase in the cost of books in recent years, or is he trying to tell us that we should not be purchasing as many books or trying to keep the library up to date? I resent his attitude regarding this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Books aren't included in this line, are they?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Books are purchased every year, as the honourable member knows.

Mr. Millhouse: Under which line are books provided for?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Over the years, there has been a considerable increase in the stock of available library books, and they need to be serviced if they are to be used effectively. The library is not used by members of Parliament only.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! What books are you talking about?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Provision is made for book expenditure and, if the honourable member showed me the courtesy, I would provide that information for him at a suitable time. However, the honourable member insists on having his questions answered immediately he interjects. Can we not get it into the honourable member's head that he is rapidly becoming classed as an idiot, not just in this place?

Mr. Millhouse: You've been telling me that for 13 years.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am concerned, for the honourable member's benefit, because everyone else is telling me that he is an idiot: it is no longer a matter of one-way communication. The word has suddenly got around and, if the honourable member wants something to criticise, he can do better than criticise the Parliamentary Library, which provides an excellent service. Perhaps it does not do so for the member for Mitcham, who is a brilliant, highly educated and intelligent man who does not need that sort of assistance. He is so superior that he does not need the help that other members need.

However, I venture to suggest that those honourable members who use the library realise that their performance in this place is assisted immeasurably by the important service that the library is able to offer and, on behalf of those members, I resent bitterly the appalling and backward-looking attack made on the library by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Mitcham imputed ignorance to Opposition members, saying that we were incapable of using adequately the research staff. I suggest that, during one of his infrequent visits to this place when Parliament is sitting, the honourable member take time to visit the library and see for himself what is happening there, because he is obviously ignorant in this respect. I recall the honourable member's remarks in the Budget debate in this place in 1974. For his benefit, as well as that of other members, I will quote what the honourable member said to illustrate the depth of hypocrisy that he has displayed this evening.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What was the figure that year—\$8 000?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: No, the honourable member went back to 1956, when he first came into this place. One does not have to go back that far to find a more recent view expressed in this place by the member for Mitcham regarding the library staff. I had raised a query, after which the member for Mitcham entered the Chamber (obviously, he was not so much at loggerheads with members then) and supported what I said, saying (page 924 of 12 September 1974 *Hansard*):

The member for Kavel has asked a question about this matter and received a vague but I suppose technically accurate answer. Unfortunately, our Parliamentary Librarian and members of his staff are poorly paid in comparison with other Parliamentary Librarians and with other members of the Parliamentary staff. I understand that one of the members of the Parliamentary Library staff, Mr. Jim Bald, is paid a salary substantially lower than that of newer members of the messengerial staff. It seems strange to me that a man who has worked here in the library for about 15 years—he was not here when I was first elected—is paid such a low salary. I have mentioned his case by way of comparison, not because he has complained to me about his salary. The Parliamentary Library staff is a small group and no-one really speaks for these officers, nor is anyone else in a comparable situation.

Mr. Bannon: You've really pulled the carpet out from under him now.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: One has to go back not to 1956 but only to 1974 to see how genuine was the honourable member's show of parsimony that he displayed this evening. There was quite an effusion in support of this poor, humble group of beleaguered officers, who laboured from dawn to dusk in the Parliamentary Library for poor wages. The member for Mitcham continued:

Over the years I understand their salaries have dropped substantially behind the salaries paid to comparable officers. I believe this matter was raised last year in another place and that no action was taken to deal with it. My object in raising the matter is that it will be given sympathetic and active consideration.

Obviously, his heart was bleeding. This is the member for Mitcham, whose words are still ringing in our ears. I know it is hard to believe, but here it is in black and white.

Mr. Millhouse: You are going to get a few more words in a minute, too.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It will need more than the member for Mitcham's legal skill and adroit footwork for him to deny that he said that two years ago, when his heart was bleeding for the library staff. He continued:

These officers are competent and helpful . . . What did he say tonight? He said that this research staff had nothing to do, I think, that they were pottering around, that nobody knew how to use them, and that it was a disgrace that they had joined the library. The member for Mitcham continued his earlier remarks as follows:

These officers are competent and helpful and, compared to their opposite numbers in other States, should receive substantially more than they are now receiving. Will the Treasurer inquire into this matter?

Just how sincere is this fellow who parades himself as the saviour of the State? He has been so used to sitting on the fence and jumping whichever way the wind blows that it is a wonder to me that he is not cut in half.

We have seen a show of complete hypocrisy from him tonight. We know he has no concern for money being spent on this line. The member for Mitcham is so intent on striking a pose in this place and trying to grab a headline that it is hard to see his true motive, and his stance changes with the wind from day to day.

However, it is my educated guess, from eight years of observing the member for Mitcham, that what he said in 1974 was probably genuine but we can never be sure of that fact. But his stance tonight cannot be reconciled with what he said in a similar debate in 1974. I think that indicates the depth of the humbug to which we have been exposed tonight by the member for Mitcham. I resent the superior, sneering implications that we get from the member for Mitcham and from other lawyers from time to time that they are some sort of race apart, and that they are the only people endowed with any flicker of intelligence in this place who have the ability to use the research staff. It is perfectly obvious that the member for Mitcham is here to put on a turn tonight, because he did not get his way. There are occasions when even he cannot get the floor in this place, and we know he is thoroughly out of sorts. We know just how hypocritical he can get, because he gets up here during prorogation speeches and praises all and sundry, including the library staff. What are we to believe: what he said in 1974 or what he said tonight? I thought that what he said in 1974 at least had a ring of truth about it.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I seek information from the Minister about the comparative salaries of the Parliamentary Librarian in South Australia and his counterpart librarians in other States. Although I have been in this place for only one year, I would like to testify to the enormous value to me, as a member of Parliament, of the library and its dedicated staff. The member for Mitcham asked what we are paid to do. It seems to me that we are paid to legislate and represent. I have been helped immeasurably by the library staff. To give an example: earlier this year I was asked to give a speech at the opening of Children's Book Week. I regarded it as an important occasion, and I wanted to speak on literature and literacy, and their importance to children, adults and the nation as a whole. I asked the Parliamentary Library to do some research for me. I do not know how many hours of salaried time went into that research, but I know that as a result of it I was given material which took me about eight hours to read and from which I spent two to three hours writing a speech that finally took only 20 minutes to deliver.

Ultimately, some of that speech was reproduced in the daily press, and I hope that as a result of it some seeds were sown in terms of the need for a national language policy. I was only able to give that speech, a well-documented one that deserved serious consideration, as a result of the assistance given to me by the Parliamentary Library staff.

Since the date the member for Mitcham mentioned, comparing the size of the staff then with the present staff, there have been many developments within the Parliamentary Library.

As a member of the Library Committee, on which I have the honour to represent the Opposition, I am aware that, for instance, the electronic media has developed to the point where it can no longer be ignored by Parliamentary libraries. Enormous records have to be kept which were certainly not kept, or needed to be kept, in the 1950's and early 1960's. All members need to refer to those records of transcripts of interviews and speeches on the electronic media.

In addition, members are provided with a reading list, which obviously takes considerable time to research and prepare for our benefit, in order to save us time, and to give us quick access to material that is politically and legislatively valuable. I believe it is not very many years ago that the library did not have a cutting service. I would think there is scarcely a member in the House who has not experienced the value of that service, when called on to make a quick speech or rebut a point and who has not darted into the library, asked for what he or she wanted, and got a quick and courteous response.

Mr. Millhouse: Whom are you kidding? How many members do you think do that?

Mrs. ADAMSON: I can only speak for myself, but when I am in the library I see other members there, and I am sure there would be a usage rate of the library comprising far more than a quarter of the members here. I add that, if it were only one-quarter of the members who used the library, that in itself would make it of considerable value to Parliament and to the State. I stress that I think the Parliamentary Librarian, by comparison with other officers of the Parliament, is underpaid. His proposed salary is \$18 000, and when one compares that with the salary of the Clerk of the Legislative Council, \$28 942, and compares the respective responsibilities and the hours of work, I think one would have to come down on the side of acknowledging that the Parliamentary Librarian in South Australia is underpaid. Will the Minister ascertain the comparative salaries of Parliamentary Librarians in Australia?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will have to provide that information for the honourable member. I think she would be aware that the Joint Library Committee is making a submission to the Public Service Board on this matter. In the course of that submission, no doubt this information will be used as part of the basis for any case put, and I imagine that the Public Service Board will have to pay attention to it as well. I will see what I can find out for the honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I divorce myself from the remarks made by the Leader of the Democrats. I was interested to hear the member for Kavel read some of the comments made in *Hansard* by the member for Mitcham in 1974. It is even more interesting to note the remarks made in 1978, when the leading speaker on the line "Parliamentary Library, \$152 000" was the member for Kavel. Honourable members should compare the remarks made this evening by the member for Mitcham with those he made in 1974 as read out just now by the member for Kavel. Dealing with the Parliamentary staff (*Hansard* page 205, 13 October 1977) the member for Kavel said:

I am puzzled by the salary of the Parliamentary Librarian, because it seems that he is paid about \$10 000 less, for instance than the Clerk of the Legislative Council and the Clerk of this Chamber.

