

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 October 1980

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

PETITIONS: RETAIL MEAT SALES

Petitions signed by 1 321 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to oppose any changes to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by the Hons. H. Allison, D. J. Hopgood, and J. D. Wright, and Messrs. Bannon, Max Brown, Millhouse, Mathwin, Lynn Arnold, and Plunkett.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 406 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITION: ELECTRICITY CHARGES

A petition signed by 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to grant concessions on electricity charges to persons receiving social welfare pensions was presented by Mr. Gunn.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 324, 357, 371, 432, 437, 479, 504, 550, 553, 557, 587 and 592.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Industrial Affairs (The Hon. D. C. Brown) for the Minister of Agriculture (The Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Metropolitan Milk Board—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Stock Foods Act, 1941-1972—Regulations—Pesticide Residues.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Coast Protection Board—Report, 1978-79.
- ii. South Australian Film Corporation—Report, 1979-80.
- iii. State Theatre Company of South Australia Act, 1972-1979—Regulations—Election to Board of Governors.

By the Minister of Transport (The Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1980—Regulations—Tow Trucks.

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

By Command—

- i. Dental Services in South Australia, Committee of Inquiry—Report, 1980.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DENTAL SERVICES

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Minister of Health): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: On 25 December 1979—

Mr. Hemmings: Can I have a copy of this?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, it is in the process of distribution, I believe—I announced the appointment of a Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services in South Australia. The committee consisted of Mr. David Martin, a company director and management consultant, as Chairman, and included as members Mrs. Marion Disney, the then Director of the Citizens Advice Bureau, and Dr. A. John Bloomfield, a former Federal and State President of the Australian Dental Association.

The committee was appointed in the light of an awareness that there were a number of inter-related issues in the dental area which required examination. These included the role and organisation of the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, dental services for pensioners and disadvantaged persons, proposed legislation to permit clinical dental technicians to deal directly with the public in the supply of full dentures, an impending oversupply of dental manpower, and the role of the South Australian Health Commission in the rationalisation, co-ordination and delivery of dental services in South Australia.

In announcing the inquiry and seeking submissions, I indicated that the report of the committee would be made public. I now table the report. The committee received over 60 written submissions and consulted many individuals and organisations, both from South Australia and interstate. From the committee's report, it is clear that there are a number of steps which will need to be taken to improve the organisation and provision of dental services in South Australia, particularly for pensioners and financially disadvantaged persons.

I am most concerned with the lack of dental services for disadvantaged groups and, since coming to office, have already taken action to improve pensioner dental services in metropolitan Adelaide. The Government is committed to improving the efficiency of health services in general and will be closely examining the report in the light of current economic circumstances. In making the report public, I propose to allow a six-week period to 5 December 1980 before recommending any action to the Government. During this time, interested parties and individuals will be afforded the opportunity to submit comments for consideration by the Government. Because of the extent of the inquiry and the nature of the recommendations, we consider it reasonable to allow this opportunity for consideration of the report before the Government takes action to implement those recommendations that it adopts.

QUESTION TIME

MOORE'S BUILDING

Mr. BANNON: My question is to the Premier. Has the contract been approved for the renovation of Moore's

building for use as courts? If so, which company has been given the contract, and has the cost of converting Moore's building now risen from \$16 500 000 to \$30 000 000?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am informed that no, it has not yet been let, but we should be able to give the Leader of the Opposition the information that he desires within the next week or so.

O'HALLORAN HILL COLLEGE OF FURTHER EDUCATION

Mr. SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Education give any further reassurance that the O'Halloran Hill College of Further Education will not cease all of its courses in art and craft next year? I raised this question last week and it appears that rumours are still continuing in the area regarding the future of courses, and in particular these rumours have been fanned by a report on radio 5MMM FM and in a newsheet distributed around the college by students. The rumours have also been further fanned by an article in today's *News*, which states (and this is a comment made by Mr. Sturt-Bray, who is a student representative at the college):

A further 100 students enrolled in the 1980 certificate course, and awaiting enrolment in the advanced course next year, were also being denied access.

"If this happens, 75 per cent of our students will not be able to afford the two hours public transport travelling time to the city or its cost," Mr. Sturt-Bray said.

Can the Minister reassure students in connection with these moves?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The situation literally has not changed since the reply that I gave to the honourable member only last week on this question. I would repeat that the changes affect only the advanced certificate courses at the O'Halloran Hill college. There is no truth, in fact, in the rumour that these courses are all to be transferred to the former School of Arts in Stanley Street which is now run by the Department of Further Education. What will happen, as I said last week, is that the advanced certificate course is being consolidated at the Croydon Park College of Further Education, which will assume responsibility for that course. I understand from statistical evidence presented by the Department of Further Education that the students involved at O'Halloran Hill represent only about 10 per cent of the total number enrolled in art and craft courses there. In addition to that, as I said previously, the students already enrolled in the advanced certificate will continue to complete their course at O'Halloran Hill, but no new enrolments will be accepted in the advanced certificate course at O'Halloran Hill at the beginning of 1981.

It would appear that someone is perpetuating this rumour out of malicious intent, I would believe, since we have already gone to considerable pains to tell the college, the staff and the students what the correct situation is. This is now the third time that I have had to reiterate the story, which is completely unchanged. We made a press release two weeks ago, and we have made two consecutive weekly statements now in the House of Assembly. That is the correct situation.

TYRE MANUFACTURING

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Can the Premier say what action the Government is taking to protect employment in the South Australian tyre manufacture and motor vehicle

component industry? There are a number of reports that the America-based Uniroyal company is about to sell its 60 per cent holding in its Adelaide offshoot to the Japanese Bridgestone group. I am informed that, if this happens, there is a good chance that employment will be protected, because the Bridgestone company does not have a major manufacturing facility in Australia. However, if Uniroyal is acquired by one of the Australia-based manufacturers, the resulting rationalisation of operations could mean that South Australian jobs would be lost.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased indeed to be able to tell the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that, during my recent visit to the United States of America on another matter (the matter of the Dow petro-chemical plant), I had long and intensive discussions with the Uniroyal company on the very matter he has discussed. I am not in a position to make any final announcement on the matter, but simply say to him that I am well aware of the need to protect the employment and, indeed, the integrity of the tyre-manufacturing industry in South Australia. I have taken the necessary steps to ensure that that operation will not only continue but will have every prospect of expansion and, indeed, create additional employment for South Australia. I cannot in any way foreshadow an announcement, which may be made some time in the relatively near future, except to say that I am confident that the tyre-manufacturing plant at Elizabeth will not only continue, but is likely to go from strength to strength.

PRIDE IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr. LEWIS: Can the Premier indicate what response there has been to the Government's efforts to boost South Australians' pride in their State and their sense of identity with the State?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am grateful to the honourable member, because I know perfectly well that he, together with every Government member, at any event, shares our pride in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Obviously, Opposition members do not hold the same pride in South Australia that we do. I think it important that we all understand that, first, we are all very much Australians, whether we come from New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia or any other State, and very proud to be so. Also, we are, in the true spirit of federalism (federalism being an association of autonomous bodies), very much South Australians. I, for one, am conscious of our role as South Australians and am proud, indeed, of what I believe is this State's unique contribution to the welfare and prosperity of Australia as a whole. The Government has consciously directed its efforts to highlighting that particular pride and to fostering a sense of pride in the Australian people. I suspect that I am not alone in seeking to do that. I believe, for example, that the previous Premier (the member for Hartley) had very strong feelings along that sort of line.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You are dead right, and I didn't do away with Proclamation Day.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That matter is the subject of a debate currently before the House, and I would not in any way give way to temptation by seeking to answer the interjection from the member for Hartley with which he has blotted his record. I am obliged to say this: if members opposite have read that as doing away with Proclamation Day, all I can say is that they had better read more carefully. The Government has made substantial donations of money and professional advice to the "It's our

State, Mate" campaign, which, contrary to some of the comments made by the Opposition, was stimulated by the electronic media, and has been organised by them. I think that the original campaign was the brainchild and creation of an advertising agency which, in the past, had much to do with the Australian Labor Party. I do not hold that against it. I think the campaign has been an extraordinarily good one, well conceived, and well delivered.

Mr. Becker: They had a better subject to work with.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I could not disagree with the honourable member in any way. The State flag lapel badges have been manufactured for a considerable time. As members opposite would know, the policy has been to restrict them very much to visiting dignitaries and Government officials travelling overseas. In August, the present Government directed that these badges should be offered to sporting teams travelling overseas, to be given to their opponents at the end of the tour as a gesture of goodwill. Since they have become more widely available, the public demand has become intense. Indeed, it is now so great that the Government is obliged to consider further means of increasing the availability of these badges. I suspect that that will be by selling them—not the Government's entering the business, but by making them available for sale through recognised retailers.

Yesterday, as members may know, Cabinet decided that the State flag, the blue ensign with the piping shrike, should be made available to be flown by every citizen in this State, treating it with due respect, as one would any State or national flag, with the proviso that it is not used for commercial promotion. State Government buildings already fly the flag. Schools throughout the State will be issued with the State flag, and recreation bodies recommended by the Department of Recreation and Sport, initially free of charge, will be given flags.

There has been an advance copy of what I believe is a very well produced promotional book on South Australia, detailing the potential, the way of life, and all of the good things for which South Australia is world renowned, and copies of that publication will in due course be distributed throughout the world to organisations and individuals interested in the potential for progress and development in South Australia. Consideration will be given also to a wider distribution within South Australia, if there is sufficient demand. Obviously, it will be necessary to make a charge for that publication if such a decision is taken.

Last week—and this is the last point I wish to make—the Minister of Tourism made available full details of the most successful "Visitor in South Australia" campaign. It was rather encouraging to hear the extremely good comments made by the visiting artists who came to Adelaide for the Channel 10 Christmas Appeal. They were met at the airport, given VISA badges, and many of them wore the badges on camera. They were very appreciative of the general feeling of warmth, a feeling that they had been greeted as visitors in South Australia. I believe that that campaign will pay off to South Australia, certainly in terms of goodwill, and in terms of cold hard cash in tourist income. This Government will do everything possible to foster and develop, to strengthen in all ways, a sense of pride in South Australia, because it believes very strongly that South Australia is a State of which we can be very proud indeed.

WUZHOU

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Every member on this side agrees that South Australia is very important—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been called on to ask a question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Will the Minister of Marine explain to the House—

Mr. Millhouse: If he can.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am asking him to explain why the Government has settled for a sum of \$620 000 as compensation from the owners of the vessel *Wuzhou*, when the amount of damage caused by that vessel to harbour facilities at Wallaroo, as listed in the Auditor-General's Report, was \$1 114 000.

I think only last week I reiterated to the House the action that I took while I was Minister of Marine, in order to arrest this ship, which led to the negotiations that finally led to a settlement being made to the South Australian Government in relation to the damage that was caused by this vessel. I know that there was some upgrading of the jetty that was naturally discounted, but I am interested to know the exact figures, and why the amount of only \$620 000 was paid to the State Government, when the damage listed amounted to \$1 114 000?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This is very much a matter which concerned Treasury and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: —with which I was very closely involved. I think it is important to put on record for the benefit of members the exact state of affairs which occurred. As the member for Hartley would well know, there was some considerable doubt about the absolute cause of the accident in which that portion of the jetty was demolished, and the judgment that was given was such that it would have been possible to appeal the case as far as the Privy Council. The situation was that it was considered as a straight business commercial decision that the delay which could have arisen from taking the case further on appeal—

Mr. Millhouse: But it went to the High Court.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not particularly interested in what the member for Mitcham wants to do when he is showing off his legal knowledge. I am simply saying, because of the delays that would have occurred, that, on a straight commercial basis, with a risk that the State might not have sustained its case, and indeed, might have lost the case and not got anything very much at all, it was worked out that the sum of \$620 000 paid in cash now (I may say that that sum was increased quite considerably after negotiation with the Chinese Government), worked out on a three-year basis, was a much better proposition than to accept the risk of a three-year delay, the loss of interest on the money, and the possibility that we might not have been awarded that sort of sum at the ultimate conclusion of the matter, anyway.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Interest was to accrue on the amount during the litigation.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: In fact, that was not the way it was presented. Cabinet considered the matter, and there was no question but that the \$620 000 in hand was a far better proposition than \$1 100 000, the cost potentially there, after three years, with the very real risk that that money might not have been available anyway. It was a decision taken on pure commercial lines, and I have no doubt at all that the State of South Australia has come out of the matter as well as it possibly could.

We have maintained the very best of relations with the Government of China at all times. Those relations were very ably fostered by the member for Hartley while he was

Premier, and I will certainly pay him credit for conducting the original negotiations, in spite of the arrest of the ship, with the preservation of those relations well in mind. They have been maintained, and the matter has been settled amicably and in the best interests of South Australia generally. We must remember that China is a major customer as far as wheat is concerned, and is certainly a major trading partner of the future, with a tremendous potential. The Government has come out of that commercial decision extremely well—as well as could be expected—and we have every hope of continuing our trade relations in the future.

LICENCES

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Transport review the age requirement on which motor vehicle licence-holders must submit themselves for compulsory annual practical licence examinations? I have received numerous complaints from constituents aged 70 years and over who have to submit themselves for compulsory practical driving licence tests. One constituent complained yesterday that she failed her test for the second time because she did not stop at a stop sign for long enough. She queried the reason given, and I was unable to explain to her how long one must stop at a stop sign. There was no traffic on her right or her left. She has now been told that she must do the third and final practical driving test on 30 December this year, which would naturally inconvenience her.

I understand that, because of the increase in the average age of the population, an increasing number of persons over 70 years of age are now being requested to submit to annual practical driving tests, and this upsets many people. Dozens of my constituents who have had to sit two or three times have complained over the past twelve months; many of these people have lost their licence.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr. BECKER: Those who have lost their licence have complained to me that they are inconvenienced in regard to their regular visits to the bank, the shop, the church, or the hospital, etc., and I ask whether the Minister or the Government has received similar complaints and whether the Minister is prepared to alter the age limit to, say, 75 years of age before compulsory practical driving tests are required?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Without a lot of investigation, I am certainly not prepared to give an undertaking that we will increase the age limit to 75 years. I would be grateful if the honourable member would supply me with details of his constituent's name and where the driving test occurred so that I can investigate the matter. From time to time, as most members will know, we receive complaints about matters such as this, and I try to follow them up as assiduously as possible. It is true that the Government has received many representations about the 70 years age limit, and the Government has been asked whether it cannot vary that limit. I am pleased to tell the member for Hanson that I am already considering that.

This important question must be considered extremely carefully, especially in the interests of road safety. I am sure the honourable member is as committed to road safety as I am. I believe that it may be possible for some variation in the limit to be made, but at this stage I cannot say what the age limit would be. I can also inform the House that there are other ways in which we can proceed, and I shall be happy to discuss this with the honourable member when I have completed looking into the matter.

CROWN LAND

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Lands say who is responsible for presenting a submission to Cabinet on whether to sell off unallotted Crown land on Kangaroo Island for agricultural or pastoral purposes—the Minister of Lands or the Minister of Agriculture? This matter has been raised in this House recently because of a fear expressed by conservation groups that 19 000 hectares immediately east of the Flinders Chase National Park was likely to be cut up into 17 pastoral blocks. The groups wanted the land added to the park.

The matter was initially brought up last November by the Minister of Agriculture, who told this House:

Another area of land about which I have spoken in recent days is a 17 000 to 18 000 hectare piece of unallocated Crown land on Kangaroo Island. There was nothing sinister about that. I referred to it because I know the area intimately, having lived there all my life . . . the future of that land is also under review by my Government.

Recently the same Minister made a further comment. He has been reported as having said at the Kingscote show that the land should be farmed. He said that it could carry 100 000 sheep. What prompted me to ask this question of the Minister of Lands, if he is the Minister actually handling this matter, was a further report of a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture at that show, as follows:

I do not intend to be dictated to by day-dreamers or day-trippers.

An honourable member: He didn't!

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: He did. Why is the Minister of Agriculture saying that he is not going to be influenced by day-trippers or day-dreamers when, in fact, he should not be the Minister responsible for any possible change in the status of Crown land?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Quite clearly I am the Minister responsible for any suggested changes that would go to Cabinet. The report referred to is one of many reports I have requested from the Lands Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department that are status reports to bring me up-to-date. They are internal reports and, in this instance, I made the report available to Cabinet for consideration. It may be interesting to note, if the report has not been made available to the honourable member (and I do not know whether he has acquired a copy or not), that the report does not contain a recommendation. It is a status report that indicates to me what the land could be utilised for, but it makes no recommendation. At the moment the report is available to the Department for the Environment, the Agriculture Department and the Lands Department for further consideration.

HEAD LICE

Mr. RANDALL: Can the Minister of Health say whether any new and possibly better arrangements have been made for the control of head lice amongst school children? If they have, what help is available for low-income families who may be unable to bear the cost of an effective eradication programme?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question because this is a matter on which I think virtually every member would have been petitioned by local schools and parent groups. Earlier this year the Health Commission and the School Health Services made arrangements for the distribution of a preparation known as KP24, which has been demonstrated to be

effective in the treatment of head lice. However, that distribution was through schools and pharmacists expressed concern that a preparation was on the schedule—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think the question and answer are similar to question 550 on today's Notice Paper, asked by the Hon. D. J. Hopgood, and the answer received. The question is similar, and I think the answer is almost identical. Surely this is repetitious.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have checked the answer to the question asked by the honourable member for Baudin. Of my own knowledge of the question which was put by the honourable member for Henley Beach, I can say there is a difference in so far as he sought information about treatment. I would however, take the opportunity of advising members on both sides of the House that, before framing questions, it is extremely important to be aware of the questions which are on notice so that members' questions may not be called out of order. In this instance, the Deputy Leader rose a considerable time after the Minister had started her answer. I ask the Minister to continue the answer.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am pleased to say that the commission has been conducting discussions with the Pharmacy Guild and the Friendly Societies Medical Association and, as a result of these discussions, the guild and the F.S.M.A. have agreed to prevail on their members to make available KP24 at a reduced price, which is basically cost plus a small handling fee.

The guild and the association have also agreed to ask their members to counsel those who purchase this preparation to ensure it is used effectively for the treatment of head lice. In addition, the guild and the association have agreed to ask their members to distribute a Health Commission pamphlet with each purchase of KP24 which outlines to the purchaser the method of treating head lice with this preparation.

The second point, which is of great importance, is the manner in which families who are in difficult economic circumstances can have access to this product, which will be retailed at a cost of \$2.50, a figure considerably less than the standard retail price. In the case of disadvantaged families who are eligible for the free book issue, the principal will provide the families with a chit which can be presented to the local pharmacist, and that chit will subsequently be cashed by the pharmacist with the Health Commission. In that way we are ensuring that no family need be without treatment simply through lack of means to pay for it.

Finally, where there are cases of lack of parental co-operation with schools regarding the treatment of head lice, the school health nurses and the local board of health will endeavour to visit the families, provide advice and, on request, supervise treatment. In this way, I hope we will be able to control, if not eradicate, what has become quite a serious public health problem in South Australia.

LAND RIGHTS

Mr. KENEALLY: What assurances have been given by the Premier to the member for Eyre, who walked out on negotiations the Government was having with the Pitjantjatjara and who threatened to resign from the Liberal Party if the objections raised by the Mintabie opal miners about the mining provisions of the new Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill were not heeded?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not too sure who is more surprised—the member for Eyre or me. I think the best way of answering the honourable member's question is to

suggest that he do the best he can to get a little more sleep at night and perhaps he will not have those nightmares.

RIDING TRACK

Mr. GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Environment consider the use of some land at the O'Halloran Hill Reserve above Seaview Downs for the use of the Society for the Care and Riding of Horses, and that a riding track be made available along the fire break strip between Davenport Terrace and Morphett Road? Over the last past five years, the society has continually sought an area of land for the agistment and riding of horses, particularly for the youth of the area wishing to participate in this sport. Regrettably, through various circumstances, its search for secure land tenure has to date met with little success, and I look forward to an early solution being found and the Minister's thoughts on this matter.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I look forward to an early conclusion in this matter, because I appreciate that the honourable member's concern has been going on for a long time. He has been concerned, and so have I. I have been out to have a look at this reserve, which is a State Planning Authority reserve. Recently, I spent most of one weekend driving around looking at these reserves, and the O'Halloran Hill Reserve was one of them. I have also had discussions with the member for Brighton about this matter, and I know that many people in his electorate are interested in using some of this land for the care and riding of horses.

I understand that the member for Brighton has already had discussions with one of the members of my department and that these discussions will continue. It is possible to allow the use of this particular land as I will outline. We have put quite a few suggestions to the people of that area, one of which is that we would provide a fenced path (a bridle path, I think it is referred to) to enable horses to travel on a particular section of that reserve without interfering with the tree plantations. Recently, there have been extensive plantings in that area, and we are very keen to ensure that they are not interfered with.

We have suggested that an area on the western side of the reserve could also be made available for exercising horses, I suggest on a shared use basis, because the aero modellers, who also use that reserve, have expressed an interest in retaining their activities there. I believe that there could be a joint usage by house owners and aero modellers. Some additional fencing will be required to protect some other trees in that area. I am very much aware of the matter the honourable member has brought to my attention previously, and now to the attention of the House, and I am looking forward, in future, to being able to help him to assist his constituents who are keen to care for and ride horses in this reserve.

- COOPER BASIN

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Can the Premier say whether the Government will, in the light of the great potentiality of the sedimentary basins in the North of the State (at least if the officers of the Department of Mines and Energy are to be believed), provide increased funds for South Australian Oil and Gas to boost its current exploration programme in the Cooper Basin and, if not, why not? By "increased funds", I mean from general

revenue, because any levy would naturally be passed on immediately to the consumer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am surprised that the member for Baudin, who was at one stage Minister of Mines and Energy, should in any way reflect on that department's officers.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Who was? I was giving the source of my information as to the potentiality of the Cooper Basin.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understood the honourable members to say "if the officers of that department are to be believed".

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's right. They are exactly my words.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think they are to be believed and that they do a first-class job, and I am at a loss to understand why the honourable member threw that gratuitous insult into his question. The exploration which has been done and which is being undertaken by South Australian Oil and Gas is of great value to the overall programme of exploration being conducted in this State. However, I think it only right to point out that a great deal more activity is being undertaken, too, by private companies and explorers generally in the Cooper Basin, in the Officer, Pedirka, and Stuart Basins, and, in particular, the highlight of our exploration programme for hydrocarbons, the offshore drilling that is to take place off Ceduna.

That will involve the very latest techniques for off-shore drilling. The drilling will take place in water depths greater than any which have been involved previously, certainly in Australian projects, and indeed throughout the world. So, quite considerable difficulties will be involved in this exploration programme. B.P. and Hematite, I think, are expending about \$60 000 000 for off-shore drilling, and they are doing this because they have a real expectation that the geological structure which is the target of their interest will prove most promising, and it looks as though it will provide considerable returns. It has been said to me that, if they are accurate—and they are quite frequently nowadays—in their assessment of geological targets, and if hydrocarbons are found at that site, they will be found in quantities far greater than those currently being exploited in Bass Strait.

Yes, there is a case for S.A.O.G. in the exploration programme, but this Government believes that, if private enterprise is prepared to put in exploration funds and to put out these risk funds in order to find bigger reserves, and provided that the Government is satisfied that exploration is going on at a rate suitable for the need, we can have every confidence in the programmes being undertaken at present, and there is no real need to stimulate S.A.O.G. exploration to any greater degree. The number of inquiries as to the availability of sites in prospect still continues. Interest is still extremely high in developing exploration in all of the South Australian areas.

TAX CONCESSIONS

Dr. BILLARD: Can the Premier give up-to-date information on the advantage taken of the pay-roll tax concessions for the employment of additional young people and the stamp duty concessions for the purchase of a first home, both introduced by this Government? These tax concessions were introduced during the last financial year as a result of promises made by the Liberal Party before the last State election. Because of this, there is considerable interest in seeing just how effective these

measures have been in application.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The most recent figures available in respect of the pay-roll tax and special youth unemployment schemes come from returns lodged up to 20 October, and they show that, for the month of August 1980, claims made for pay-roll tax exemptions totalled 1 976 in relation to additional youth workers employed by 556 firms. The Commissioner has also pointed out that those figures do not include additional youth workers engaged by employers who lodge returns on other than a monthly basis. That means basically that the actual figure as at August this year is more than 2 000.

As to that part of the scheme which refunds a proportion of the pay-roll tax paid by firms which hire additional youth employees, the figures as at 29 September show that applications for refunds were approved to 494 firms, involving an additional 731 youth workers. I know of the honourable member's very great concern and interest in this matter, and I am sure that he will be reassured to know that that scheme is steadily working on, not in a spectacular fashion but nevertheless creating employment for young people.

As to the stamp duty remissions, the figures for the 11 months from November to September inclusive show that 7 659 transfers have been granted the benefit of stamp duty concessions, with a total cost in forgone revenue of \$3 717 000—an average concession per transfer of \$405.40. I think we must agree that that 11-month period is a most significant one, and certainly that stamp duty remission, the concession made to first home buyers, has been a very popular initiative indeed—a total of 7 659 up to September, and the figure no doubt is higher now. That is a scheme with which the Government is quite pleased and which it intends to continue.

TOWELS

Mr. HEMMINGS: Can the Minister of Health explain the apparent inconsistency in her reply to the member for Hanson about the shortage of towels at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital when she said:

The reasons for the shortages in this and other hospitals included delays in delivery and industrial problems.

It should be noted that the South Australian Towel Company, which previously supplied towels, has recently been forced to lay off some 40 workers because of the lack of South Australian Government orders. I am advised that in the past there has been no problem with deliveries and that there have been no industrial problems at the South Australian Towel Company for 15 to 20 years. Workers there are currently on short time and machines are idle. Perhaps the Minister should look at her planning and administration within the Health Commission.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Health.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I recall, I alluded to the fact that industrial matters could have been a cause of delay: I did not say that they were. I should say that when the Industrial Services Management Committee calls tenders for the supply of towels it is obviously looking for the best quality, or the appropriate quality at the lowest price. If local suppliers are not able to meet those requirements, I am quite sure that the member for Napier would not wish the order to be placed with a firm which has tendered at a higher price than that of other makers. So, there was no inconsistency whatsoever in my reply, and the answer I gave explained quite satisfactorily the situation concerning the provision of towels in hospitals.

JOSEPH VERCO

Mr. BLACKER: Can the Minister of Fisheries say whether a preliminary assessment has been made of the damage to the *Joseph Verco* and, if it has, what is the extent of that damage? Can the Minister also say whether the lengthy time taken to refloat the vessel will result in additional costs of restoration?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There is a Question on Notice by the member for Semaphore on this matter, and I think some of the matters raised by the member for Flinders will be dealt with in the reply to that Question on Notice. I think I can tell the honourable member, without offending anyone, that the vessel has been refloated and that it is still exhibiting quite a large degree of instability.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The truth is never kind, Mr. Speaker. On the advice of the Department of Marine and Harbors, the vessel is *in situ* where it was raised, and the question of stability will be looked at. When that is rectified and an appropriate site has been found to take and moor the vessel in a secure position, those other questions that the honourable member has raised will be looked at, particularly with regard to the length of time, which I think is the point that the honourable member for Semaphore raised. The answers to those questions will be provided.

PRISONS ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, if I can get his attention. Have I got his attention?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will proceed with his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Government cause the terms of reference of the Royal Commission on prison services to be widened? I would have asked the question last Thursday, but I had a more pressing question to ask the honourable lady, the Minister of Health.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will get back to this explanation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, quite. I had to ask about the I.M.V.S. last Thursday, with some effect, apparently.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I desire to explain this question, with your permission and the concurrence of the House. Since the terms of reference of the Royal Commission were so hastily got together and published, there has been a good deal of criticism about them. I have suggested that they are so broad as to be not really effective. I think the prison officers want the terms widened: something like that was said last Thursday when the Royal Commission had its first meeting.

I am prompted to ask the question particularly by the comments of Dr. Allan Perry, of the University of Adelaide Law School. An article in that well-known journal, the *Advertiser*—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may cite the article as long as it does not refer to the existing terms.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I know that you would not allow me to transgress in that way, Sir. The article states:

Dr. Allan Perry, lecturer in criminology, said the terms of reference "are directed to looking at the symptoms, and are not wide enough to deal with the disease." . . .

"We really need an in-depth inquiry into the prison system," he said.

"That was clearly established in the N.S.W. Royal Commission."

While we do not want to get into the pickle that New South Wales got into—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I will not go on with that. We want to get to the crux of the problem, and I take Dr. Perry's point that we are not getting to the crux. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether the Government has considered or will consider widening the terms of reference with a view to meeting the objections or the suggestions that have been made by me, the prison officers and Dr. Perry.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find it hard to understand how widening the terms would meet the objections raised by the honourable member, who has just gone on record as saying that he believes the terms are far too wide. The matter is one of great concern to everyone, and I am sure that everyone shares the Government's view that the truth must be arrived at.

Mr. Millhouse: We want precision in the terms of reference.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government is determined to do whatever is necessary to ensure that the truth becomes known. Representatives from the P.S.A. and the A.G.W.A. came to see me some days ago and put to me that they felt that the terms of reference should be far wider than they are. I noted the remarks made by the gentleman quoted by the honourable member and, having considered the matter, my advice is that the terms of reference as they are drawn (and on this I totally agree with the member for Mitcham) cover a great deal of ground and allow a great deal of latitude (if that is the word) to the Royal Commission.

We have determined that the best way to deal with this problem, since there seems to be such a diversity of opinion in the community, is to leave it, as I believe it should properly be left, in the hands of the Royal Commissioner. I understand that counsel have already made representations to the Royal Commissioner, and I have no doubt that, if in his wisdom the Royal Commissioner believes that the Government should be approached in regard to making a change to the terms of reference, he would do so.

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

Mr. RUSSACK: Has the Minister of Transport seen an article in today's *News* featuring claims by the member for Norwood that the Highways Department had not been even-handed in the installing of safety fences at a pedestrian crossing on Kensington Road because it had constructed a superior fence of tubular steel on the southern side of the road? The article, headed "War flares on Liberal-Labor boundary. Snobbery claim on new fences", states:

A road which divides the electorates of the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, and a former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, is the centre of politically-backed snobbery claims.

When the Highways Department decided to move a pedestrian crossing 30 m along Kensington Road, the change included building of safety fences next to crossing entrances.

Outside a deli on the Norwood side, a solid Labor electorate, the fence was standard wire mesh.

But outside a clothing boutique opposite in Mr. Tonkin's true-blue electorate of Bragg, the fence is differently-designed and painted wrought iron.

INSULTING

And the wrought iron, more aesthetically pleasing than the wire mesh, led Labor member for Norwood, Mr. Greg Crafter, to comment: "It's definitely on the nose."

"It's a classic example of one law for the rich and one for the poor. It's insulting for the people on this side of the electorate. It gives the appearance that some people are more important than others."

I bring this matter to the attention of the Minister.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: This must be one of the most amazing efforts by a member of Parliament in recent times. I am extremely disappointed in the member for Norwood, whose grandstanding is a petty exercise in publicity seeking—there is no other word for it. It is true that the Highways Department constructed cyclone mesh fences on both sides of the road, and representations were made to the Highways Department and, indeed, to me, that something ought to be done because the cyclone fence was completely out of keeping—

Mr. Crafter: By whom?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If the member for Norwood wants an answer and wants to hear the truth, he should keep quiet. It is quite obvious, as I repeat, that the cyclone fence was completely out of keeping with the location, and (due credit to the Highways Department) it decided to replace the cyclone mesh fencing on the southern side with a tubular steel fence. It was perfectly obvious that it was ridiculous to have a tubular steel structure on one side of the road and a cyclone mesh fence on the other side of the road. It was completely out of keeping with the whole location. So, last week the Highways Department notified the Norwood council that the tubular steel fencing would be erected on both sides of the road. If the member for Norwood had bothered to check with me, with the Highways Department or with the council, he would have been told that before he went into his petty exercise that we have seen in this afternoon's paper.

DAY-TRIPPERS

Mr. SLATER: Has the attention of the Minister of Tourism been drawn to a statement made by the Minister of Agriculture during an address to the Kingscote show when he said:

I do not intend to be dictated to by day-dreamers or day-trippers.

Does this reference to day-trippers represent the Government's official attitude to visitors to Kangaroo Island, or does the Minister think that her colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, was simply passing judgment on his colleagues?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Until a question earlier this afternoon, my attention had not been drawn to the reported alleged statement of the Minister of Agriculture. I did note the reference to day-trippers, and I would say that any reference to day-trippers would certainly not have been one that would denigrate them, because, as I am sure the honourable member will agree, day-trippers or day tourists or day visitors, as they can variously be described, are extremely important elements in the tourist structure of the State.

The honourable member can rest assured that I have the greatest respect for anyone who chooses to be a day visitor to Kangaroo Island or any other place, and I am quite certain that the Minister of Agriculture has a particular respect for those who are day visitors, particularly in view of the fact that his district of Alexandra takes in not only Kangaroo Island but also Fleurieu Peninsula which, along with the Barossa Valley, would probably have more day visitors than would any other area of the State.