At least the member for Kavel is consistent in his concern, whereas he has pointed out the inconsistency of the

member for Mitcham. I support this line, as it relates to the staff in the library, who are of great assistance to me. I know that I and many other members depend on this service in the course of our duties in this Parliament.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am very happy to be divorced from the natural Leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Alexandra. Let us see how many leaders there are in the Liberal Party: there is the natural Leader in front of me; there is the so-called Leader, Dr. Tonkin, and half a dozen pretenders to the leadership, as well as the former Leader, the member for Light. They are an unhappy crew.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member should refer to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is always a fascinating exercise for me to embark on what is likely to be an unpopular line, and to see the mutual geniality between the members of the Labor Party and members of the Liberal Party when members of one or other of the Parties are attacking me. It is about the only other thing (apart from Parliamentary perks) that members of each Party agree on—what a dreadful fellow I am; I am no good at all for anything.

The member for Kavel reminded the Chamber, amidst much rejoicing on both sides, so far as I could see, of what I said in 1974. The member for Kavel very seriously misrepresented the tenor of my remarks. I do not for one moment criticise any individual member of the library staff; they have given me a great deal of help for over 20 years now. What I do say though is that there are far too many members on the staff.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I invite the Minister to tell me of one decision of this place that has ever been affected by speeches made by members based on research that they have had from the library. I challenge any honourable member to tell me when any of the research work that has been done by the Parliamentary Library for members on either side of the House has changed a vote in this place. We know that it does not. It does not matter what you say here; the vote has been decided somewhere else, anyway.

That is the position and I challenge the Minister to deny that. Of course he cannot, any more than he can say how under this line books are provided. If he looked at the subheading of it, he would see that it is for salaries, wages and related payments, yet one of the arguments he tried to use against me was that we had to buy books for the library. What an ignorant fellow he is, and here he is pretending to be the Premier. I do not criticise for one moment any member of the library staff, from Mr. Casson down to the most junior member of that staff. They have given me good service. I like them; they have always been courteous, friendly and helpful. However, that does not alter the fact that there are far too many of them.

I come to the point raised by the member for Coles, and the point which I raised in 1974 and which the member for Kavel has raised—the level of salaries paid to members of the staff. I complained about this in 1974, and I do not retract from that. The Premier said then that he would refer the matter to the Public Service Board, yet we still have the same complaints now. The profession of librarian is one of the lowest paid professions in our community, as the member for Coles knows. Librarians are not paid much more than priests and ministers of religion, who are the least well paid members of any profession. I do not agree, and I did not agree in 1974, that we should pay such a low salary to individuals. I wanted to see it raised, and I still want to see it raised, because I believe that they are underpaid.

That does not alter the point that I make: we are spending on the Parliamentary Library far more than we should, far more than the people of South Australia get

value for. There should be fewer members on the staff, and they should get an increment in their salary. I thought that was perfectly well known when I spoke, but of course members on both sides had to try to find something to divert from the thrust of the criticism I have made, namely, that we are proposing to spend \$177 000 on the Parliamentary Library, and there simply is not the value for the people of this State in this expenditure.

I knew before I started that what I said would be unpopular, because no member in this place, in my experience, is ever popular when he questions any expenditure in this place, because we all enjoy it. I am afraid that many of the noble sentiments that members express about service and why they are here, and so on, are utter humbug. We have heard a fair bit of it tonight.

Mr. Goldsworthy: From your corner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Kavel may chide me for that and ridicule me—

Mr. Goldsworthy: You can talk; you invited it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is amazing to see the self-satisfaction of these members who are here in this place—

Mr. BECKER: I rise on a point of order, Sir. What has this to do with the line?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was your own members who interjected.

Mr. Becker: Shut up!

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Hanson is completely out of order. I do not uphold the point of order. I remind the honourable member for Mitcham that he should confine his comments to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If it had not been for the interjections of members of the Liberal Party, I would have finished long ago, and if it had not been for some of the more intemperate remarks of the Minister the line would probably have been approved by now. Still we are not going to get very speedy progress while he is in charge; we know that from past experience. No-one in all this debate has said one word in justification of the enormous increase in the level of expenditure on the library, or justified it by the results which are produced by members of Parliament, either in this place or outside it.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The line we are dealing with involves \$177 000 and includes contingencies, which cover books as well as wages and salaries. The member for Mitcham might care to read that. I am informed by library staff that in years gone by no other member has caused a greater use of time by library staff than has the member for Mitcham, and at one stage his bringing of visitors to the library was constant. He would complain to the library staff if there were not members of that staff available to show those visitors around the library.

That was reported to me tonight, and it should go on the record, in view of the honourable member's remarks. There is an objective in better informing members of Parliament; whatever else has happened, the better service that is provided by the library has succeeded in that objective. The level of information that is available for members and the degree of work that is done by members as a result of the availability of the library are of fundamental importance; they may not be to the honourable member, but they are to others. The expanded service provided by the library is fully justified and is accepted by the vast majority of members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I must rise again, in view of the very mean attack that was made on me by the Minister. He said that he had been told by a member of the library staff, whom he did not name, that at some time in the past I had complained because there was no member of the library staff available to show my visitors around.

Mr. Russack: The Library Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Library Committee members do not show visitors around the library. Did the Minister say a member of the Library Committee had complained?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I said that you had complained to the library staff about the lack of people available to show your visitors around the library. Do you deny you did that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do deny it. I do not know whether you are referring to the 1950's, the 1960's, or the 1970's. This is the second time in this debate the Minister has lied about something.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The statement that a member of Parliament has lied is contrary to Standing Orders, and I would ask the honourable member for Mitcham to withdraw that remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will try to think of some other word that has the same meaning.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will withdraw that, and say, as I said before, he said something deliberately and he knew it is untrue; to me that amounts to exactly the same thing.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I believe the source of information is correct.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Tell me the source of the information and give me the details.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order. The standard of the debate should not fall to an argument between members on either side of the Chamber.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It was not I who raised this peculiarly nasty suggestion. I think it was the Minister who said I had made this complaint at some time in the past of which he has given me no details, and I have no recollection of ever having made such a complaint. If the Minister wants to justify what I believe is deliberately untrue, I ask him to get up and give me the details.

Line passed.

Joint House Committee, \$189 000—passed.

Electoral, \$470 000.

Dr. EASTICK: A sizable sum was made available last year for holding an election. More than \$167 000 of the \$375 218 actually spent on election fees was illegally paid over. I am not implying that the officers did not earn their money, but it highlights an administrative situation that is to be reorganised in the future. The Minister authorised the expenditure of that money against the provisions of the Act and the regulations. Members on this side will be expecting the legislation soon, be it by way of regulation, or alterations to the Act. Notwithstanding that an election is not expected, will up-to-date State electoral rolls be available regularly? Inquiries at Commonwealth electoral offices indicate that no electoral rolls are available for South Australia and it is not intended that any will be printed soon. Members and the public are at a disadvantage when the last roll available is the one prepared for the December 1977 Federal election. Does the State Government believe that a new electoral roll should be prepared at least annually?

The high cost of preparing electoral rolls is warranted. If the Minister ascertains that the cost is not warranted, why not? Previously the interim advice, which was provided by computer print-out, was prepared on a running basis. Persons whose names were added, for example, in the month of February were associated with those who had been put on in previous months; then, when March or April was reached, those new names were associated with the computer print-out on a running basis, so that they were all available on the one sheet. The new method, which has been in use for some months, is that the

computer print-out provides only those names of persons that have been placed on the roll in the period since the last print-out. There is no immediate method of cross-checking names on the roll.

Numerous inquiries are made at the electoral offices by people seeking business contacts and by members of families who are looking for details of enrollees. What is the Government's attitude to this situation?

Are the Electoral Act regulations to be updated or re-presented to the Parliament? Eight or nine months ago I indicated to this Chamber some discrepancies which exist in the present regulations. I have had, with the approval of the Minister, discussions with a senior member of the Electoral Department, who recognised that alterations were necessary.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Attorney-General): We propose to have not less than one print-out of the roll of each House of Assembly district each year, and one has been provided for under the line for publication during this financial year. The Government intends shortly to print a consolidation of the regulations under the Electoral Act, which will take into account the matters about which the honourable member spoke to Mr. Guscott, and other matters.

Mr. EVANS: Recently, I was informed that the Federal Electoral Department intended to close two polling booths in my district—Ironbank and Scott Creek—and one at Verdun, on the border of my district with the Murray District. When I contacted people who live near the polling booths, I found the vast majority happy to travel the short extra distance involved in going to another polling booth. Perhaps the Attorney could consider closing some polling booths in the near metropolitan area, effecting savings at future elections.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I shall be happy to look at the situation. In my own district, one or two booths could be similarly placed, but I imagine any suggestion that residents from One Tree Hill should go to the Gawler polling booth would cause a considerable outcry. However, aspects of the matter are worth considering.

Line passed.

Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, \$39 000—passed.

Parliamentary Committee on Land Settlement, \$4 000.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I am aware that the committee formerly had specific functions dealing with matters of drainage and land settlement, but I should like the Minister to say what purpose the committee now serves, and whether its work has declined.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I gather that the work of the committee has declined in recent years. I shall take the matter up with the Minister of Agriculture, who would be better able to account for the functions of the committee, and I shall see that the honourable member gets an appropriate reply.

Mr. CHAPMAN: As a member of the Land Settlement Committee, I support the voting of \$4 000 to cover remuneration of members, travelling and accommodation expenses, and so on. I am fully aware of its activities over the past several years. From the middle of 1976 until later in that year, the committee investigated matters on Kangaroo Island.

Mr. Millhouse: That was a special inquiry.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Yes, but there have been others of which the honourable member is probably not aware. During the inquiry, the committee met at Parliament House on 14 occasions from 10 June to 2 December 1976. On that subject alone, the committee convened at the Parndana Hall, on Kangaroo Island, for the purpose of receiving submissions on 19, 20, and 21 July and on 24, 25,

and 26 August. It met at the District Council Chambers in Kingscote on 23 August. Further inspections by the committee were conducted on 21 specific properties which were under review. After the Kangaroo Island meetings and inspections, the committee met at Parliament House on that specific subject.

Although that was one of the busiest projects undertaken by the committee, it has met this year, not regularly, but as and when required. It does not meet merely to discuss problems associated with the Rag Act, as it is known. Land settlers who are financed by the State Bank and by other lending authorities attached to the Lands Department—the Rural Industries Assistance Corporation, for example—and any land settler who seeks to have a loan underwritten by the Government and who gets into difficulties with repayments or mortgage commitments can find his case referred to the Land Settlement Committee.

Committee members receive a modest payment. Their annual salary, I think, is less than that of members of any other standing committee of the Parliament. The committee has dealt effectively with matters put before it, it has reported to the House in accordance with the Land Settlement Committee Act, and I have nothing but praise for the way in which the Chairman and his predecessor have carried out their duties. Whether the Minister chooses to supply further information is up to him, but at present I am closer to the situation and more aware of the activities of the committee perhaps than he is.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: For many years I have believed that the Land Settlement Committee should have gone, and I have said so in the past (perhaps the member for Kavel might care to look up some references to that in *Hansard*). The committee was originally to recommend areas of land for development by war service land settlers immediately after the Second World War, which has long since passed. For a long time it has been one of those small perks that some members have had.

Mr. Nankivell: And matters relating to the South-Eastern drainage scheme when I was its Chairman.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member reminds me of another of its jobs, but for many years this committee did not meet at all. I stand by my comment that membership of the committee is a perk (true, not a big perk) for some members of Parliament who have nothing to do.

Mr. Chapman interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Alexandra is getting testy. As I paid him a compliment this afternoon and again tonight, I am surprised to hear him go on like this.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will refer to the line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I intend to refer to the committee's report on Kangaroo Island, to which the member for Alexandra referred. I have had to read it.

Mr. Chapman: Only with respect to the meetings held—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member claims it is only in respect of the meetings that were held, yet the Hon. Mr. Hill in another place and he dissented from the committee's report.

Mr. Chapman: Only a portion of it.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, but on a vital point. Their dissent was piffling, suggesting a reduction in rents on Kangaroo Island. That would not have helped.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I remind the honourable member that the contents of the report by the Land Settlement Committee is not relevant to this line, and I ask him to confine his remarks to this line.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to canvass the

contents of the report, but if it is the honourable member's justification for keeping the committee in existence, in my view, after having read the report, it provides no justification. If we are to have inquiries such as that held into Kangaroo Island, the best way to do it would be by an *ad hoc* committee from this House rather than keeping the Land Settlement Committee and looking for work for it. That is all that it has had to do in recent years. I agree with the thrust of the remarks of the member for Mallee. The committee has long outlived its usefulness.

Mr. VENNING: Whilst I am a comparatively new member on the committee, I commend it for the work it has done. I also commend the outstanding contribution of the member for Alexandra to the committee, especially in the recent investigation regarding Kangaroo Island concerning many of his constituents. I support the committee and its continuation, and I am disappointed that the member for Mitcham is in such a knocking mood. I hope that he will take a more realistic view of the problems confronting members of Parliament. Although I am a recently appointed member of the committee, I realise that its work fluctuates according to needs, so that with a good season coming up I would expect its activities to be less than in the past three years, when the committee was confronted with much work.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I rise to take up a point made by the member for Mitcham. The reflection he made following the committee's activities on Kangaroo Island should be challenged. In late 1975-76 the Government announced the removal of broad-acre licences of 21 soldier settlers on Kangaroo Island. But for the activities of the committee, the whole 21 settlers would have been dismissed from their properties under the decision of the then Minister.

It was only as a result of the full investigation and the final report to this House (and important details were conveyed to the department as well) that the Government did a backflip on this issue and removed only six lessees from their farms. The widow of one settler has subsequently been rehabilitated in the metropolitan area, and action was taken in respect to one other settler, but all the other settlers, in accordance with the committee's recommendation, have done extremely well. I am proud to report on that situation in order to challenge the accusation of the member for Mitcham in his blasting attack on the lack of activity and the lack of need for the Land Settlement Committee.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot let that attack go unanswered.

The CHAIRMAN: I hope that honourable members will not respond continually to comments made, but the honourable member is in order this time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to make two points. First, I remind the member for Alexandra that it was an early report of the War Service Land Settlement Committee recommending the use of land on Kangaroo Island that led to our problems in this matter. That was even long before my time here. All war service land settlement has been recommended by the committee, and much of it has turned out to be disastrous. Secondly, I challenge him that all those settlers have done well as a result of the committee's recommendation. They have not, and he knows it. They are his constituents, they are his responsibility, and many of them have been shabbily treated indeed.

Line passed.

Legislature, Miscellaneous, \$1 126 000.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister explain why there is such a big increase in the allocations for administration expenses and the costs of fuel and light, rates, cleaning, etc? Last year the payments made were

less than the amounts voted in each line, yet there is a big increase this year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The reason for the underspending on the first line is that some expenditure was carried over into the ensuing financial year. The amount proposed includes arrears of Government Printing Division charges for 1977-78 of \$50 000. If the sum is adjusted for that \$50 000 on its own, the actual payment for 1977-78 would have been \$804 000, and the sum proposed for this year would have been \$870 000. It is expected that there will be additional expenditure over and above the Government Printing Division requirements, as well as increases to the Parliament House telephone accounts, consolidation of statutes, and Public Buildings Department air-conditioning charges as expected for the current financial year. They are the main reasons for the increase apart from the carry-over.

Regarding fuel and light, rates, cleaning etc., the June cleaning costs were not debited until July 1978. They are covered in the figure for this financial year, whereas they were not covered in the last financial year. The proposed sum allows for increased costs affecting electricity, gas, water and sewerage, and cleaning charges. There is the carry-over from the June cleaning charges into July, together with the increased costs of the various items covered.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I refer to the item "Travelling expenses of members and ex-members of the Legislature and relatives". We know that arrangements are made and accepted regarding members, but I want to discuss the matter of ex-members, who have certain rights and privileges available to them, after having given nominal service to the House. I believe that earlier this year an ex-member raised the question whether he could travel by air rather than by rail, the latter involving only contra accounts. Will the Government consider the sum that would be the member's right for travel to be allocated to travel by air, as present members are entitled to do? This is an important issue. My argument is that an ex-member should not be compelled to use the railways, but an equivalent sum should be made available to him to use air travel if he so wishes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That proposition was considered by the Government and rejected.

Mr. Nankivell: But this is a different proposition.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The proposition that anything should be done in relation to ex-members for air travel was rejected. The only provision made in relation to ex-members is for rail travel. Only certain ex-members are entitled to a gold pass, namely, those who have been in Cabinet for three years. An internal arrangement for travel in South Australia is made with the railways for our ex-members, and that involves certain charges. The Government considered this proposition and was not prepared to make any arrangement for ex-members to travel by air.

Mrs. ADAMSON: Can the Minister say what major components are involved in the line relating to administration expenses, minor equipment and sundries, for which a large sum is provided.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The major components relate to printing charges to Parliament, mainly *Hansard* costs. The other major components are telephone, costs relating to consolidation of Statutes, and servicing charges for the Public Buildings Department with respect to various activities in relation to equipment.

Mr. EVANS: Members are given a pass that entitles them to use State Transport Authority buses as well as the train within the State, in addition to entitling them to some benefits outside the State. After they have ceased to be

members, if they have served for eight years they are entitled to certain privileges. Can the Minister say whether any members have used their pass for coach tours conducted by the authority, and whether the passes entitle members to use day tours, such as the recently introduced ones called "Beaut Tours"?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer is "No".

Line passed.

State Governor's Establishment, \$229 000—passed.

Premier's, \$5 028 000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct my remarks to the line "chief stipendiary magistrate and stipendiary magistrates" in the Justice Division, the allocation for which is \$848 000. The matter I raise is one of some gravity, and I have only with some hesitation decided to raise it. It concerns the appointment and method of appointment of magistrates and some of the appointments that have been made recently.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the honourable member wish to discuss the method of appointment of magistrates and some specific recent appointments?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Some of the persons who have been appointed, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out that, although the honourable member is not allowed to reflect on members of the Judiciary, he is permitted to comment on appointments as they relate to salaries, but not on the merits of persons who have been appointed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am not going to name people; that would be silly.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought it was better to make the point rather than to call the honourable member to order later, whether or not he believes that the ruling is silly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is why I gave the warning in the beginning, so that the Chair would know what I was going to say. With the utmost deference to your person and office, I point out that magistrates are public servants. They may be members of the Judiciary, and this is one of the anomalies about which we have argued for a long time. Their appointment must be open to scrutiny by Parliament. As public servants, they are not in the position of judges either of the Supreme Court or of the Local and District Criminal Court.