BUDGETARY CONTROL

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Treasurer consider amendments to the Public Service Act and the Audit Act to

implement efficiency auditing and to make departmental heads more accountable to the Parliament, as recommended in the 1975 report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Public Service conducted by Professor Corbett? Under the Public Service Act, only very general accountability is laid down in relation to permanent heads in the financial management of their departments. An examination of the *Hansard* transcript of the Estimates Committees fails to show any evidence to indicate that departmental heads are being held responsible for expenditure, and the Auditor-General is not charged with the responsibility for examining and reporting to Parliament on the effectiveness of Government expenditure with a view to obtaining maximum cost benefits. Under the present Audit Act, the Auditor-General lacks the powers which the Corbett Committee in its 1975 report recommended be vested in him, and also the powers vested in the Commonwealth Auditor since his Act was recently amended.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, the whole question of efficiency audit has concerned this Government ever since it was elected to office, and it was largely as a result of that concern that the whole question of programme and performance budgeting, internal audit and other various measures which are presently being considered were undertaken. There is a need for internal audit and for manpower auditing, and I believe that the implementation of programme and performance budgeting not only makes it possible for departmental officers to keep a tighter rein on expenditure and be more aware of money that is being spent but also encourages them, I believe, to take that action.

There is no question at all but that, with the adoption of these procedures, the morale within departments has increased quite considerably, particularly in the management areas. As the member for Morphett will know, a co-ordinating committee has been set up to look at the entire Government accounting system, programme and performance budgeting, the internal audit measures, and powers which perhaps should be strengthened as far as the Auditor-General is concerned, and these are all matters which are unwinding and developing as time goes on. Certainly, I shall be pleased to put forward to the co-ordinating committee the suggestion the honourable member has made and allow the committee to consider it further. I totally agree that there has been, wherever this has been introduced in private enterprise, a very much greater sense of responsibility on the part of managers, and I am quite certain that that sense of responsibility will be no less in the Public Service.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: A few minutes ago the member for Stuart asked me a question which I must admit I took as something of a joke. The member for Eyre is, very properly I believe, concerned that the true situation has been misrepresented by the member for Stuart. I would like to place on—

Mr. Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do wish the Leader would be quiet. I would like to place on record the fact that the member for Eyre has been involved in all of the discussions and at all stages of the negotiations which have taken place between the Pitjantjatjara people and the

Government. He has taken this part, and a very important role, as a representative of all his constituents, whether they be Aboriginal people, pastoralists, miners or anyone else in the area. He has assiduously and properly put forward the concerns of all groups in the community, and that involves the most recent episodes where he has very properly put forward the concerns of the Mintabie miners. I believe that he has acted most responsibly in this way.

The report in the local publication quoted by the member for Stuart is ridiculous. The member for Eyre has not been approached at all at any time by the editor or any writer of that publication, and I believe that he can afford to treat the allegations that have been made in the publication with the contempt that they deserve.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PEDESTRIAN LIGHTS

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. CRAFTER: Some moments ago the Minister of Transport sought to attack me personally over statements that I had made to the daily press with respect to the installation of pedestrian lights in an area adjacent to my district. I made those comments to the press after receiving representations from a constituent about this matter, which has been proceeding now for some months. My constituent has sought assistance in this matter from the Minister's department and from local government. She has received much assistance from the Norwood council, as I have. I have been in constant contact with this council over this matter.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he has sought leave to make a personal explanation, not to debate the issue on behalf of public persons.

Mr. CRAFTER: The Minister has alleged that I should have contacted the council in my district about this matter, and I seek to inform the House that I have done so. I have been in close contact with that council, and in fact I must say that I spoke to the *Adelaide News* last Friday about the matter, and on Friday afternoon I checked with the council, and as late as Friday afternoon the council had been told that the Highways Department had refused to install a fence on its side of Kensington Road similar to that which had been provided, to the benefit of constituents on the side of that road that forms the boundary of the Premier's district. Naturally, as a result of this situation the officers of the council to whom I spoke were most embarrassed, my constituent was outraged, and I had no other alternative than to raise this matter for public discussion, and I did so. I note that the Minister has refused to explain to the House from whom he received representations.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not part of the personal explanation.

Mr. CRAFTER: In the light of these circumstances, I believe that the Minister has not explained fully to the House the background of the circumstances whereby an amount of some \$30 000 has been expended to provide these lights and associated facilities in quite a partial manner. The resulting effect on the community has been—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must withdraw leave of the honourable member to continue. He is now debating the issue, and getting quite away from a personal explanation.

At 3.12 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (WATER AND SEWERAGE RATING) BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Waterworks Act, 1932-1978, the Sewerage Act, 1929-1977, and the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act, 1954-1975. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The Waterworks and Sewerage Acts contain provisions exempting from water and sewerage rates lands used exclusively for charitable purposes, for the purposes of public worship or for various other stipulated purposes. In addition, there are various other special Acts (e.g., the Country Fires Act) which specifically exempt certain lands from water and sewerage rates. The Engineering and Water Supply Department has always acted upon the basis that the exemption from rates does not prevent the levying of charges, at concessional rates, for water actually supplied or for sewerage services actually provided. In some cases a minimum charge has been imposed. Recently a number of organisations that enjoy the benefit of the exemption from rating have questioned the validity of certain of these charges; among them, a Country Fire Service organisation.

In view of the fact that the matter is not entirely free from doubt—a minimum charge, for example, might arguably be said to be a rate—the Government has decided to introduce amendments to establish a clear statutory basis for making charges of the kind that have traditionally been made in relation to the supply of water and sewerage services to land exempt from rating. It is emphasised that this legislation is aimed at land exempt from rating, and in no way impacts on the right of Country Fire Service organisations to continue to obtain water for fire fighting purposes free of charge, apart from a nominal rental for fire hydrants.

The Bill also amends the West Beach Recreation Reserve Act. That Act exempts the West Beach Trust from rates and charges under the Waterworks and Sewerage Acts. While the Government believes that the exemption from rates should stand, it can see no justification from exempting the trust from charges. The amendment therefore modifies the exemption by removing reference to charges.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the amendments shall come into operation on 1 July 1980, that is to say, the commencement of the 1980-81 rating year.

Clause 3 amends the Waterworks Act. It provides that notwithstanding an exemption from rating, the Minister may recover charges from the owner or occupier of exempt land for supplying water or providing other related services to the land. The charges must not exceed the rates and charges that would be payable if the land was not exempt and methods for determining the charges are provided. Clause 4 makes corresponding amendments to the Sewerage Act. Section 13 (1) (vi) is made redundant by the amendments and is struck out. Clause 5 modifies the exemption presently enjoyed by the West Beach Trust by removing the reference to "charges".

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

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 September. Page 935.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In speaking on behalf of the Opposition, I indicate at the outset that the Opposition supports this Bill. The Minister, in his second reading explanation in introducing the matter, pointed out that purposes of the section were to make available to the Lyrup Village Association by way of grant or loan moneys which would be concerned with the construction, installation or rehabilitation of irrigation and drainage headworks and any ancillary works associated thereto. The Bill seeks to alter section 107a in the principal Act, but I believe it is necessary also to consider section 107, which immediately prefaces section 107a, in order for the House to fully understand what is proposed in the amendments. Section 107 clearly provides:

Except as is provided by section 107a of this Act, no advances or allowances shall hereafter be made by the Minister to the association.

In the relevant division of the Crown Lands Act the word "association" is clearly defined as meaning the Lyrup Village Association, which I understand has been in existence in one way or another since 1915.

The proposal we are asked to consider seeks to change the present situation, which was last altered in 1978 by way of amendment at that time, whereby in sections 18a and 18b of the amending Act limitations were made on the amounts which could be provided by way of advance or allowance as specified in section 107a. Clearly, if one looks back, one finds these amounts being upgraded on occasion. The proposal that we now have before the House from the Minister is that the Treasurer may from time to time pay to the association by way of grant or loan such amount or amount as he may approve for the purposes of this section. The Opposition would have no quarrel with this. It would save having recourse to altering legislation on occasions when all members and all those concerned with the Lyrup Village Association would believe that an amount was necessary to be made available, either by loan or grant, to carry out works which needed to be done on the irrigation installations.

The second part of the Bill provides that any loan made by the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (2) shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may determine. That is also in accord with the view of the Opposition. However, I bring to the attention of the Minister that, as far as I can determine from a study of the parent Act which has been available in consolidated form since, I think approximately 1975, subsection (4) will still be extant in the Act, and it provides that the amount paid to the association by way of loan pursuant to subsection (2) of section 107a shall be repaid by the association to the Treasurer with interest at the rate of 5 per cent, and so on. There are actual specifications, whereas we are proposing to insert a new subsection (3) saying that any loan made by the Treasurer pursuant to subsection (2), which we are also rearranging in the Bill if it passes this House, shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Treasurer may determine. It may be that these two subsections are not in conflict, but I think that it would be a fairly moot point whether they are. Perhaps the Minister, when he replies on this matter, can enlighten the House. I indicate the support of the Opposition for this matter.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I appreciate the attention given to this Bill by the Opposition. It is a matter which actually dates back to

1973 when the previous Government gave approval for advances to the Lyrup Village Association to proceed with the rehabilitation of the Lyrup area. At that time it was considered unnecessary to renew the rising main.

However, with the problems that have developed, particularly in the past 12 months, it has become essential that this rising main be replaced as quickly as possible. The Chairman brought to my notice only a few days ago the difficulties with which the people are being confronted now that the main irrigation season in that district is approaching. As such, the attention that has been given to the Bill will be appreciated by all concerned.

I recognise the matter that has been raised by the honourable member, namely, whether or not there is a conflict. In the advice that has been given to me, no indication was given that this matter would result in a conflict, so I can only take it that these amendments will do what is required, and will not create any problem.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: If it will, you can do something in the other place.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I certainly give the honourable member the assurance that I will again draw this matter to the Attorney-General's attention. If there happens to be any conflict that has been overlooked in this House, undoubtedly, after the Bill passes this House, the Attorney-General will look at this matter in another place. Once again, I appreciate the attention that has been given to the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Advances to association."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise only to place on record that I accept the Minister's assurance that, if there is a possibility of conflict between the two subclauses to which I referred earlier, he will have a look at this matter and have the necessary action taken.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 18 September. Page 932.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The arrival of this Bill in this House culminates a most deplorable chapter in the Government's history. The Government and the Attorney are in disgrace for their childish and ridiculous behaviour in relation to this whole matter. This almost mind-boggling exercise has been brought about by the stubbornness and stupidity of the Attorney in trying to go through the history of this whole matter. I will not bore honourable members with the whole of that history: suffice to refer to the Hon. Mr. Milne, when the matter was debated in the other place. Perhaps this is an occasion for me to report that we should have no Ministers at all in the other place: certainly the Attorney-General should be here, where we can deal with him, and not over there, where he can create tremendous confusion.

Mr. Millhouse: As he does?

Mr. McRAE: As he does continuously, and as he did in this matter. The Hon. Mr. Milne was frantically endeavouring to follow this most difficult and technical debate—one that is difficult enough for most lawyers, anyway, and one that became more difficult because of the barrage of amendments and counter-amendments being moved in the other place. He was being continually urged

by the Attorney that certain amendments that the Attorney had moved had the opposite effect from what they actually did. So, as a result of that, having given the matter mature consideration, and having discussed the matter with his colleague in this place (the member for Mitcham) and me, he announced in the Legislative Council that he would support a move for a Select Committee, and very properly so.

That Select Committee has been set up, and I am told that it is about to take its first submissions and evidence on 5 November. I am also told that I will be one of the first witnesses, and I am very pleased to be able to go along and give evidence before that Committee. It just shows the childishness of the Attorney and his Government, in the light of that Select Committee going on in the other place, that they are persevering with this Bill here and trying to roll it through on the numbers.

They may succeed in doing that, but I am assured that, if they do, it will be kicked out by the other House again, and they will be back to square one. That demonstrates two other things, namely, the naivety and stupidity of the Attorney, anyway, in not having a Select Committee now that he realises what is the truth; secondly, the humbug of the Government, which has spoken so much about Select Committees as a way in which the Parliament can properly advise itself but, having had the perfect situation in which you need a Select Committee, because of divisions in the community, the Government refuses to co-operate. On that basis, the Opposition will be voting against the Bill as it stands *in toto*. That will be our first step, and that will be a measure of our protest against the arrogance, foolishness, and childishness of this Government. In terms of substance, there is not a great deal wrong with the Bill. I will not trespass on the rules of the House by referring to amendments which are foreshadowed.

Mr. Becker: Why mention them?

Mr. McRAE: I am allowed to foreshadow them, as the honourable member well knows. There is a defect which, I hope, can be cured, in relation to the banking records. The policy of the Australian Labor Party in relation to corporate crime is, clearly, that, as these offences have grown alarmingly over recent years, there needs to be a more sophisticated ability on the part of the police to deal with persons who commit such offences. Equally, we are conscious of the fact that there is a need to balance criminal investigation with the protection of one's civil liberties. I know that at least the member for Mallee supports the general philosophy that I have espoused. He does not for a moment think that we should give a magistrate the extraordinary powers that are granted to him by the Bill, as it stands, should it pass unamended, to permit the police to set out on an exhaustive investigation of a person's banking and other records, without any notice to that person. Certainly, some notice has to be given.

I acknowledge the reality that due search and inquiry must be carried out, but we have to balance it. We cannot have the spectre of Big Brother looming again. Again, this was a perfect opportunity for the Government to have co-operated and to have had a Select Committee on the whole matter of the Evidence Act, because to correctly amend the part of the Bill which we are now discussing is a most complex exercise indeed and one in which, in order to secure a balance, I would like to have had the advice of my fellow counsel in the law, of the Law Society, of bankers, and of other interested parties. But no, we are not to be given that opportunity. I hope that the other place will see that this Government gets its just deserts and that it is brought to book on this, with the whole thing

being thrown out unless the Government learns to co-operate.

Obviously, as I have foreshadowed, the balance of my remarks is to be given a little later. At the moment, I am simply indicating that, while the rump of the Bill as it has come down from the Upper House does not cause us a great deal of concern, with the exception that there needs to be an amendment in relation to the protection of private rights in the searching of bank and other records, nevertheless, we intend to oppose the second reading as a gesture of protest, futile though it may be, against the behaviour of the Government throughout this whole exercise.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): With due respect to the member for Playford, I do not think that I can go quite as far as he and his Party propose to go in voting against the second reading of the Bill, because, while I will have a good deal to say later on at the appropriate time on the matters he mentioned, and I guess we will be in the same interest then, I cannot think that it is appropriate to vote against a Bill such as this which, with one exception which I will mention, is not merely innocuous but would be an improvement to the principal Act. I propose to support the second reading, but I point to the problem which arises (and the member for Playford adverted to this briefly) in clause 7 of the Bill, whereby it is proposed to widen section 49 of the principal Act which at present gives a judge the power to make an order for the inspection of bankers' books. The principal section states:

49. (1) On the application of any party to a legal proceeding a judge may order that such party be at liberty to inspect and take copies of any entries in a banker's book for any of the purposes of such proceedings.

(2) An order under this section may be made either with or without summoning the bank or any other party, and shall be served on the bank three clear days before the same is to be obeyed, unless the judge otherwise directs. Any Sunday or public holiday shall be excluded from the computation of time under this section.

According to the marginal notes, that has been in the Act for a long time, and I have never heard any complaint made about it or about its abuse. I have never known an order to be made under it, but no doubt orders are made under it from time to time. Obviously, when the power is in the judge only, in the members of the legal profession who have been appointed because of their knowledge, experience, and sense of responsibility, the chances of abuse are pretty small—the sort of abuse that may arise when a person has not been notified that an order has been made in relation to his books.

In clause 7 we propose to extend the power by giving it not only to a judge, as at present, but to a special magistrate. With due respect to Their Honours the special magistrates, I think it is far more important, if we are trying to do this, if we are to widen the group of judicial officers who can make orders under this section, that there should be a safeguard in the Act so that those who are affected by it or whose books and records are affected should have some notification.

I do not propose to canvass any amendments, but I appreciate the interest which the member for Mallee is showing in the matter, and I think it would be wise to insert a provision so that there must be notification to a person who is not a party to the proceedings that his books are to be or have been looked at. If an amendment such as that is moved in due course, I shall certainly give it very favourable consideration.

As the member for Playford has said, the real row about this Bill concerns a matter which is not yet in it, which was

taken out in another place, very properly, so that it can be considered; the matter is now being considered by a Select Committee. I will certainly most vigorously oppose the insertion in the Bill in this place of that provision, but that is a matter to be debated in due course. I will support the second reading of the Bill, and I hope that it is amended in Committee and that it is then passed, with that amendment only, and sent back to another place.

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): I rise to make it plain that I support the general thrust of this Bill in what it seeks to do, namely, to make it possible to control white collar crime. Certainly, as the law stands at the moment, it is too easy for too many white collar criminals to be well and truly gone and the trail cold before officers of law enforcement agencies are able to detect the crime, collect sufficient evidence of its having been committed, and bring the criminal to book.

As other speakers on the measure have intimated, it is my intention at a later stage, since I have reservations about clause 7, to move some amendments to it. As the Bill stands, I am concerned that insufficient scrutiny of the activities of those people who are given this additional power of access to private individuals' bank records is not balanced with the responsibility that they should have in exercising that power. At the moment, no-one would know, if this Bill were to become law, how many such applications were made, how many were then granted, to which special magistrates or judges the applications for the authority were made, and the number which each magistrate or judge had granted. Because there is nothing in the Bill that I can see requiring that check and that balance to ensure that the civil liberties of the individual are protected, I believe it is deficient. I believe, furthermore, that the public should feel not only, as it can now, that it can trust the integrity of our police officers and other law enforcement officers in the Corporate Affairs Department and trust utterly our officers in the courts who are special magistrates or judges.

But I believe that they should be further able to continue to be capable of trusting them. As the Bill stands, they would have to have some doubt about the future, either in the short term or the long term, because of the enormous power which the Bill then gives to a Government (if you like to look at it in those terms) to appoint a special magistrate who for some reason or other could be then beholden to that Government, which could then require that special magistrate simply to sign all the applications that the Minister of the Crown directs the police to make, and obtain wholesale approval to investigate the banking records of a large number of citizens without anyone ever knowing that it was happening.

While under the terms of this Bill it would be an offence for any police officer to use that information for other than purposes of obtaining a conviction, or at least contesting a matter in court, where the allegation is made that someone is guilty of an indictable offence and is culpable as a criminal, there is nothing that would otherwise prevent that information being leaked in conversation, ultimately developing the bones of a character assassination. My concern is that, if this were done on a large enough scale, it could result in a number of people having their personal lives quite unnecessarily investigated and exposed to public scrutiny without those individuals being able to identify the source of the libel or slander and take action against those people in order to stop it. That is the fear I have. I know that the record in South Australia of both the police and the Judiciary is impeccable. However, I also know through personal experience that not all magistrates

can be trusted all of the time in such matters, and wherever I have travelled in the world I have seen and have personally suffered the consequences of such injustices as can be perpetrated on private citizens which would occur if this Bill in its present form were to become law.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the whole House that it have power to consider a new clause relating to the abolition of unsworn statements.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

New clause 4a—"Evidence by accused persons and their spouses."

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I move to insert the following new clause:

4a. Section 18 of the principal Act is amended—

(a) by striking out from subparagraph (b) of paragraph VI the passage "or the nature or conduct of the defence is such as to involve imputations on the character of the prosecutor or the witnesses for the prosecution";

(b) by inserting after subparagraph (b) of paragraph VI the following subparagraph:

(ba) he forfeits the protection of this paragraph by virtue of subsection (3);

(c) by striking out from paragraph VIII the passage "or any right of the person charged to make a statement without being sworn"; and

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

(2) A person charged with an offence is not entitled, at his trial for that offence, to make an unsworn statement of fact in his defence.

(3) A defendant forfeits the protection of subsection (1) VI if—

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

(b) the imputations do not arise from evidence of the conduct of the prosecutor or witness—

(i) in the activities or circumstances giving rise to the charge;

(ii) in the activities, circumstances or proceedings giving rise to the trial; or

(iii) during the trial.

(4) This section, as in force immediately before the commencement of the Evidence Act Amendment Act, 1980, applies to a trial that commenced before the commencement of that amending Act.

(5) This section, as amended by the Evidence Act Amendment Act, 1980, applies to a trial that commenced after the commencement of that amending Act whether the charge was laid before or after the commencement of that amending Act.

Mr. McRAE: In my view, this new clause contains the highly objectionable passage paragraph (c), which provides that the passage "or any right of the person charged to make a statement without being sworn" be struck out from paragraph VIII. Let me say immediately that there are two real problems with that. First, the Liberal Party still does not seem to have understood that, quite apart from the merits or demerits of the philosophy of this, there is one group in the community at least which

deserves to be looked after, and that is the Aboriginal people. That group of people made submissions to the Attorney which I would have thought were self-evident. All they sought (and this is without going to the heart of the matter) was that there be an exception when in the view of the judge the person before the court was unable to give sworn evidence or would be placed in a position where he would be disadvantaged because of his antecedents, education, handicaps or for any other reasons. That is not the exact amendment that was put to the Attorney, but it is the substance of it. A submission was very carefully drawn by the Aboriginal League of Rights (I think Mr. Hiskey is its legal director at the moment) in such a way so as not to distinguish the Aboriginal people from other persons in the community, but to recognise the obvious fact that there are people in the community (and the Aboriginal people happen to be one of these groups) who in some cases, because of their very backgrounds in isolated areas or because of lack of education and other problems would, because of the nature of things, be placed in very grave difficulties. The Aboriginal people are not the only ones. There are also other people who can be handicapped because of illness or other physical disease or accident. As I say, that amendment was very carefully drafted and was put before the Attorney, but it has been totally ignored.

I find it appalling that not only has this Government ignored the fact that the Council has a Select Committee already established and due to sit on 5 November but also that in trying to move this amendment it has ignored an obvious plea from an obvious source. That is the first matter that I raise; it is deplorable that the Government could not do better than that. Of course, I am not blaming the Minister of Education in respect of legal matters, and maybe I would not blame him in respect of the submission from the Aboriginal group, if he can assure me that in his capacity as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs he was not aware of it. Can he give that assurance?

The Hon. H. Allison: I have considered it.

Mr. McRAE: He says he has considered it. I am afraid that I must now equally condemn the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs as I condemn the Attorney, because the Minister cannot fall back on a lack of legal knowledge or training in this case. This is a substantial matter which apparently was brought to his attention, which he considered, and which he rejected, and that is very poor.

There is a grave conflict in the community as to the abolition of unsworn statements. This has been expressed in many ways. A Professor of Law at the Adelaide University, Professor Rupert Cross, I think summed up the matter reasonably well when, in relation to unsworn statements, he said:

It appears to be a harmless survival from a former age where it was a valuable concession. There are certainly more urgent cases for law reform than that.

Some members may not know the history of the matter. It should be recalled that, until the late 1700's or the early 1800's the accused had no right to make any statement in any circumstances. At about that time, this concession, which Professor Cross saw as being an anachronism, was made, and it has stayed with us ever since. I agree that, in the north-eastern suburbs where I have been active, the Liberal Party has a mandate, in respect of sexual offences and offences involving children, to say that it has electoral support to abolish the unsworn statement in those cases. My personal view is that that is a fact, and I have no doubt that that would probably be the case around the State, but never in the course of the election did the Liberal Party go any further than that.

I refer members to the Attorney's second reading

explanation in another place; in introducing the Bill, he referred to only one of those two matters, but we will grant that he overlooked the other. He referred to the prevalence of sexual offences and the prevalence of abuse of the unsworn statement in those cases. I am prepared to read that as including offences against children. I have looked at the various statistics that have been quoted in the Council, I doubt very much whether these statistics can be relied on, because, until this issue arose a couple of years ago, I doubt whether anyone kept accurate records about how many unsworn statements were made compared to sworn evidence. My experience in the Criminal Court indicates that there is a much greater prevalence of unsworn statements and abuse of unsworn statements in sexual cases than in other cases, perhaps with one exception, and that is corporate crime. That is another example of how this Government, because of its inflexible attitude, is defeating its own cause.

The obvious way in which to approach this matter is to get it before a Select Committee so that the question of bank records can be looked at, as well as the unsworn statement, and the question of dealing with corporate crime, because it is all intermingled. My view is that, in offences involving corporate crime, there should be no trial by jury. Many members of the legal profession would support that view and many would violently oppose it, but at least the legal profession and other members of the community have a right to be heard. The Government is simply trying to steamroll these amendments through the House without proper consideration. The member for Mitcham has highlighted one consideration, and I have just highlighted another, whereby the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has totally ignored a very good submission sent to all members by Mr. Hiskey.

My view is that there is no need for this unseemly rush. If adequate and proper consideration was given to the matter and if the unsworn statement was abolished in cases of sexual offences and offences involving children, but with proper and adequate precaution for those groups to which I have referred, we could wait and see what happens over a period. We could collect adequate and proper statistics. The Liberal Party has been vocal about the criminal justice area, but it seems to be very heavy on statements, but light on research and flimsy on thought, because the whole tangled web involved is a disgrace. On behalf of the Opposition, I indicate that we will most certainly oppose the proposed amendment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I oppose the amendment, and I adopt the arguments that have been put forward in opposition by the member for Playford. Of course, I am not particularly well in touch with what goes on in another place, because I have enough work to do in coping here, but I understand that this clause was originally in the Bill and, after a good deal of backing and filling and hesitation, etc., it was excised from the Bill and a Select Committee of the Legislative Council was set up to consider the question of unsworn statements. If the Government is insisting on putting in this provision, which affects the right of an accused to give an unsworn statement, it is paying a studied insult to the Legislative Council, because it is asking the Council to accept an amendment, thus pre-empting the inquiry and the report of the Select Committee in that House.

That in itself would be a sufficient reason for the amendment to be defeated, but I know that the amendment will not be defeated, because the Liberals, like sheep, will follow the Government in this matter. I will be glad if I am wrong, but I doubt that I am wrong, and, thus the amendment will pass. There will then be

some collision between us in another place, and that will be the worse for the Bill; I can tell the Government that. I doubt very much whether the ladies and gentlemen in the Upper House will give way, and that is one reason why we should not accept this amendment. There are other substantive reasons, such as those put by the member for Playford.

There is a good deal of controversy among those groups which are particularly concerned with this matter in regard to the wisdom of the action that is proposed, and let us remember that not only groups of people are interested (such as Aborigines, lawyers, or people like that); it could be any citizen. Anyone could have the misfortune (perhaps even yourself, Sir) to find himself in the dock, faced with the question of whether he should give evidence on oath, shut up, or make an unsworn statement.

Any citizen could be affected, not only interested groups. It would be very foolish for us to rush in and try to insist on this amendment when an inquiry is going on in another place to see what is the best solution to the problem. That solution will be found in the calmer atmosphere of a Select Committee, and all those concerned will be given the opportunity to submit evidence. There is no need for me to say more than that: it does not matter how long we talk, because debate is unlikely to change the minds of those members opposite, but for the cogent reasons that I have given, the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is often said that Parliament is a boring place and that nothing very interesting takes place here, but every now and then the practitioners of the Parliamentary system notice a little trick that is brought forward by one Party or another in order to confuse. We have an example on this occasion.

As I understand it, the clause we are debating, which was part of the original Bill introduced in another place, was defeated in the other place and has been referred to a Select Committee. Yet, the House of Assembly is being asked to debate a clause that is the subject of a Select Committee in the Legislative Council. If that is the case, I am not too sure that we are not in contempt of the Legislative Council and the Select Committee. If we are, I think this is a shoddy state of affairs indeed. I intend to vote against the new clause.

What I am concerned about is that the Minister in charge of this Bill is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in South Australia. The issue that we raise in relation to unsworn statements is the effect of what is proposed on disadvantaged people within South Australia, of whom the Aboriginal people are a substantial component. Yet the complaints of the Aboriginal legal aid people in South Australia who have gone to great lengths to advise members of Parliament, Ministers and particularly their Minister, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, of the effects that the abolition of sworn statements will have on the ability of certain Aborigines to give evidence before a court have been totally ignored. The Minister, by his efforts to this stage, seems to indicate that he will not participate in this debate at all.

As I represent the District of Stuart, I know that the overwhelming majority of the people who appear before the courts in Port Augusta are of Aboriginal descent, so the abolition of the unsworn statement will affect a significant number of my constituents, and I am concerned about that. I do not want to argue the points of law put forward by the members for Playford and Mitcham, who are members of the legal profession and who have expressed opposition to this clause. It is quite obvious that there is a considerable difference of opinion within the community whether or not the abolition of the unsworn

statement should be passed by this Parliament. Clearly, every member of this House, and I suspect most members of the community, would agree that the unsworn statement in cases of sexual offences and in offences relating to children ought not to be the privilege of accused persons; they ought not to be able to use the unsworn statement in those circumstances because that gives them an unfair advantage and puts the victim at a considerable disadvantage. I think we are all agreed that the unsworn statement should be abolished for those cases. Regarding disadvantaged persons, not one argument has been put forward by the Government to justify its action. I am anxious to hear the Minister justify the need to abolish the unsworn statement in all instances, when we realise the degree of opposition voiced by the legal profession and concerned people and groups within the community who are concerned about disadvantaged people and the effect that this action will have upon them. I am anxious to hear from the Minister.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Several arguments have been put forward in opposition to this new clause, which I request the House to adopt. It seems to me that there is almost an implication that the Select Committee which has been appointed in another place is the first intelligent body to consider this matter, and that simply is not true. There is a welter of evidence across the world in support of the abolition of unsworn statements. The matter was considered and unsworn statements were abolished many years ago in the U.K., and in the United States the unsworn statement has not been permitted for decades—

Mr. McRae: Because it never existed.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Rights exist in the United States for almost anything else. One would think that, if they had regarded this provision as serious, they would have introduced it. The United States seems to have rights for almost everything that opens and shuts. In Western Australia, one of the mainland Australian States, the unsworn statement has been abolished. In addition, a number of legal reform and review committees have been held across the world. New Zealand set up such a committee in 1966, and in South Australia the Mitchell Committee seven or eight years ago investigated the unsworn statement issue. Generally, in the Westernised world there is a pattern of movement towards abolition of the unsworn statement.

That is not really surprising. One thing is surprising though, and that is that in South Australia there is a much higher incidence of the use of the unsworn statement than anywhere else, including the United Kingdom where I believe, from memory, it is as low as 11 per cent and in Victoria, again from memory, it is as low as 14 per cent. In South Australia it has been quoted by various sources as being as high as 65 per cent to 70 per cent of people choosing to make unsworn statements. I do not know whether the research has elicited exactly why such a high level of unsworn statements is evident in South Australia. My personal observation is that perhaps the judges are addressing themselves to juries and emphasising the importance of the unsworn statement far more than they are doing in other courts in Australia.

Perhaps, too, there is a realisation on the part of counsel that there are certain advantages for people making unsworn statements because, in making an unsworn statement, a defendant does not have his own character brought into question by being cross-examined. The defendant can make malicious, false statements, he can denigrate the character of the Crown witnesses, he can denigrate the character of the Crown prosecutor, or anyone at all, without having his own character brought into question at all, and that seems to me to be wrong. I

point out that the Women's Adviser only in 1979 pointed out to the then Attorney-General in South Australia that, in the case of sexual crimes, the women had to be subjected to gross cross-examination. They are asked for very pertinent, relevant points drawing out character and everything else, and yet the defendant can make a whole host of denials and allegations; he can impugn the witness's character, without having his own character or actions questioned. I do appreciate that members of the Opposition realise the importance of having unsworn statements—

Mr. Keneally: That's a bit—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Playford was the first speaker on your side. In short, there is a welter of evidence from reform and review committees across the world in favour of the abolition of the unsworn statement. Another interesting comment came from the member for Stuart when he referred to the defendant as being the victim, which of course—

Mr. Keneally: No, I did not say that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The member for Stuart referred to the defendant as the victim, unable to make an unsworn statement. The word used was "victim", which implies that the police victimise people who are brought before them. That was a direct inference I drew from the member's statement. I am quite sure that when he reads *Hansard* he will take the same inference that I did. I was a little concerned, too, at the implication of the member for Playford that the Attorney-General and I were less than concerned at the imputations that this legislation will have for Aborigines, specifically, and for illiterates and semi-literate persons. I realise it was bracketing Aborigines into that category, but not all Aborigines by any means are illiterate or semi-literate.

That, too, I felt was slightly patronising. I drew that inference because little attempt was made to point out that many Aborigines are in fact quite capable of expressing themselves adequately. However, I do share his concern for illiterates of any race, colour or creed who may appear before the courts. I remind members who have spoken against the amendment that, in fact, the Mitchell Committee several years ago, when addressing itself to this problem, did point out that, while that side of the argument does exist, there is another side to the coin. On a number of occasions people who are having difficulty, through illiteracy or semi-literacy, in expressing themselves adequately, do appear better on frequent occasions by virtue of being cross-examined and of standing out quite firmly on crucial points in evidence. They were unable to express themselves clearly, given an unsworn statement opportunity, but on being cross-examined they did in fact stand firm on crucial issues. To suggest there is only one side of the argument is I think erroneous and the Mitchell Committee pointed out that possibility. There are just as many pros as there are cons in that case.

I will say that I did not see the written evidence that the honourable member referred to. When I said I had considered "it", I meant I had considered the issue. I have done so in the light of what the Mitchell Committee said but certainly not in the light of any subsequent or immediately past submission that may have been presented to the Attorney-General or others. I have not seen that. I have considered the issue, and unsworn evidence is a vestigial relic of the past. In the past, the defendant was simply not allowed to make a statement in his defence, and the right to present unsworn evidence was a relaxation of that rule. However, when the rule itself was removed from the Statutes, then the unsworn statement at the same time lingered on and on, and it is in South Australia where it has been perpetuated probably more

than anywhere else, so it is a surviving anomaly of the past.