There has been in the legal profession only since the present Attorney-General came to office considerable disquiet over a number of persons who have been appointed and over the method in which those appointments have been made. I have received an anonymous letter, dated 21 August, signed "*Pro Bono Publico*", obviously written, as it claims to be, by a lawyer, and parts of it are relevant to this matter as an example of the disquiet within the profession. I will quote from it in part only, because it names names and reflects on individuals.

With some of the reflections, I agree; others, I think, are wrong. However, the general tenor of the letter shows the unease and disquiet that exists in a large part of the profession about the way in which this Government (particularly since the present Attorney-General was appointed) has gone about its appointments. One of the absurd anomalies in relation to the administration of this Government is that, instead (as always used to be the case) of the Attorney-General's being the Ministerial head of the magistracy, it is now the Premier, so we must debate this item in the absence of the Attorney-General, which is a pity. It would not be a bad idea if he came into the Chamber, because the Attorney might want to defend himself, and he ought to be given an opportunity to do so. Part of the letter states:

Dear Mr. Millhouse, I am writing as a representative of a

group of legal practitioners in this State. Our names are not provided for obvious reasons—any person who offends the Dunstan Government may expect no advancement in a profession the upper echelons of which have political patronage as one of the principal criteria of membership.

For years we and other members of the profession have been subjected to witnessing the appointment to the magistracy and judiciary of people who have been either lacking or at the best mediocre in legal ability, yet resplendent in left wing views, Labor Party support, identification with groups which carry votes, friendship with Labor members, or having a record of provision of funds to the Party.

I do not necessarily agree with all of that. However, it is simply an example of the outlook of certain members of the profession. The letter continues:

We take this opportunity of writing as we have it on reliable authority—

They go on to canvass what they say is a projected appointment to the Children's Court, and to list 11 individual appointments, which I will not mention. Although I agree with some of the criticisms, with others I think they are off the beam. The writer continues:

There have been other appointments where the appointees have not been so singularly lacking in qualifications but, being on a par with other members of the profession, have been given the nod because of their Labor support and friendships. What faith can the public have in our legal system? What hope can a member of the legal profession have for recognition of ability when ability is not a criterion for recognition? What respect can we be expected to have for those who judge our clients?

I personally do not share your politics and two of our group have voted Labor in the past, but we recognise you as an honest man who is not afraid to speak out.

Honourable members here would probably put it differently, but that is how the writer of this letter put it. The letter continues:

We trust you will raise the question of this pending appointment—

I do not intend to raise that specific matter—

so that we and many other practitioners who are equally concerned do not have yet another political judicial figure to whom we must mockingly bow.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Is that letter unsigned?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, it is an anonymous letter. I was hesitant about using it but, because I know that this is the sort of thing that is being said widely amongst certain sections, if not by most members, of the community, I thought I was warranted in quoting those parts of it that are not obviously quite inappropriate to use publicly. The writer concludes:

It is fortunate that, in this State, the statue of justice is depicted as wearing a blindfold. Yours faithfully.

The Minister will probably have to defend this, but he and members of his Party know that there has been widespread criticism of some appointments that have been made to the minor Judiciary in the past two or three years. This is a serious matter in itself and serious if members of the profession are so critical of those appointments.

I say no more on that point. However, I should like to refer to another specific thing on the matter of appointments. It has come to my knowledge that on a number of occasions applications have been called for appointment to the magistracy. The applicants have been screened by the Public Service Board or by the individual who has that responsibility, a recommendation has been made, I believe to the Attorney-General (presumably that is done as a matter of courtesy, because technically they would go direct to the Premier) or certainly to the

Government, for the appointment of a candidate who, after due inquiry, seems to be the best candidate, and the Attorney-General, I am told, has simply written on the recommendation, "Not acceptable" or "Not suitable. Mr., Mrs. or Miss X is recommended," and that has gone to Cabinet and the appointment has been made.

That, too, is a serious matter because we have (and I know this from my experience as Attorney-General) a proper mode of appointment to the Public Service, and that applies to the magistracy as well. However, in some cases, anyway (and I accept the accuracy of the information I have been given) the recommendation made by the Public Service Board has been wiped and another name substituted and that person appointed. In the opinion of many people, that person has obviously not been the appropriate choice. That, again, is a serious matter.

I realise, as I realised when I was Attorney-General (the matter is still unresolved, although there are arguments both ways) that the members of the magistracy are placed in a delicate situation. They are public servants, yet judicial officers. They are beholden administratively to the Premier as their Ministerial boss, yet they must in many cases adjudicate on matters in which the Government is involved. We had the unhappy incident in the past 12 months when Mr. Derek Wilson was badly treated. Thank heavens, eventually, as a result of threats of withdrawal of labour by the magistracy, the Government backed down on him, and Mr. Wilson was eventually put again in the position that he had occupied for many years in the Adelaide Magistrates Court. I had my differences publicly with Mr. Wilson from time to time while I was Attorney-General and perhaps since. However, on this occasion I believe that he was shabbily treated indeed and that that treatment came principally from the Attorney-General himself. Luckily, on this matter, the Attorney-General had to back down.

I do not like having to raise this matter, but it is a serious one that has caused me and other members of the profession disquiet. I considered that it was my duty to raise it, and I am sorry that the Attorney-General has not responded or come into the Chamber. Although, undoubtedly, the Minister in charge of the debate will have something to say about this matter, he is not the one who is in the hot seat, either as the nominal Ministerial head (the Premier) or as the Attorney-General.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In reply, I state, first, that recommendations made in relation to appointments in this area are carefully considered by Cabinet before being submitted to Executive Council. Secondly, the member for Mitcham would realise that it is general practice that appointments to the magistracy will not lead to promotion to the Local Court or Supreme Court Bench.

Mr. Millhouse: But it does sometimes, you know. What about Brian Greaves?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In normal circumstances, it does not. Normally, if one takes on the position of magistrate, that is as far as one goes.

Mr. Millhouse: George Walters was a magistrate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Before George Walters became a Supreme Court judge he was Master of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Millhouse: He started as a magistrate.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He may well have started as a magistrate, but I am saying, and the honourable member knows it to be the truth, that in normal circumstances further promotion does not take place. The same applies in the Local and District Criminal Courts.

Mr. Millhouse: Is that the policy of this Government?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That has been the general

policy but there are occasional exceptions to it. In normal circumstances, that is the situation that applies. That means that there are all sorts of legal practitioners who are not available for appointment as magistrates. Any legal practitioner who has ambitions to become a Queen's Counsel or judge would certainly not make himself available to become a magistrate. It is a very close matter of judgment, in relation to the kind of people who can be appointed as magistrates, to determine who is more able than another. That is a matter of judgment and it is possible legitimately for people to reach different conclusions.

I have little doubt that if I were looking at a list of candidates along with the member for Mitcham, who knew the list of candidates well, it would be most unlikely that the two of us would reach the same conclusions about that list of candidates. So when anything is said in criticism of certain appointments it has to be borne in mind that invariably when individual abilities are being considered and comparisons are being made a difficult matter of judgment is involved. So far as I know, the main point of criticism has tended to be about the appointment of anyone as a magistrate who is not a legal practitioner.

Mr. Millhouse: You have done that twice with Bill Langcake and Doug Claessen.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think it was also done in relation to the appointment of Judge Rogerson.

Mr. Millhouse: At least he was a practitioner.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: He did not practise; he was a Professor of Law, which no doubt would make him respectable to the honourable member, but there were still legal practitioners who objected to that appointment. All I say to the honourable member is that as someone who is not a legal practitioner and not involved as a member of a union in defending the closed shop that is involved, I for one do not accept the proposition that if you are a lawyer but happen not to be a legal practitioner you are therefore disqualified from being appointed as a magistrate or a judge. I believe that representations that have been made on that account have little substance in them other than a fear that perhaps the monopoly that legal practitioners have tended to have over these appointments in the past might somehow be broken and that that might somehow detract from future prospects of certain members of the legal profession.

Mr. Millhouse: That's ridiculous.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I put it to the honourable member that, in these cases of special pleading where the special interests of people are involved, there is an element of that sort of closed shop attitude of looking after one's own. I believe, in particular, that criticism with respect to Mr. Langcake and Mr. Claessen are particularly ill founded and that it is most unfair to both of those gentlemen to subject them to the kind of criticism that has been made for that reason. I would hope that the member for Mitcham, who no doubt when he was Attorney-General had some kind of relationship with Mr. Langcake, would have seen it as a more proper approach not to mention Mr. Langcake's name in the way that he did.

Mr. Millhouse: I didn't mention his name.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: You did; you specifically said in your interjection, "Mr. Langcake and Mr. Claessen".

Mr. Millhouse: I did not mention them previously.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: You mentioned them in your interjection. Mr. Langcake was a person who gave service to the honourable member when he was Attorney-General. I think it is a pity in those circumstances that the honourable member saw fit to even mention his name by way of interjection. I do not accept that, because these

gentlemen happen to have not been legal practitioners, they are therefore disqualified from appointments as magistrates and automatically brought under suspicion, which is the kind of thing the anonymous letter the honourable member quoted tended to do. I think it is a pity that his normal judgment did not allow him to follow his usual practice with respect to anonymous letters. I suspect his judgment is gradually becoming more and more deficient these days.

Mr. TONKIN: The item "Policy Division, Administrative, Committee Secretariat, Publicity and Clerical Staff" has been the subject of comment in the Auditor-General's Report at page 200. The staffing in the Premier's Department of the Administration Division, the Policy Division and the Publicity and Design Services Division is a matter that has given the Opposition considerable concern in the past. I do not intend to ventilate the matter to any great extent now except to say that, by comparison with the staffs of Premiers in other States, South Australia has a staff level that probably equals the combined total of the others. It is an amazing situation that I believe is totally wrong and cannot be justified. I would like from the Minister details of the actual staffing in those various divisions of the Premier's Department; namely, the Premier's and Ministerial staff, the Administration Division, the Policy Division and the Publicity and Design Services Division. I should also like to know what are the functions and responsibilities of the people concerned (I realise that the Minister may not have the full details with him now), as well as details of the cost benefit of those officers to the people of South Australia.

I think, from memory, the Premier of Victoria (Mr. Hamer) has five people on his staff. I notice on page 198 of the Auditor-General's Report, under "Premier and Ministerial Staff" that there is a considerable increase, payments amount to \$4 738 000, an increase of 27 per cent, and an increase of 16.5 per cent in salaries, wages and related payments. That has increased again this year in the proposed expenditure, and it seems that that is a little more than can be accounted for by ordinary increases relating to inflation and wage claims. I would like further details of any proposals to increase the staff, and particularly details as to who those people are and what they do.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The total salaries figure covered by the Premier's Department is \$3 884 000, which is very little different from the amount actually spent under salaries. That is partly because of the transfer of the Unit for Industrial Democracy to the Labour and Industry Department. I think that, in the adjusted figures that the honourable member has, that would have been taken into account. There is very little provision for staff expansion in the Premier's Department; it is subject to the same staff ceilings as any other Public Service department, and must be staffed in line with the overall objective of the Government, which is zero growth in the number employed in the Public Service for the whole year. At the end of June 1979 the number employed should not be any greater than at the end of June 1978. That objective applies throughout and means that areas where expansion takes place have to be offset by reductions elsewhere.

The numbers of staff under the line are: Ministerial, 20; administrative, 26; and policy (which includes the committee secretariat), 20. Whether the Auditor-General included in his figure of 19 the committee secretariat, I am not sure. The staff for publicity and design is 28. If one checks through the general growth rate that applies where the figures are directly comparable, one finds that in the administration area the increase over actual is very small. In the administration area, the increase is \$67 000 on

\$1 490 000, a total increase of 4 per cent. That is very low.

So far as the tasks are concerned, I think that the work of the Publicity and Design Branch is fairly well known to the honourable member. If he wants more information, I will get it for him. The Policy Division is involved in doing a series of reports for the Government in relation to the Premier's needs and the needs of other departments. Much of the investigative work that is done is carried out within the Policy Division. I am not sure whether the economic intelligence unit is located in the Economic Development Department or not. That is another informational function that is carried out and is of some significance to the Government.

It may be difficult to make straight comparisons between States, because it depends where the services required by Government are located. It may be that publicity is not located within Premiers' Departments in other States. It may be that more of the Policy Division activity that is carried on here is located within Public Service Boards in other States, and it may be that the kind of statistical work done by the economic intelligence unit goes on in the Treasury in other States. I can vouch for the fact that a very tight situation applies to all areas of activity within the Premier's Department in this financial year.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a pity really that you, Mr. Chairman, called the Leader when you did, because he has no interest in the legal profession and we have gone on to another matter.

The CHAIRMAN: The Chairman will give the call to the honourable member who rises to his feet. I imagine that the honourable member for Mitcham cuts across the Leader's line as well.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope I do. There are a couple of things I want to say to wind up the other debate: first, I did not mention names when I spoke the first time, and it was the clear implication in the Minister's comments that caused me to prompt him for the names of the two lay people who have been appointed to the magistracy. I do not know what possible harm there could have been in that. I criticised Mr. Langcake's appointment at the time, but said what a good secretary he had been to me. That was his role, not as a judicial officer in the Licensing Court. I can see no reason why the Minister took that point, except for something to say.

The second, and far more important thing, is that he reacted typically as a layman would in suggesting that all I was interested in was the closed shop. In fact, members of the legal profession who are talking in this way (and I only used that letter because I know from my own knowledge that that is a fairly good example of the sort of way people are talking) say these things not because they are concerned to protect the profession. Indeed the appointments to which greatest exception has been taken, and the ones of which I was thinking more particularly, were not Langcake and Claessen at all, but people who are legal practitioners but who are just not up to the standard that is required. The real point of worry in the profession is the standard of service that these people can give to the public. After all, magistrates and the courts are there to give service to the public. If they do not do it effectively and efficiently, the public suffers. I suppose, being fair-minded, there may be something in what was said, but not the preponderance of significance that he gave to it.

I now refer to the line "Policy Division, Administrative, Committee Secretariat," and so on. I have for long wondered what the hell value we get from these people. I point out to the Leader of the Opposition that this is not unlike the query I raised originally on the Parliamentary Library, but this is on a far greater scale. What is the justification for having all these people in the Premier's

Department? I do not know what they produce, or how much better off the State is. When we hear that there are 24 or 28 in the publicity and design section, one wonders very much whether this is not just Party politics at Government expense.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you think there's political patronage?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not say that overall, but there have been a number of appointments that I think have been quite inappropriate, and I wonder why they were made in individual cases. Undoubtedly, there are many members of the legal profession, as instanced by the writer of that letter, who would say "Yes" to the honourable member's question.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Do you subscribe to that view?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not subscribe to it altogether. As I say, I do not agree with all the examples given in the letter. I am perhaps in an unusual position in that I have had experience of the way that appointments are made, the considerations, and so on. Some have been poor appointments. Regarding the matter that the Leader raised, there is no doubt in my mind that we are not, as taxpayers, getting value for the money that is poured into the Premier's Department.

The Minister has said, and I agree with him, that one cannot compare States. It is a matter of personality; a strong Minister or a strong Premier will draw many people to himself and to his own department. That has happened in this Government, with great respect and deference to the Minister in charge of the House at present. The Premier has taken over many functions that in the past were exercised by, for example, the Chief Secretary. However, that does not account for the enormous growth in the numbers in the Premier's Department most of whom, although they probably chase each other with paper work, do not really in the end contribute very much to the welfare of the State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Mines and Energy) moved:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr. TONKIN: Do I take it that I have had an assurance from the Minister that I will receive a list of the various people in the divisions I have outlined, together with a note of their duties?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Subject to the amount of work involved in doing that. You are talking about the listing of almost 100 people. It may be appropriate simply to give a summary.

Mr. TONKIN: That is not the assurance I require. With the staff that the Public Service Board has and the staff that the Premier's Department has in so many areas, they have to be paid every fortnight. Surely there must be an establishment list. We have not had a Public Service list for almost two years, I think. I suppose one is due again now. We should know who works for the Premier's Department, whether they are employed as Ministerial employees, and whether they are in the policy division or in the economic intelligence division. It is difficult to understand when I see that many people are employed in the Department of Economic Development. The lines show that there are considerable numbers of people employed in that sort of research in both departments. How much duplication goes on there I do not know. I would like some indication of who works where and what they do in the Premier's Department.

The level of employment in the Premier's Department is a disgrace, but it is becoming less of a disgrace because the

people of South Australia are becoming accustomed to this situation. It now seems to be the done thing in South Australia that the Premier has many people working in his policy division, either as Ministerial officers or members of the Public Service. This is not good enough; Parliament deserves to be able to form some opinion as to whether the work they are doing is justified and of value to the taxpayers of South Australia, or whether their job is simply to keep the Government of this State in office. I find it absolutely amazing that there are only two members on the Government benches.

Mrs. Adamson: And no Ministers.

Mr. TONKIN: I am prepared to accept that there may be difficulties in getting this information, and I do not expect an answer tomorrow. However, I believe this Parliament is entitled to the information when Parliament sits after the week's break. I would also like details about the item "Terminal leave payments". To whom will those terminal leave payments be made, and why? I make no criticism of Mr. Amadio, but I notice there is a considerable increase in the amount for arts development. Where will the extra money be spent, and will we be getting value for money? What is the value to the people of South Australia?

Mr. Millhouse: Could it be better used to reduce unemployment?

Mr. TONKIN: So we can get the record straight, I intend that this question be implied in every query as to an increase in expenditure henceforth. I am referring not necessarily to a 4 per cent or 5 per cent increase which could be explained by inflation but, when it gets above that level and there is a disproportionate increase, I would like to know whether or not that additional expenditure is justified. Are we getting value for money? Should that money be better spent in stimulating the private sector and in rejuvenating industry in this State?

This system of line budgeting makes it extremely difficult for us to find out whether we are getting value for the taxpayers' dollar. Is the Government setting its priorities as it should? The Liberal Party has a policy of supporting the arts which is just as strong as that of the present Government, but the Liberal Party also have a sense of responsibility to the people of this State and we recognise that it is no good supporting the arts if the general economy of the State falls down to an extent where private enterprise is forced out of business, where people lose their jobs, and where they are no longer able to afford to patronise the arts, and to enjoy the undoubted benefits that expenditure on the arts otherwise brings.

There seems to be a disproportionate increase in the allocation for arts development. What is the reason for this? Are we getting better value for that expenditure than we would get if that money were spent somewhere else; for instance, in promoting the private sector, in providing pay-roll tax incentives, and even in providing some form of job creation.