I do not think there is any question that it has come in for increasing criticism over the years, and in the past decade there has been a welter of evidence against the unsworn statement with steady moves towards its abolition. The fact that we and other States have not yet abolished it does not mean that such processes are not imminent in many places. Many observers feel the situation is particularly unpleasant in cases involving allegations of sexual offences. The conduct of the court seems to be weighted in favour of the defendant who chooses and who is permitted to make an unsworn statement. By doing that, he can enter into the wildest of allegations and really obnoxious imputations against the character of the prosecutrix, in the case of rape, without himself incurring any risk. The Mitchell Committee has recommended that the right of an accused person to make an unsworn statement be abolished, and the action of the Attorney-General in another place of introducing this legislation was carrying out that recommendation.

The subsidiary recommendation that the character or previous convictions of the defendant should not be brought into issue by sworn evidence involving imputations on the character of the witnesses for the prosecution has only been partially accepted by the Government. A defendant, we say, shall not be able to make out his defence involving imputations on the character of the prosecutor or a witness for the prosecution, and he must limit his defence to matters relating to matters dealt with in clause 4a (d) (3). If he goes beyond these bounds, his previous convictions can be elicited by the prosecution, so that there is some defence built in for him. This was the formula proposed by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission, and that proposal is accepted by this Government. The member for Playford said that he was regretting the fact that he had not been able to obtain some counsel from fellow members of the Law Society. I do have assurance from the Attorney-General that this series of amendments has been agreed to by members of the Law Society.

Mr. McRae: Some members.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Obviously, some members. I suppose the member for Playford would only approach some members so, there again, there are two sides, and one seeks the evidence that one chooses. In any case, I have the assurance of the Attorney-General and as such I felt that the measure should be supported.

The question of rape cases has been dealt with adequately. There is no question that there is very strong support that unsworn evidence not be allowed in such cases. I do not believe that people should be allowed to attack Crown witnesses without recourse to cross-examination, and an examination of their character and the background to the allegations to which they are being subjected.

The matter of corporate affairs has been referred to by at least one member opposite. There, too, we acknowledge that there is a whole host of complexities. Unsworn evidence can be devious, and complicated. Unsworn evidence by the defendant can serve to confuse jurors, at the same time as the Crown witnesses have to put their evidence on oath. I believe that there, too, unsworn evidence should not be permissible. Evidence should be sworn and people should be liable if they carry false witness before the courts in the form of evidence. I firmly stand behind the Attorney-General in another place in moving this amendment.

Mr. McRAE: There is no such thing as a pattern in relation to unsworn statements throughout the world. The

United States has never had this system. In the British system, it is still retained and, in fact, members will recall that in the case of Jeremy Thorpe, a very serious case, Thorpe had access to an unsworn statement and a better example you could never get. Weeks upon weeks, allegations were thrust upon that man and there was nothing surer than, if he was to get into the witness box, he would face the same treatment that we complain about in the case of victims of rape offences. In fact, the whole matter was summed up by the New South Wales Government commission. The commission regretted being unable to make any firm recommendation as to the abolition or retention of the right to make a statement from the dock, and after lengthy discussion found itself hopelessly divided on the question. Those who supported a change in the law regarded their case as pressing, and were not amenable to any suggestion that there could be no urgent need to alter a system that had been operating for some time. The opponents of change were just as firm in their views.

That is the sort of situation we have had all the time. New clause 4a (d) (3) is a change from what the Attorney was presenting in the Council, so apparently the Attorney is capable of learning and being convinced that he can be wrong. I would put to him and to all members that everybody, not just the Attorney, might benefit from a proper inquiry before a Parliamentary Select Committee.

As to the notion that, just because Justice Mitchell is recommending it, we should be adopting it, that is not right. We should not be abdicating our duties in that way. I have never known a Government to be more adept at relying on some reports, and not others. There are whole parts of the Mitchell Report that the Government will not implement, I am sure. There are many reports of the Legal Reform Commission, headed by Justice Zelling, which the Government will not introduce, because of its coalition with the Country Party.

One provision, in particular, in that category is the long-sought after abolition of the rule in *Searle v. Wallbank* concerning liability for animals.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister calls this a vestigial relic, in one breath, and says that it is used in 60 or 70 per cent of cases, in the next breath.

The Hon. H. Allison: I said in South Australia.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes; we are talking about South Australia, which is the only community for which we have responsibility. It is a very funny vestigial relic, if it is used so widely. That leads to my second point, arising again out of the Minister's comments. He seems to start with the assumption that every accused is guilty, and his nose will be ground into the dirt. In fact, the assumption of the law is that an accused is innocent until proven guilty. The whole thrust of the criminal law has been to bend over backwards to protect the rights and interests of an accused person. This is one way in which that is done. That is not a decisive argument, but it is an important matter, one of which the member for Playford felt could be left unsaid, and so did I, at first.

We do our best under our system to protect the interests and rights of an accused person. If we do away with the unsworn statement (and there are arguments for doing away with it entirely or in part), we are weakening *pro tanto* the position of those accused of crimes. That should be spelt out and understood by all members. My third point, arising from what the Minister has said, is that juries these days, whatever might have been the position in days gone by, are not made up of fools. Most jurors are well-educated and intelligent people.

Does the Minister really think that they have the wool pulled over their eyes and do not realise that some people

have given evidence on oath and been subjected to cross-examination, whereas the accused who makes an unsworn statement is not so subjected? They can work out as well as anybody else the difference between the two and the weight they will give to sworn evidence and an unsworn statement. He does not realise that. He thinks that clever lawyers can hoodwink jurors and manipulate facts to suit their own clients. That is a fool of an attitude, if I may say so, with charity to the Minister, and, if he had spent some time in the courts, he would see that.

The Hon. H. Allison: In defence of the Attorney-General, the statement that this is a vestigial relic—

Mr. Millhouse: That's the phrase you used.

The Hon. H. Allison: That was my statement. I have used it frequently in the House, for instance, as regards the apprenticeship system which is a relic of the guild system in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and which is still perpetuated in modern times. But because everyone uses it, we need not acknowledge that it is the best way of training apprentices. The coccyx bone, on which the honourable member sits is a vestigial relic of a tail, and serves little purpose, but it is there and he uses it every day. South Australia is one of the few places anywhere that uses the unsworn statement in as many as 70 per cent of cases, and that is no indication that it is the best means of conducting a defence. I stand by what I said: it is a vestigial relic of the past. This part of the law supposedly compensated for an ancient rule. When that ancient rule was cast aside, this part of the law was retained. It is archaic but admittedly, it is used extensively in South Australia. I am not unaware of what goes on in South Australian courts. For the honourable member to suggest that there are no skilled lawyers in South Australia is probably a denigration of his own work in the courts. There are skilful lawyers, and the honourable member pays no great service to the law if he tries to brush that aside. I do not think that I implied what the honourable member alleges, anyway. I still support the new clause.

Mr. KENEALLY: Just in case the Minister's selective hearing might on this occasion be correct, I will put right for his benefit and for the benefit of readers of *Hansard* that, in my previous contribution, I said that, in the case of alleged sexual crimes and alleged crimes affecting children, the unsworn statement puts the victim at a disadvantage, while it advantages the accused. I trust that the Minister will not try to point score again on that matter.

I agree with the Minister that there are many Aborigines in South Australia who are as competent as any other person to take part in court proceedings. They would not be included in my reference to disadvantaged people. That matter should be considered by the court. We have a system whereby 60 per cent or 70 per cent (the Minister's figures) of cases before the courts in South Australia have the unsworn statement element in them. My concern, as a layman, is that, if, at a stroke of a pen, we abolish that system, it may disadvantage a great number of people. I have already spoken about some of those people. Either the system we are currently using is very wrong, to the detriment of justice in South Australia, or it has some value. If there is a question whether or not it has value, I, as a member required to make decisions on such an important subject, would wish to have before me evidence that could be given to a Parliamentary Select Committee.

I know that the Minister has said that the Legislative Council does not possess all the wisdom on this subject and that there are other inquiries, and he quoted the Mitchell Report. This particular issue, which has raised a considerable amount of opposition among the legal profession, is one about which I would like to have more

evidence. I am not all that keen on the unsworn statement in all its aspects. Much of what the Minister had to say was absolutely correct, but that does not detract from the value of the Select Committee currently taking place. I do not know what has possessed the Government to bring this clause before the House for debate, when a Select Committee in another place is already looking at it. If we pass this new clause, and it becomes part of the Bill, it will be referred back to the Legislative Council, which has appointed the Select Committee. It seems to me to be a petty act by the Government to show the Legislative Council that it is not going to dictate to the Government in regard to the matter that the Parliament will debate.

I return to my original statement that, in one sense at least, this is a contempt of the Parliamentary process. Although we are not members of another place, the Legislative Council is an integral part of the Parliamentary system in South Australia. It has rights to set up Select Committees and rights for those Select Committees to have status and respect from the House of Assembly, and that is what it is not getting. The Minister has not concerned himself at all with that point.

The Minister is also, as I have said, Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. Can he tell the Committee what representations have been made to him by groups within the Aboriginal community and, on their behalf, what representations he has made to the Attorney-General representing their views on unsworn statements? I suspect that, although he has had representations made to him, the Minister has not supported the people for whom he has been given responsibility by the Government in their desire to have their wishes considered by the Attorney-General. I hope that the Minister will tell the Committee exactly what he has done to fulfil his responsibility, as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, in representing their clearly-expressed desire that disadvantaged people, in which group a great number of the Aboriginal community are included, should retain the right to give unsworn evidence.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The reply to that request is quite simple. I have had no representations from any body, either Aboriginal or representative of Aboriginal people, expressing concern.

Mr. Keneally: Have you sought any?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have not sought any, because the alleged importance of this clause to that group of people was not drawn to my attention. I did not seek trouble where I had not already been alerted to it.

Mr. Keneally: But surely—

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In examining past reform and review committee recommendations, I found that the question of Aborigines was referred to by the Mitchell Committee, and there were arguments on both sides, to the extent that I was reasonably assured that, in any given set of circumstances, it was just as likely that a cross-examination could elicit better response from an illiterate or semi-literate person, whether or not of Aboriginal descent, and that, in cases where a person was feeling insecure, unsure, uncertain, or could not express himself or herself verbally, given a line of questioning, that person would stand firm on issues where it was obvious to that person that this was really the crucial question. I accepted the comments which I read.

I have not had any evidence submitted to me from responsible organisations, although I realise, from what has gone on in this debate, that probably some representation has been made to members of another place. Therefore, I have nothing before me, as Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, by way of a request from the people

whom I am representing. I hope the honourable member will accept that, and, if he can produce any alternative evidence indicating that I have not received something that I should have received, obviously I shall be only too eager and interested to find out what it is.

An allegation was made by the member for Playford that the Attorney-General was being selective in introducing reform measures. I would suggest that he is obviously no orphan there, because, in Opposition, I can recall on frequent occasions pointing out to the then Attorney-General that he, too, was being selective in introducing reform measures, and that measures which we, as an Opposition, would have liked introduced were being omitted. I am not suggesting that either honourable gentleman was incorrect. Both had their point of view.

This House and the Upper House entered into deliberations, and finally came down with conclusions, and I assume that that is what will be done in this case—that this House, although it is alleged that we are in contempt in dealing with the matter while a Select Committee has been appointed in another place, nevertheless is a key House in the bicameral system and is quite entitled to analyse these matters and to make recommendations precisely as it sees fit. I still commend the clause to the Committee.

Mr. KENEALLY: I wonder whether the Minister is aware that the Aboriginal people form a very large component of those people in prison in South Australia. From memory—and other members might be able to provide more accurate information—I think that, although Aborigines make up less than 2 per cent of the South Australian community, about 50 per cent of women in gaol and 27 per cent of men in gaol in South Australia are Aborigines. Having regard to those figures, does the Minister not believe that he has a responsibility to look into changes in the law that may adversely affect the people for whom he has responsibility? I do not wish to say anything more. The fact that the members of the Aboriginal community have not seen fit to make representations to the Minister says more about the Minister than anything I can say.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not see a very sound logic behind that statement. There is an implication in what the member for Stuart says that to abolish the unsworn statement and to make the sworn statement the only means of defending oneself would put more Aboriginal people, or more illiterate or semi-literate people, in prison.

Mr. Keneally: I didn't say that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If that is not what he said and what he has implied, obviously his logic falls away, because he was highlighting the number of people, male and female, of Aboriginal descent who are in prison, saying that, for that reason, I should be making sure that I was presenting this clause with full consideration.

Mr. Keneally: You should be concerning yourself about it, which you obviously have not.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am concerning myself about it, and I do not see any logic in the suggestion that a sworn statement will put more people into prison than will an unsworn statement. The logic behind the clause is that people can appear before a court at the moment, and they can make an unsworn statement to denigrate someone else's character. They can make incorrect statements. We claim to be in a Christian era, therefore we make sworn statements, although that may be a vestigial relic of the Christian era. I know that some members opposite prefer not to swear on oath when we make our allegiance to the Queen quite clear when we are sworn in at the beginning of the Parliamentary session. Whatever the reasons behind

it, we swear on oath, and the fact that we do so carries a certain weight. It tells a person that, in swearing on oath, you should tell the truth, and, if you do not, falsehoods can be brought into question afterwards. That is the weight of this clause. I am not suggesting for a moment that to make a sworn statement mandatory would throw more people into prison. It should, I believe, keep them more honest in making their defence. It should stop them from making wild allegations against another person's character. That is what this clause is about.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (21)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon, M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae (teller), Millhouse, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Chapman. No—Mr. Whitten.

The CHAIRMAN: There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes.

Amendment carried.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The SPEAKER: It has been brought to my attention that in the division in Committee relating to the Evidence Act Amendment Bill the member for Flinders's name was inadvertently left out. The member for Flinders voted for the Ayes on that occasion, and I direct that the votes and proceedings be corrected accordingly.

FOREIGN JUDGMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DOMICILE BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADOPTION OF CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill is consequential on the proposed new Domicile Act. The Bill removes the power of a court to make orders relating to the domicile of origin of an adopted child. This power will become unnecessary by reason of the proposed abolition of the rules relating to revival of a domicile of origin on abandonment of a domicile of choice. The Bill also removes a provision of the principal Act dealing with the effect of an adoption order upon domicile. This matter is now to be dealt with under the proposed new Domicile Act. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 removes the power

to make orders relating to domicile of origin. Clause 4 removes the provision dealing with the effect of an adoption order upon domicile.

Mr. KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

RAILWAY AGREEMENT (ADELAIDE TO CRYSTAL BROOK RAILWAY) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August. Page 613.)

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I want to make some sort of protest about the way the Government has just acted. If that is the way the Government is going to act (to move that progress be reported, without having any consultation with the Opposition), I am not quite sure how this House is going to progress satisfactorily. My Whip was not advised, nor was the member for Playford nor I.

The SPEAKER: I draw the Deputy Leader's attention to the question before the House, which relates to the railways agreement.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thought I would mention that matter before proceeding. The Opposition supports this Bill but, even so, there are a number of matters in the Minister's second reading explanation that I believe deserve some attention and some criticism as well. Indeed, in his speech the Minister made a number of glib and factually incorrect assertions which in my view do not hold water. For instance, he made the following statement:

Honourable members will recall that for many years South Australian Governments have sought the connection of Adelaide to the standard gauge railway system serving the mainland capital cities.

The Minister failed to mention that the only reason why subsequent State Governments had to continue to campaign to obtain the standard gauge railway line was that Liberal Governments in Canberra had failed to honour their promises. The Whitlam Labor Government translated promise into action. Let us remember that it was Gough Whitlam and our former Premier, Don Dunstan, who signed the agreement that initiated work on this project. It was Prime Minister Fraser who shelved the project.

During the Gorton Government, the Minister responsible, Mr. Sinclair, wrote to Don Dunstan advising him that the Commonwealth Government had decided to accept the proposal of Maunsell and Partners for the provision of a standard gauge connection from Adelaide to Crystal Brook. The next Liberal promise was made, again in a letter to Don Dunstan from Prime Minister William McMahon, on 18 June 1971. On that occasion Mr. McMahon pledged:

The Commonwealth is prepared at this time to agree to the following works . . .

I am not quite sure what he meant by "at this time". That is something that anyone can conjecture about, I imagine, but at least the then Labor Government in South Australia accepted that he actually meant that to mean "at that particular moment". Mr. McMahon pledged that the following things would occur:

(a) Adelaide to be linked to the east-west standard gauge line by the construction of a new line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook;

(b) the construction of standard gauge connections to industry at Elizabeth, Mile End and Woodville; and

(c) the provision of standard gauge facilities only at Islington and Dry Creek.

That is what Billy McMahon promised the Liberals would do, but later events showed that this promise was a flimsy one. I remind the House that that date was 1971. However, the Government changed, and, during the Whitlam Government, Maunsell began preliminary work preparing master plans and specifications for the Crystal Brook line specifications. This work culminated in the signing of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook Standard Gauge Railway Agreement Act, 1974. Some six years earlier it was signed by both the then Prime Minister and Don Dunstan, who was Premier of this State. The following year, the Minister of Transport's predecessor, Geoff Virgo, was presented with the anticipated construction programme by the Deputy Railway Commissioner. At least at that stage some progress was being made. Within two months of the Fraser Government's taking office, the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon, announced that his Government was reviewing all expenditure programmes. He told the Hon. G. T. Virgo, as he was then, and is now in my view, that no funds would be made available for the Crystal Brook line venture until this review had been completed. For the third time there was a back-off from the Liberal Government in Canberra in relation to this very important South Australian project.

From this turning point in the history of the project, Mr. Nixon and his Government played a totally obstructive role. No other description can be given to the role played by the Liberal politicians in Canberra of that day. I will quote some of those instances.

First, he attempted to reduce the funds made available in 1975-76 from \$6 700 000 to \$4 000 000, a cut of some \$2 700 000 in the 1975-76 Budget. Fortunately, these funds had already been committed to specific contracts, and Mr. Virgo was able to argue successfully against the first cut-back. In June 1976, Mr. Nixon announced that the Fraser Government had decided to appoint an independent committee to inquire into the project. This had the desired effect of further stalling work on the standardisation project, and the work again ground to a halt.

Eight months later, that committee reported and recommended against the project, probably what the Federal Government of the day wanted at that stage. Another five months passed before Mr. Nixon, in a letter to Geoff Virgo, stated that the Commonwealth would not be able to provide any funds for the standard gauge connection in Adelaide in 1977-78. As honourable members can see, the Minister's recollection of history was not quite accurate or, if it was accurate, he did not relate it to the House. Quite obviously, that was for political reasons. The reason why successive State Governments in South Australia had to keep badgering for the standardisation was that the Liberal Government in Canberra had broken its word, but had tried every conceivable stalling device before it had the guts to admit that the deal was off.

Mr. Becker: Did G.T. write this?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Certainly, I consulted him. Perhaps the member for Hanson would be advised to consult him on the history of the railways agreement: he may learn what happened. The Minister should do likewise so that he knows the facts. There were other inaccuracies in the Minister's speech. He stated:

Under the terms of that agreement [the 1974 agreement] the State was required to contribute one-third of the cost of the line's construction.

I would not be petty enough to point out that South Australia was required to contribute 30 per cent, not one-third: however, the Minister made a major error, or attempted to deceive this House. If the Minister checks,

he will find that, when the railways were transferred to the Commonwealth, so were the financial commitments. That was one of the many advantages gained from the transfer of our railways by the State Labor Government to a Federal Labor Government.

However, it seems that the Liberals in this State are still opposed to that transfer, because on 2 September the Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser*, when referring to the freight rates being charged by New South Wales, as saying that he wished that South Australia still controlled its own railways. I will bet that he really does not believe that. The Premier would know the great deficit that the railways caused. The Premier should be reminded that South Australia has rights in relation to freight rates under the agreement reached with the Commonwealth, and the Minister should be pressed to use them if he so desires.

The Minister has also said in his speech that a subsequent review of the standardisation proposals indicated that it was of such magnitude that its construction costs appeared to be much greater than those that could be justified for the benefits to be gained. That was an interesting statement, because the South Australian Government told the Federal Government that in 1970, when Geoff Virgo was the Minister, yet it has taken the Liberals in this State until 1980 to work it out. Let us look at the facts. The South Australian Government had reservations about the Maunsell Proposal right from the very beginning: that was expressed.

On 26 October 1970, Mr. Virgo met with Mr. Sinclair in Sydney. The notes from this meeting, taken by a senior public servant, Mr. Johnson, show that South Australia was pushing for the "Fitch Plan", a proposal put forward by the then railways Commissioner, Mr. Ron Fitch. This proposal recommended a conversion rather than a new line. However, according to those notes, the Commonwealth believed that there was a danger in the conversion proposal rather than a new line, because a modern, proper strength line was deemed more adequate than the upgrading of the existing line. The narrow gauge conversions were out as far as the Commonwealth was concerned.

Following considerable resistance to the proposals put forward by the South Australian Government through its Railways Commissioner, Mr. Virgo suggested that the financial proposals in Mr. Fitch's report should be examined by a Commonwealth team. This was accepted, but on 17 March 1971 Maunsell wrote to Mr. Virgo enclosing a copy of their report on the "Fitch Plan". That report, they said was unfavourable and, therefore, the Commonwealth rejected the "Fitch proposal". The State Government then agreed to the Maunsell proposals in order to get the project under way. I think that was proper at that stage. Too much time had been lost.

So, despite the Minister's fudging of the issues and the history of this agreement, the current agreement under discussion differs from the "Fitch Plan" in very minor details only—except, of course, for the huge escalation in cost caused by 10 years of Liberal delays. But let us again examine the Minister's second reading speech. Referring to the Government's reaction to the Joy Report, he said, "Accordingly, the project lapsed . . ." As I have already pointed out, the project was axed: it did not lapse. It was axed by Prime Minister Mr. Fraser, and by the Federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Nixon. That is fairly and squarely where the blame lies. No-one can deny that fact. If the South Australian Government of the day had had its way on any occasion throughout the negotiating period, we would now have been enjoying this tremendous advantage to which South Australia is entitled.

The Minister should be aware that on 4 February 1977 Mr. Nixon sent Mr. Virgo a copy of the Joy Report. Its major recommendations were:

(a) That the Maunsell proposals were unacceptable because of cost [exactly what the South Australian Government had protested back in 1970]; and

(b) that instead "improved bogie exchange facilities at Port Pirie would be a greatly more economic alternative". This is his grammar, not my English.

That was written by Mr. Nixon at the time. It is ambiguous to me. I do not know what he means by "improved bogie exchange facilities at Port Pirie would be a greatly more economic alternative". He may have a reason for saying that that I have not been able to understand. It is interesting that Dr. Joy could reach this conclusion after noting earlier in his report the following:

We accept that a major reason for constructing the standard gauge to Adelaide is that, in the total concept of gauge standardisation in Australia, Adelaide was to be included, and this commitment should be honoured. We are unaware of the extent of economic justification for other gauge standardisation projects. The fact that the Adelaide connection was "deferable" should not necessarily mean that, because it is being judged later than the others, it should be subject to more stringent criteria.

It seems that Dr. Joy made a quite sound observation but ignored it in his recommendations. The Joy Report met with loud and bitter reaction from South Australians. The *News* of 8 February 1977 reported Mr. Virgo's reaction as follows:

Any move to scrap the standardisation of the Adelaide-Crystal Brook rail line would be disastrous for South Australia. The State Government would oppose vigorously such a move. It is absolutely ludicrous for anyone to take steps or even consider continuing the blunder of the past and persist with different rail gauges in Australia.

Editorials in both the *News* and *Advertiser* next day, Wednesday 9 February 1977, supported Mr. Virgo. The *Advertiser* said:

It will be a damaging blow to the State as a whole, and in particular to local manufacturers who depend on interstate markets, if Adelaide continues to be the only capital city not connected to the standard gauge rail system.

Likewise, the *News* said:

State Transport Minister, Mr. Virgo, uses strong language in the latest row over the standard gauge rail project.

Honourable members will note that the words "latest row" were used. Even the *News* at that stage was cognisant of the fact that there had been far too many rows about this project and too much delay. It was further stated:

He says it would be disastrous if the Adelaide-Crystal Brook scheme were scrapped. And he is quite right.

The Government of the day had the support of the highest level of the press in this state—the *Advertiser* and the *News*. On the same day the *Advertiser* reported on its front page the following:

A claim that Canberra was trying to "Welsh" on the Crystal Brook-Adelaide standard gauge rail link was "ludicrous and mischievous", a Federal Government spokesman said yesterday. He said no decision had been reached on a report recommending the scrapping of plans for the link.

As we all know, five months later, funds were withdrawn from the project and it was shelved. The article appearing under the name of the Federal Government spokesman in the *Advertiser* that day was untrue.

However, the Joy Report also had a secondary, alternative recommendation. This was for a minimum cost standard gauge link plan. On 10 February 1977, Mr. Virgo

wrote to all South Australian members of the House of Representatives and Senators urging support for the standardisation project, and on 14 February he had talks with Mr. Nixon about implementing a plan along the lines of the Joy Report's second recommendation. Labor Federal members, plus Senator Condor Laucke, wrote to Mr. Nixon asking that the standardisation go ahead. I do not know why the other Federal Liberal members did not participate in supporting the State Government of the day; surely it was in their interests to do so. Surely it is the job of Senators to look after the interests of South Australia, or at least that is what we are told. From my research into this matter it does not appear as though there was any other support.

On 11 March, Geoff Virgo then wrote to Mr. Nixon with a modified standardisation proposal. No reply was received to this letter until 16 August, when the Federal Minister informed the South Australian Government that the funds had been withdrawn. But after all this, the Minister opposite appears to say that the project lapsed. I am afraid he is taking Party loyalties too far, and I am sure that some of his Federal colleagues from South Australia would agree with me on that.

Finally, the Minister told us:

The Liberal Government in its election policy on transport stressed the importance of this matter and promised to press ahead with all necessary negotiations with the Commonwealth. We have been most successful in reaching such a complex agreement in such a short time since we took office.

What a lot of ballyhoo! This was a somewhat fatuous and childish statement: the Minister knows that; he is no fool. He knows that he leads himself open to criticism when he makes those sorts of statement. The details of the scheme and the agreement were devised by the Australian National Railways long before the present Government came to office 13 months ago, and any claim by Mr. Wilson that he was responsible is quite silly. In fact, I imagine this matter goes back long before the Minister even anticipated he would be the member for Torrens, sitting initially on the back bench of this Parliament.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You read carefully what I said.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I did read it carefully. It is absolutely no good the Minister's trying to get into this place and to take credit for this rail connection. It has been a long, drawn out struggle and well he knows it. The facts are that it was generally accepted that, as soon as the Tarcoola to Alice Springs line was completed, the standardisation project would proceed.

I have indicated that the Opposition will support this railway agreement Bill. We will do so, but I felt that it was important today to clear up the inaccuracies presented by the Minister in his second reading explanation, and to put on record the real facts about the history leading up to this agreement. I would also like to put on record in this Parliament—and I am sure the Minister opposite will agree—that this House and the people of South Australia appreciate the tremendous, if somewhat frustrating, work put in by Geoff Virgo and Don Dunstan in bringing about this agreement for the standardisation of the line to Crystal Brook.

I do not want to say much more than that. The Opposition is clearly in favour of this Bill, having been one of its strongest supporters of it over the past 10 years. It has been in a position to make a considerable effort, having been the Government of the day. I think I can say that our Cabinet, our Government, our members, our Ministers and our Premier did everything humanly possible to see that this line proceeded. We were well aware of the worth to South Australia of such a project, and it was for that reason that Geoff Virgo and the then

Premier fought so strongly for a project we considered to be of tremendous value to this State.

I do not want in any way to hold up the passage of this Bill. I and other members on this side want to see it go through as soon as possible. Having said that, I think it was incumbent on me to draw to the attention of the Minister those inaccuracies and those credits that I think the Minister was trying to take for his own Government, whereas clearly they lie with the Labor Government between 1970 and 1979. I support the Bill.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I support the Bill. The standardisation of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook broad gauge railway by 1983-84 is essential if the A.N.R. is to achieve its corporate objective of breaking even by 1988-89. In addition to that objective, it is essential for the well being of this State in terms of opening up the transport link to our northern areas and to the markets with the Sydney-Perth transport link. In addition, the standard gauge line will shorten transit times between Adelaide and Western Australia, the Northern Territory and New South Wales by more than one day and give a significant transport cost advantage to industry in this State, in addition to establishing that link.

This project will facilitate the development of resources in the Far North of South Australia and the Northern Territory, and will give A.N.R. a keener edge with which to generate new business. In general terms, as has been described, the project involves converting the existing broad gauge line to standard gauge by transposition of one rail, plus 11 kilometres of new line to be constructed between Merriton and Crystal Brook. I will make some remarks a little later in relation to that 11 kilometres of line. Standardisation will, among other advantages, result in increased livestock traffic from the Northern Territory owing to improved quality of livestock delivered to the Adelaide market. The competitive position of rail traffic between Adelaide and Perth, Adelaide and the Northern Territory and Adelaide and Sydney will greatly improve. As I have said, those transit times are reduced because of the elimination of bogie exchange.

The A.N.R. has many corporate objectives, one of which is improving its efficiency. Another of A.N.R.'s current objectives is increased profitable revenue, and it is estimated that there will be a basic growth of about 3 per cent a year over the next few years with a possibility of modal shift from road to rail of about 15 per cent in 1980-81 owing to fuel price escalation. The A.N.R. has established a rating strategy which escalates at a rate to which the market will bear with annual increases of not less than, as I understand it, about 70 per cent of the consumer price index, taking into account cost reductions arising out of efficiency measures that I have mentioned which are the basic objectives of A.N.R. In addition to the objectives of A.N.R. to be achieved by 1988-89, the other side of the coin to which I have referred is the prospect of significant new business, which is of great interest to South Australia as well as to A.N.R. The General Manager of A.N.R., Dr. Williams, has said that the A.N.R. is actively and even aggressively pursuing business opportunities associated with most of the major developments currently in the news. First there is Mereenie Oil. There are about 21 000 000 tonnes of proven crude oil in the Mereenie Field, which is South-East of Alice Springs, and this is in addition to the large quantities of gas. The size of the field doesn't justify a pipeline and the A.N.R. is endeavouring to obtain the contract for rail. The potential traffic is about 10 000 tonnes per week.

The distinct probability of the Roxby Downs mining project going ahead, because of the success of the Tonkin

Government in September last, has been enhanced by the recent announcement of feasibility studies in the area.

That A.N.R. connection to that mining project will involve the construction of about 100 kilometres of track to link into the trans Australian line at about Pimba, and offer a potential tonnage of between 300 000 and 600 000 tonnes by rail per year. One could list other projects to indicate that the economic prospects to recover profitable revenue by A.N.R. with the completion of this standard gauge rail link will be enhanced.

The result will be the removal of the unnecessary tax burden on the Australian taxpayer by the provision of a modern transport service, which is essential for the growth of Australia as a whole and South Australia in particular. It will be achieved by the completion of this standard gauge link and the opening up of the prospects, with the development in South Australia being spearheaded by the Tonkin Government.

There has been a good deal of local debate and publicity in my electorate about the 11 kilometres of new line that will be laid between Merriton and Crystal Brook. The Government's attitude has been quite clear on the matter, and I would like to reiterate that. It heeds the view of local government authorities and encourages them in the decision making process. In this instance, the Crystal Brook District Council determined that it was in the interests of its residents and ratepayers that a particular course be taken by the standard gauge link. In that respect, as member for the district, I respected those views, and represented those views as expressed by council, to the appropriate persons who were charged with the responsibility of making a decision on which particular route would be adopted by A.N.R. I would like to reiterate that the South Australian Government has, as I am led to believe, no rights to determine which route would be selected by A.N.R. The South Australian Government handed those responsibilities to the Federal Government when it signed the South Australians Railways Country Transfer Agreement. The State Government has the right of re-closure but not in relation to extensions or routing of railway lines, and in that regard the responsibility for determining the route was with A.N.R. and the Commonwealth Government, and to that end the local government authority made submissions to the appropriate body.

During the course of those discussions and the debate within the community, I believe it is unfortunate that there was a lot of innuendo in relation to the role that the former member for Rocky River had played in this regard—unjustified, unwarranted and untrue criticism in relation to the activities of the former member for Rocky River. I would like to defend most forcefully his actions in the past, as local member, in relation to this subject, and I believe he has had unjustified criticism placed on his shoulders in that regard.

Now that the formal agreement has been signed and we have seen in the past few weeks work on the line commence, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the fact that the Government should consider encouraging the Federal Government and A.N.R. to consider the extension of that standard rail link from Snowtown through to Wallaroo. The current proposal, of course, does not provide for the conversion from Snowtown to Wallaroo and, as I understand A.N.R. is keeping the matter constantly under review with respect to origins and destinations of traffic into and out of Wallaroo respectively, the well being of that port and of the workforce at the end of that line is, I believe, directly related to the connection of the port of Wallaroo to the standard rail gauge link.

The report that I have received from A.N.R. indicates that about 190 000 tonnes of freight have gone in and out of Wallaroo during the past 12 months. An analysis of that traffic might indicate that Wallaroo could be adequately served by the broad gauge system, but that does not take into account the problems with transfer and shipping of sulphuric acid from Port Pirie, where it is manufactured, to the port of Wallaroo, of which product there was last year about 46 000 tonnes. There are difficulties in relation to road transport of sulphuric acid of that quantity, and there are also difficulties in changing gauge and bogies in relation to its transfer at Snowtown from one gauge to the other in order to tranship it to Wallaroo. I understand that the appropriate union has lodged an objection in relation to that approach by A.N.R.

In the 1970 Fitch Report, which has been referred to in the debate already, support is given to Maunsell Consultants, who advocated that the conversion of the Snowtown to Wallaroo railway line to standard gauge link could be done at a minimum cost by the inclusion on that line of an extra line so that Wallaroo could be connected to both a broad gauge and standard gauge link. The appropriate local government authorities within the district have certainly taken some initiative in relation to that in making a submission to A.N.R. and to the State Minister to use his good offices to encourage his Federal counterpart to give very serious consideration, at the completion of the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standardisation project in about two years, to then embarking on the completion of the standardisation between Snowtown and Wallaroo to service not only light industry and the jobs that are associated with and dependent on that in Wallaroo but also to provide through the agricultural areas of the North adequate access to the products of that industrial area.

For example, during the last year between 35 000 and 40 000 tonnes of superphosphate was despatched from Wallaroo superphosphate works by rail to the following bulk super depots: the South-East, I understand, about 20 000 tonnes; Booleroo Centre, 8 000 tonnes; and Jamestown, 8 000 tonnes, the latter being transferred by the bogie exchange system at Peterborough. With the escalation in fuel costs, with A.N.R. looking at more lucrative markets, there is no doubt that it will be establishing further bulk superphosphate depots through country areas that will be used increasingly by farming communities as fuel prices and transport costs escalate, particularly if A.N.R. continues the policy which the General Manager has indicated, that its rates will escalate 70 per cent of consumer price index of each year.

In addition to connecting the agricultural areas closely and economically to the products of the superphosphate works at Wallaroo, a number of other associated products could be used on this transport link if it were connected to the standard gauge network. For example, in regard to bulk grain shipments, the port of Wallaroo has, in fact, established its record in terms of being a quick clearing port.

I think it was in the early 1960's, that the port of Wallaroo was used as an experimental bulk grain port, when grain was railed from all stations east of Spencer Gulf to move the grain harvest. It proved at that time beyond doubt that the then efficient rail system could handle the increased traffic converging on the silo terminal. However, since then additional silo complexes have been built, thus changing that pattern of transport of bulk grain. However, if Wallaroo were connected to the national rail standardisation network, South Australia could, through the port of Wallaroo, export grains from the New South Wales grain area to the benefit of this

State's port facilities and the railway network.

In addition, we have the live sheep export factor, where Wallaroo has proved in recent years its capacity to export, on large sheep carriers, regular shipments to the Middle Eastern countries. Areas of New South Wales and Queensland have large supplies of sheep, and have shipped them to Wallaroo in the past for the export trade, but that trade is being hindered by the break in gauges, and the number of necessary off-loading points to spell the sheep; for example, in Parkes, New South Wales. With a standardisation link to Wallaroo, this industry could be greatly improved. At present, a number of other factors are associated in relation to bulk sheep pellets from Adelaide to Murray Bridge by rail, hopper-bottom trucks, etc.

Other industries could be coupled with the live sheep export trade, if it were allowed to develop, by the removal of one inhibiting factor, namely, the break in gauges between the Eastern States and the port of Wallaroo. A number of other products could be used through the port, such as general cargo containers, timber, cornsacks, and the like, but I will not go into them in detail. The argument remains the same in relation to those products as, indeed, it does in relation to those I have already mentioned.

Mr. Keneally: Have you mentioned uranium?

Mr. OLSEN: The port of Wallaroo, coupled with the standard gauge network, could provide a ready access to those markets and provide what, I believe, is a further impetus to decentralisation in this State. The member for Stuart commented on the export of uranium. It is interesting to note that the Corporation of Wallaroo has already made a submission to the Government encouraging it to consider the port of Wallaroo for the export of uranium products. I support the local government authority in that regard, because it is approaching objectively the future of South Australia: the coupled resources boom in which this State can share along with the other States. I am sure that the member for Stuart would not hinder that prospect for the port of Wallaroo.

Mr. Keneally: If it is a choice between Wallaroo and Port Augusta, you'd have my utmost support.

Mr. OLSEN: We know that the port of Port Augusta could never fit the bill, because of the usually low tide there. However, the port of Wallaroo has the capacity to service economically the large ships that would be required for the export of a product of that nature. I support the legislation, and ask the Minister to give every consideration to prevailing on his Federal colleagues and A.N.R. to make an announcement before long that, with the completion of this line, they will embark on a programme to connect Wallaroo to the standard rail link.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): Basically, I support the Bill, but with many reservations. As I said in the Chamber last week, I was disappointed that a copy of the study of the effects of standardisation on metropolitan Adelaide had not been given to the Opposition because, clearly, this study will have an effect on standardisation when it is introduced in the metropolitan area. The Minister has promised me a copy, but I dare say that it will be too late by the time I receive it. Nevertheless, some of the implications are the effects on Port Stanvac, the Lonsdale industrial area, Tonsley Park, Outer Harbor and industrial sidings throughout the metropolitan area; the safety and operational aspects of dual-gauge operation in the metropolitan area, considering the alternatives of passenger operations on the outer or inner rails; the requirements of freight and passenger movements between the South-Eastern line and locations north of Adelaide; the requirements of freight movement from the

Angaston area to LeFevre Peninsula; the capacity of the existing metropolitan rail system to carry future traffic of both A.N.R. and S.T.A.; and the cost implications for the State Transport Authority of the use of the authority's metropolitan railways by the A.N.R. Commission and of the possible diversion of some or all of A.N.R.'s traffic from the authority system.

The Minister is no doubt aware of those statements, because they came from a study that was initiated by the previous Government into the effects of standardisation on metropolitan Adelaide. No doubt, the member for Semaphore will have something to say in relation to the lack of information that has been supplied to him, as I understand from his comments about the effects of standardisation in his district. It is particularly disconcerting to find that this information had not been given to the Opposition, because many issues will result from the effects of standardisation. In particular, we have heard a great deal from the Chairman of the A.N.R. Commission and from the Minister about the benefits of standardisation on metropolitan Adelaide, particularly the benefits that will accrue from the standardisation of the line from Crystal Brook to Adelaide.

The effects on metropolitan Adelaide have not been touched on by many speakers. I will quote from a letter given to me by the union to which I previously belonged, and sent to Dr. Don Williams, the General Manager of the A.N.R. Commission. The letter, dated 29 September, states:

It has been brought to my executive's attention that the A.N.R. intends to delay the connection of the Islington standard gauge yard with the Mile End and Keswick complex for some 18 months after the completion of the Crystal Brook to Islington project. My executive was further informed that goods loaded at Mile End for the West and N.S.W. via Broken Hill will have to be bogie exchanged at Islington and that passengers between Adelaide and Port Pirie will be transported by bus.

Should this information be correct we consider it to be most unsatisfactory and most detrimental to both the A.N.R. operations and the general public. Can anyone expect a firm, loading at Mile End on broad gauge, to have their consignments travel approximately six kilometres then delayed for at least 12 hours to have them bogie exchanged before they can get them on their way?

The standard gauge line between Adelaide and Crystal Brook is meant to expedite and not to delay the movements of goods so as the A.N.R. can compete with road transport. My executive having properly considered the detrimental effects such a delay will have on all concerned, i.e., the A.N.R., its employees and its customers have directed me to inform you of the following resolution:

That the S.A. branch of the A.R.U. insists that the proposed new standard gauge complex at Keswick and Mile End be simultaneously constructed and connected with the main standard gauge line Crystal Brook to Dry Creek.

If this job is to be done it should be done properly and completely. Piecemeal jobs belong to the past and should not be entertained in the '80's.

Hoping that yourself being a progressive and forward thinking person, you will agree with our views and direct accordingly.

Thanking you in anticipation.

I cannot say that I agree with all the sentiments expressed, but I am quoting from the letter. Clearly, there would be major problems, as indicated in it, for the travelling public from other States who come in on the Overland, or from the South-East, if they had to embark at Keswick and then be transported by bus or even be transported from

Adelaide. I suggest that, if this were to occur, we could probably lose quite a few rail patrons.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are they saying that they will be transported from Adelaide to Islington?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes. Then there are the effects on the alterations to the goods sheds at Mile End and on the employees there. Where can they be transferred to? We have not heard very much about that, and we do not know a great deal about the siting of the bogie exchange at Dry Creek. Although we know roughly where it will be, there is no specific indication. We do not know how the freight forwarders will be catered for at the Islington and Dry Creek complex. We are not aware of the effects on the grain silos at the various depots. I understand that they will continue to be catered for at places such as Mallala, Long Plains, Nantawarra, and Red Hill, but there is no specific reference to that in the Minister's explanation.

Other matters affecting the running of these services relate to the effects on the controlling of the traffic. Will it be done with joint co-operation, or will it be done by the A.N.R.? This matter raises major problems for the S.T.A. and the A.N.R. Commission, as the Minister no doubt will appreciate. I understand that numerous delays have occurred in the past because of some conflict between the train controllers who operate the A.N.R. and S.T.A. centralised traffic control equipment. I do not reflect on them, but this is a feeling that comes across from the employees on the job.

I have not been able to ascertain what provision will be made for vehicle access to the Islington complex for members of the public who wish to forward freight from that depot. I am also unaware of the type of installation to be erected by the freight forwarders and the effect this will have on the Mile End goods sheds and what traffic will be sent from where. Within the inner city area, will any part of the park lands at North Adelaide be affected? This question was raised in the Joy Report in 1977 to the then Federal Minister for Transport, Mr. Nixon. Clearly, there are numerous issues that we have not been able to determine or on which we have been unable to question the Minister in relation to the effects of the standardisation of the line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook.

A couple of the issues raised by the member for Rocky River also exercise my mind. He was, quite clearly and properly, looking after the interests of his constituents.

Mr. Mathwin: He was reading your mind, was he?

Mr. HAMILTON: I am not saying that. In terms of economies, he raised the question of the transshipping of goods from Snowtown to Wallaroo via Kadina. That is not the only line that will be affected. The Snowtown to Gladstone service will be affected, as well as the possible need to transfer. Although I am not a pessimist, while nothing has been said on this, especially on the Snowtown to Gladstone service, I am somewhat pessimistic about the future of that service under the A.N.R. Commission, and in particular the policies expounded by the commission in numerous articles. I am greatly concerned about the future of the line from Bowmans to Kadina, and whether or not it will be closed. There was some speculation about that many years ago, and any closure of that line would raise the question of the transportation of grain from places such as Balaklava; for many years, that grain has been transported to Wallaroo through Bowmans. This will affect Wallaroo and the shipping port there, but certainly that is not spelt out in the Minister's explanation.

We do not know what type of passenger services will be provided on the new line. As a union official, many years ago I had it put to me by a senior inspector within the then South Australian Railways that it was contemplated that, when the A.N.R. took over, the passenger service to

Peterborough could work via Crystal Brook, in conjunction with a fast freight, the "cabbagey", as it was called. This is one of the issues that has exercised the minds of many railway employees in Peterborough. The Minister would be well aware of the concern I have expressed about the possible effect on employees at Peterborough and also Port Pirie.

The Minister would also be aware of the number of questions that I have raised in relation to these issues. For example, I have been informed that at Port Pirie some 210 staff will be affected by the standardisation of this line. Whilst the Minister has replied to me that he has made representations to the Commonwealth Minister requesting sympathetic consideration wherever possible to maintain the status of those employees at both depots, I view—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: That was well before you made representations to me.

Mr. HAMILTON: I have no doubt that the Minister did do this, but what I am very much concerned with, of course, is whether a socio-economic study has been carried out on these two towns. I ask the Minister whether such a study has been conducted; according to the information I have received, one has not been done, and I therefore question the wisdom of not carrying out such a study, particularly in relation to a place such as Peterborough. I can imagine the compounding effect of the loss of jobs on the town of Peterborough. The Chairman of the A.N.R. Commission, Dr. Don Williams, had discussions with railway employees there, and he estimates the loss of some 101 jobs. So, when one takes into account the combined earnings (and even if one is somewhat conservative in estimating the earnings of these employees at an average of \$10 000 per year per employee), one can imagine the effect of the loss of 101 employees from Peterborough.

I believe that, if the Minister has not requested such a socio-economic study, he has been remiss. Also, I believe that such a study should have been carried out concerning the likely effect on employees at Peterborough and Port Pirie. Moreover, with regard to housing of the employees at those locations, what remuneration will those employees be entitled to receive should they be required to transfer to another locality? I resided in Port Pirie for some 11 years, and projecting my mind some 10 or 20 years hence, I envisage the very problems that these employees are currently experiencing at these two depots.

That was the major reason why, when I was in the railways, I decided to sell up my home at Port Pirie and transfer to the city. At that time I envisaged that there would be many problems with railways employees trying to sell their homes, because when there is to be a mass exodus from a town, there is no doubt that, when people put their homes on the market, they will have many difficulties in trying to sell them at market value. Not long after I moved to metropolitan Adelaide, many others took the same step, and there has been a continual drift from Port Pirie to Adelaide of railway employees astute enough to see the problems that were likely to be there in a couple of years. Therefore, I believe that one of the reasons why we should seek compensation for these employees is that I can envisage that those employees will lose \$10 000, \$20 000 or \$30 000 because they will either have to sell their homes or, in order to retain their homes, remain in Port Pirie.

Mr. Evans: What about supporting uranium enrichment?

Mr. HAMILTON: That is something they would not do. If the honourable member would like to speak to me privately, I can say a bit more than that and about the affects it has on my relatives, so let us not get on to that tack. There are many problems in relation to the

standardisation of the line from Port Pirie to Adelaide, and I hope that the Minister has taken some cognizance of the problems I have raised in my contribution to the debate.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I support the Bill, and I think every member would agree that it is desirable that we have the capital cities of this nation connected with a standard gauge railway line. I think many of the comments by members as to the cost advantages and the benefits that can accrue from the standard gauge line would be fully supported by all members, and to that extent I concur in the remarks made.

However, I want to raise another point at this stage, because I was contacted by members of the Crystal Brook area concerning the point the railway enters into or around Crystal Brook, a point that has previously been alluded to in this debate. I feel it is only fair that my involvement concerning this query should be fully outlined to the House. I was contacted in late April by our State Secretary, Mrs. Helen Tiller, who at that time had in her office three members of a deputation who had met Dr. Williams, the General Manager of A.N.R., that day. The request was made to Mrs. Tiller in the following terms: "Helen, you are our last chance; can you help us?" It was a plea by that deputation for assistance to clarify, for the District Council of Crystal Brook, its position, and to reopen negotiations in an attempt for the council to get the views of the community heard. As I was in Port Lincoln at that time, I asked Mrs. Tiller whether she would endeavour to arrange a deputation to see the Federal Minister for Transport, and this was arranged on two days' notice. However, it did not go all that well, because, whilst we caught the plane on time, unfortunately there was fog at the Melbourne airport. We circled there for 1½ hours and then had to return to Adelaide because of the fuel transporters' strike in Melbourne. So, we had to come back to Adelaide to refuel so we could then go back to Melbourne and from there on to Canberra. The appointment was for 2 o'clock, and we actually arrived in the Minister's office at 2.25, but at 2.30 the Minister had a Budget appointment, so in reality we had only a five-minute appointment with the Minister.

Mr. Olsen: Mr. Giles fitted the bill very well.

Mr. BLACKER: The member for Rocky River has advised, and quite correctly, that when we arrived at the Minister's office Mr. O'Halloran Giles, the member for Wakefield, was there.

Mr. Keneally: Sticking his nose into things that do not belong to him. It is Laurie Wallis's electorate.

Mr. BLACKER: The member for Stuart is perfectly correct, because, whilst Mr. Giles said he believed it was in his district, when we looked up the map it was found it was not in his electorate. In fact, it was in the district of the member for Grey, Mr. Laurie Wallis. In initial attendance at that meeting was Senator Don Jessop, but he was unable to stay for very long, and the deputation was left initially with the Minister and his adviser and then, when the Minister had to leave, with Mr. O'Halloran Giles, who later reported to the Minister the outcome of that meeting. He was good enough to forward me a copy of his notes to the Minister and, whilst I cannot disagree with the basic concept of those notes, they were not detailed to any great extent and, as such, did not give a complete picture of the situation.

Having been advised by Mr. Giles of what he intended to do, I then believed that it was necessary to write to the Minister to fill in the situation as I saw it, bearing in mind that the deputation concerned had advised me of the position as it saw it. The letter that I forwarded to the

Minister for Transport, the Hon. Ralph Hunt, stated:

Following our very brief meeting last Thursday, 1 May, I feel I must write to you to give greater explanation to the position as I see it. This problem first came to my notice after our State Secretary was contacted by members of the District Council of Crystal Brook inquiring as to whether the Party [the Country Party] could help in any way.

It appears as though the Australian National Railways have been influenced to change the programmed route for connection at or near Crystal Brook upon the influence of one man, that being the former member for Rocky River in the House of Assembly, Mr. Howard Venning.

The member for Rocky River has raised Mr. Venning's name and I believe that, because I wrote to the Minister in this context, I should explain what I said so that there can be no misunderstanding in regard to my involvement and how I came to be involved. The letter continued:

Mr. Venning owns most of the property between the siding of Merriton and Crystal Brook. I was asked whether I would lead a deputation to you, a deputation elected by the district council and at a public meeting held in Crystal Brook to discuss the problem.

That deputation consisted of the Acting Chairman of the district council, Mr. Geoff Dennis, who has lived all his life at Merriton, Mr. Rolly Nicholls, a councillor for 22 years and Chairman of the district council for seven, and Mr. John Millard, an electrical contractor, a former clerk/overseer of the Crystal Brook District Council for 13 years. These gentlemen were nominated to present the case to you for the line to enter Crystal Brook via route 1 as originally planned and promoted by A.N.R.

At a district council meeting in December 1979, the Chief Engineer of the A.N.R., Mr. Des Smith, advised the council that the rail would approach Crystal Brook from the south-west, sweep around the southern part of the town and enter on the alignment of the Port Pirie-Sydney railway line. At that meeting with the district council, Mr. Smith gave a firm undertaking that that would be the site chosen and gave a number of reasons as why that should be.

He advised council that he was to have dinner [or lunch] with Mr. Venning, and I understand this took place that evening. It was at that dinner that Mr. Smith was influenced to change his mind. Unfortunately, the district council were never again consulted as to the alignment of the proposed new railway; in fact it was not until approximately three weeks ago—

and this letter was dated 6 May, bearing in mind that the initial contact was in December 1979—

that rumours began to circulate at Crystal Brook that a new alignment was to be used. After three attempts by the district council to get A.N.R. to come to Crystal Brook to explain their change of attitude, eventually Mr. Smith did go to Crystal Brook, and later at a public meeting stated that after having had dinner with Mr. Venning he had changed his mind.

The public meeting totally disagreed with the feeble explanations given for the change of route, and at that meeting a vote of 78 to two was taken, supporting the original A.N.R. proposal of route 1.

Mr. Keneally: Who were the two?

Mr. BLACKER: How does the member know I had written the names? The two who opposed the measure were the sons of Mr. Howard Venning, the former M.P. and landholder in question. The letter continues:

Since the public meeting at which the vote was taken, Mr. Howard Venning himself personally has been ringing some residents and lobbying them for their support.

The district council then made attempts to see Dr. Williams, General Manager of A.N.R., and sought the assistance of the local member, Mr. John Olsen. Mr. Olsen

was reluctant [I am advised] to assist the council in their request for the railway line entering via route 1. Mr. Olsen was unavailable to attend with the deputation to see Dr. Williams [on or about 28 April].

At the deputation with Dr. Williams, Dr. Williams stated that he listened to Mr. Venning because Mr. Venning claimed that he was speaking with the authority of the community. This obviously is blatantly untrue. It was at this stage that I was contacted for assistance. Through our head office, Mrs. Helen Tiller made the arrangements for a deputation to you and regrettably, because of bad weather and the delay in flight schedules, we were only able to have the benefit of five minutes of your time. Mr. Geof Giles, M.H.R., then continued with the meeting and he took a few sketchy notes which I understand are to be forwarded to you.

Mr. Giles was obviously backing the proposal of route 2, as was Mr. Grigor from the A.N.R. From the notes that you read during our brief meeting it is obvious that the committee report of the A.N.R. has been based upon irrelevant facts and cannot stand up to question; for example, Mr. Grigor claimed that the railway traffic would be inconvenient and noisy to residents. It should be pointed out that all Sydney traffic goes through that route anyway and that the wide A.N.R. easement ensures that there is no inconvenience to local residents.

Another point raised was that it would be noisy for the hospital. Mr. Grigor agreed that that was not a case when it was pointed out just where the hospital was situated. Other issues that have been proposed were that the trains would have to block highway No. 1 when interchanging. A brief look at the map would clearly indicate that there is three kilometres of straight run available for double track if necessary for interchange. Yet another reason was the cost of the points and interchange because of its distance from the station. An elementary check on the distance would indicate that this is blatantly untrue.

Then came the matter of costs, and it has been presented to you that route 1 would be nearly as expensive to construct as route 2. I challenge this remark, for route 1 is a shorter distance on level ground with no creek crossings and the only embankment necessary is to raise the line to the existing level of the Sydney railway line. This is only because there is a depression in the ground where this junction would meet. In fact, at that triangle on the south-east portion of Crystal Brook the existing route would have a level crossing on one part of the triangle and an underpass on the other.

Yet another problem thrown up was the availability of fill for that embankment. Immediately adjacent to that railway line is the S.A.R. line which has been abandoned. The lines and sleepers have been removed. However, all filling and ballast still remains, and this would be ideal material right adjacent to the proposed embankment, and the carting for that fill would have to be the cheapest possible. Further to that, the whole issue of the underpass can be overcome by a slight re-routing of the Clare road, and this matter was explained to Mr. Grigor and Mr. Giles.

I hope that they have taken the necessary details of that explanation. Whilst speaking with Mr. Grigor, he stated that he had been speaking with Dr. Williams and that Dr. Williams's personal opinion was that it was much of a muchness as to which of the two routes should be used. If that statement is to be considered as valid, then surely the interests and the wish of the whole community should be taken into consideration.

When considering this proposal with the alternative route 2, there are a number of additional costs and hazards which must be taken into account. It is my understanding that route 2 would require a longer length of track, it would require a level crossing across National Route Highway No. 1 (which is unnecessary in route 1), it would require at least one major

bridge (construction work estimated to be in the vicinity of \$3 000 000 as well as a number of smaller culverts and embankments to cross the gullies at the foot of the hills.

Furthermore, the distance in the operation of switch gear would be considerably greater from the Crystal Brook railway station. These are the disadvantages as I see them in the construction of route 2 as compared with route 1. On the advantages and disadvantages of the railways entering Crystal Brook, the only tangible excuse that may have any credence at all, that has been proposed by Mr. Venning and A.N.R., has been that the operating costs of an Adelaide to Perth run would be cheaper because it would be 2 kilometres less via route No. 2.

I should point out that, whilst this may be the case, it also means that the Adelaide to Sydney run is extended by between three and four kilometres, so the advantage to one is more than offset by the disadvantage to the other.

On looking at A.N.R. sketch maps later, I found that the distance was 4.1 kilometres, to be more precise.

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

Mr. BLACKER: Before the dinner adjournment, I was relating to the House the contents of a letter that I forwarded to the Federal Minister for Transport, the Hon. Ralph Hunt. The letter continues:

Secondly, the junction at Crystal Brook is the main railway junction between the three capital cities, Sydney, Adelaide and Perth and if that junction is not placed in a town it would be necessary for a considerable amount of back tracking from Port Pirie or from stations further away. Crystal Brook is in the centre of a very rich agricultural area and could well be a selling centre of stock and the central freight services for the Mid North. Should proposal No. 2 be adopted then such service facilities will be unavailable and one must then seriously question the reason for the existence of A.N.R. at all.

If A.N.R. is designed for the sole purpose of express freight between capital cities, then one can understand the by-passing of major centres en route. However, it is my contention that A.N.R. should be designed for the servicing of the community as well as for large volume freight and should of sheer common sense and logic be routed through the centres most likely to give additional freight and therefore revenue to A.N.R.

There would be a considerable outcry if the passenger services to Port Pirie and Port Augusta were disbanded and surely the likelihood of additional passengers from Crystal Brook would enhance the viability of any passenger services. After our brief meeting with you on Thursday last Mr. Geoff Giles then had his secretary look after our deputation.

I made a number of efforts to see some of the N.C.P. members; however, my only success was to see Tom McVeigh for a mere five minutes before Mr. Giles's secretary had arranged a cab to take me back to the airport. I am certain that I was being shielded from seeking the advice and support of any of our other colleagues. The deputation did, however, get to see Mr. Allan Cadman, Chairman of the Transport Parliamentary Committee. Mr. Cadman advised that a few members of the transport committee had visited Crystal Brook and had inspected the proposals. It was at this meeting that we found that never at any stage did any member of that Committee make contact with the district council.

Having worked on the Public Works Standing Committee in South Australia, I find that this means of collecting evidence is most irregular and I would think the committee is to be condemned for their partiality in receiving evidence. May I make the suggestion that the committee and A.N.R. be obliged to receive public evidence from the community

and particularly make themselves available to the District Council of Crystal Brook who had been consulted with the original Route 1 proposal.

The deputation, upon returning to South Australia, was quite pleased that it had the opportunity of meeting you and presenting a few facts to you and to other members of the committee. However, since that time there have been further developments that I find very disturbing.

On Saturday night, at a social gathering, Mr. John Millard stated that the Liberal Party was most displeased with the deputation for going through the Country Party and myself and that if the council didn't toe the line they would not have a railway at all. Mr. Millard was obviously influenced enough to take to task our State Secretary, Mrs. Tiller, for her involvement in arranging the deputation. It was also stated that if council did not now work through Senator Jessop the Liberal Party would have the Minister for Transport over-ridden, inferring directly that they would ask the Prime Minister to interfere in your decision-making.

I find this heavy-handed politics quite inappropriate and, one thing is for certain, I personally will not accept such standover tactics. Unfortunately if this matter is not rectified with some logic and common sense then our Party will suffer because we have been strong promoters of decentralisation which Route 1 would give—Route 2 would do nothing more than further centralise the activities in capital cities.

In conclusion, I would be happy to hear of any genuine argument which supports Route 2; however, at this stage there has been nothing of any consequence presented which would suggest that the railway should by-pass Crystal Brook. No doubt we will be in touch further on this matter; however, I trust that the above will give you some insight into some of the problems facing the district council. I believe a grave injustice has been done to the community of Crystal Brook and I personally believe that the matter should be fought all the way.

Following that, I received a letter from the District Council of Crystal Brook together with a complete submission of the district council's report to the Federal Minister and the submission that it in turn presented. Whilst it is a lengthy document and time does not permit me to read it into *Hansard*, I would like to quote a couple of relevant parts. Part one gave a history of the Crystal Brook rail link. Part two, headed "Advice to council", stated:

A.N.R. did not consult the District Council of Crystal Brook regarding the change from scheme I to scheme II. In fact, the council was not advised of the change to scheme II until it was brought to its notice by rumours from local landholders. Even then it had to make firm inquiries to A.N.R. to have the facts confirmed. It was not officially confirmed until mid-March 1980 even though it was well known locally that scheme II was projected as early as December 1979.

It is that very aspect that concerns the district council in its endeavours to have its views heard. The submission goes on with further subsections outlining the specific aims and objectives of schemes I and II, and A.N.R.'s objections to scheme I when first advised of scheme II. It also states the advantages claimed by the district council for scheme I. Part 7 deals with the advantages claimed for Crystal Brook under scheme I; part 8 deals with the environment; part 9 with existing freight traffic; part 10 with the Indian Pacific connection; part 11 with decentralisation; and, finally, part 12 is the summary of the submission and states:

Apart from the obvious benefit of regular rail freight and passenger services to Crystal Brook, we do not expect any sudden lift of fortunes to come to our town as a result of the implementation of scheme I.

Rather, as fuel prices increase and road transport becomes

less attractive, we expect to see a gradual increase in rail usage. Then, as the standard gauge system gets properly organised, residents of surrounding districts and, in particular, stock agents and associated rural industries are likely to more fully appreciate the advantages of the rail system as it would then operate from Crystal Brook. We have no doubt that, provided satisfactory time-tables can be operated, the rail usage from the town will increase to the point of becoming a very profitable operation for A.N.R. However, this cannot happen without the implementation of scheme I which is of the utmost importance to Crystal Brook and the Mid North towns of South Australia in the vicinity of the town and we believe to South Australia generally.

It would be ridiculous and disastrous for Crystal Brook for A.N.R. to repeat the fiasco of the last 45 years by building a line to Adelaide which bypasses Crystal Brook for two kilometres and yet makes no provision for the people of the town to use this line except by travelling by road 30 km to Port Pirie or 50 km to Snowtown. We also believe that it would be grossly unfair to the rural community generally to deny them the opportunity of sharing in a rural stock marketing centre which is so obviously a practical possibility at Crystal Brook in conjunction with scheme I.

We earnestly request your closest consideration of the facts we have submitted and seek your approval for the implementation of A.N.R. scheme I in lieu of A.N.R. scheme II.

Further to that, I was informed that there was to be a public meeting at Crystal Brook on 16 July. I wrote to the Chairman of the District Council of Crystal Brook (Mr. Colin Matheson) advising him of the latest contacts I had had with the Minister. Since my initial correspondence with the Minister, there have been numerous phone calls and contacts between either the State Secretary or me and the Minister. That happened twice in Canberra and once more when the Minister came to Adelaide on other business, when he made it his business to inform us fully of what was going on.

For that meeting on 16 July, there was considerable local lobbying for both schemes. To that end, the Railway Committee of the District Council of Crystal Brook believed that it was obliged likewise to lobby for that scheme. On the day before the meeting, it circulated a householder letter, on the front of which was a map outlining the two proposals and giving the actual distances relating to that scheme. It also gave distances in relation to points for rail interchange, together with the length of the scheme. The letter was headed, "The most important meeting ever held in Crystal Brook: tonight, 8 p.m., in the institute"—such was the feeling in the town at that time. The letter states:

Don't be misled by the propaganda in *The Recorder* and your letter boxes pushing for the adoption of railway scheme 2! Check these facts.

The letter relates many of the facts, most of which I have related to the House, so there is no real point in my repeating them. They set out, in answering 18 specific questions, the reasons why the Crystal Brook District Council was promoting scheme 1 to go through the town. The letter concludes:

If you are interested in the future of Crystal Brook—attend this meeting and register your support for Australian National Railways Scheme 1.

It was signed at the bottom by the Railway Committee of the District Council of Crystal Brook. I have also received copies of sketch plans, etc., from A.N.R. I have spoken with many of the persons involved in the negotiations and, in the final outcome, I believe that the council's wishes have been heard. After all, all we were after was for the district council to be heard and for its submissions to be

presented and got through to the Minister. From my contact with my Minister, I realised that he was totally unaware that there was any difference of opinion in the community. It was his opinion, and it had been given to him in that way, that all was well. It was all on the assumption that the local people had been consulted in this way, but that was not the case. Following this, I received a very nice note from the Chairman of the council, thanking me for reopening the channels of communication.

After all, that was all I was able to do, and that was all I set out to do—allow the channels of communication to get through to the Minister to ensure that the council's views would be heard. To that extent, I think that the letter that was sent to me, which I will not relate to the House, fully outlines the council's appreciation to that extent. In addition, I have on file copies of the memorandum from Mr. Geoffrey O'Halloran Giles to the Minister for Transport advising him of Mr. Giles's assessment of the meeting. This was sent to me through the council on the advice and at the direction of the member for Wakefield (Mr. Giles). The file I have is reasonably complete, certainly to the extent of having the council's views heard and presented to the Minister.

That particular incident was perhaps an aside to the general thrust of the Bill now before us. To that extent, it is somewhat regrettable that such circumstances should ever have to arise. Nevertheless, they arose. Threats were made that the railway might not eventuate, because of my involvement, but I believe that that was never the case. It is that type of threat which prompted me to rise today, to be able to outline to the House exactly what took place. As I said earlier, the whole purpose was to get the councils views heard. It had been assured by A.N.R. that route 1 would be the proposal, and any further consultation would pass by the board.

I fully support the measure before the House, believing that it is a great step for South Australia. It offers the potential for further development and the additional spur lines and interconnection with the standard gauge system that can service the whole of Australia. No doubt, with the further connection from Alice Springs to Darwin, which has now been proposed, it will add another leg to the grid crossing this nation. If Adelaide can be connected into that grid, surely the whole of South Australia will benefit by it. I support the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I have listened with considerable interest to the contribution of the member for Flinders, and I will make two points as strongly as I can in relation to his remarks. First, I draw to his attention and that of the House the fact that the Federal member who represents Crystal Brook, and the man who ought to have been involved by those who wished to promote the interests of Crystal Brook, was Laurie Wallis. In the whole litany of events, as explained by the member for Flinders, the Country Party, in its attempts to become involved in the controversy at Crystal Brook, did not see fit—

Mr. Blacker: By invitation.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes, by invitation. It did not see fit to take up the matter with its Federal member. The honourable member said that he had had discussions with Mr. O'Halloran Giles, M.H.R., who was not sure whether or not Crystal Brook was in his district: that should have been clear evidence that he was not involved. I also note that the matter was taken up with Senator Jessop, who, the honourable member said, was unable to attend for any great time a deputation in Canberra. The member for Grey was well aware of what had been going on in Crystal Brook from the outset. He is the member who represents the electorate, and he had 25 years experience in the

A.N.R. before going into Parliament. He was the appropriate person who should have been involved in all the negotiations. For him not to have been involved seems to me to be a lack of courtesy, to say the least, on the part of those who were dealing with this matter.

I do not direct that criticism at the Crystal Brook District Council, because it was dealing with Mr. Wallis. The Chairman of the council has a reasonably close relationship with Mr. Wallis that I am not prepared to discuss here. It is sufficient for me to assure myself and anyone else that this relationship with the Federal member would have been kept.

I am not prepared to criticise the involvement of the member for Flinders. He is the Leader of the Country Party in South Australia, and it is within his rights to become involved in issues in South Australia that are brought to his attention. I do not cavil at that at all. That is the appropriate course of action for him to take as Leader of one of the minority Parties in this State. However, I draw to the honourable member's attention and that of the House that the Federal member for Grey (Mr. Laurie Wallis) ought to have been consulted by organisations such as the Country Party if they become involved in issues of this kind.