The Government has turned its back on job creation. It is supporting neither unemployment relief schemes nor stimulus to the private industry in this Budget. That is a serious defect, and perhaps we would be better off spending that money in one or other of those spheres.

Another glaring anomaly relates to the sum of \$135 600 proposed for the Ethnic Affairs Branch. The Liberal Party supports every possible assistance for ethnic communities to enable them to become part of the total Australian community. It has a policy which provides support for interpreters and translators. This figure shows an extreme increase. The amount voted last year was \$83 600, and actual payments totalled \$49 022. Can the Minister explain this considerable increase?

It is particularly important when we realise that the sum of \$35 000 is proposed on another line for contract interpreters and translators. I am grateful to the Government for providing an annotated document so that I can follow these figures through. I am not in any way critical of the fact that we need to spend money to provide adequate translating and interpreting services, but I should like to know the reason for the enormous and sudden increase in both lines. Are we setting our priorities correctly?

The subject of the Premier's overseas visits has been covered, but I am concerned to find that not only was \$44 880 spent last year, but \$30 000 is to be set aside for the present year. Either the Premier intends to go abroad again—

Mr. Millhouse: He goes every year. What's surprising about that?

Mr. TONKIN: He does not go every year, but he goes regularly. Either he is going away again in this financial year, at considerable expense, or the \$45 000 quoted as the cost of the most recent trip was not the full cost, and it is expected that bills will come in to increase that by another \$30 000. Bearing in mind the size and scale of the tour last time, I think the latter is quite likely, but I should like the Minister to enlighten me.

The sum of \$4 000 is proposed for payment to consultants for services. A similar amount was voted last year, but actual payments totalled \$1 400. What is the explanation for that? What is the quarterly magazine, for the publication of which \$63 000 is proposed? Has there been a cost-benefit study on the publication of the magazine? I do not know whether it is *Vantage*, which is a quarterly magazine, or whether it is some other magazine. The Auditor-General's Report refers to a quarterly magazine entitled *Vantage*.

Mr. Mathwin: Is it a give-away?

Mr. TONKIN: No. Some of the cost of \$63 000 is expected to be recovered by subscriptions and from the sale of advertising space, but I wonder how much is to be recovered and how much this magazine will cost the South Australian taxpayers. How much good would that money do for South Australia in stimulating the private sector and creating real jobs? This is a disgraceful state of affairs.

Administration expenses have been split by the Auditor-General in his report (page 200) into \$48 000 for travelling, motor vehicle expenses, etc in 1978; \$51 000 for printing, stationery, subscription magazines, book and charges; and \$26 000 in respect of telex, postage and private telephone reimbursements. For entertainment, purchase of liquor and working lunches, \$16 000 was spent. That is an amazing situation. Indeed, it is the second year that \$16 000 has been expended on entertainment, purchase of liquor and working lunches.

We went into detail on this last year when the Premier tried to claim that this sum was for State banquets, dinners and receptions. He claimed that we would not want to see South Australia downgraded by not providing appropriate entertainment for visiting dignitaries. We subsequently found that allocation was not for that purpose at all—it was an expense (and this was revealed from questioning in this House) incurred by the Premier or by his officers on entertainment.

We tried to determine through questioning just how the sum was spent, because the expenditure of \$16 000 on entertainment, purchase of liquor and working lunches is an extraordinary amount. Could not the \$16 000 have been halved, with perhaps \$8 000 or \$10 000 being put into the fund to stimulate the private sector? Further, \$10 000 was allocated for the production of Government information films, with \$21 000 being allocated for photographic and art materials.

The production of a prestige book on South Australia involved a \$9 000 allocation. What is the value of promoting South Australia with a prestige book when there are people out of work and looking for work? It comes back to the setting of priorities, and I am not convinced that this document as it applies to the Premier's Department, especially regarding the scale of employment, staffing and spending in the department is a proper ordering of priorities—it is not. It is a disgraceful ordering of priorities, and I condemn it. Let the Minister try to give us some answers, but I am totally and absolutely appalled by the amount that the department is willing to spend: money that could be better spent in doing good for the people of South Australia.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Leader seems to have a general philosophy that, if one is a public servant, one has not a real job, that if one is not doing something that is productive, one is prostituting the State in some way. He also thinks that anything that happens within the Government, anything that happens in order to publicise the State, and anything that is done to try to obtain some future benefit for the State, does not involve real employment by the people who are concerned with it, and that in some sense it is a scandalous waste of money.

Unfortunately, if one carries this sort of attitude to the extreme (and one sometimes gets the impression that the Leader carries things to the extreme), it means, for instance, that the manufacturer of a school toilet seat, if it is done by private enterprise, is productive, whereas a schoolteacher is not productive.

Mr. Millhouse: That's ridiculous.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is the logical consequence of the Leader's position: if *Vantage* can be produced at a cost of some thousands of dollars, involving labour, jobs and material, and it can be used effectively as a means of promoting the State, this somehow is appalling and should not be done, and other States would never consider doing such a thing. We never see publications from Queensland, Victoria, New South Wales, or anywhere else! They are apparently different. There, it is productive, whereas here it is not. It is simply not good enough to say that, if the Government does something to promote the State, be it in terms of a quarterly magazine such as *Vantage*, or in terms of regular entertainment provided by the Premier—

Mr. Tonkin: Government information films.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON:—be it Government information films or the regular entertainment provided by the Premier automatically for all visiting ambassadors—

Mr. Tonkin: It doesn't cover that. I went into that last year.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I was involved today with a lunch for a certain gentleman who has bought *Burmah Exploration*. The lunch was paid for by the State and, undoubtedly, the costs are borne somewhere in the Premier's Department line—certainly not in my line. That sort of provision is absolutely necessary for the State. The State has to reciprocate often for entertainment that is received when we visit elsewhere. The Leader should be aware that these matters are considered carefully. Certainly, all Ministers are instructed by the Premier to be careful about this. On the other hand, certain entertainment is necessary to be provided, and certain entertainment expenses have to be met. I think that the Leader really wants to carry on with his theme of attacking everything that is done, saying that it is a waste of money and that we are not getting value for the taxpayers' dollar.

The provision is mainly for *Vantage* (published quarterly), 8 000 copies of which are produced. Although

most of them are distributed free of charge, there is a hope that we will be able to sell 2 000 of the 8 000 copies, but only at a nominal price. Anyone who has read *Vantage* would agree that it is an absolutely first-rate publication and a credit to the State.

Mr. Millhouse: What does it bring in that's any good?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has suddenly become the little Sir Echo of the Leader. Whatever else one can say about the member for Mitcham and the Leader, when they are both saying the same thing, and when the member for Mitcham is being Little Sir Echo, one must be suspicious indeed. What the member for Mitcham is wanting to say in relation to this matter is that, if times are difficult and we are not in the short term able to attract industry, we should cease all attempts at any kind of publicity or promotional work. That is nonsense, and it will not do. The standard at which *Vantage* is produced is a high one, and the quality of the reports in it is very good. It is an informational magazine about South Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: Who's going to read it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: *Vantage*, as against any speeches the member for Mitcham ever makes, is something that I do read and something that is worth reading.

People in other States and companies that may be involved in certain aspects in South Australia read the articles that may concern them. Regarding the Leader's other queries about staff in the Policy and Administration Divisions, and so on, I will try to do the best I can. However, I cannot guarantee that the Leader will get everything he wants. I refer now to terminal leave payments. Last year's figure occurred as a result of payments for Parliamentary counsel, the official secretary, two magistrates, and six other staff officers. Obviously, the payments during the year turned out to be greater than expected. At this stage it is expected that 11 staff officers will retire in 1978-79, made up as follows: policy, one; publicity and design, two; Parliamentary counsel, one; magistrates, three; immigration, one; Planning Appeal Board, one; and Agent-General, two.

The Leader also asked about arts development, on which last year an under-spending occurred, even after national wage and other salary increases, because only one additional staff member was recruited during the year, compared to the provision of four extra officers. So, at the end of the year, the Arts Development Branch had one more staff member than it had at the beginning of the year. The 1978-79 allocation provides for the recruitment of a contract officer, who will act as the co-ordinator of regional cultural centre trusts, and staff numbers will be increased on that account.

Mr. Tonkin: By how many are they increasing?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: According to my information they are increasing by the appointment of a contract officer. The recruit who was brought on late last year will be paid for a full year.

Mr. Tonkin: In other words, you are increasing staff.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In that area, yes. I repeat what the Premier said: that any increase in staff must be offset by a reduction somewhere else. Regarding the Arts Development Branch, my information concerning the current year and the increased expenditure of \$35 000 does not seem completely to tie in. However, staff members now total 11, and provision is made for the appointment of a co-ordinator for regional cultural centre trusts. The Leader will, I think, realise that the work of the Arts Development Branch has increased as a consequence of the establishment of those regional centre trusts. Whether any further provision relates to the establishment

of the new Community Development Department, I am not sure.

Regarding the Ethnic Affairs Branch, the 1977-78 expenditure was under-estimated because of the late recruitment of staff. Five officers were appointed during 1977-78 compared to the provision for 12 officers made at the beginning of the last financial year. The 1978-79 figure allows for a full year's salary for nine staff members. So, it is not intended to expand the branch to the full provision of 12 staff members that was originally planned. The main source of the increase in the branch is that the existing staff of nine was appointed mainly towards the end of the last financial year. We are getting a full year effect on those appointments.

So far as contract interpreters and translators are concerned, provision is made for payment for a full financial period for work done on behalf of client departments, except the Premier's Department, State courts, tribunals and commissions. The client departments are recharged for services rendered and income received is paid into departmental revenue, so the position with the translating service is that, wherever that service is provided to another department, that department is charged for that service. A part of the cost here is offset by a receipt into revenue within the Premier's Department.

Mr. Tonkin: So, the actual expense is incurred but it shows in other departments.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is right. This is offset by a receipt into revenue, which is a normal Treasury practice. The Leader should be well aware of that if he has ever read these Budget documents.

Mr. Tonkin: Peter pays Paul.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a means, when a service is provided to other people, which is costing the Government money, of charging the other departments for those services so that they give some thought to the extent to which they use those services.

So far as the provision for the Premier's overseas visit is concerned, the Premier does not have any particular plan at the moment. I do not believe that there is any carry-over of expenditure for next year, according to the information I have.

Mr. Becker: There should be.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is no mention of it here. The provision of \$30 000 is made for an overseas trip by the Premier and his officers, but at this stage he has made no plans; it is purely a contingency provision.

Mr. Mathwin: Perhaps he will go to the South Pole and look for icebergs.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Perhaps the honourable member, in current circumstances, will shut his big mouth.

Mr. Millhouse: That was insulting.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was intended to be insulting because it was an uncalled for remark by the member for Glenelg. Regarding consultants for services, this is a provision that may be required within the department and a small allocation is made. As members would appreciate, there was only one occasion on which it was used last year.

In general, strict instructions have been given throughout the Public Service so far as economies are concerned, and tight control is being maintained on the numbers that are employed. It is open for members to disagree about the value of certain things that are done; that is their prerogative. But I do not think that disagreement should be expressed in a form which suggests that, if a person is a public servant and perhaps involved in some kind of promotional work, he is not doing a real job.

Mr. Tonkin: I didn't say that.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: You did. You said, in relation to *Vantage* the \$63 000 being spent was nothing to do with employment and that the \$63 000 should be used in looking after private enterprise. The implication was that if that money was spent on private enterprise, jobs were created but if it was spent in the Public Service they were not. I suggest to the Leader that he ought to recognise the fact that Government expenditure creates employment directly.

Mr. Tonkin: I know that is your philosophy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is a fact of life. Look at the reductions in employment that have been brought about by the Leader's Federal colleagues simply because they have reduced employment opportunities in an important area of the community. If people who were previously employed in that area have less to spend because they are now on the dole, as a consequence of the reduction in Government expenditure, this has multiplied effects and further consequences on the private sector. Every time the Commonwealth Government cuts expenditure on construction, as it has done ever since it has been in power, it costs jobs in the private sector. Let there be no mistake about that, and no amount of hogwash that we get from members of the Opposition can alter that fact.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister talks about numbers in the Premier's Department and suggests that just because they are there and are given a job that is doing the State some good in creating employment. What a nonsensical proposition: we are just putting people on the pay-roll because we are creating employment. It is not quite as simple as that. During the 1950's and 1960's we saw industrial development in this State, where a policy was followed by the Government without all these 20 hanger-ons and a Policy Division to tell the Government how it ought to run the show. There was a policy then of keeping this State on the rails, and of keeping Government costs under control. As a result of that, this State did considerably better in attracting industry. We have seen a change of policy by this pace-setting Government in the 1970's, and no number of Government employees in a Policy Division, an Economic Development Department or an Overseas Division will attract industry to this State or do anything to develop this State if the advantages that we had in relation to the other States have been lost.

In other words, the idea of putting more and more so-called experts on the Government pay-roll, to develop policies, when the Government's fundamental approach is entirely wrong, is simply a waste of taxpayers' money. The Minister honed in on this glossy magazine *Vantage*, which costs \$63 000 for a few thousand copies put out quarterly. I have had a look at *Vantage*. It puts a cheerful front on things. This Government is very good at putting a nice gloss on things.

Mr. Venning: Window-dressing.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, that is apt. If the Government was honest, it would say that South Australia is in very poor shape. That is not knocking the State; that is facing reality. We have record unemployment in the State, which is likely to get worse. Moreover, we have got by far the worst budgetary situation of any State in the Commonwealth, notwithstanding the fact that we had a bonanza through the sale of one of our assets, the country railways.

I looked at *Vantage* with a great deal of interest. It was sent to me *gratis*; I was on the mailing list. I was very interested in the style of the articles which have general interest in them. We asked a few Questions on Notice about how much contributors were paid, and the answer

was "Normal commercial rates." That was how keen the Government was to tell us what it was paying people. One article was on a small restaurant in my electorate, on Bethany Road. Its proprietors are Nathalie Leader and Alan Gallagher.

I first heard of Alan Gallagher during an election campaign; he was in the front bar of a hotel in Tanunda, and he was spreading lies about me. This is Labor Party tactics, to get your mates in the front bar, and it does not matter whether what is said is true or not. Gallagher was reported as saying that he had been a member of the Liberal Party, that Goldsworthy was no good, and that he (Gallagher) had been to Goldsworthy several times with problems but nothing had happened.

Mr. Groom: What's untrue about that?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am talking about *Vantage*. I was doorknocking on Bethany Road when I called on Nathalie Leader and Alan Gallagher. I said, "I am your friendly member." He said, "I am Alan Gallagher, how do you do." I said, "You are the fellow I have been hearing about in the front bar of one of the pubs in the town." If the ground could have swallowed him up, Gallagher would have been very happy. After that initial shock to his system, Gallagher and I parted on reasonable terms. He got the message that in future it would be best to stick to the truth.

There is an interesting article in *Vantage* by Gallagher and Nathalie Leader. They are obviously mates of the Government. It is the type of article that finds its way into this glossy magazine *Vantage*. It is a nice bit of light reading, but I have grave doubts as to its value in promoting South Australia and encouraging people to come to this State. The Government is great at spending money to put a nice gloss on things but, when it comes to getting down to fundamental policy decisions, this Government has made up its mind on its basic policy thrust, and we know what that is.

Regardless of the number in the Government's brains trust, it will not make the slightest bit of difference in attracting industry to this State. In the words of one investor, "This is like a leper colony to people who have money to invest in this State."

No number of officers in the Policy Division will change the situation. An example of this is the citrus industry. One of the multitude of advisory committees was charged with the responsibility of preparing a submission for the I.A.C. in relation to the citrus industry. The Premier had no idea about it when he came into the House last week; it was shovelled off to one of the committees. The Minister of Agriculture had a hazy notion about it. A submission was sent to the I.A.C. to chop the citrus tariff from 65 per cent to 25 per cent. This submission was prepared by one of the brains trusts in the Premier's Department in the name of this Government. I believe a decision has been made to maintain the 65 per cent tariff.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! There is a very tenuous thread indeed between the line that the honourable member is currently taking and the line that he should be speaking on.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am interested in the amounts provided for charges for Publicity and Design Services. The Premier has waxed eloquent on television recently about the necessity for people to contact their members of Parliament and tell them how bad the Federal Budget was. I have not had a call or a letter, nor have the majority of my colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I doubt very much whether the honourable member can relate that matter to the lines.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I want to know whether it is covered in the line.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: No, it is not.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier used the facilities, I assume, of his political staff in his Policy Division. He has what he acknowledges as political staff in the Premier's Department who promoted at great expense the demonstration on the plaza. The Premier acknowledged that he had no qualms about spending money for such a promotion. Where is the cut-off point in such expenses? The campaign involved a series of television advertisements, and when they aroused no enthusiasm the campaign was changed to something else, but it did not run for long. Can the Minister say what amount of public funds is expended for political purposes within these lines? Do charges for publicity cover expenditure by the political staff, or where is that expenditure covered?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Advertising expenditure is not covered within the lines at all.

Mr. BECKER: The sum of \$13 700 is proposed for the purchase of new motor vehicles in the Administration section of the Premier's Department, \$4 500 is proposed for the purchase of motor vehicles for Arts Development, \$6 900 for the Ombudsman, \$4 700 for the Parliamentary Counsel's Branch, \$4 500 for the Ethnic Affairs Branch, and \$10 000 for the Agent-General in England, a total of \$44 300 for the purchase of new motor vehicles. How many new motor vehicles per department are being purchased for the first time; what make and models of vehicles are to be purchased; to whom will they be issued; will log-books and records of mileages and costs for each vehicle be kept; and what is generally the replacement period of such vehicles?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The normal policy regarding the replacement of motor vehicles operates after a motor vehicle has been around for two years or has done 40 000 miles, or something of that order. Normally, it means that the original purchase price of the motor vehicle, which is free of sales tax when purchased by the State, is covered by the secondhand price at which the vehicle is sold.

Under "Administration" provision is made for the replacement of three motor vehicles, and one motor vehicle is to be replaced under "Arts Development", and another under "Ombudsman" (members can see from the figure there that the Ombudsman gets a better quality vehicle). The Parliamentary Counsel's Branch involves a provision for a replacement motor vehicle, but no such provision is made for the Planning Appeal Board. A replacement vehicle is to be provided for the Ethnic Affairs Branch, and provision is made for one replacement vehicle for the Agent-General in the United Kingdom, where it is expected that the vehicle will be purchased. The general policy regarding the purchase of motor vehicles in South Australia is that the contract is divided equally between Chrysler and G.M.H. Purchases have to be either Valiant or Sigma cars or Kingswood or Torana cars.