Secondly, I am absolutely certain that, in this whole controversy, Mr. Howard Venning was absolutely correct in his desire that the second option should have been taken. I have spoken to senior railway officials and, had the decision been made on pure railway economic terms, the decision for route No. 2 would have been the appropriate one. The decision to take the line into Crystal Brook occurred because of a community desire for that to happen. That is fair enough. The Australian National Railways has bowed to the strongly expressed wish of the Crystal Brook community. However, that does not mean that the efforts by Mr. Howard Venning, the former member for Rocky River, were wrong; they were not wrong. Mr. Venning was absolutely correct, and this has happened only because the A.N.R. has accepted the community's wish.

It is grossly unfair to Mr. Venning, and indeed a matter of some regret, that things were said at that time about that gentleman's involvement in this matter. I have always found Mr. Venning to be a man of principle, and I think that in his dealings on this occasion those principles were upheld.

I turn now to the Bill, which I support and which is a further step in giving Australia a standard gauge railway system. It involves an effort at this late stage to undo the mistakes which were made 100 or 50 years ago and which have bedevilled the Australian railway system over that period. There is no doubt that economically the State, particularly Adelaide, will benefit by the standardisation of the railway line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook. Bogie exchanges that occurred at Peterborough and Port Pirie caused delays, sometimes of only 24 hours and sometimes longer, in the transshipment of goods from Adelaide to Sydney and Perth.

However, I must also say that, once the line to Adelaide has been standardised, there will still be a need to bogie exchange traffic going from Melbourne to Perth, unless that traffic goes via Sydney, which does not seem to be a sensible cause of action. So, traffic coming from Melbourne to Adelaide destined for Perth will be transhipped or bogie exchanged at Adelaide. There will therefore be a delay in relation to those goods.

Having said that I agree with the Bill, and having supported the economic arguments that have warranted its introduction, I must say that there is an area of considerable concern to me as the member for Stuart,

namely, the loss of jobs that will result from this line being standardised. Without being critical of members who have spoken in this debate (because they had matters of concern to themselves that they have raised), greater attention ought to have been given to the results of this measure on the people at Port Pirie and Peterborough.

As the member for Albert Park has already said, 113 jobs will be lost at Peterborough and 211 jobs will be lost at Port Pirie. For Peterborough, which is a railway town, this will be an absolute disaster. A total of 113 jobs there is the base of the town's economy, and one can only see Peterborough falling back to become a whistle stop. This is unfortunate, because it has been a significant railway town in this State's history. It is indeed sad to see this aspect of our history passing on.

Of course, the effect on Port Pirie will not be as traumatic as it will at Peterborough. Nevertheless, the effect will be considerable. The loss of 211 jobs at Port Pirie will have a severe economic effect on that city. However, I am more concerned about the effect that it will have on the individuals themselves: the railway workers, the people who in many cases, having given their lives to the railways, have decided towards the end of their careers to settle in Port Pirie, to buy their houses and put down their roots there. Those people have decided to bring up their children and to develop a lifestyle amongst their friends at Port Pirie. It is not good at this late stage in their careers for these people to be threatened with the possibility that all this will change and that they will have to move.

I support the Port Pirie City Council, the unions and residents at Port Pirie in their attempts to ensure, as much as they are able, that those people who work in the railways at Port Pirie are able to retain their jobs there. When they discuss the railway agreement and the standardisation of the railway line with their Federal colleagues, the Minister and the Government should ensure that their colleagues in Canberra are well aware of the feelings of this Parliament, which ought to state in the strongest possible terms that, although we agree with the standardisation of the railway line, we are most unhappy about the effect that it will have on the railway workers in South Australia, particularly those at Peterborough and Port Pirie.

I have attended a number of meetings with the General Manager of the Australian National Railways (Dr. Williams), unions and the Port Pirie City Council. At the most recent meeting that I attended, the General Manager of A.N.R. was trying to convince the people that jobs would be available, either in Adelaide or perhaps at Port Augusta, for those who would be displaced at Port Pirie. It was asked how the 98 bogie exchange workers (49 from each of Port Pirie and Peterborough) would be replaced in Adelaide. We will require in Adelaide only one bogey exchange, which, when fully manned, will employ only 49 persons. So, immediately 49 skilled bogie exchange workers will be without a job, there being nowhere for them to be placed in Adelaide. At that time, Dr. Williams considered that there might be an opportunity to place these workers at Port Augusta.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought there were 27.

Mr. KENEALLY: No; 49 is the full complement. In reply to the Minister's inquiry, I have in front of me a letter from the Federal Minister explaining the number of bogie exchange workers from Port Pirie and Peterborough who will be displaced, and 98 is the total number on the list. The suggestion that those people could be employed at Port Augusta is a fallacy. More railway jobs have been lost at Port Augusta as a result of the corporate plan than at Peterborough and Port Pirie together. There will be no

jobs at Port Augusta for people who are displaced at Peterborough and Port Pirie. Either they will have to come to Adelaide, or the A.N.R. must enforce the redundancy provisions—and that is what will happen at Port Pirie and Peterborough. People will be forced to accept the redundancy provisions. That may be all right for people who are getting close to the end of their working life, close to retirement, but it is most inappropriate for workers in middle age or younger; there are women involved as well as men.

I want to make the strongest representations, through this Parliament, to the authorities concerned about the welfare of the railway workers who have, for a number of years now, had their livelihood threatened. It has never been possible for them to be given the assurances that they need. I have in my numerous discussions with A.N.R. representatives, tried to get clear guidelines as to what will happen to the workers in the North of this State. If I asked questions about the Peterborough work force, I was told that they would be placed at Port Pirie or Port Augusta. If I asked about the Port Pirie work force, I would be told that they were going to Port Augusta or to Adelaide. If I asked about the Port Augusta work force, there was always work for them somewhere else. It has never been possible to get the authorities to say what was to be done with the work force of those three railway communities who have been adversely affected by the corporate plan and who will be adversely affected by this legislation, necessary as it may be.

I believe that the corporate plan, as being imposed by the Federal Government on the railways, with the A.N.R. imposing the corporate plan on the workers, will be effective. When I say that it will be effective, I take into consideration that the corporate plan envisages a decrease in A.N.R. staff in 1980-81 of 358 workers; in 1981-82 of 358 workers; in 1982-83 of 344 workers; in 1983-84 of 322 workers; and in 1984-85 of 341 workers, a decrease in staff under the corporate plan of 1 723 workers within the next five years. There will not be any sackings; of that I am assured. People are not sacked now. There is another term; they are retrenched. People used to be sacked. However, the effect on the worker is the same.

There will not be any retrenchments, but there will be a natural wastage and encouragement to the workers to seek employment elsewhere. The reduction of 1 723 in staff will have a considerable effect on the finances of the A.N.R. Commission. I believe that, over the years, it will be able to meet the main drive of the corporate plan, that is, to at least break even or perhaps make a profit. I believe, too, that the railways will command a greater percentage of the total transport dollar in Australia over that period, because the increase in the price of fuel is such as to make rail traffic much more attractive.

That will happen; and when the railways have gained the additional percentage of the traffic that is available in Australia, there will be an expansion of jobs, but those jobs will be in Adelaide, not in Peterborough, Port Pirie, or Port Augusta. In a total sense, as railway towns, in my view, those communities cannot look forward to any expansion of work opportunities. The A.N.R. has been telling these communities that, when the railways become more competitive and when the traffic flow increases, so will job opportunities, but the A.N.R. is not prepared to say where those job opportunities will be. They will be here in the metropolitan area, in Adelaide.

As a former railway worker of 20 years and a person very heavily committed to decentralisation, particularly in the northern Spencer Gulf cities, I am most disturbed about the prospect of what will happen there. I have little faith in the assurances given to the communities by the

A.N.R. Commission.

I do not know that there is any need for me to take this matter further, but, to recap, there is general support for the standardisation of the line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook. I was amused to read in the second reading explanation that the Minister had said that this was one of his Party's pre-election promises, and, because the Government had been able to write the agreement very quickly, this is another example of its honouring its promises. On balance, that would be about as important as the Government's saying that it was going to sit in Parliament in 1981 and, when Parliament sits in 1981, saying, "Now we have honoured our promise." All the negotiations had taken place previously. It is, as the Deputy Leader has said, a fatuous statement, and it is about time the Government stopped trying to take the credit for matters such as this. If it wants to honour some of its promises, let it honour the promises in relation to the provision of jobs in South Australia, the promises in relation to small business people, the promises to lift the economy generally.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: The loss of jobs that will take place as a result of this measure will have dramatic effects on the economy in South Australia. The Minister has said that the loss of jobs in the northern part of South Australia will be picked up as a result of the measures started by his Government to provide jobs in the area. There has been no example up to the present of any of those projects coming to fruition. I imagine the Minister is talking about some of the mining ventures. I heard the member for Rocky River saying something about the uranium enrichment plant, which will pick up the jobs lost to railway workers at Port Pirie. These jobs will be lost to railway workers in the next couple of years, and the uranium enrichment plant is still pie in the sky for South Australia. The Government cannot give assurances to workers at Port Pirie who will be displaced as a result of this measure that they will be able to get jobs in the uranium enrichment plant when, if ever, the plant is built in South Australia (and I say that advisedly); probably it will not be built at Port Pirie. I have it on reasonable assurance that the Government is seriously considering Whyalla as a logical place for a uranium enrichment plant, if, in fact, it gets around to building it. The Redcliff project would have picked up some of the jobs that are being lost through the railways. There is no doubt about that, and I would expect that that might still occur.

Where those jobs would be picked up would be in the construction work force, and, after the Redcliff petrochemical plant is constructed, together with the power house, those construction jobs will no longer be there. The railway workers would have to be retrained to be able to do the work that the petro-chemical company would require them to do. There is no guarantee that those jobs would be available to railway workers. Anyway, railway workers are a special breed. They give their life to the railways. They like what they are doing, and it is a choice that they make.

We have people coming to Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Peterborough who want to be involved in the railways. As I said, they have given their life to the railways, but they now see that whole lifestyle and their life's work threatened because jobs will not be available for them when they come to Adelaide. That is the critical factor involved in this Bill. It was dealt with in a very minor way by the Minister, and it was not referred to at all by the member for Rocky River or the member for Flinders.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Or the Deputy Leader.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Deputy Leader knew that the member for Albert Park and the member for Stuart would be concentrating largely on this subject. There is a team effort as far as the Opposition is concerned. If there is a team effort as far as the Government is concerned, I am prepared to accept that. I seek an assurance from the Minister when he replies that he will use whatever powers that are available to him in this matter. I am not sufficiently *au fait* with the agreement that we have with the Federal Government to be sure that the Minister has the power to require the Federal Government to keep the jobs at Port Pirie. I know the Minister has powers in relation to the closure of railway lines, but I suspect that there are powers within the agreement to allow the Minister and this Government to oppose the transfer of jobs from our country communities to the city or elsewhere if that is the will of this Government. I know that the Port Pirie City Council again last night was discussing this matter, which is of critical concern to the people of Port Pirie, and I trust the Government shares that critical concern.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I entirely agree with what the member for Stuart has said about the railway line in the vicinity of Crystal Brook. I, too, find it an amazing decision, especially when considering today's planning principles. Throughout Australia people are trying to plan transport corridors in a manner that will have the minimum effect on local residents. I often have the pleasure of going through Cummins, the home town of the member for Flinders, and one of the first things that strike one about that nice little country town is that it is divided and spoilt by the railway line going straight through the middle of it.

Mr. Peterson: Semaphore Road is the same.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is right. One can travel right around Australia and reach the same conclusion about this matter. In regard to passenger services on railways, I suggest to the member for Flinders, Mrs. Tiller and others that they find out from the Australian National Railways Commission how many people currently use, and have used over the past 12 months, the daily service between Peterborough and Adelaide. If the honourable member had done his homework he would know of the great problems that the Minister of Transport and I are having in trying to save some of those services. I understand that about \$300 000 a year is lost on that passenger service alone. I am not sure what is the loss for the Gladstone service, but I think it is even worse.

There are 16 buses a day going through Crystal Brook, and the honourable member, who comes from Eyre Peninsula, knows the type of service that the Stateline organisation has given to Eyre Peninsula, and more recently to Leigh Creek and other parts of the North. Those services are second to none. I do not believe that there will be, at least in the immediate short term, a swing back to rail passenger services, because the buses are so comfortable and—

Mr. Blacker: Are you opposing the decision of the Crystal Brook community?

Mr. GUNN: Yes, I am opposed to it, and I make no apologies for that. I believe that the basis of the decision is that a gentleman by the name of Mr. Nicholls for a long period had a political axe to grind with the former member for Rocky River, and this was his opportunity to get even. I understand that the Crystal Brook council was divided three to four on this issue. I also understand that a number of other courses of action took place which did not in many cases give the correct information, but I would like to talk

to people such as Des Smith, from A.N.R., the man who was responsible for building the railway line to Alice Springs. I would like his view about where the railway line should go, and I do not believe there would be much doubt. He is one of the most experienced railway engineers in Australia. I would like to know what are the real opinions of the A.N.R. Commission on this matter.

What will happen when the first trains start going through Crystal Brook on that line? How long will it be before people realise the sort of noise problems that they will have?

Mr. Blacker: The difference is between 10 trains a day and 13 trains a day.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member has referred to the number of trains, and it is obvious that there will be an increase in the amount of rail traffic in this country. If members think about this or if they have had the opportunity to travel overseas and see how railways operate there, they can have no doubt that there will be an increase in the amount of rail traffic. It is absolutely essential for this country not only that the Adelaide to Crystal Brook line be standardised as soon as possible but also that the standard gauge link be pushed through from Alice Springs to Darwin as a matter of top priority. Indeed, we should be looking seriously also at the Adelaide to Melbourne line as regards a standard gauge hook-up.

If we are going to shift the large amounts of freight, keep Australia economic, and benefit from the natural resources that we have, we have to be able to shift materials from one side of the country to the other. That is absolutely essential. I am not saying that there is not a place in this country for road transport, because I am a great supporter of road transport, and there are many facets of transport that the railways cannot handle. We will always have to rely on road transport. Also, I believe that there is a place for passenger rail services throughout this country but, unfortunately, over the past few years, the costs associated with these services have forced A.N.R. to reduce its services. I understand that that body is at present looking at the service from Adelaide to Perth and that there is a good chance that that service will be discontinued, so that we will have only the Sydney to Perth service, because there is not a demand for the service from Adelaide.

On Friday the Minister of Transport and I spent a considerable time in Peterborough. We had the opportunity to meet the corporation and to discuss at length with it the problems associated with the expected downturn in the activities of the railway workshop at Peterborough. The Minister gave the people a very good hearing. One of the matters that was brought home to me immediately was the lack of thought given to this matter at the time of the transfer agreement that was negotiated and entered into by Premier Dunstan. If members opposite, who were so keen to support that agreement, had given it a little more consideration and taken more care over the sort of agreement that they signed, perhaps some of the problems we are facing in towns like Peterborough could have been alleviated.

Mr. Hamilton: Why don't you remedy them now? It is in the Minister's hands to remedy them now.

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member who is having so much to say now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders permit each member to make one contribution. The record shows that the honourable member for Albert Park and the honourable member for Stuart have already spoken and I would ask them not to continue to interject.

Mr. GUNN: My conscience is quite clear on this issue. I did not vote for the agreement when it was originally introduced in this Parliament. It is all right for those members who did vote for it to make a lot of noise now, but people can examine *Hansard* to see how they voted. The protections that they now want were not written into the original legislation. I think that anyone who goes to Peterborough would be concerned at the effects of the downturn as a result of the A.N.R.'s policy.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Sit him down.

Mr. GUNN: I do not think the Minister needs the help of the member for Mitchell. The member for Mitchell can whinge and whine as much as he likes, but I am making this speech and I do not need his assistance.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Do you want to bet on that?

Mr. GUNN: It would appear from the way he is performing that the member for Mitchell has indigestion from the dinner he had this evening.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Ha, Ha! Talk about facts and not nonsense.

Mr. GUNN: I was referring to a fact that the honourable member cannot dispute. He voted to give the railways away—to give all the authority over the railways of this State to the Commonwealth, and he gave no protection to the people of South Australia. That is a fact that the honourable member cannot dispute, and I know that, as a former Minister, he is embarrassed about it. No doubt his colleagues have been giving him a hard time because of the poor negotiators that he and his colleagues proved to be. However, I do not intend to labour that point. I am concerned about the effects that this agreement will have on my constituents in Peterborough. The member for Stuart indicated that about 41 people would lose their jobs at the bogie exchange. My understanding is that 27 people will lose their jobs, and that a number of other people are involved at Peterborough in looking after the bogies themselves but not directly involved in the changeover at the bogie exchange. I have been assured on a number of occasions by the management of A.N.R. that it is quite conscious of its responsibilities.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In writing?

Mr. GUNN: If the honourable member will just be patient. I hope that the A.N.R. officers live up to those responsibilities, because I believe they must be fully aware of the social consequences of the decisions that they make. There is no doubt that without a great deal of effort they could virtually wipe Peterborough off the map, and their decisions could have a considerable effect on Port Pirie also. Therefore, I believe that in any decisions they make in the future these people should be conscious of the effects of their decisions on a town like Peterborough, which unfortunately has very little other employment opportunity for people. The abattoir at Peterborough creates only seasonal work, and other work in the pastoral industry and the farming industry is also very limited. It is very important that if, other aspects of railway operations can be relocated at Peterborough, they should be relocated accordingly. I have been told that, due to the upsurge of traffic that will take place with the standardisation of the railway line, there will be an increased demand for train crews.

Mr. Hamilton: When is that going to occur—10 years?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member should be patient. He had the opportunity to put forward his views, and I intend to make my contribution to this debate. As I was saying, I have been advised that there is a likelihood that there will be an increased demand for train crews.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Who told you that?

Mr. GUNN: The officials of A.N.R. I would suggest that the member for Mitchell take the trouble to go up and

arrange to meet the General Manager.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: We do know the general doctor. You have been advised.

Mr. GUNN: I often have discussions with Dr. Williams, who I would say is often not particularly pleased with me: I am fully aware of that.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You've had discussions with him and he assures you of that?

Mr. GUNN: I would suggest to the member for Mitchell that perhaps he had too good a dinner tonight, and I will ignore him, as I realise that interjections are out of order and I do not want to unduly delay the House. In conclusion, I suggest to the member for Stuart and others who have been loud in their condemnation of this particular exercise, in relation to the loss of jobs, that they have not put forward to the House any constructive alternatives as to how the railways could employ these people. It will be interesting for members of the House to hear these as both members have claimed to have had some experience in the railways area, yet they have not made any suggestions as to where the railways could employ these people.

Mr. Hamilton: Where could they?

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member was very loud in his criticisms of this matter. I understand that the former Minister of Transport, Mr. Virgo, supported this particular agreement, and I wonder what magic formula he put forward to the Commonwealth or the A.N.R. regarding how these people could be gainfully employed. I am the first to say that, if honourable members have any constructive comments to make, everyone will be pleased to hear what they are. During the last few years the honourable member would know that there has been a drastic cutback in the number of railway employees in my electorate. Owing to the use of concrete railway sleepers and heavy welded rails, Kingoonya will virtually be closed at Christmas time. We know that Oodnadatta is finished. Marree will have only three railway jobs left in the new year. At Wirrappa and some of those other little railway sidings, the houses are gone and it appears that most of the sidings across the Nullarbor will be removed and that there will be very few along the new line. I ask honourable members opposite, if they have any constructive criticism or alternative suggestions to make, to bring them forward.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How many discussions have you had with Dr. Williams?

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitchell has become quite paranoid in his attitude towards Dr. Williams.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: How many discussions?

Mr. GUNN: A number of discussions. I often see Dr. Williams during my regular visits to the far-flung areas of my constituency. I often see him, and I suggest that, if the honourable member wants to know anything more from Dr. Williams, he take the trouble to go and have a chat with him or with Mr. Smith. I am pleased that the Government has brought this legislation forward. The first piece of legislation, similar to this, was introduced in Parliament on the very first day that some of us sat here in 1970. It has taken over 10 years to bring about a meaningful agreement that will actually get the project on the way. It has taken two Liberal Governments to initiate it. In 10 years the Labor Party could not do anything about it. The Minister was quite right when he said that it was a part of our election policy, and he has used his good offices to get the project going.

I am concerned about the schedule, clause 5, page 11. If I were not to occupy the position that I will be occupying in Committee, I would have the opportunity to make some constructive criticisms about altering that. That will not be possible, however, so I support the measure, even though

I am concerned about the possible effects that this legislation will have on a number of my constituents in Peterborough. I hope that A.N.R. can find suitable alternative employment for those people in Peterborough.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): I agree that the provision of this railway line will be of great benefit to South Australia. We have heard that a standard gauge will simplify the use of the railways and remove the awkward and expensive bogie exchanges necessary to cope with the varying gauges in use in Australia today.

The conversion to a single full through railway concept is obviously much overdue, as is the easy access for our commodities and produce, and access to our ports and other things. I applaud the method applied to achieve this end. I believe that there are a couple of problems that the installation of standard gauge may bring to this State. I think that it will act against a specific State facility, the Outer Harbor terminal. I think that, once a standard gauge link is provided in Australia, the other ports and freight forwarders will move in and use the freight forwarding facility to be built at Islington to the detriment of the Outer Harbor facility. That facility is being supported by the major freight forwarding companies in this country, T.N.T., which is a recognised international company, and Brambles Ruys, which is also an international company. Also, I see in today's *News* that Mayne Nickless is now moving into the overseas field.

I think that that, linked with the impending amalgamation of the Storemen and Packers and Transport Workers Unions, which are the two major unions involved in cargo handling, will make a vast difference to the trade. I support the Bill in concept, because I think it is for the benefit of South Australia. However, I cannot support the Bill as it has been presented, particularly part 3 of the first schedule, which states:

Commencing at Gillman Yard "D" Cabin a new standard gauge line will be provided along the alignment of the existing State Transport Authority broad gauge Rosewater loop line to Port Adelaide "A" Cabin junction; thence continuing along the alignment of the existing State Transport Authority Up and Down broad gauge Adelaide to Outer Harbor lines to a point between Largs North and Draper stations approximately 16-80 km from Adelaide Railway Station; thence continuing generally north-easterly to cross Victoria Road, Largs North, at a point on the western boundary of section 387, hundred of Port Adelaide, approximately 50 metres south of the boundary of sections 387 and 427, hundred of Port Adelaide; thence continuing generally easterly through Port Block 4, Harbors Board Reserve adjacent to its southern boundary to connect with the existing Australian National Railways broad gauge railway tracks serving the Port Adelaide River frontage and Outer Harbor areas; thence continuing northerly to terminate at the Outer Harbor berths.

That route has been absolutely rejected by the people of the Semaphore electorate. Thousands of names have been signed to petitions rejecting that route. Those petitions have been sent to the S.T.A. and A.N.R. and, I think, to Canberra and to the Premier.

An honourable member: What about consultation?

Mr. PETERSON: There has been no consultation about the route. It came out more or less by accident in the first place and has been in this Bill since then, and is still there.

An honourable member: The member for Rocky River mentioned this matter.

Mr. PETERSON: I heard earlier that the member for Rocky River said he believed in consultation between local government authorities and the people of the area to select the most favourable route. This suggested route, as I

said, has been rejected by the people of the electorate of Semaphore. Every major industry in the area has rejected the route and written to people concerned giving reasons for this rejection.

Since June this year other routes have been under consideration by the Australian National Railways. I proposed that the line be directed along the river from Glanville to link up with the existing freight service link, which is an A.N.R. link, I believe, now, on the eastern side of the peninsula. It is the line of least disruption to people. It is also the most convenient.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I agree.

Mr. PETERSON: Then get them to change the route. Change the schedule and I will sit down. All the industries are on the eastern side of the peninsula. From the bridge all the way along the eastern side to Outer Harbor, we find oil depots, I.C.I., Hardie's Industries, and ETSA (although it is not there much now and does not use the line). On the eastern and northern sides of the peninsula there is 600 acres of undeveloped land. Also, the container terminal is at the northern end and Outer Harbor is at the end of the line.

There is absolutely no reason for any other route to be taken other than that link to the eastern corridor. No other route except the southern link to the Elder Road line is acceptable to the people of Semaphore.

Mr. Hamilton: What about crossing the river?

Mr. PETERSON: We would accept a bridge. If the line takes the route specified in the schedule, two houses will have to be demolished immediately. People have lived in one of those houses for 17 years since they built it. A family bought the other house in February this year to set up a new life because the house suited them, but they will have to leave. There are two aged persons villages and the train will run right along the back fence, causing disruption to these people in the twilight of their years because of freight trains running near the back fence day and night. The line will run past the school and a whole section of people at Largs North will have their life style completely disrupted.

As I said, there is general community rejection of this. This has been reflected in the public meetings held, petitions sent and phone calls made, and I know the Minister has had plenty of these. The State and Commonwealth Ministers have been contacted, as has the A.N.R., continuously since June this year, with no result. The State Minister of Transport suggested in the House last week (or hinted) that there might be an alternate route suggested this week when this Bill was introduced, but that has not come to light, so we are stuck with Part 3. Is there any other answer, or is that it? The Bill states that the route can be varied by consultation.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: And my agreement.

Mr. PETERSON: Yes. The thing that works against that clause is clause 5 of the Bill. If I vote for this Bill, the agreement is approved.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The agreement is approved, but we can vary it.

Mr. PETERSON: Why not vary it first? Why put it up as part of the schedule?

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I will explain it to the honourable member later.

Mr. PETERSON: I have plenty of time now. Clause 5 states:

- (1) The Agreement is approved.
- (2) The State consents to the construction, administration, operation and maintenance of the railway by the Commonwealth or the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement.
- (3) The State, the Transport Authority and each State

Authority are authorised and required to perform any provisions of the Agreement that are required by the Agreement to be performed by them.

If we agree to 5 (1), that means that that is it. That all points to my interpretation that, if I vote for this Bill, I support the first schedule, Part 3. I cannot accept that on behalf of the people I was elected to represent. I agree with the principle of a standard gauge railway and can see the benefits of it. I support the concept and, if that schedule was not there, I would be the first to vote for it, but I cannot. As Part 3 titled "Outer Harbor Connection" has been agreed to by the State and Commonwealth representatives, I will not be supporting this Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): Until I read the Minister's second reading explanation, I did not intend to enter this debate. When I read it, I thought what a hypocritical statement it was from a Minister of the Government. For years and years Liberal Party members have been criticising the attitude that we have taken in our efforts to standardise the rail system in this State and country. It was only one Government, the Whitlam Government of 1972, that set into effect the standardisation of the rail system. We got all the criticism from members opposite when we were in Government. I must admit that the present Minister was still working in his chemist shop, so he did not really have a chance to say anything about it, but the criticism we got was that Big Brother was stepping in and taking over the running of the State's railway system.

Mr. O'Neill: The Canberra octopus.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, that was used effectively in election campaigns. Then, when the agreement was reached by the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments for the transfer of the country railways, we heard all the talk from the present Government members who were then in Opposition. It is interesting that the present member for Rocky River is having to keep rushing backwards and forwards to get advice from the former member for Rocky River on how members of the present Government should react in this situation. It is interesting to see that the Minister, in his second reading explanation (I am sure he must have had his tongue in his cheek when he said this), stated:

The Liberal Government, in its election policy on transport, stressed the importance of this matter and promised to press ahead with all necessary negotiations with the Commonwealth.

Mr. O'Neill: How profound!

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes. Two years ago members opposite were saying that the Dunstan Government had sold a con trick on the people of this State. How things change in this area! When my colleague the member for Albert Park asked pertinent questions about how this possible agreement we are now debating would affect the workers of Peterborough and Port Pirie, the Minister was completely bemused and perplexed. He had not thought about the problem that railway workers would be retrenched. He is not really worried. I think that is basically what this is all about. He has received the instructions that the particular agreement has to go ahead and he has to toe the line.

Mr. Trainer: Acting like the willing pawns of the dead hand of Canberra.

Mr. HEMMINGS: One could say that. I used to think that the incumbent Minister of Transport had a little more sense but I think he is slowly sinking to the level of his compatriots. The Minister also said in his second reading explanation:

Such improvement is long overdue.

Again, how very profound! When I came to this

Parliament in 1977, not one member of the present Government, when in Opposition, was supporting the transfer between the Dunstan and Whitlam Governments of that time. Not even the member for Eyre was supporting it. That member always hedged his bets and more or less said that we should not really take over the country railways, because that was socialism. The member for Eyre does not really understand socialism. He could not even spell the word.

Mr. O'Neill: The member for hot air.

Mr. HEMMINGS: Yes, for hot air.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member, when referring to another member of this House, will use that member's correct title.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I thought I did not say anything else. What I would like to place on record in this House is what the Whitlam Government did for this State regarding the railways. That Government had the foresight to see that the railways of this State were totally inadequate. It had the courage to pass legislation so that the railways of this State would be adequate and it had the foresight to negotiate with the Government of the day to ensure that the country rail services would continue at that particular time.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are now debating a rail standardisation Bill, not the full ramifications of the railway system of South Australia, and I ask the honourable member to come back to the point. Otherwise, I will have to rule him out of order.

Mr. Millhouse: The point is that, if it had not been for the Liberal movement, none of this would have happened. It was our members in the other House that got the Bill through.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I would never ignore your remarks, Sir, but I will ignore those. The Bill we are debating tonight is connected with the agreement between the Whitlam and Dunstan Governments, because, if there had not been a Whitlam Government elected in 1972, we would still be existing with the inadequate railway system that existed then. Members opposite know that, but they are justifying themselves tonight. We have had the member for Rocky River, who is receiving rather poor advice from the Speaker's gallery, and we have had the member for Flinders, who suddenly has decided that he wants to be a socialist and work on getting the best for his district. I cannot think of any other country members around this area because there are very few on the Liberal Party side. I am sure that perhaps the member for Glenelg, who may wish to take part in this debate and talk about—

The SPEAKER: Order! Who will take part in the debate is a matter for the individual to determine and it is for the Chair to call that member. Each and every member called to take part in the debate is expected to connect their discussion and contribution to the measures contained in the Bill before the House. The honourable member for Napier will please contain himself to the Bill.

Mr. HEMMINGS: The member for Glenelg does need some encouragement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HEMMINGS: The reason why I quoted the member for Glenelg was that he, being a—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier has had ample warning of the consequence of moving away from the clauses of the Bill. It is my intention to call the next member to speak. The honourable member for Elizabeth.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Well, Sir, my

colleague having been summarily dismissed from the debate—

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a reflection on the Chair that the Chair will not accept.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Very good, Sir. I rise to speak in this debate but I must say that, in doing so, I am in rather some difficulties to know how to proceed, given your quite strict rulings. This is a second reading debate and I well recall in the past one particularly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. I have indicated previously that I will not accept any comment that is a reflection on a ruling of the Chair. If the honourable member still wishes to dwell on the reasons why the member for Napier was refused leave to continue, it is simply that the honourable member was warned on a number of occasions that it is important to link one's remarks to the clauses of the Bill, and the honourable member for Napier persistently refused so to do.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I hope that I will have the opportunity to contribute to this debate tonight because I want to make one point which I believe is of some importance. It relates to a very small part of the line covered by this agreement—the section joining Salisbury to the city of Adelaide. I want to refer to that section because, in essence, that will duplicate an existing line and will be the only part, except for the section between Crystal Brook and Port Pirie itself, that will duplicate an existing part of the rail system of this State at the present time. One of the grave difficulties that has racked the Australian railway system (or, to be more correct, the rail systems of the six States and the Commonwealth) for many generations past has been the appalling decisions that were made late last century in relation to gauge principally, and in particular in relation to where railways were to be built, and also the lack of co-ordination and foresight among the States and the respective Governments.

I believe that we have an important opportunity to very cheaply duplicate the existing suburban rail services from North Gawler to Adelaide by simply designing the standard gauge line between Salisbury and Adelaide so that a suburban rail link between Salisbury and the city could be established, with a train service providing all station stopping services between those two points. That would enable the passengers on trains from North Gawler to the city to have services that stopped at stations from North Gawler to Salisbury and then went express to the city. The Minister could argue that there is not that sort of demand at the present time. However, given the oil crisis and the inevitable demand for suburban rail traffic that will build up in the northern suburbs of Adelaide, I believe that we will be missing a very great opportunity if we let this chance pass by without at least doing the necessary engineering research on the matter.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Are you suggesting that we standardise the broad gauge?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I am suggesting that the standard gauge from Salisbury to the city (and I appreciate that it is proposing to go to Keswick and not to Adelaide railway station) should be built in such a way that in the future—even as soon as it is built—it could be used as an all-station stopping suburban track for Salisbury to Adelaide traffic. Members who have travelled into other parts of Australia and other metropolitan areas will know that Sydney has a good example of this. The line from Parramatta to Sydney Central is a six-track line, at least from Strathfield. From Strathfield to the city on the northern tracks trains run a regular service, stopping at all stations to the city. It enables trains from Blacktown,

Liverpool, Parramatta, Hornsby, and the like to go express from Strathfield to the city, or at least to Redfern. This ensures that people living in outer suburbs can get to the city in a very short time—much more quickly than they would otherwise be able to do.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They can use the ordinary broad gauge now.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: They can, but the broad gauge trains now stop at most stations. I am referring to peak periods. It is not possible now to run an express train from Salisbury to the city because the stopping all stations trains are already banked up on the line. I think the Minister has the point, which is an important one, and he has listened to me with considerable interest. That important consideration ought to be taken into account. I can well imagine that there will be a whole range of objections. For starters, the line at the moment is proposed to run on the west of the existing railway line, and therefore it would not be convenient possibly to use most of the existing stations for the stopping places on that line. However, I do think that we have a very good opportunity with this Bill and this new line to at least design it so that in the future the necessary investment could be made to enable it to be linked up in the manner that I have suggested. I have little doubt that in a few years time suburban rail traffic will be needed to a much greater extent than it is presently.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is certainly on the North Gawler line. I see that you, Mr. Speaker, are nodding. I am not sure whether you are agreeing with me or whether you are nodding to one of the persons leaving the Chamber. However, I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, would appreciate the benefit of this proposal, as much as my constituents, and the constituents of the member for Napier would appreciate it. It would provide a service that would give the best of both worlds. Commuters on the outer fringe of the northern suburbs would be able to travel to the city much more quickly. Those who live in the nearer northern suburbs would also be able to have a regular service, and would not have to be the bunnies on the end of the line who always have to stand up on crowded trains. At least on the morning services it is always the people in the nearer suburbs who suffer the problem of having to stand.

It might be argued at present that there is no immediate need for it. I would not claim to be an expert and to be able to foresee exactly what the demand for rail services will be. However, I would make one point which is quite telling. If members cast their minds back to three or four years ago, they would not have foreseen the dramatic change that has taken place in urban transport in this country even in that time. In this State there has been a dramatic change, and such changes are likely to continue. At present, the change has principally been from larger motor vehicles to smaller ones. However, I believe that is part of the transition. People will simply find that they cannot afford private motor vehicle transport in the way in which we have had it and enjoyed it in the past. They will be forced to rethink their travel arrangements and their mobility in general. When that occurs, demands will be on the Government for the provision of much more efficient urban public transport services. I think these demands will be irresistible.

I would foreshadow that one of the demands will be for a duplication of the suburban service on the North Gawler line. I believe that this service that we are now proposing to build does provide the potential for the basis of such a service. I want to emphasise that I am not suggesting that we establish such a service at the moment, but I think that

the engineering design of the service should look to the future and should take into account the matters that I have raised tonight with a view to designing the line so that at some future date it can be linked up in the fashion that I have suggested and can be used for urban commuters travelling between Salisbury, Elizabeth, Gawler, and the city.

As I have said, I am not an expert in these matters. As a member of the House some years ago, I recall that the member for the former seat of Heysen always had a great interest in these matters. He was much more able to contribute to such debates than I ever would be able to.

Mr. Max Brown: He brought the subject of railways into every debate.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am reminded by the member for Whyalla that Mr. McAnaney had a great capacity for bringing railways into every issue raised in the House. I will link up those remarks in a moment with the Bill. I remember that, on one occasion, he was speaking in the homosexual reform Bill debate. He said that he had not intended to do so, but he was concerned that these practices might become prevalent on the railway system. When it was pointed out to him that the legislation concerned consenting adults in private, he proceeded to apologise to the House and say that he could see that there would not be any great difficulty. His interest in railway matters should be noted by members, because the railway system is one of which we, as the successors of many members and as the successor associates of many members of other Parliaments in this country, have made a complete and utter bungle. I think that it is about time that we started to take a much longer-range view of the importance of rail transport in this country.

I hope that the comments that I have made tonight, which affect only one small part of the system and which, I am sure, could be effected without very much difficulty, represent the kind of forward thinking that ought to go into our rail system. I commend the Bill, but I know that certain problems arise from it. I am saddened to think that people in towns, particularly in Peterborough and Terowie, will be put out of work. I think that the history of service of people in those towns to the railway system of this State has been truly magnificent and wonderful over a long period. I, for one, am saddened to see those towns withering on the line, as it were, as the result of the decisions that have to be made in the interests of progress.

I make one further point. I still think that there is a firm solidly based community in Peterborough, and I think that this Government, having taken a decision (a correct decision, and I want that put on record) that fundamentally affects the interests of people in Peterborough, particularly, to a great extent, should, as a matter of its responsibility, look to what other alternative Government activities (or private, if available, but I assume that private industry is unlikely to be greatly attracted to Peterborough) could be established in Peterborough to provide employment for the people who will be replaced and to ensure the continuing economic survival of that important historic community in this State.

I will not labour this point, but I raise it seriously for the consideration not of this Minister, but of the Government generally, that, when it is contemplating its plans for new prisons around South Australia, Peterborough be given some consideration, because I think that a town of that size could well accommodate a small to medium-size country prison. The House knows my views on the point of smaller prisons.

An honourable member: There aren't any criminals there.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: There are no criminals at

Gladstone, and few at Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier. Long-term non-security risk prisoners can be accommodated in such places, and there is an argument in favour of small and medium-size gaols as against large prisons, and New South Wales is realising that now. Mr. Speaker, I think you for your particular generosity in relation to my comments tonight which, while I have related them to the Bill, have been possibly somewhat wider than the ambit that you might have allowed me.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport): I thank Opposition members for supporting the Bill, although I really did not expect that they would do anything other than that, given the past history of events, but I appreciate the Deputy Leader's saying that the Opposition would support the Bill. He said he recognised the importance of the Bill, and the Government is grateful for that. However, I will make some remarks about the contribution of some members. I will begin with the contribution of the Deputy Leader by pointing out that, at no stage in my remarks on this matter, either outside or inside the House, have I ever reflected on the work done by my predecessor (Mr. Virgo) and his colleagues in trying to obtain standardisation of this important link for South Australia. At no stage have I ever decried their efforts and will in trying to obtain this standardisation. I think that the Deputy Leader must have misinterpreted my remarks at some stage to have formed that conclusion.

I also point out that he was very critical of some of the remarks I made in my second reading explanation regarding the transport policy of the State Liberal Government. I will place some facts on record for the Deputy Leader and his Opposition colleagues, including the member for Napier, whose contribution to this debate should well be forgotten by most members. The Deputy Leader, or one of his colleagues, accused me of hypocrisy.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I never used the word.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Then, it must have been another honourable member, and I apologise to the Deputy Leader. Does the Deputy honestly believe that, the fact that, after the State election, when this Government came to office, within three weeks of that date I was over in Canberra discussing this important asset to the State with the Federal Minister for Transport had nothing to do with bringing this railway agreement to the fruition we are seeing now? Does he honestly believe that the numerous conversations and communications that the Premier had with the Prime Minister had nothing to do with bringing this agreement to fruition?

The Hon. J. D. Wright: No, I don't.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Does the Deputy Leader honestly believe that the negotiations that have been carried out by my officers over the past few months in very difficult negotiating sessions have had nothing to do with bringing this agreement to fruition? Does the Deputy Leader believe that our having an agreement that absolves this State from paying an actual financial cost towards the construction of this railway has nothing to do with the negotiations that have taken place between this Government and the Federal Government? It is because of this Government's negotiations with the Federal Government, because of this Government's transport policy before the last election and the promises that were

made therein, and because we have honoured those promises (indeed, we did it very quickly) that we are debating this agreement this evening.

I want to dwell on the point made by the Deputy Leader regarding the 1974 Bill, because he said some very truthful things about it. I did not know, but I accept the Deputy Leader's word that the former Government of which he was a member was dissatisfied with what was known as the Maunsell plan, the master plan and the 1974 agreement. In 1976, the cost of that plan was \$146 000 000. Of course, as the Deputy Leader said (although I think he got confused later), the South Australian people were to pay 30 per cent of that sum, which is a lot of money.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: I said that.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the Deputy Leader did, and I have just said that he did. I believe (and he can correct me if I am wrong) that the Deputy Leader then went on to say that that money was returned to us under the railways transfer agreement. I do not know whether that was the exact import of what the Deputy Leader said, but that is not the case. Certainly, a project was formed with that 1974 railway agreement. Under that joint project between the Federal and State Governments, certain amounts of property were purchased. Indeed, the State did have to make a contribution on a ratio of 30 per cent. At least, it was supposed to do so. However, it did not do so, because the Commonwealth lent it the contribution. However, under this agreement, the \$860 000 interest that South Australia has already paid on the 1974 agreement will be repaid to this State on completion of this agreement. That is all that I wish to say about that matter. I do not think that it advances the cause to discuss any more the question of what has gone on in the past. We are concerned now with this agreement and the future for South Australia.

I mention one thing that was referred to by the member for Rocky River, who canvassed this matter at length. Indeed, the honourable member made an excellent speech in which he enumerated the advantages that this standardisation would bring to South Australia. He referred to the Wallaroo-Snowtown standardisation. I must say that that is not included in the agreement that we are now debating. However, I assure the honourable member that it is very much a live issue in negotiations between my officers and those of the Australian National Railways Commission. I also assure the honourable member that we will pursue that standardisation. I believe that some length of that line is already standardised; the member for Albert Park may know what length has already been standardised. I believe that there is a real chance of the Wallaroo-Snowtown link being standardised after the completion of the other branch lines that we will be discussing later.

I want now to refer to the most important issue, in human terms, that is connected with this rail standardisation agreement, other than the actual standardisation and the railway work itself. I refer to the effect that this agreement will have on northern towns, particularly Peterborough and Port Pirie.

The members for Stuart and Albert Park (I believe that the member for Elizabeth also mentioned it) referred to the matter of unemployment and the effect that this agreement will have on those towns. The member for Eyre also mentioned this matter considerably in his remarks. I must say that I foresaw fairly soon after (I must admit that I did not foresee it immediately) we started negotiating that this would be a very grave human problem. As I have already told the House, I wrote to the Federal Minister of Transport. Indeed, I spoke to him many times about it and, on behalf of the State Government and the people of

Port Pirie and Peterborough, urged him to treat the A.N.R. employees in both those towns with the greatest amount of humanity and compassion in the restructurings of the operation of A.N.R. that were to occur because of the standardisation agreement. The Federal Minister wrote back to me (I have already told the House about this) assuring me that this would be done. However, it is quite easy for one to put things on paper but it is not always so easy for one to carry out those things.

I believe, from the discussions that I have had with him, that the Federal Minister is equally as concerned as I am about this issue. I assure members opposite that the State Government will continue to press for equitable treatment for those particularly unfortunate people who may lose their jobs in that location. We must realise, of course, that A.N.R. has given an undertaking that these people will not lose their jobs *per se*.

It is all very well to say that, but it is not so easy for one to be relocated to another town when one has set down one's roots in a certain area. We realise this. The question of A.N.R. employees is not (nor could it be) a part of the agreement. However, I assure the House that we will be pursuing the welfare of those people, certainly to our best endeavours.

I compliment those members who realised that this issue was the most important one, in human terms, connected with a standardisation agreement. In fact, the member for Albert Park also referred to several pertinent matters, some of which we may be able to discuss in Committee. He referred to such things as the Dry Creek bogie exchange, and said that he was still unsure of the exact location of some of these installations. The honourable member said that he was also unsure about what would happen with the freight centre at Islington and about how the A.N.R. would operate the freight centre at Islington.

I must tell the honourable member, and indeed the House, that the final route and land requirements are subject to detailed survey. That is clearly mentioned in the agreement; the detailed survey must still take place. There has not yet been time to carry out that detailed survey, so I cannot give the honourable member for Albert Park that detailed information. However, I undertake to let him have it as soon as it is obtainable and as soon as the survey work has been carried out.

The freight centre at Islington, which will be of extreme importance to the future of this State, and to Adelaide as a capital, will be operated by Australian National Railways. The member for Albert Park may have noticed advertisements in the press asking for freight forwarding companies to register their interest in having facilities at the freight centre at Islington, and the A.N.R. intends to put spur lines into the industrial estate at Regency Park. Once again, I cannot give the exact details and the exact locations, but I will try to get that information for the honourable member as soon as they are finalised, although I cannot say when that will be.

The member for Albert Park also mentioned the rail standardisation study. I have become confused, because I think that over past weeks the member for Albert Park and I have been talking about two different things. Was the honourable member talking about a report prepared under the former Government?

Mr. Hamilton: No, a study initiated by the previous Government into the effects of the standard gauge in metropolitan Adelaide.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The effects of this standard gauge or converting the present S.T.A. broad gauge to standard gauge—the whole metropolitan system?

Mr. Hamilton: Yes.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The report is not yet

finished, and its completion is a long way off. I cannot understand how I would have let the honourable member know that it would be finished in October. I think we have been talking about different things, but I shall explain that to him at another time.

I will not dwell much longer on the matter now, because I believe we should get the Bill into Committee as soon as possible. I commend the member for Elizabeth on his very constructive contribution to the debate—not the member for Napier, but the member for Elizabeth. I will take up what the member for Elizabeth has said. I understand now what he means, and I believe that it has merit. The honourable member is quite correct with his predictions of the future trend of rail transport, especially on the Gawler, Christie Downs and Noarlunga lines. There is merit in what he said, and we can discuss the matter with the A.N.R. Commission. It is the commission's line, and if we run our public transport on it we would have to pay running rights, but that is negotiable. Depending on the requirements on the line by A.N.R., it may well be possible to use that as a duplicate line. It would be necessary to have special standard gauge rolling stock in the S.T.A. fleet, but I think that could be overcome.

The member for Elizabeth also said that the Government should consider the town of Peterborough, in particular, in the provision of future facilities and future development. I have been thinking along those lines. As the member for Eyre said, he and I went to Peterborough only last week. We talked to the officials in the town, the corporation, and we went to the A.N.R. workshops and talked to the leading hands and the men. We went to the bogie exchange and talked to the men there. We got their views, and everything said here tonight reflects the views of the employees at Peterborough. It was an important experience for me, as I believe it was for the member for Eyre, and I have formulated the idea that perhaps we can compensate in some way for the effects that this project may have on the town of Peterborough. That is something I would want to discuss further with the member for Eyre, in whose district Peterborough is situated.

The standardisation of the line from Adelaide to Crystal Brook will bring immense benefits to South Australia. I will not enumerate them again, but I believe that the State is on the verge of a very large expansion which will be aided considerably by this standardisation project. We are in very exciting times, in relation to the expansion of railways services, with the completion of the line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs, the statement that that line will be pushed through to Darwin, and the Adelaide to Crystal Brook standardisation.

To add to all of that, one of the most critical things for South Australia is, as was mentioned by the member for Eyre, the standardisation of the Adelaide to Melbourne line. I know that that is the busiest line on the A.N.R. system and that the standardisation and the probable eventual electrification of the Adelaide to Melbourne line are of vital importance to South Australia. It cannot be overlooked by whatever Government is in power in this State. The Chairman of the A.N.R., Mr. Keith Smith, has admitted the very serious problems existing with the Adelaide to Melbourne line at the moment, and I imagine that most members of the House would be aware of them. There is the question of insufficient crossing loops between Adelaide and Serviceton, and the delays to passenger traffic on the Overland are legion. The condition of the line between Serviceton and Melbourne needs close attention very shortly. The question of our containers coming from Melbourne by rail also puts this State at a disadvantage. Your remarks, Mr. Deputy Speaker, on the eventual standardisation of the Adelaide

to Melbourne link are extremely important, and I commend you on your views.

The member for Semaphore has said that he will be unable to support clause 5 of the Bill, the clause in which the agreement is contained, because it contains in the description of the railway work the route for the linking of the container terminal at Outer Harbor with the standard gauge. The route goes through the middle of LeFevre Peninsula, and that is the route that his constituents most oppose. For the benefit of the member for Semaphore, I want to set out clearly what is happening, so that he can understand exactly what the situation is. Before the honourable member approached me about his constituents, I had realised that we would have problems with that route. At that stage, many months ago, I instructed my officers, together with officers of the Highways Department (and I enlisted the support of the Minister of Marine, so that we could get officers from the Department of Marine and Harbors) to enter into negotiations with A.N.R. forthwith to see whether we could vary that route. As I told the House last week, a decision is imminent. The committee has met on several occasions and recommendations have been made. The member for Semaphore will realise that there are three routes, and the route he would like to see instituted is the Dunnikier Road route. The three routes are now with the South Australian Department for the Environment for assessment of an environmental effects statement prepared by A.N.R.

As I understand it, the environmental effects statement does not recommend any particular route: it just gives the environmental effects of the three routes. After the South Australian Department for the Environment has assessed that statement, it will be time for the A.N.R. to decide which route to choose. I hope that the A.N.R. will take the advice that has been given to it by the officers of my department and the department under the control of the Minister of Marine and Harbors, and that we can announce to the honourable member that route in the near future. I am trying to explain to the member for Semaphore why we cannot make an announcement now—because there has been no final decision.

All that I can ask of the member for Semaphore is that he show some patience mixed perhaps with optimism. The honourable member also mentioned that he was worried about clause 17 in the agreement, which gives the State Minister the right to agree to a change of line in the schedule. In other words, that particular clause in the agreement gives the Minister the right, initiated by the Commonwealth Minister, to agree to a change of route. So, in fact, the House should be under no illusion that none of the routes can be altered, as long as the agreement of the State is obtained. I can assure the member for Semaphore that, if the A.N.R. and the Commonwealth Minister recommended to me that we should have the Dunnikier Road route (and I am sure we would do that if the A.N.R. recommended it), there would be little chance that the State Minister also would not agree. I can assure the honourable member that that is the position. If the honourable member still wishes to oppose that clause, that is his decision, but by opposing it he is opposing the whole railway agreement and the provision of standard gauge between Adelaide and Crystal Brook. That is the one clause covering the whole of the railway work.

Finally, I was not particularly impressed by the contribution of the member for Flinders on the question of the line between Merriton and Crystal Brook. As the Minister representing the State Government, I received deputations from all the interested parties in that unfortunate dispute. I made representations to the Commonwealth on behalf of all those interested parties, as

I had to as the State Minister, and I had to do that in an even-handed way, which is what I did. The former member for Rocky River has cause to believe that he was not well treated in the whole affair.

Bill read a second time.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he must confine his remarks to a personal explanation.

Mr. OLSEN: The member for Flinders earlier this evening quoted from a letter he wrote wherein he said that the District Council of Crystal Brook had sought my assistance, which was true. However, he went on to say that I was reluctant to assist the council in its request for the railway line entering via route No. 1. The correct facts are that my office made the arrangements for the deputation that met Dr. Williams, General Manager of the A.N.R., at the request of the District Council of Crystal Brook, and I was happy to do so. In addition, I arranged for council to meet the State Minister on the issue, as well as writing to my Federal colleagues advising them of council's attitude. Further, on behalf of council, I met with the State Minister of Transport and the Director-General to inquire and thus determine under the State railways agreement whether in fact the South Australian Government had some prerogative in relation to the particular route that the standard gauge rail link would take. After seeking that advice on behalf of the council, I then advised it that the State Government had rights in relation to the closure of railway lines but in fact had no rights in relation to an extension or routing of lines. In addition, at the request of the council, I arranged for Senator Jessop to visit Crystal Brook and meet the council to discuss the issue which I had raised with him in correspondence previously, pointing out the attitude of the council. I refer to the advice that I gave the council following discussions with the State Minister of Transport and the Director-General, and I referred to that in my speech earlier today. Had the member for Flinders been present, he would have heard it.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have listened carefully to the personal explanation, and it seems to me that the explanation is straying beyond the bounds of a personal explanation and getting towards the area of debating the question. I would appreciate your ruling on this matter.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order. I did point out to the member for Rocky River prior to his receiving leave to make a personal explanation that he must confine his remarks to a personal explanation, and I have been listening carefully to what the honourable member has had to say. I suggest that the honourable member continue his personal explanation only to inform the House of the matters that he believes may have been incorrectly quoted. The member for Rocky River.

Mr. OLSEN: I have quoted the facts as related to the District Council of Crystal Brook specifically upon its request of action on my part. I know that the council and the community are aware of my action on this subject, even if the member for Flinders is ignorant of or ignores those facts.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Commencement."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: As I understand the proposition put to me during the personal explanation of the member for Rocky River (and I could not listen to

both), we will go through the clauses, and then the schedule will be dealt with later. Is that the situation?

The CHAIRMAN: The effect of clause 5, if approved, is to agree to the contents of the schedule to the Bill. The appropriate time to debate the schedule is therefore on the question that clause 5 stand as printed.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Members should be entitled to ask any questions under clause 5, which is the crux of the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: During the debate on clause 5, the honourable member would be quite in order in raising any matters referred to in the schedule of the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: With great respect, Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that clause 5 is all that is in the Bill and covers the whole situation. Once clause 5 is passed, there does not seem to be any more in the Bill, so to restrict questioning or comments directed to the Minister to what is in the schedule would not cover the discussions that ensued in the second reading debate. There were many varied questions and topics raised in the debate, and I think that we should be able, under clause 5, to ask any question pertaining to what was raised in the debate, and that we should not have to adhere strictly to the schedule.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the honourable member that in the Committee stage we do not have as wide-ranging a debate as we have during the second reading stage, when we are actually dealing with the principles of the Bill. When the Committee is discussing clause 5 the honourable member is entitled to refer to any matters referred to in the schedule of the Bill, and in the remaining clauses of the Bill the honourable member will be able to refer to matters pertinent to those clauses. I assure the honourable member that the Chair does not intend to be strict in this matter, but I have to point out that as long as the matters are referred to in clause 5 and the schedule I will allow them to be raised.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: If clause 5 is passed, the agreement is approved. I want to inform the Deputy Leader that the agreement contains almost anything that he would want to refer to: it refers to all the railway work, the financing, and the route itself. Questions that were raised on those matters in the second reading debate would all be covered by the agreement. I cannot see anything of a particular nature that would not be covered under clause 5.

Clause passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Approval and carrying out of agreement."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I wish to make a comment and then ask the Minister a question about the employment situation. As the Minister has said, this is a serious problem particularly for the people of Peterborough and Port Pirie. The Minister said that he had written to the Federal Minister about this situation. I was in Peterborough immediately following the announcement that an estimated 140 people could lose their jobs in the course of the standardisation project. As this was some time ago, I do not know whether that figure is static, or whether it has increased or decreased. Can the Minister tell the Committee the actual figure? It concerned me vitally that 140 people would have to uproot themselves from their homes and move somewhere else. I know that we talk of relocating people as one of the things that can be done these days, which I suppose is all right in itself; it is certainly better than having no job at all. However, if one lives in a town as most of those workers have done for most of their working lives, it is not easy to have to move, because they lose their homes and friends, and so on. It is one of the social problems that modernisation and

progress cause in whatever industry one is in, but it does not mean that we have to like it or accept it. We must find proper solutions for people affected by this situation, whether it is brought about by technological change, modernisation, or anything else.

The Peterborough people themselves indicated to me the effect that this would have on the town. It is not a large town, as members know, and to immediately take what could be 280 people out of the work force in a place like Peterborough would have drastic effects on the local business community. It would have an effect on the schools, the abattoirs and the hotels. The town would be vitally affected by the loss of that number of people. As I have said, I do not know what the latest situation is; I do not know whether that figure has decreased, although I certainly hope it has. Concerning the uprooting of these people at Port Pirie and particularly at Peterborough, what guarantee has the Minister been able to receive from the A.N.R.? I know that it has been said that these people would be placed in some type of employment, but I want to know whether the Minister has been able to ascertain whether they would be given an opportunity to choose employment and whether they would have similar classifications and similar rates of pay to those they now enjoy. If similar classifications are not possible, then of course the next thing is at least maintaining the rates of pay. Can the Minister outline the position regarding these employees?

Also, can he say exactly when the uprooting may occur? Finally (and this is more a State matter than a State-Federal matter), what plans does the Government have to keep Peterborough a viable country town? It is most important for us to know that at this stage, and it would appear to me that the Government must have given some thought to this matter. I do not think it is too early to tell the Parliament and the people of South Australia exactly what plans the Government has in this regard.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The latest figures that I have indicate that somewhere between 101 and 113 people are affected. When I was at Peterborough last week talking to the men in the paint shop, I found that half their number had already gone. In the particular paint shop that the member for Eyre and I visited, the leading hand told us that half his complement had already gone. That may be why there is a discrepancy in the figures that we have been hearing. At one stage, the figure of 140 was mentioned, and now it is possibly 113. I shall try to obtain from the A.N.R. the exact figure involved, although it has been said in correspondence that the number is 113. On the question of relocation of those employees, the only agreement that I have from the Federal Government is that they will not be disadvantaged, other than that some of them may have to leave the town of Peterborough to find work elsewhere, such as at Port Pirie, Port Augusta, or Adelaide.

I am not underplaying that as a serious disruption for a worker and his family. I believe that to have lived for most of one's life in a particular location and to have become part of the community and then to be disrupted by an event such as this can be, in some circumstances, tragic. I do not think that that is too strong a word to use in some circumstances. All I can do is tell the Deputy Leader that I will pursue negotiations with the Commonwealth. The question of the employees is not part of this particular agreement, and that is why I wrote separately to the Federal Minister. As soon as I realised that that was not to be part of the agreement, I contacted the Federal Minister officially on this point and got his assurance about what I have just said. However, that does not mean we should rest there, and I will certainly do what I can to cover the

other points that the Deputy Leader mentioned in his remarks a moment ago.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What about the Government's own plans?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I did answer that point when I spoke about the contribution made by the member for Elizabeth, who also mentioned that point. I cannot tell the Deputy Leader now what the Government's plans are because they are not formulated. I can tell him that it is under consideration.

Mr. PETERSON: I am well aware that Government officers have been involved in the investigation of alternate routes. It is my sincere belief that they support the Dunnikier Road route on the Peninsula. I realise that I will be voting against the entire Bill if I vote against this clause, but I am not aware of any other method open to me to register the point I wish to make. Under Part IV, "The Railway and Railway Work", clause 17 (1) only gives the State Minister the right to approve an alteration and not to initiate an alteration. Where do we stand if the A.N.R. decides upon the Largs North or Osborne route? What right of appeal have we, or are we left with no recourse whatever? I believe that the Minister supports the Dunnikier Road route, but it is possible that, if I support the Bill, I will find out next month or next year that I supported the laying of a railway track in an area in which I sincerely believed it should not go. I want to know where we stand if they decide to use a route that is just not acceptable.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Whatever the agreement says, I did initiate discussions with the Commonwealth. I did initiate a review of the route, whether it says I ought to or not. The honourable member will have to take my word for that. Those discussions have proceeded apace. I am trying to tell the member for Semaphore that I cannot tell him what the route is going to be when a final decision has not yet been made. I cannot help the honourable member out of his dilemma. He has to weigh the State's interests and national interests against the interests of his electorate. I know that it is difficult, because I have had problems myself in that regard. The honourable member has that decision to make, and I warn him that if he opposes this clause he opposes the whole standardisation agreement. I can give him no more guarantees. I have done everything I can for his constituents and him. As I told the honourable member before, I initiated the discussion with the Commonwealth before he came to me about the matter. In fact, I was ahead of him on this occasion.

Mr. PETERSON: Have we a right of appeal? Can we get it altered if they decide to take a particular route?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am advised that we do have a right of appeal.

Mr. PETERSON: I will support the Bill so long as we have a right of appeal.

Mr. HAMILTON: There are a number of questions I raised with the Minister previously relating to the line from Bowmans to Kadina and that section of track between Balaklava and Bowmans which, as the Minister would be aware, carries a considerable amount of grain to the port of Wallaroo. Is the Minister aware of the intention of the commission in respect of cartage of grain to Wallaroo? Is it the intention of the commission to not use that section of track between Bowmans and Kadina? Alternatively, is it the intention of the commission to rail grain via Snowtown to Wallaroo?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I cannot answer the honourable member's question. I am not aware of the commission's plans for that. I will undertake to find out and let the honourable member know. In fact, I will refer

the matter to my officers, who have been doing the negotiating, and get an answer for the honourable member as soon as possible.

Mr. HAMILTON: Turning again to the point I raised about the socio-economic study, has the Minister or A.N.R. requested a socio-economic study for Peterborough and Port Pirie? If so, is it possible to ascertain the results of that survey? Also, is the Minister aware of the action of the New South Wales Government in purchasing the homes of employees who, because their jobs have become redundant, are required to transfer to another locality? The New South Wales Government purchases the home when an employee cannot get market value for that home. If the Minister is not aware of that, will he investigate this matter and make representations about it to the A.N.R. Commission?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I was not aware of that last point. I will look into it for the honourable member. However, if houses become redundant to A.N.R. requirements they will eventually revert to the State. I know what the honourable member is worried about, that employees receive a reasonable market value for their homes. I was not aware of the New South Wales provision, but it is something I will take on board. Turning to the matter of a socio-economic study, to my knowledge there has not been one done. If there had been, I would certainly make it available to the honourable member and other members who wish to see it. It may not be too late to press for that to happen.

Mr. Millhouse: What exactly is a "socio-economic study"? It has been talked about by the member for Albert Park all day.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member for Mitcham wishes to raise any matters, he must wait for the call. The honourable Minister.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I was going to answer the member for Mitcham, but I will leave that to the member for Albert Park.

Mr. HAMILTON: If the member for Mitcham comes and sees me I will give him a copy of the study done in 1975 in Western Australia. It was a socio-economic study carried out on the closure of railway yards there.

Regarding the signalling alterations in the metropolitan area, can the Minister advise on any negotiations that have taken place with A.N.R. and the State Transport Authority in respect of what type of signalling will be initiated in the metropolitan area? In particular, I refer to the centralised traffic control installation and, as I understand it, the proposed amalgamation of three or four signalling boxes under the auspices of the central traffic control system that currently operates.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Those negotiations still have to take place and take place in some detail. I cannot help the member on that. He is very knowledgeable in railway matters and I would expect that sort of question from him because he does his homework on these things very well. I cannot give him any answer, because the detailed negotiations have not taken place.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have to point out to the honourable member for Albert Park that Standing Order 422 provides that, in Committee, a member may not speak more than three times to any one question. He has already spoken three times and, therefore, cannot speak again to this question.

Mr. BLACKER: I noted with interest the comments that other members and the Minister made in the second reading debate and I regret that there was ever a need that I should have to be drawn into this problem, because it is way outside my area. Members of the district council deemed it necessary to seek all assistance that was

available. That is how I came to be involved. I also question the wisdom of the comments by other members who have seen fit to go completely against the wishes of the council in their criticism of my views.

My only request was that the views of the council be heard in the consultation on any route as it enters at or near Crystal Brook. It got back to the point that the council was consulted when route No. 1 was first proposed in December 1979, and it was not until rumours circulated around the district about three months after that an alternative route came up and later it was confirmed that the alternative route was then the proposed route, without any consultation with the council. It was then that the council became involved and sought my assistance. I note even in this schedule, printed on 21 August this year, that there is still no delineation of the actual site and it is still subject to survey and other requirements. Will the Minister do everything in his power to see that the District Council of Crystal Brook is fully consulted on this measure?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Once again, it is like the matter raised by the member for Semaphore. In the case of that member, the delineation is there. In the case of this vexed issue it was deliberately made vague, of course, because of the unfortunate political circumstances that surrounded the whole issue. The A.N.R. has made the decision, I understand. All the representations have been made. At some stage, I will receive a communication from the Federal Minister for Transport delineating the route and it will be up to me, as State Minister, to agree. Obviously, if all this business has been gone through and all the studies have been made into routes (and I have expressed my regret at what happened at Crystal Brook), I will have no course but to agree, especially if members understand that this agreement is referring to what was known as scheme 1.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister what he may consider a peculiar question. In my view, it has merit, because I am not able to properly analyse the schedule where the agreement is contained. Obviously, the Minister has had Crown Law advice, the best legal advice and the best brains that his department can provide to advise him. I have not that facility at the moment. It should not be long before I have it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: How long is that?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister should not get too upset.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must stick to the clause.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Is the Minister satisfied completely with all clauses in the agreement, and exactly what scrutiny has the rumour been given and by whom, and were there any areas where his Government was not quite satisfied with the terms of the agreement?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I thank the Deputy Leader for that question, because I think it is very relevant and probably one that would be asked of any Minister who was bringing forward an agreement such as this. No, I am not particularly satisfied with many things in the agreement but, on balance, I think we have done very well. We will agree to give A.N.R. title to a large amount of land in the metropolitan area parallel to our own railway tracks, and it will be theirs. We lose all rights, as a State, to that land. I understand we even lose the mineral rights, which is quite extraordinary.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We'll be unlucky if they find gold there.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, or uranium. I am not particularly happy with that. I should have thought that we could come up with a joint ownership scheme. This was

discussed carefully with my officers in the negotiation stage, and we had representatives from Crown Law in the negotiating team, as well as my officers, including the Director-General. I am not particularly happy about this matter but I am happy that that is all we are giving to the Commonwealth: we are giving land. We are not paying for the standardisation.

That land is worth a lot of money, but we are giving it, and are not paying one-third of the cost of standardisation, which is estimated at \$68 000 000 and may be more by the time it is finished. I am very pleased about that. The other thing we have negotiated is that, although it is not delineated in here as anything that will take place immediately, we have negotiated the extension to Outer Harbor. I, the Premier, and the Government believed that that was extremely important. We negotiated very hard. We requested that, so in some respects we are in the position of a supplicant.

We believed it extremely important to get that connection to Outer Harbor. I hope that the Deputy Leader agrees with the benefit of bringing the standard gauge from any State to Outer Harbor. It is a tremendous asset. The Minister of Industrial Affairs was one Minister who pressed me very hard on this matter. Taken on balance, I am happy with what we have gained in the negotiations. I believe they have been very successful. I will mention one instance that I was not particularly happy about: we have given up a bit of our birthright.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Any other matters?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. A.N.R. is now talking about a Wallaroo-Snowtown link. That is not in here but it is something that we can activate if A.N.R. agrees. There was also mention of a Lonsdale link eventually and Mitsubishi being put on the standard gauge. This is a bit further off into the future. I am not particularly happy that the interstate passenger terminal will be at Keswick. I would have preferred it to be Adelaide Railway Station, but it is vitally important to keep the standard gauge to the west of the broad gauge.