Mr. Becker: Which personnel will be issued with the vehicles?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A replacement vehicle is being provided for the Ombudsman himself. Departmental vehicles are available for the department and are used on an as-required basis.

Mr. Millhouse: Why does the Parliamentary Counsel need a vehicle?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That is for the whole Parliamentary Counsel staff, but I will find out for the honourable member. The normal practice regarding a purely departmental vehicle is that it is available for officers, as and when required, on Government business. In my department the various sector managers must frequently travel into local council areas. They have access

to the departmental vehicle pool. The normal policy within the Government is that, if an officer uses his own private vehicle, for which he is reimbursed, there is a certain point of use beyond which (as a result of our investigations) it pays the Government to provide that employee with a departmental vehicle.

Dr. Eastick: Especially if he is being paid to drive to and from work.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: That normally would not be the case.

Mr. Dean Brown: It is if it is used for official purposes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It depends on what the official purpose is and on the circumstances. I will inquire whether or not any of the vehicles to be purchased by the Premier's Department are for the exclusive use of any particular officer. I imagine that in most cases they are available for departmental use. My department has vehicles available for general departmental use, and officers who require them have to apply to use them. There is always a queue and a complaint or two about the non-availability of vehicles.

Mr. Becker: What about log-books?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not know whether log-books are kept for individual vehicles.

Mr. WOTTON: The Leader has already referred to the massive increase of about \$45 000 in the Arts Development Branch, and I draw attention to an additional over \$9 000 allocation to the branch. Can the Minister explain the activities of the branch and say why this increase is necessary? Is the division a watchdog over such institutions as the Jam Factory, the Festival Theatre, and the State Theatre Company, all of which have their own administration and staff?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The Arts Development Branch is concerned with the development of Government policy in all areas of the arts throughout the State and is the first point of contact for any approaches made with respect to matters concerning the Festival Theatre, the Playhouse, or Space, matters concerning music development, arts grants, and looking after visitors to the State who want to attend the Festival Theatre. The arts grants covered through the Arts Development Branch are substantial. General supervisory activity is undertaken through the branch on all State Government expenditure with respect to the Festival Theatre, the State Opera, the State Theatre Company, and the Jam Factory. The range of activities in which the branch is involved is large indeed. Mr. Amadio does an excellent job. A large part of the development that has taken place and the way in which it has taken place have been a consequence of the work he has done. Basically, the branch is—

Mr. Gunn: A waste of taxpayers' money.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I would have expected the honourable member to say that. The branch is involved in all relationships in the arts area both within and outside the Government sphere. The Education Department is involved in extensive activity in the arts area, both in drama and music, and in the general arts development. The Arts Development Branch is involved closely with the Education Department. Considerable work has to be done, and that is basically why it is a reasonable size, involving about nine people. There has been an expansion in the activities of the branch, because the development of the Regional Centre Trusts has involved it in additional work, and co-ordination work, in relation to the activities of those trusts.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is an expensive exercise: nearly \$150 000 to do what the Minister has said. It is as good an example as one could find of the fact that, when the Premier wants to find money for something in which he is

interested, he finds it all right, and we have that in arts development. However, I am less charitable or more courageous than are members of the Liberal Party, because I do not think that all those people do a good job (I think that some of them are passengers). I am not afraid to say so, unlike the member for Murray, who says how marvellous Mr. Amadio is. He is a nice fellow, but that is by the way.

The fact is that millions of dollars are being spent in this broad area of the arts in South Australia at a time when, in my opinion, the money could be better spent. We hear all the time (and I agree with them) complaints from Labor members about unemployment, which is the biggest scourge facing this country at present. Much of this money is being channelled into the arts because the Premier likes this sort of thing. There is no penny-pinching in the arts field in the Budget. Nice big increases are allocated because this happens to be the Premier's interest and it is the area in which many of his friends happen to be occupied.

I now refer to the allocation of \$85 000 for terminal leave payments in the Premier's Department. Although \$34 000 was voted for this line last year, \$84 908 was actually spent. That represents an enormous increase. I suspect (indeed, the Minister said this when answering the question from the Leader of the Opposition) that a part of this included a payment to the former Parliamentary Counsel. I now ask what was the payment to the former Parliamentary Counsel, now His Honour Judge Daugherty, under this line?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to the allocations for the Unit for Industrial Democracy. Will you, Sir, allow debate on this matter now or when the Labour and Industry Department lines are debated?

The CHAIRMAN: There is no vote for the Unit for Industrial Democracy under the Premier's Department heading. That matter can be debated when the Committee is dealing with the Labour and Industry Department.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: My question relates to the publication of the quarterly magazine *Vantage*. I realise that the magazine's circulation is limited, and I suspect that its advertising is also limited as advertisers find it uneconomic to advertise in such a small magazine. I imagine, too, that advertising therein would be expensive and that, as the magazine has such a small circulation, it would not pay people to advertise therein. However, I noticed that the winter 1978 edition included two or three pages of advertising, including many small advertisements for restaurants. Will the Minister say what was the magazine's total advertising revenue in its first year of production?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get that information for the honourable member, as well as the information requested by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: What, haven't you got it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have the aggregate figure relating to the number of officers involved in terminal leave payments, but not the individual figures.

Mrs. ADAMSON: I refer to the allocation to the Ethnic Affairs Branch. Although actual payments last year totalled \$49 022, \$135 600 is being allocated this year, a considerable increase. Where are the ethnic affairs adviser and clerical staff, as well as the community interpreter staff, presently located, whom are they serving, and what plans exist for any expansion in terms of location to account for this considerable increase in payments?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I told the Leader that this occurred because of the appointment of officers late in the previous financial year. That is the major reason for the increase in expenditure in the 1978-79 financial year. The

branch will this financial year have the full year's effect of nine officers, five of whom were appointed late in the last financial year. I will get the information about location.

Mr. BECKER: The allocation for "Immigration" is \$245 700 this financial year, compared with actual payments of \$281 274 last financial year. At page 203, the Auditor-General's Report states:

The role of the Immigration Branch is to process applications for passages and provide accommodation where required. British migrants who are assisted under a joint Commonwealth-State agreement are given transport as required to permanent homes and some are provided with meals and accommodation at the Woodville Reception Centre. A charge is made for each meal or bed provided in excess of a free period of one week. Under the joint arrangement, 300 migrants were assisted during 1977-78 (441 in 1976-77).

I understand that the role of the Immigration Branch has been taken over by the Commonwealth Immigration and Ethnic Affairs Department and that the reception centre at Woodville will now provide only hostel accommodation and facilities for refugees, student teachers, public servants and other people who want to avail themselves of the accommodation for short periods. Why is there such a large allocation, if the previous work of the branch was mainly to arrange and assist passages of immigrants coming from Britain?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The main reduction in staff had occurred through non-replacement of those who have resigned or retired. Negotiations are proceeding with the Commonwealth both in respect of the operation of this branch and of the hostel. I am not aware of those negotiations being completed at this time.

Mr. Becker interjecting:

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Further negotiations are going on in relation to the hostel, as well. I do not think they are completed. Presumably, the general Government policy in this area would be that it will not retrench people but will allow wastage to take place and endeavour to find other employment for people involved if the activities in this area cease altogether. The honourable member can be sure of that.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I refer to a letter from the Women's Advisory Unit, signed by Deborah McCulloch, on 17 August 1978, which states in part:

Dear Madam/Sir,

As you may know, recently the Women's Information Switchboard was established . . . The Women's Information Switchboard is open from 9.30 a.m. to 9.30 p.m., seven days a week, and is womanned by six paid staff and many volunteers.

I understand that "womanned" is the sexist equivalent of "manned". If we are not to discriminate between the sexes, should it not have been "personned"? The letter continues:

The Women's Information Switchboard is an extension of the information service which was offered through the Women's Advisory Unit since its inception. The Women's Information Switchboard is ready to give information to any woman on any problem at all, or on any issue of importance to women. It is a pilot project, supported jointly by the Women's Advisory Unit and the Libraries Board of South Australia, to assess the need in the community for such information services.

The project will be evaluated at the end of 12 months to see if the need which we estimate is confirmed.

I ask the Minister what portion of the allocation of \$67 800 under this line will be used in this Women's Information Switchboard, so that it can be womanned for this period by six paid staff?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will get the information for the honourable member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Would the Minister also get information as to the total cost of this Women's Information Switchboard service?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes.

Mr. WOTTON: I ask the Minister about overseas visits of officers. Could he provide details of the officers who have travelled overseas in the past 12 months and how long they were away, and has he details of intended visits of officers for the next 12 months?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think anything has been finalised for the next 12 months. I think there was a Question on Notice relating to the Premier's and officers' visits for the past 12 months. The honourable member will probably find that information in *Hansard*. If he does not, I will get it for him.

Mr. MATHWIN: The provision for the visit to South Australia by an officer of the Agent-General in England is \$8 400. That is a sizable sum for such a visit.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This is for the visit of the Agent-General, who returns to South Australia once every two years, and stays for a couple of months. He tours around South Australia in order to get information. I am not sure whether his wife is also covered by this provision.

Line passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.4 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 28 September at 2 p.m.