We cross it at places like Dry Creek (only crossing single lines) but once we start to cross from the western side into the Adelaide railway yards across broad gauge lines we have significant problems in relation to cost and signalling, as the member for Albert Park would assure us. It makes good sense to keep the standard gauge to the west. I ask honourable members to look very closely at that. The honourable member asked whether there is anything else that I am not happy about. A.N.R. will need to take a piece of parklands in North Adelaide, and no doubt that will upset the Lord Mayor.

Mr. Millhouse: How much?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I cannot give the member for Mitcham the exact area. I do not envisage it to be very much.

Mr. Millhouse: A hectare or a half a hectare?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: About a quarter of an acre, I am informed.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: What is the location?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is by the North Adelaide crossing. I believe we can help the city council by making other land available from S.T.A. land resources, and I want to do that. I hope that that answers the Deputy Leader's question. Some things I am happy with, and other things I am unhappy with. On balance, I believe that it is a good agreement to the State.

Mr. KENEALLY: Earlier this evening the member for Albert Park read a letter to the House written by the branch secretary of the Australian Railways Union to Dr. Williams, the General Manager of A.N.R. In that he canvassed certain matters. The Minister did not answer

one of the specific issues raised in this letter, and I quote it again in part, as follows:

It has been brought to my executive's attention that the A.N.R. intends to delay the connection of the Islington standard gauge yard with the Mile End and Keswick complex for some 18 months after the completion of the Crystal Brook to Islington project. My executive was further informed that goods loaded at Mile End for the West and New South Wales via Broken Hill will have to be bogie exchanged at Islington and that passengers between Adelaide and Port Pirie will be transported by bus. Should this information be correct, we consider it to be most unsatisfactory and most detrimental to both the A.N.R. operations and the general public.

He goes on to inform the General Manager that the following resolution had been passed:

That the South Australian branch of the A.R.U. insists that the proposed new standard gauge complex at Keswick and Mile End be simultaneously constructed and connected with the main standard gauge line Crystal Brook/Dry Creek. I think the Minister has indicated that he has a very close working relationship with A.N.R. as to what it intends to do on the city end of the standardising of the rail link. Is the Minister able to say whether he is aware of A.N.R.'s attempt in this regard and, if he is, whether the Government is making representations along the line recommended by the Australian Railways Union, as that seems to be eminently sensible.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I apologise to the member for Albert Park for not answering the question before; I made a note of it but overlooked it. I am not aware of that situation. I gather that it is being said that the Salisbury to Adelaide connection will be completed some 18 months after the completion of the country section. I will be very surprised if that is the case. I will be unhappy if that is the case, and I will certainly make inquiries. I take this opportunity to point out that Mr. Ralph Taylor, a member of the A.N.R. Commission (as the members for Albert Park and Stuart well know) would possibly have something to say about that.

Mr. Hamilton interjecting:

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I cannot help the member for Albert Park if he foresees problems in that area. I would think that Mr. Ralph Taylor would be unhappy, if that is brought to his attention. However, I will try to get some information.

Mr. PETERSON: I agree with the Minister's statement and comments about the Outer Harbor link; it will be of benefit to us. The initiative is commendable, and I congratulate the people concerned with it. I support the whole concept of the standard gauge line being of benefit to the State. However, the one point that worries me is in relation to the rights of the people on the peninsula. We have been told we have the right to appeal. What will be the machinations of that appeal, and how do we do it? Do we need to go back to the petition system again, or can we make a direct approach to the Minister if something goes wrong and a route is selected that is not acceptable?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I do not see how I can help the member for Semaphore much more. The appeal would be to arbitration, and there would have to be an arbitrator. I am not giving the member for Semaphore an undertaking that I will appeal, or anything of that nature. There is no commitment whatever. There is a right of appeal that the State Government will have at its disposal. I cannot help the honourable member any further. I believe that he should remain optimistic.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I must have missed hearing you, Mr. Chairman, telling the member for Albert Park that he had asked his three questions and could not ask any more on this clause. I thought that there was some sort

of agreement between the Minister and I, with your approval, Mr. Chairman, that all of the questions necessary to be asked under this Bill would be asked on clause 5. I do not think there is much in the rest of the clauses but if you, Mr. Chairman, are going to stick strictly to the Standing Order as to the three questions then we are going to pursue our rights under other clauses. For the expeditious passage of this legislation, if you allow us to continue and finish our questions under clause 5, we will finish it much more quickly. I put it as a suggestion—I am not disputing your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I will take it that on that occasion the honourable member was raising a point of order, otherwise he will have exercised his three rights. Unfortunately, the Chair does not make the Standing Orders, and I am bound by the Standing Orders. I am afraid that I cannot bend the Standing Orders to suit this debate. I point out to the honourable member that they were brought into effect a number of years ago, and my duty as Chairman is to make sure that they are in force.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I have one further question, but I know that the member for Albert Park has more and obviously he will ask them on other clauses. Following the Minister's statement that he was somewhat concerned with having to relinquish rights to a piece of land given to the A.N.R., or the Commonwealth, as owner, I ask what is the value of that land. Has he had it valued and can he tell us the value? I believe the Minister talked about the fact that, if South Australia were paying its share for the line, it would be about \$68 000 000. Is the Minister able to give some comparison as to the cost to the State of surrendering the rights of the loan?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: No. Since no survey has yet been done, it is difficult to give even an approximate estimate. I should inform the Committee that the \$68 000 000 is the total cost of the project.

If it were the same agreement as we had with the 1974 Bill, we would be paying 30 per cent, but that is not on this time. We make no contribution, but we do hand over the land. I was convinced that it could have been better to have joint title to the land, but the Deputy Leader will recall, from his days as a Minister, that, whenever the Commonwealth builds an institution in a State, it likes to have strong rights over the land; this applies to airports, railway rights of way, and anything else the Commonwealth owns. That has been traditional, whichever Party has been in Government in Canberra. I move:

Page 1, line 16—Leave out "railway" and insert "Railway".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 6—"Reference of matter to the Parliament of the Commonwealth."

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

Page 2, line 3—Leave out "railway" and insert "Railway".

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Minister said that the Government had not had the land in question surveyed; therefore, it had not been valued. Does the Government intend to have the land surveyed?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I am afraid that clause 6 does not allow the Deputy Leader to canvass the matter he is now raising. I will have to rule him out of order.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: When can I ask that question, Mr. Chairman? I put this matter to you earlier in order to expedite the business of the Committee, saying that you ought to waive Standing Orders, but you refused to do so. It is clear that you are going to disrupt the Committee. I am going to get an answer at some stage.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that it is the responsibility of the Chair to enforce Standing Orders. The Chair did not make the Standing Orders. Therefore, the honourable member will have to comply with them.

The honourable member can refer only to matters contained in the clause under discussion. I suggest that he examine clause 10; he may be able to raise that matter during the discussion on that clause.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, with some latitude, you might allow me to suggest to the Opposition that, when in Opposition (and we have had considerable experience), it is not a bad idea to canvass all the matters to which one wants answers in the one speech, and allow the Minister to follow through. There is no way in which Standing Orders can be otherwise changed.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Vesting of certain land."

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, am I in order in asking my question, which you ruled out of order previously, under this clause?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member should ask his question, and I will determine its relevance.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that the honourable member should not imply that the Chair is deliberately intending to deny him his rights.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I was not implying that.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member was going close to it.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Before asking my question, I tell the Premier that neither my colleagues nor I need any advice from him. We are all aware that the Premier was in Opposition for a long time, and he made a very poor fist of it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I rule those comments out of order. The honourable Deputy Leader will raise the particular matter with the Minister, or resume his seat.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I ask the Minister again whether or not he or the Government intends to have the land in question surveyed so that an accurate assessment of the value of that land can be obtained. If that is the intention, will he advise Parliament of the assessment value and, if it is not the Government's intention, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is part of the agreement that a detailed survey will be carried out forthwith of the land acquired, and that will be valued, and I will inform the Deputy Leader as soon as I have that figure. It may take some time. I believe that the survey work is proceeding now. It has been assumed that this Bill would pass the House, and work is continuing in contemplation. I do not think that any money has been raised. I believe that the survey work is on its way, and it must be done carefully. The route is delineated, but the detailed survey has yet to be done.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Certificates."

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I move:

Page 2, line 39—

After "the" insert "Commonwealth".

Page 3, line 3—

After "the" insert "Commonwealth".

Line 9—

After "delegate of the" insert "Commonwealth".

Line 10—

After "appointed by the" insert "Commonwealth".

Line 11—

After "delegate of the" insert "Commonwealth".

Amendments carried.

Mr. HAMILTON: Can the Minister advise, in relation

to the land on which, I understand, the new administration building may be built, at Mile End, what type of building will be constructed? I understand that it could be a multi-storey block. Has this matter been discussed with the A.N.R. Commission? What car parking facilities will be provided?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Although I think that the decision is fairly well known, it certainly has not been officially announced that the headquarters building will go to Keswick or Mile End. I know that the Adelaide City Council was keen to have it go elsewhere, but that is a matter to be resolved between the Australian National Railways and the Adelaide City Council. However, I have not seen a design of the building. I was merely told that the headquarters building was to be at Keswick or Mile End. That is all I can tell the honourable member.

Clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (11 and 12) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 September. Page 935.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): The guts, or the gravamen, of this matter (depending on one's viewpoint) lies in the second reading explanation, in which the Minister said that, when the Port Adelaide Centre Supplementary Development Plan was amended in 1977, it was not realised that a change in the title of the district business zone to Port Adelaide centre zone effected by the plan effectively precluded the authority from exercising its power under 63a, as the district business zone referred to in section 63 could not be identified.

If one refers to section 63a, one finds that it provides that the State Planning Authority may, with the Minister's approval, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire land within the Port Adelaide district business zone for the purpose of redevelopment. The amending Bill seeks to change "Port Adelaide District Business Zone" to "Port Adelaide Centre Zone", and, if that amendment is carried, we will meet the requirements that have been placed before the House.

Clause 2 of the Bill amends section 63a of the Act, first, by striking out from subsection (1) the passage "the Port Adelaide District Business Zone" and substituting the passage "the Port Adelaide Centre Zone" and, secondly, by striking out from subsection (6) of section 63a the definition of "Port Adelaide District Business Zone" and substituting a definition of "Port Adelaide Centre Zone". That requirement is therefore met.

One would be excused for suggesting that it is almost fifteen months since the present Government came into power and that, through the Minister, it has effected this amendment, which has been necessary for a period much greater than the period for which the Government has been in office and to which I have referred. One is tempted to suggest that this is one of 100 Bills that need urgent action by the Government.

The Opposition supports this Bill, the import of which is that a simple error has been made in describing an area in the Port Adelaide business area. Both sides of the House agree that, in relation to the redevelopment of this area, the powers that need to be provided should be provided. As I have said, an inadvertent error was made in the description of the area concerned, and the Minister has introduced this Bill in the correct form. It is apparent to the Opposition that, if the this amending Bill is passed, the

necessary correction needed in relation to this matter will be effected. The Opposition wholeheartedly supports the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Redevelopment of the Port Adelaide Centre Zone."

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: By way of interjection, which is against your ruling, Sir, on these matters, it appears that the Minister is in some doubt whether the Opposition supports this measure. I remind the Minister that the Opposition does support it, and that an inadvertent error has obviously occurred in this respect. There was no intent on anyone's part. The nomenclature used earlier, which resulted in the definition of "Port Adelaide District Business Zone" appearing in the Supplementary Development Plan (which has led to this impasse, restricting the powers of the State Planning Authority and other bodies that would be correctly delegated under that statement in the Act), will be corrected by this amending Bill.

This could be corrected by the amendment before the Committee if the words were to read "Port Adelaide Centre Zone" and the accompanying definition means the land constituting the Port Adelaide Centre Zone under planning regulations relating to the City of Port Adelaide. I believe that the Opposition has indicated clearly to the Minister its intention in this matter.

Mr. Evans: Will you explain it to me? I could not quite understand.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Fisher lives a long way from the Port Adelaide core area, which might be a third term used to describe the area we are speaking of. If I suggest to him that we need to change it from the definition that previously applied, the Port Adelaide District Business Zone, to the Port Adelaide Centre Zone, I think it would be rather beyond him. I do not wish to worry him unduly. He has enough problems in his area with fires and other matters—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think this is right out of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: —which do occur and have occurred from time to time. I suggest it would be better if he took a rain check on the matter we are considering and left it to the Minister and the Opposition to resolve.

Mr. Mathwin: How about relating it to the clause?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will link that up to the clause. Clause 2 amends section 63a of the principal Act. If the member for Glenelg is not clear on which is section 63a of the Act, I refer him to the Planning and Development Act, which clearly states that the authority may, with the approval of the Minister, either by agreement or compulsorily, acquire land within the Port Adelaide District Business Zone for the purposes of redevelopment. It might not be apparent to the member for Glenelg that this is the problem the Committee is called on to consider. There is no such area as the Port Adelaide District Business Zone in respect of the Supplementary Development Plan in relation to the powers of the State Planning Authority.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us about the Myer's situation down there.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the member for Glenelg need not assist the member for Mitchell. He needs no assistance.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you, Sir, for your affirmation of my abilities in this area. I am pointing out to the member for Glenelg that the Minister understands the

problem, and so does the Opposition. The Opposition is anxious to accord its co-operation in this matter, and can do without the unwarranted and ill-informed interjections of the member for Glenelg. I am anxious to assist in the redevelopment of the area, and the honourable member would do well to chide himself and refrain from ill-informed and unwarranted interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Mitchell should relate his remarks to the clause. He is now out of order.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will do that. We are talking about section 63a.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: And I suggest that the member for Glenelg should cease interjecting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I apologise, Mr. Chairman, for being stung and provoked into straying, if I did, from the point under consideration: that is that there is a need to correct a simple error in semantics which may elude the honourable member, but I believe that the Minister understands that a difficulty existed in the time of the previous Government and still existed in the time of the present Government. We have before us an amending Bill which will take care of that matter. The Opposition supports it, and it will have a quicker passage through this Committee if the member for Glenelg—

Mr. Mathwin: And the member for Mitchell—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I suggest that the honourable member for Glenelg should not continue interjecting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:—decides to refrain from his usual inane interjections and allows the measure to proceed as it should. The Opposition supports the Bill.

Mr. KENEALLY: Am I to understand that the Minister is going to treat this Committee in such a cavalier fashion that, after having had presented to the Committee and to the House two well-informed and in-depth interpretations of section 63a and how it affects the Port Adelaide District Business Zone, he is going to let it go by without answering? I think the Committee deserves more than that from the Minister. Either he does not understand what the member for Mitchell has pointed out or he wishes to evade the point.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I am glad to see that the Bill has been corrected in the form in which it now arrives before the House at the third reading. I am also glad to see that it will now be much easier of interpretation by the State Planning Authority and other bodies concerned with its implementation.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 August. Page 776.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): Let me say at the outset that the Opposition supports this Bill, as indicated in another place whence it has come. Let me also say that we believe that the Bill in fact represents an attempt by the Government to disguise its total lack of activity in the field of ethnic affairs, its lack of new

initiatives, and its lack of priority in this important area of Government responsibility. Certainly, as part of the policy of the Liberal Party before the last election, one could read of the formation of an Ethnic Affairs Commission based on that which had been established in New South Wales. By making that promise, the Liberal Party purported to suggest that it placed some special or higher priority on ethnic affairs than did the Labor Party.

The record completely belies this. In fact, one of the ironies of this Bill is that the creation of an extra statutory body, while certainly fulfilling part of the platform of the Liberal Party, totally contradicts another part of its platform which talks about doing away with such bodies, reducing their numbers, and reducing the number of Acts, regulations, and so on, that this Parliament has to deal with. That is an interesting facet of this promise. Here is an area in which we have always maintained, on our side of the House, whether in Government or in Opposition, that there was no real necessity for an Ethnic Affairs Commission. What is far more important is what is actually being done for the ethnic community in South Australia.

I refer to what initiatives are being taken and what resources are being put their way. That is what counts, not some sort of window-dressing or appearance of activity through a commission or Act of Parliament, etcetera.

I think that we can be reasonably proud of our record in this respect. It is certainly true that New South Wales had an Ethnic Affairs Commission with quite a large staff. It is something that was initiated by a Labor Government in New South Wales. One could therefore ask why, if that was the policy of the Labor Government in New South Wales, it was not followed here in South Australia. The answer is, of course, that we are a much smaller State than New South Wales. I do not think that a State of our size, which implies less complexity and better relationships and simpler relationships between groups and people in our community, calls for the fairly massive bureaucratic framework that may be necessary in a larger State or at the national level.

That is one of the advantages that we perhaps enjoy as a smaller State. As I say, that was very much part of the rhetoric of the Liberal Government when it was in Opposition. Therefore, we have fair reason to say that, while in New South Wales the move to an Ethnic Affairs Commission was probably something that well suited that State and the complex nature of ethnic community relations in that State, there was no real necessity or demand for it here in South Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: If it is complex in New South Wales, surely it would be complex in South Australia.

Mr. BANNON: These matters are much easier to comprehend and deal with here. The honourable member would probably agree that this is so over a whole range of things that happen here in South Australia. As I have said, we support the Bill. We do not believe that it is really necessary. In fact, we believe it is a cover for a lack of activity but, nonetheless, we are prepared to go along with it as part of the enactment of the election promises and mandate of the Government and, more particularly, because in itself there is nothing specifically wrong with an Ethnic Affairs Commission. We are aware that sections of the ethnic community are in support of this proposal and welcome it. We simply restate that in Government we did not think it was necessary.

What was our record in this area? It is fair to say that, of all the Governments in Australia (and this has been borne about by committees of inquiry and references in such reports as the Galbally Committee, and so on), the Dunstan-Corcoran Labor Government in this State put into effect more policies and devoted more public

resources to ethnic affairs than any other. It is a record of which we were very proud indeed. In implementing those policies we also involved, through a range of committees and advisory bodies, the ethnic communities themselves. In other words, it was not a policy imposed on the ethnic communities by some sort of bureaucratic procedure; it was something that was implemented in consultation with those communities.

We did that without the need to create an extra or special statutory authority, something that I would have thought would be commended by the present Government. Our policy stated that we wished to ensure that ethnic communities have the right to participation and to full and continuing consultation and information in the implementation of ethnic affairs policies. We sought to do that not by creating a commission which would be appointed by the Government—by the Minister—but by (and I will quote again from our policy)—

... encouraging the formation by ethnic communities of a central organisation representative of all ethnic groups in the community.

That is a fair principle: it is a recognition of the complexity of the inter-relations of ethnic communities. It said that, while there were a number of groupings and councils among the various ethnic organisations, it was better for the Government to encourage and support the development by the ethnic communities of a representative committee than to have it imposed from above or created by Act of Parliament. In some instances one needs an Act to promote a particular social change. In other instances, it is best that it comes from the communities themselves and that any legislation or executive action be enabling rather than prescriptive. That was the policy that we were following in Government and I think it was one that was showing considerable signs of success.

We were encouraging that formation of an umbrella organisation, and we were assisting it by the various granting committees that were established in our time. The Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee was one such organisation. It did not purport to be representative of the total ethnic community; in fact, the concept of it was that its membership would be changing over a period so that different individuals and representatives of various groups in the ethnic community could take their place on that committee, which would mean that that committee's policies (perhaps its granting priorities, and so on) would change. That was a healthy and productive process, but we never pretended that the Ethnic Grants Advisory Committee was the be-all and end-all of the process. Indeed, that would be one of the means by which this umbrella organisation of which I am speaking could be encouraged.

I was very pleased to be for a short time the Minister assisting the Minister of Ethnic Affairs, under which portfolio that body was established and set up. The way in which we went about it and the future hopes we had for it indicate the way in which Government can productively assist a committee without providing some prescriptive formula over it, which is what this present Act does. There were, of course, other committees such as the Ethnic Festivals Grants Committee, which operated in a similar way but with more restrictive terms of reference.

As to our achievements in ethnic affairs generally, they were outlined fully by the Hon. Mr. Sumner in another place, and I do not intend to go into them at great length, but it is a pretty impressive record and, as I say, it is one that, in fact, no other State could equal or match in terms of initiatives taken and sustained throughout the time of our office. Some of the major initiatives were those in the field of education, including pioneering programmes such

as the 10 schools programme, aimed at multi-cultural education. There was nothing like it in Australia at the time, and other Education Departments and systems are still battling to catch up with the lead that we have given in that area.

So education and the multi-cultural programme is something that we were very proud of. There were other smaller areas: the question of allowing drivers' licence tests to be taken in a person's native language, the provision of Government publications in various languages, the arts development area where we provided specific funds to assist ethnic festivals and thus allow the ethnic communities to have a showcase for their culture and talents within our society and a point of contact with other communities of which this State is comprised, the establishment of the State Interpreter Service, the welfare grants programmes, the way in which we actively took part in the Australian Assistance Plan, the foundation of residents' associations, migrant information centres, and so on, all of which I think have provided a very sound base for any programme of ethnic affairs support from the Government.

We also initiated a number of important research projects and looked at things such as the rights that those of non-English speaking background should have within our community, even those who were not formerly citizens of the State, for instance, in relation to local government voting rights.

One of the things worth referring to, because it is another of those examples where the present Government has been able to enjoy the fruits of the activity commenced by the former Government, was the establishment of an ethnic directory. It was significant that, at the launching of that directory, the Premier made a pointed reference to work being undertaken over the past six months, or some time span that indicated that the whole project was encompassed within the period that he had been in office. That was not a very honest statement or, indeed, a statement that does the Premier much credit. In fact, that project has been commenced and considerable work done on it under the former Government. The Premier was fortunate to be in office at the time when that work came to fruition. I am not gainsaying his right to appear and officially launch the publication. I think it is very important that (a) he take some credit that his Government continued the project (the Government could have terminated it), and (b) that he endorse it as Premier of the State at the time, but I would have thought that a little more generosity and a little more honest acknowledgment of the role of the former Government was called for on that occasion. In fact, one of his officers had to correct him on the time scale over which that project had been launched. I think the correction was inadvertent, but nonetheless it was made publicly at the time. Unfortunately, there have been a number of other examples of this. I think it is a pity that the Premier has, even up until now, steadfastly refused to make an appropriate or adequate acknowledgment, except in some rare instances, of the fact that on occasions he is appearing as Premier to endorse work or programmes that were commenced prior to his Administration coming to office.

What the Labor Party did in office is one thing; what we plan to do is another, and against that must be set the record of this Government, which, as I said at the beginning, is pretty thin. My colleague in another place, the Hon. C. J. Sumner, for a brief time was Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, and in fact during the brief time commenced a number of programmes and a major reorganisation of the Ethnic Affairs Division, which was putting it on to a very strong footing. Indeed, again, I

imagine that the fruits of the work that he undertook will be reaped in the establishment by the present Government of the Ethnic Affairs Commission (in other words, the Ethnic Affairs Division, under a different name).

A number of areas of policy were being investigated at that time. For instance, within departments there was a proposed order of investigation, beginning with health, including industrial health matters which were under review at the time; discrimination procedures, which were also under review; welfare matters; labour and industry, involving an exercise on the industrial legislation, the work force and the role of non-English speaking migrants in the work force and the role of migrant elderly; migrant youth; the area of community development, and the development of ethnic communities in that process; public and consumer affairs; migrant crime; and community education.

So, a number of matters were under investigation, and a number of committees had been established to promote policies in those areas. Regrettably, it would appear that a lot of those initiatives have not been followed up and, of course, that is one reason why I say that the Ethnic Affairs Commission is, in a sense, a public indicator of Government concern in an area where there is not much substance in terms of activity actually undertaken.

For example, there was a migrant police working party, and yet my colleague was advised that in the period between 15 September 1979, when the Government came into office, and the middle of this year only two meetings of that working party had been convened. Clearly, it is something that was consigned to limbo, and nothing much was to be done about it. The excuse was that there was a need to give the Police Department sufficient time to produce a submission to the committee, but it seems odd that all those months should go by and the migrant police working party should simply languish.

There was the case of the various programmes of investigation initiated by the former Government. Again, my colleague was advised in July of this year that, in view of the proposed establishment of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, the Minister in another place thought it would be more appropriate if subcommittees reporting to the commission were to act as working parties to advise the Government on programme implementations and policies. However, there was no indication that major initiatives were being taken in this area. The attitude was, "Hang on to it until we get an Ethnic Affairs Commission"—a great excuse for months of inactivity in this area.

With regard to the migrant health working party, my colleague was advised by the Minister in another place in a letter dated 26 September that the working party had met twice since 15 September, that its next meeting was scheduled for 7 October, and that at that stage no date had been set for the presentation of the working party's report. That is a pretty dreadful record, too. Again, apparently that committee on migrant health has been consigned into limbo, pending the establishment of an Ethnic Affairs Commission.

I suggest that those are acts of omission. But then we have had major acts of commission, such as the cutting out of funds for major projects that involve ethnic affairs. Of course, one of the most startling was the cancellation of the Thebarton Community Centre, a centre which was very specifically aimed at and based on a community with a high density of Greek and Italian population. Indeed, this matter is one that has concerned my colleague the member for Peake, and I know that he is going to have one or two words to say about that shortly. This was a major project to give direct benefit to an ethnic community in a

particular location in Adelaide, and one that I suggest would have attracted great support from ethnic communities throughout Adelaide.

The people there would have had a community centre, a marvellous interface between the non-English-speaking and English-speaking communities, and a marvellous collection of services and facilities in the one place. That project was cancelled out of hand. That was the end of it. Construction work was scheduled to commence in December 1979.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Whom were you advising to be honest a short while ago—yourself?

Mr. BANNON: I was advising you to be.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I think you should be, too.

Mr. BANNON: It is hard to reply to an interjection that is a bit ambiguous. The statement I made was that work on the Thebarton Community Centre—

Mr. Millhouse: He's telling you you're not being honest. There's nothing ambiguous about it.

Mr. BANNON: No. I repeat that work on the Thebarton Community Centre was due to start in December 1979. What is dishonest about that?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: But you have misread me. You were saying that the funds were cut off, and withdrawn.

Mr. BANNON: Yes, they were. That project has been dismantled. The decision has been made, we understand, that only the high school development is to go ahead; that some bridging funds have been provided to maintain an officer such as the community arts officer (who is also getting funds from the Australian Council) and one or two others on the staff of the Thebarton council, not as part of the community centre project, because that project has been cancelled. Where is the dishonesty in that? I shall wait for the Premier's response, but I think he ought to listen to my colleague, the member for Peake, also.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You have just proved the point yourself.

Mr. BANNON: If that is the extraordinary way in which the Premier is going to try to maintain his Government's record in ethnic affairs, then I am afraid he is going to get little credit or support.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: It is the extraordinary way the Leader is debating.

Mr. BANNON: There is one project that was cancelled: what is another sin of commission? The information centres! The Liberal Party made quite clear in its policy documents:

That financial assistance will be given to community-based cultural and community centres.

I have already spoken about the cancellation of the Thebarton Community Centre experiment and project. What about the ethnic information centres? At the very same time as the Minister was in receipt of a major report on information services and was trying to imply some sort of Government priority in this area funds were cut off progressively from a series of information centres which were servicing ethnic communities specifically.

The Thebarton Information Centre was forced to close at its prime location on Henley Beach Road, because Government funds were withdrawn. In the past week or so realisation of this has seeped through to the Findon information group, and the local member for Henley Beach has had to introduce delegations in some vain hope that he will be able to convince the Premier and the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs that funds ought to be maintained for that vital community service. I hope that the member for Henley Beach is saying loudly and clearly to those Ministers that this was an election promise, that there was no hint given that funds would be cut off from these organisations. I hope he is referring

them clearly and plainly to that election policy that stated that financial assistance would be given to community-based cultural and community centres. That is what is happening, in actual fact, out there in the real world in the community while in this Parliament we debate the establishment of an Ethnic Affairs Commission in the form of this legislation.

The record is not very good so far as activity is concerned. I certainly recognise that the Government is paying a great deal of lip service to its contacts with the ethnic community and suggesting that there is some great activity going on. I would certainly commend the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs for his regular and assiduous attendance at the various functions and activities organised by the ethnic community. That is about where it stops. It is all very well to turn up at a function, smile, shake hands, and compliment the organisers on their progress, but it is quite another thing to provide them with concrete assistance and support which will advance the causes in which they are intended. That is what has been lacking so far as this Government is concerned.

What programmes and projects are going on are, in the main, the result of either the previous Government or, in one or two instances that can be pointed to where there is something new, one looks to the Galbally Report and the fact that there is Commonwealth money available for it. Great credit is taken at State level for what, in fact, is a Commonwealth initiative. There is very little substance, indeed, in what is happening in ethnic affairs in this State and, indeed, in this Bill, when one looks at the record of the current Government. We turn to the commission itself. I have already commented on the fact that it seems odd that a Government bent on reducing the bureaucracy and the number of regulations, Acts of Parliament, and so on, is creating a commission. In order for the Government to justify doing that, one would imagine that there are some very strong and cogent reasons for doing so, reasons which make it absolutely necessary for effective work on behalf of the ethnic communities to be carried out by means of a Commission.

We look at the Bill to see whether, in fact, that is the case. For a start, the precedent is that of New South Wales. I notice that in another place the Minister is claiming that the Liberal Party's activity here pre-dated anything done elsewhere, particularly in New South Wales. He is reported as pointing out that in 1977 his Party released a policy on ethnic affairs which stated that it would establish a Community and Ethnic Affairs Commission and that the New South Wales commission was not, in fact, in operation at that time. In a technical sense, it is true that the current New South Wales Ethnic Affairs Commission was not in operation then. In fact, the legislation establishing it in its present form was introduced after that date, but there was an interim commission operating, and operating very effectively, along the same lines with a view to finally moving to a legislative situation in New South Wales at the time the Liberal Party policy was published, so that was an odd claim made by the Minister and one on which I think the record should be set straight.

Turning to the Bill itself, we will see whether there is something special being provided for the ethnic communities in this State. In introducing the Bill it has been said that the reason for it is the need for a more broadly based and authoritative body through which people in ethnic communities can work out their problems, a body needed to provide sound advice to the Government and its agencies on matters relating to ethnic communities from an independent position. I think that is the crux of this situation. The Government has said that

the Ethnic Affairs Division, as promoted by this Government, with its assisting advisory committees and grant awarding committees, was not independent enough and that this Ethnic Affairs Commission creates some major independence on the part of the ethnic communities. I remind the House again that our policy was that that sort of broad umbrella advisory committee should emerge from the ethnic communities themselves. Division II, clause 11, provides:

In the exercise of its powers and functions, the commission shall be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister.

That is not an unusual clause in any bill dealing with a statutory authority. It is in most of the Acts governing statutory authorities and is a quite proper thing. However, it should be stressed that this commission is subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. If the ethnic communities believe by listening to the Minister that they are going to have an independent commission and that this is a body that can make decisions, spend money, and so on, of its own volition and at its own will, then they are very wrong and had better look at the Act to see what it states.

In that respect, the commission is no different from a Government department. Clause 13 consistently emphasises, as it deals with the functions of the commission, that the Minister is in the central position; the commission is there to investigate problems relating to ethnic affairs and to "advise the Minister", says paragraph (a); it is there to provide services including interpreting, translating and information services approved by the Minister to ethnic groups, says paragraph (d); it is there to report and make recommendations to the Minister on matters relating to the avoidance of discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin, says paragraph (h). Further on we find that the financial provisions, of course, require moneys to be voted by the Parliament, that under clause 21 there are auditing provisions which have to be carried out, and that reports have to be submitted to the Minister for his approval. Clause 15 allows the Ethnic Affairs Commission to set up advisory committees with the approval of the Minister. One can go through most of the clauses, most of the powers, and find that in nearly every instance, and always subject to the over-riding general control and direction of the Minister, the commission can only act with due regard to Ministerial approval and, ultimately, of course, that means to Cabinet itself. I hope that that is going to be made quite clear to the ethnic community, whose expectations have been raised so high by this Bill, that that is what the Government conceives.

In raising that, I am not raising it as a matter of criticising in terms of those being quite proper provisions to be in any Bill governing a statutory commission of this Parliament. That is fair enough, but I think it emphasises that there is little difference between what existed under the previous Government, which was effective and was working well, and this rather window-dressing exercise being promoted by the present Government. I come now to the final point on the Bill. In Committee, we can make points about one or two other alterations that could well be made. For instance, the Bill makes no provision for any kind of employee representation. Those working in the commission will not have any right of membership on it, and there are one or two other less important matters.

Let me turn to a quite substantial point at the end. We contend that there has been insufficient consultation with the ethnic communities over this Bill and that the Government, having had an election policy and being embarrassed by the fact that it was not doing very much in this area and that it did not see fit to allocate much more in

terms of new resources, with the exception of one or two Galbally grants to this area of public administration, decided to dress it up with a commission and introduced this Bill. However, in doing so it did not go to those communities whose interests are supposedly served by this Bill.

The Minister can point, as he has done in a letter to my colleague the Hon. C. J. Sumner, to the fact that from about August copies of the Bill were despatched to various individuals and various sections of the ethnic community. He says that on 15 August he despatched copies to 12 ethnic communities. There were many more groups than that, but a favoured 12 got copies. On 27 August, a further six copies were despatched to other ethnic groups. Presumably they had heard about the favoured 12 and wanted to get a bit of action and look at the provisions, so they asked the Minister if they could have copies. The copies were hastily sent to them. The Minister goes on to say:

The spokesman for the group who visited the Premier and me on 16 September was handed 25 copies to distribute to members of that group and other friends on 23 September. There was a group that got together to complain about the lack of consultation, and among the advantages they got was not only an interview with the Premier and the Minister assisting but also 25 copies despatched on 16 September, about the time the Bill was introduced. Indeed, the Bill had gone through the Legislative Council at that stage. It went through on 26 August, so that is significant. We see that, 11 days before the Bill was passed by the Upper House, 12 ethnic communities got copies. The day after the Bill was passed, a further six copies went to some other ethnic groups and then, following complaints about lack of consultation, about a fortnight later 25 copies were given to a delegation that attended.

It has been a fairly odd process of consultation as far as the ethnic communities are concerned. I think that is typified by the group that called to see the Premier and the Minister. They also consulted my colleague the Hon. C. J. Sumner. Their representative is a Mr. Ralph Langen-Zueff, who has written to the Premier and the Minister on a number of occasions setting out the feelings of that committee. The group's complaint is that there has been insufficient consultation on the provisions for a large number of people in the ethnic community.

Obviously, others are saying, "Get the Act through and we will see how it works: we will go along with it". However, I believe that a significant group believes that there has not been sufficient consultation. The Bill was passed in the other place on 26 August and we are now debating it, nearly two months later. There has been ample time for a full consultative process to take place among the ethnic community, initiated and organised by the Government. There is no evidence that that has happened. I think that is a fair indictment on the Government. One thing that I suggest is that this Bill be deferred at this stage for at least another two or three weeks so that consultation can be properly carried on.

It seems extraordinary that the Government simply presses on regardless with a measure that is meant to benefit a significant section of our community without talking to that community. There are classic instances of this happening in recent months, such as the Auctioneers and Appraisers Act legislation which we will be dealing with on another occasion. They indicate a general view of the Government that, if it thinks something is right and if it has consulted a small group as a sounding board, it can rush in, establish something and expect loud applause for its efforts. That is not good enough for the ethnic community in this instance, and many people in that

community want more time to look more closely and make representations to the Government. I will quote from a memorandum prepared by the group to which I have been referring. In a letter that Mr. Langen-Zueff signed, he sets out his committee's three points on this measure. He has complained about the fact that there have not been sufficient copies of the Bill and not sufficient ability to consult widely enough. He says that, having sent out some 15 to 20 copies of the Bill, one can contrast this with the *Ethnic Directory*, which lists hundreds of names of communities, associations and so on.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Which group is he representing?

Mr. BANNON: He is representing a fairly broadly-based group of people involved in the ethnic community and I know that one of the Government's tactics has been to denigrate any of these groups and suggest they are unrepresentative. I think they refer to that with considerable—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: How many have now resigned from that group? I think there are a number.

Mr. BANNON: That may be so. I realise that that is the tactic of the Government. When it meets opposition from any group, it attempts to say that that group is unrepresentative or in some way incompetent. Whether that group is large or small, they are people who are sincere and informed as far as ethnic community activities are concerned, and they have a right to be listened to, whether the Government agrees with them or not. I will quote the three points made by Mr. Langen-Zueff. He says, first, that the committee welcomes, as does the informed public in general, the establishing of such an Ethnic Affairs Commission, provided an effective commission will have maximum and sympathetic access for the benefit of all persons of any origin and background. That is a fair point and a point well made by the committee. The second point is:

Provided that, after sufficient public consulting, collating, and reporting, such future commission will show assured and truly representative and participatory involvement for and by such diverse components in South Australia's fabric.

The third point is:

Provided that its future Commissioners will be appropriate all-rounders, sensitive and experienced in the relevant problems and feelings of former displaced persons, refugees and migrants and others and their individual and/or collective endeavours to mesh and integrate in our multi-cultural society.

That is a rational and fair sort of proposal to make and one which a number of people in ethnic communities think has not been fully met by this Bill. It may be that they can be satisfied. If some have resigned from the committee, it suggests they have been satisfied with discussions with the Government, but some people still have disquiet about the Bill and there are still suggestions that there should be a more determined effort by the Government to consult with those communities.

Mr. Mathwin: What are you saying about displaced persons?

Mr. BANNON: If the member had any knowledge of ethnic affairs, he would know what the term meant.

Mr. Mathwin: I know what it means. I was in amongst them.

Mr. BANNON: Well, I would hope that he would show some greater sympathy for their position in our community. I do not think it would be productive to pursue the interjection by the member for Glenelg.

Mr. Mathwin: Where are they all now?

Mr. BANNON: There are former displaced persons in our community and I will certainly advise members of this

committee in particular of the member for Glenelg's interest in it. I suggest that his colleagues keep him out of ethnic affairs if that is the sort of attitude that he has got.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BANNON: We support the Bill. We believe that while not necessary it will be welcomed by many in the ethnic community and, indeed, it has the potential to do some good work, although the results will be shown only when the Government gets down to hard work, puts some resources into ethnic affairs and does something about them. Bearing all that in mind, we suggest that further time is needed for consultation on this Bill and its impact on the ethnic community.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I support the Bill. I want to refer mainly to clause 13, which deals with the functions of the commission, which will comprise one person full time (the commissioner), and seven part-time members. Clause 13 provides the functions of the commission, as follows:

- (a) To investigate problems relating to ethnic affairs and to advise the Minister and make reports and recommendations on the basis of those investigations;
- (b) to consult with and provide advice to Government departments and instrumentalities on the implementation of ethnic affairs policies;
- (c) to undertake research and compile data relating to ethnic groups;
- (d) to advise on the allocation of funds available for promoting the interests of ethnic groups;
- (e) to provide services (including interpreting, translating and information services) approved by the Minister to ethnic groups;
- (f) to consult with other bodies and persons to determine the needs of ethnic groups and the means of promoting their interests;
- (g) to arrange and co-ordinate meetings, discussions, seminars and conferences with respect to ethnic affairs;
- (h) to report and make recommendations to the Minister on matters relating to the avoidance of discrimination on the basis of ethnic origin; and
- (i) to co-ordinate initiatives in the field of ethnic affairs.

(2) The Commission shall, in carrying out its functions, act wherever possible with a view to encouraging participation by voluntary organisations and local government bodies.

I support all those aims, and the responsibilities of the commission. I wish to pick out the point that the Leader of the Opposition made in saying that we as a Party came into Government stating that we wished to do away with some of the statutory bodies that we have and have fewer of them and repeal some of the laws and regulations which we find are superfluous and of no real benefit to society and which, in some cases, are shackles to society in its operations.

Because we have chose to bring in an Ethnic Affairs Commission the Leader suggests that that is contrary to our policy. At no time did we say that we would not make new laws or regulations or create statutory bodies or set up commissions if we thought that they were of vital importance to some section or to the total community. That is an indication of the importance that we as a Party place on the establishment of an Ethnic Affairs Commission. The Opposition should be aware of that—that it is important enough for us to say that this is where we need a new body created. The Leader of the Opposition also made the point that in a State such as South Australia there may not be the same need to have such a body as there would be in New South Wales, where

there is a larger population. I do not accept that argument. In the Eastern States of this country there are 11 500 000 of the 14 000 000 people in this country.

In a smaller community such as the South Australian community, some of which is spread over a vast area, some small ethnic groups are isolated. They do not have the opportunity to communicate with those of the same origin as themselves in the way of culture and language, and so the difficulties to the individual are much greater than they would be in New South Wales and Victoria where there are mainly much larger populations in the country centres and, in particular, in the metropolitan centres.

Because of the sheer weight of numbers, the minorities are not as small as they are in our State, and their isolation is not as great. That is what we need to be conscious of. The isolation and disadvantages of these people can be much greater in a State such as South Australia than is the position in some of the larger more populous States. I would agree that we have a better opportunity to maintain a better standard of living. We have a greater opportunity to give benefits by way of individual consultation in our State than in other States. I do not accept the main thrust of the Leader's argument.

Functions of the commission, such as providing services (including interpreting, translating and information services), approved by the Minister, to ethnic groups are not just of benefit to the ethnic groups. Quite often when we refer to ethnic groups we are talking about groups of origin from other countries who are comparatively few in number and who may not be Anglo-Saxon. One could argue that people who are Scottish, Irish or English by descent, are ethnic to some degree. If we went to another country, they would class us as ethnic.

When we are trying to communicate with those groups, it is an advantage to us, as Parliamentarians, if an interpreter is present. So, the provision of interpreting services is not just to help the ethnic groups but also to help the rest of us who may be considered not to be ethnic and who have a command of the English language and can communicate amongst ourselves, although we may not be able to communicate with ethnic minorities.

I express my disgust at a pamphlet put out by the Progressive Conservative Party in the last Federal Election. It is a similar base to a pamphlet distrubed a couple of years ago attacking Asian immigration to this country and put out by a group called the C.I.A.

Mr. Millhouse: It's getting a bit wide of the Bill, isn't it?

Mr. EVANS: I will tie up my remarks for the member for Mitcham. I wish to refer to the pamphlet because it will be the responsibility of the commission to report to the Minister on this aspect. I will not refer to all of the pamphlet but, in part, it states, "For your children's sake, the Asian invasion must stop." It then makes an allegation that the Liberal Party and the Labor Party worked in collusion to begin the Asian immigration to Australia and the Democrats supported them. I believe that the Asian people started to come to this land well over 100 years ago. I have nothing against the Asian—people they work hard and are just as good as any other citizen. That sort of filth that went out in the earlier pamphlet, plus some of the comments that are not so rough in this pamphlet, do not help us in working with our Asian neighbours or with the Asians in our community. I believe all members of Parliament would take a dim view of that sort of publication. If he can, I hope the commissioner will take some action in referring those matters to the Minister.

I believe that it is fair in this debate to make some comment on how some people in the community view the attitudes that Parliament, Government departments, and

political Parties have had towards ethnic issues. Some people in the community who we might call Australians, because they were born here, feel at times that they are disadvantaged as against ethnic groups. In other words, some of the lower-income groups in the community or those who have had an unfortunate rough trot in society, when things go against them and they seek help from a Government department, may not get the same response and immediate attention that some of the minority groups get, when it is obvious that they are from an ethnic community and are disadvantaged. I believe that, within our community, some bitterness has grown up in this regard. We need to try to alter the attitudes of Government departments in this area, so that we treat everyone equally where the disadvantages are the same or where the unfortunate circumstances are similar.

I also believe that some (and I am pleased to say that it is only a minority) of our ethnic groups have learned how to exploit the situation. Certain departments and certain benefits are made available for those in ethnic groups in our community who are genuinely disadvantaged. All that people do who exploit these benefits is to cause bitterness between those who are genuine about their approach to the benefits offered and the facilities provided, as against those who exploit the situation. More particularly, they cause a bitterness, which does our society no good, among others who may not be from ethnic groups.

The pamphlet to which I referred earlier, from the Progressive Conservative Party, highlighted this matter. Some people of southern European origin (and I will not disclose the nationality) came to me absolutely irate that we were allowing Asians to come into Australia. In other words, they were hostile because we, as a country, were allowing Asians to come to this country, as they, as immigrants, were allowed to come to this country from Southern Europe. The racial discrimination that exists within society is not Anglo-Saxon against the European, Asian, Indian, or Pakistani group only, as some people tend to make us believe, because there is a vivid and intense degree of discrimination by some Europeans, particularly southern Europeans (I am not saying all migrants) against the Asian group. They see the Asian migrants as a real threat within our society.

I think that we, as a Parliament, should recognise that, whether or not we like it, in this State and in Australia are going to find a larger number of Asians (quite rightly so) coming to this country because more of our sons and daughters, as they travel the world and as they mix with other races, will find that, biologically, they appeal to them and marriages will take place, regardless of refugee or migrant programmes that might be forced on us. I hope that the Commissioner, in his role as Commissioner advising the Minister, will work not only for better communication between the ethnic groups and basically Anglo-Saxon groups within our society, but between the ethnic groups themselves, because I believe that a real wall is building up in the area, about which I have spoken, of some people being anti-Asian. We must remember that whether Parliament votes money in relation to ethnic affairs for television or radio stations, for support of newspapers, for cultural interests, or language courses (although our language is taught in most countries now), it is taxpayer money that we must justify. I believe that this position can be justified and the commission we are creating can be justified, but it will need to act responsibly to convince the taxpayers in the long term that that is the case.

We have to be conscious that, if any member went to any one of the countries from which these people have come, and wanted to obtain the same sort of help to learn

the language, study the culture, or to work in such a society, we would not receive it. Nowhere else in the world does a society offer as much to ethnic groups as we do in this country. So, I say that I support the Bill 100 per cent, but I make the House conscious of the fact (although most members have heard comments of this type) that we have the responsibility to recognise the other aspects, and, in particular, the commission is responsible for trying to iron out some of the ripples that exist in society in reporting back to the Minister and to act, where necessary, with ethnic groups that work with each other, while we all work together to make a truly multi-cultural society.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I rise to support the Bill, although I hasten to add that, prior to the election on 15 September 1979, the Labor Government in Peake would not have needed such a commission. I say that, because of the committees which were set up under the Dunstan Government. As long ago as 1972, a committee was established to inquire into the setting up of a community centre at Thebarton. This centre would have had a section for the ethnic groups in which interpreters and all facilities would have been included in the education section of the school. The percentage of students who attended the Thebarton school was 70 per cent of Italian and Greek origin, together with a fair percentage of Serbo-Croatian and English-speaking students. I have brought to the Government's attention that the committee issued 12 000 pamphlets in Italian, Greek, and English to householders. It also visited 5 540 private homes and made out questionnaires.

Step No. 4 involved the employment of 13 interviewers to conduct a detailed survey of 5 540 homes. The interviewers had interpreters with them. Of those homes, 741 were selected at random, and of that number 426 home owners were successfully interviewed. The departments, instrumentalities and organisations contacted by this committee and kept informed of all matters included the Department for Community Welfare, the Recreation and Sport Division, the Department of Public Health, the Hospitals Departments, the Further Education Department, the South Australian Police Force, Libraries, the University of Adelaide, and the Crown Law Department, all of which would have been involved in the community centre, where there also would have been cafeterias, sporting facilities (including squash courts), and so on.

Since 15 September 1979, activity at Thebarton has stopped. The ethnic people in my area do not know what has struck them, because the community centre proposal was completely dismantled by the Liberal Government. Indeed, until well into this year I could not even ascertain from the Liberal Government what it was going to do in relation to the community centre. Even then, I was not notified by letter from the Minister who eventually was responsible for handling the community centre, as it was handed on to the Minister of Local Government in another place.

I then read in the press that the matter had been handed over to the council. I have been told by the Town Clerk and Mayor of Thebarton that many things were going to happen in relation to the community centre, but to this date I do not think that anything has happened. I have checked on the school, and there has been very little activity there, other than the dismantling of the existing community group of people who work there. These people have been shifted to a different section in the council, and I am certain that some of them do not know what their position is now.

For some reason, one of the persons in charge of that area has been shifted, and possibly he would be wondering

about what has happened to all the plans and dreams that the people of Thebarton had in relation to the community centre, which included the ethnic affairs aspect.

Further, the residents association that was formed in Thebarton was treated with contempt, because in most cases these people were not paid. Only two paid people were attached to it, one of whom has lost his job and the other of whom has been retained. The residents association assisted in many cases with interpreting for the migrants in the area, as the people there would be predominantly Italian and Greek. This department, which assisted in ethnic affairs matters, was, to my way of thinking, savagely treated, because it was virtually told within two weeks that the section would be shifted from its area opposite a shopping centre on Henley Beach Road to council premises. The section was shifted to a room in an old picture theatre owned by the council. The office in which the one girl who retained her job was located was quite respectable and satisfactory. However, I should like Government members to understand that one does not just tear up a place to which migrants have been used to going for years for information and put in in another place, and expect the migrants to be able to adjust immediately and go to that new place.

Because of the position of my electorate office, not far from the office to which I have referred and which was shifted, I have seen clearly what has happened. Apparently, the Government did not go along with the system that had been operating successfully for many years and decided to put it under the control of local government.

I am criticising not local government but the attitude of the Government that took this action. The council had this thrust upon it, and the council does not know at this stage how it is going financially.

An interesting aspect of the Thebarton Residents Association was that, when it had word that it would be shifted, the association's representatives asked whether I would be prepared to lead a deputation to the Minister to whom this money was allocated. I agreed to do so and, to my surprise (I still do not see what reason he had for doing this), the Minister refused to see anyone other than myself. The Minister said the week before that he would see a delegation, but he saw only one person. He knocked back the other two persons who comprised the delegation and, when I visited the Minister's office on I think the following Monday or Tuesday (I am not sure which day it was), I was approached by two people from the Minister's office, and I was told that the Minister would not see anyone but me.

[Midnight]

I could not work out the Minister's reasoning, because the two people with me were from the residents association. This is why I say that the Government ripped this department to pieces over a couple of weeks, and no-one had an opportunity to do much about it. Apart from the little we saw on television and in the press, there was little information, and there was not much we could do about it except to protest at the office. The member for Henley Beach may laugh on the other side of his face if the same thing happens in his district. Of course, it may not happen now that Henley Beach is held by the Liberal Party. The Government may be more sympathetic when one of its own members holds the seat. However, I ask the honourable member to show me respect by not carrying on stupidly, laughing and joking. He should listen to me and, if he thinks I am wrong, he can speak when I have finished. I shall return now to what I was saying about the

Minister's attitude. The Minister is from the other House. He is sitting here listening, and if I am not out of order—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. Russack): Order! The honourable member may not refer to that.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I am sorry, Sir. I turn now to the way in which this Government treated the residents association. The Minister refused to see anyone except me, but one person is never a deputation. I have heard criticism from members on the other side about how undemocratic some union officials are, but, if the Minister thinks he was being democratic by seeing only one person, I would like someone to explain how that can be so. I would like to ask the Minister—

Mr. Mathwin: Not too much.

Mr. PLUNKETT: The honourable member can interject, and I will speak more loudly. Why does the Minister refuse to pay the telephone account and the electricity account incurred, amounting to about \$400? I have a letter from the Minister saying that he did not consider that it was the responsibility of the Government to meet those costs. With the time allowed for the association to wind up its affairs, I think the Government should meet full responsibility for the amount of \$400. I have written to the Minister, asking him to rethink the matter and to meet the cost. I have spoken to one of my colleagues in the other House, the Hon. Chris Sumner, asking him to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister in that place.

The Greek and Italian people in the Peake District do not know what has happened. Over the years, they went through the exercise of completing questionnaires, holding local residents association meetings, and so on, so that no mistake could be made. New members may laugh, because they do not understand, but the committee of which I am speaking consisted of some members of the present Liberal Government, and they agreed with the various aspects of the community centre. I wonder why they changed their mind when they got into Government after 15 September.

Mr. Hemmings: Murray doesn't like Italians.

Mr. PLUNKETT: Perhaps that is the case. I do not know his attitude. I do not want to waste the time of the House: I never do. I do not think anyone could accuse me of romancing or carrying on, unlike some members opposite. I would like to know what the Government plans for the ethnic people in my area. Are they to be treated with disrespect because they live in a Labor district? It appears that that is the case, and the Minister has completely ignored my area since he has taken over this portfolio.

I have been told by the Town Clerk that I need not worry too much about the community centre's not going on in the aspects originally outlined, because the future community centre will be the Hallett Bricks pughole. I do not know whether members on the other side have been down South Road and looked at the pughole.

Mr. Lewis interjecting:

Mr. PLUNKETT: I would expect that from the member for Mallee. He thinks that a pughole might be a joke. He knows nothing about brickmaking. Looking at the area on South Road, it is easy to imagine how long it will be before the ethnic people in Peake will get a community centre. It will be 20 or 30 years before the place can be developed. The council is saying what it is going to do, but it has done nothing up to date. It has got no money. I should like some answers to my questions at a later stage. Does the Government intend to give the council any money to establish these facilities, even though it may be years before anything happens?

I hope the Government does not sell the houses bought over the years by the Labor Government. I hope it will not

sell them or lease them, as it is likely to do. Looking at the Liberals, we see the dollar sign. They are like the Yanks: you are no good unless you can sell it. The eyes of Liberal members light up when they see uranium and hear how much money is involved. Let them spend a bit of money in an area to the west of Adelaide where facilities are needed. If it had won the last election, the Labor Government would have had the project practically finished by now and most of the area would have been completed. I ask the Liberals to stop thinking about profits for a while and to put some money back into an area where there are no facilities. I would not expect the Minister who is trying to interject to understand.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not reply to interjections. They are out of order.

Mr. PLUNKETT: I stood up to speak for only 10 minutes. I can always say what I have to say in 10 minutes, as long as I do not get stupid interjections. When I get interjections, I stay on my feet.

I would like to know from the Government why it put someone out of work, only two people were fully employed by the residents' association. These people assisted the Greek and Italian communities and other ethnic groups in the District of Peake. They assisted for years, and were then treated with contempt. One person was thrown out of work immediately, and the other was retained, although I do not know what her future is. I do not know whether she will be retained in employment continuously, but I hope that she is. I ask the Government to start spending money and putting some facilities in the Thebarton area for the ethnic people living there.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. It is the Government's policy to establish this commission. The Government appreciates the great work done, especially by interpreters and the translating service. This work by ethnic people covers a wide field. Obviously, many members in this House have had troubles in understanding people who have come from overseas. I can understand that. Obviously, when the member for Napier gets on his feet members struggle to understand what he is talking about but, nonetheless, he has improved with his stay in this country, and undoubtedly he will continue to improve as time goes on.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: There's plenty of room for it.

Mr. MATHWIN: There is, indeed. There is a great need for ethnic organisations, and over the years some marvellous work has been done by the Good Neighbour Council. It is a fine organisation, which served a very useful purpose while it existed. I was one of the early members of the Good Neighbour Council; in fact, I was one of the foundation members of its British Committee, and no doubt when the member for Napier landed on these shores I may have been one of the gentlemen who went to see him and gave him some good advice.

Mr. Hemmings: I'd have got the next boat back.

Mr. MATHWIN: Obviously, the honourable member took the wrong boat, because he finished up on the socialist benches instead of the Government benches. The Government believes in a more broadly-based group having much greater authority than the situation that now prevails. The commission will be able to resolve the problems and troubles of migrants and the different ethnic groups throughout the ethnic community. Much has been said by the Leader in relation to the policy of the Liberal Party on this matter. I remind the House that our policy states:

A Liberal Government is committed to providing equal opportunities for self-advancement to all, irrespective of

national origin, colour, sex or religion.

This means that the member for Napier will have a fair chance. The establishment of the Ethnic Affairs Commission is another one of our promises; indeed, it is one of the mainstays of our policy which the people obviously support. Ethnic groups throughout South Australia supported it in our overwhelming victory last September. No doubt they knew that as a Party we would fulfil the promises that we had made. In the early part of our policy we stated that we would put this matter in train as soon as possible.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Napier will not interject out of his seat.

Mr. MATHWIN: Our policy also states:

The Liberal Party will establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission. The objects of the commission will be—

To provide opportunities for all migrants and their families to establish themselves in the social and economic life of South Australia; and—

to recommend actions and policies which reflect the real concern of the community towards such groups.

Particular attention will be given to those who encounter problems and difficulties in their work, in family situations . . .

The commission will be an active body in and through which all migrants can work out and solve their problems.

Our policy stated that we would act immediately in this matter, because far too many of our citizens had been denied proper facilities for far too long. That was part of our policy, and we have acted on it as soon as possible in the short time that we have been in office. Of the marvellous things we have done in office, this is another area in which we are implementing our election promises. We have brought this Bill before the House, and I hope that all members will support it, as the Leader of the Opposition said in his speech earlier. In the conclusion of our policy statement (and I do not want to go through it all) the Liberal Party pledges:

that the new Ethnic Affairs Commission will maintain extremely close relationships with all ethnic groups.

That is purely and simply what this is all about. This commission will encourage people to join in the social and economic life of South Australia, and it will give sound first-hand advice (because it will be made up of people from the different areas and different ethnic groups) in matters relating to ethnic communities. It will do so independently. Clause 6 deals with the constitution of the commission and provides that there will be one full-time member and seven part-time members. In regard to the qualifications of these members, the clause provides:

In selecting nominees for appointment to the commission, the Minister shall have regard to—

(a) the knowledge;

(b) sensitivity;

(c) enthusiasm and personal commitment, and

(d) nature and extent of involvement with ethnic groups . . .

That is what the Minister is bound to observe, and I hope that he will, when deciding which groups are to be represented, ensure that the people who come from the United Kingdom (the English, the Scots, the Welsh and the Irish, of whom there are about 250 000 people in this State) are represented on the commission.

Mr. Slater: Particularly the Irish.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, they are all as one.

Mr. McRae: You'll have trouble getting the Irish represented from that group.

Mr. MATHWIN: They are reasonable people.

Mr. McRae: They are wonderful people, but how can the English represent the Irish?

Mr. MATHWIN: That has been done many times. Indeed, I represented the Irish at one stage of my military career. I also represented the Scotch, although I did not wear a kilt; I wore trews. I hope that the Minister will see to it that the migrants from the United Kingdom, with whom I have a very close association are represented on the commission. As I said in an earlier debate in this place, when a member called me that horrible word "Pommie", at least I am Australian by choice and not by accident. There are many accidental Australians in this country, but I am not one of them.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope that the honourable member will link up his remarks.

Mr. MATHWIN: I will, Sir. I am about to sit down but, as somebody who may be more qualified than many to speak on this subject, I thought it only right to put forward the view that the Bill is a good one and to recommend to members that they support it. Again, I stress to the Premier as Minister of Ethnic Affairs the importance of ensuring that the 250 000 or more migrants in South Australia are represented on this excellent Ethnic Affairs Commission.

Mr. CRAFTER (Norwood): I have received many representations from persons in my electorate who would fall into the category of those who would be benefiting by this legislation and who are very sceptical about this measure and doubtful of the Government's sincerity in introducing it at this time. My Leader has pointed out in some detail the lack of proper consultation that has been carried out in the community about the precise need for this measure and how it will operate. I might add that there is grave concern about the extremely broad discretion that the Minister has with respect to choosing the part-time members of the commission. The speech that we have just heard from the member for Glenelg adds to those fears that I have. I am most concerned that the Government does not have a deep understanding of the meaning of the "ethnic" or "ethnicity" or of the precise nature and composition of ethnic minorities in our community.

That does not give members on this side of the House or the community generally much confidence in what this commission will achieve. The member for Fisher was very quick to read into *Hansard* the functions of the commission. Who could oppose those? That would be like opposing motherhood. The functions are broad indeed, and every person who is concerned for the community would want to embrace those aims of the commission. However, is the commission the proper body, and will it be composed in such a way that it can fulfil those functions? I doubt that very much, and so do many people in the community who the Government is saying will benefit from this measure.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Why do you doubt it?

Mr. CRAFTER: Because it is just not possible to identify and bring together people who are representative of those who most need special assistance. We have had a plethora of reports in the 1970's. Fortunately most of them came from the initiatives of the former State Government and the Whitlam Federal Government, particularly through the Royal Commission into Poverty in Australia. I know of one area, that of the relationship of migrants and the law, and their access to the law, but there are others in other essential services, such as health and welfare services. I am not sure about the composition of the commission, nor are those people who have spoken to me about this. The Minister, in his wisdom, will have the sole

power without any requirements of consultation or any criteria to use, other than some broad concept of the enthusiasm of people for the task, to choose these people, appointing them for periods of up to three years to sit on this commission and to direct services and policies in particular areas. I know that just within the Italian community there are some 64 clubs representing greatly diverse groups of people who identify themselves with that community. They come from all walks of life. How can one person (and no doubt there would be no more than one Italian person on this commission) speak for all of those people?

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Would you consider that you speak for the people of Norwood?

Mr. CRAFTER: I think it is possible for a member who works full time in an electorate to be much closer to his people than it is for a member of the Italian community to speak on behalf of all those Italian people in this State. Even if he went to one club a week, I dare say he could not visit all the clubs in one year, regardless of the many thousands of people who do not even belong to clubs or who cannot gain access to adequate or essential services in the community.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Do you see your entire electorate every year?

Mr. CRAFTER: I see a substantial number of my people every year. There is in the community that doubt about the effectiveness of this body, and it is a very real doubt, which I am conveying to the House. This is the creation of a new statutory body, a new commission. It must be one of the most loosely formed bodies that have been established by this House. It does not require its authority or law-making control to be brought before this House by way of regulation, and it is to have these broad functions. Despite the pious statements which the Government has been making and which its members made when in Opposition about the members, functions, powers and accountability of commissions and bodies that orbit this Parliament, once again we find that the Minister has extremely broad powers in selecting the commissioners. Also, the Minister has absolute financial authority over this commission, and in fact he reviews its budget each year.

The Minister detailed the additional powers that this Commission will have, which no doubt will be discussed in Committee. Again, I have grave doubts about the Government's sincerity in establishing a body of this nature, whereas on other occasions it has criticised such bodies. A further point that supports my suspicions is generally the Government's WASP-ish identity: a Party predominately of white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, and it is seen as such, particularly by the ethnic minority communities in this State.

In my view this is a political move by the Government to embrace in some way these communities that it sees that it must identify with in some way other than having representatives in this Parliament or in senior positions in the Party. The member for Fisher quoted from the Progressive Conservative Party's pamphlets issued at the recent election and began his quote "for your children's sake", which reminds me of some of the pamphlets or advertisements which were put out by the Government Party during the State election in September 1979 and to which I referred in my Address in Reply speech on 26 August this year. I quote again that infamous advertisement, officially authorised by the Liberal Party, that appeared in the *Il Globo* newspaper. It was not aimed at a representative group of people within the Italian community. It was in the Italian language. It was not aimed at the accountants, lawyers, doctors, young

professional people or those with managerial skills who are Italian born or come from Italian-born parents that I know. No! It was aimed at a group of people in the Italian community who did not have a good grasp of politics, government or the English language. The advertisement was as follows:

Our children receive a poor education,—
trying to identify with them by using that tense—
and when they finish school all they can do is work as a
factory hand or a field labourer.

I know in the schools in my district of the rather magnificent multi-cultural facilities, staff and attitudes, and the involvement of parents with their children and teachers in overcoming some of the great problems children have when English is not their first language and some of the benefits children have when English is their first language from their learning experience in a school which has children with other primary languages. The advertisement continued, as follows:

But, with the closing down of factories and companies, and with the disappearance of industry and commerce because of the Labor Government, our children are and will remain unemployed.

I interpose to say that I know of people in my electorate who have come and seen me about their loss of jobs and security because of this Government's decision with respect, particularly, to the Public Buildings Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department, people who have, in fact, lost their jobs despite assurances that they would not. They, contrary to what the member for Glenelg said, have not been provided with these "wonderful promises", to use his words, that were offered to them prior to that election. The advertisement continued, as follows:

Even our right to educate our children the way we want to has been denied us by the overbearing dictatorship of the A.L.P.

No statement could be further from the truth with respect to migrant education. The achievements of the Education Department in the field of migrant education during the 1970's were outstanding right throughout Australia and were regarded throughout Australia as outstanding. The advertisement continued as follows:

A Liberal Government will change all this.

No doubt some of the people who have seen me are expressing clearly their disappointment that a Liberal Government has not, and will not, change all this. We are being offered here, and no doubt they are being offered, another commission, another group of people, I suggest, who are as unrepresentative as the people who were offered this advice prior to the election. They are being offered a commission to solve their problems, but I cannot see how it will be providing jobs, or will be changing these problems in education as perceived by the advertisement. More seriously, and more importantly, that advertisement went on to use a fear tactic, a tactic which we saw prior to the last Federal election. It was used effectively and so frighteningly prior to the last State election. The people who are most frightened are frightened because of their backgrounds and historical experiences in their homelands and the circumstances in which they left them, in many cases as frightened people, who were insecure and who looked to Government to provide that security. The advertisement continued, as follows:

A Liberal Government will make it safe for our daughters to walk in the streets without being molested by all those thugs who, for the last 10 years, have been acting as if they own the place.

Here we see an official Liberal Party advertisement frightening these people in the community. We have seen

very clearly from crime statistics that crime is increasing and not decreasing under this Government. It is not just under this Government, but throughout the Western world and it is, of course, related to unemployment and a whole series of factors in the community. Any Government would be foolish if it went out and promised, as this one has, that it will make it safe for our daughters to walk in the streets without being molested, etc.

Mr. Mathwin: It is the society we live in.

Mr. CRAFTER: Why make these rash promises? Why frighten people in this way? One hopes that we are all working to build up a community where it will be safe for the public to use the streets and feel some confidence in their neighbours. But no, I feel and fear that this commission, because it must make choices about who is going to represent diverse communities and diverse groups, which have even within what is known as an ethnic minority group very diverse cultural and language differences, will further divide our community and will not provide that information that is necessary to the Government, or, in fact, will involve those very communities in very divisive activities in order to be heard by Government, curry favour with Government or be known to members of the Government in the hope maybe sincerely that that will bring benefits to the section of the community that they belong to.

I fear that the stated utterances of the Government (and I pointed to just one aspect of those advertisements that appeared prior to the last State election) are an indication of the problem that the Government has in identifying with the ethnic minorities in the community. It seems that it is essential that it provides something that is tangible evidence to these communities that it is concerned for them and that it understands them, but the very contributions that have been made by Government members this evening indicate all too clearly that they see it as an "us" and "them" situation. Surely it must be totally other than that if a commission of this nature is to work and to be effective in changing policies and the delivery of essential services in the community.

It is my suggestion that the very suggestions that a commission, if it worked properly and, if it is going to be created, one would hope that it would make, would be the sorts of recommendation that would be most objectionable to a Government that holds the views that it has held over a long period of time. It will be a commission that I suggest would be more objectionable to the Government than the Women's Adviser in the Department of Further Education, the Education Department or the Premier's Department, because it will be presenting the same views on the behalf of those people it represents, on behalf of scores and scores of groups in our community that have suffered great injustice and inhumanity because they have not been heard to the extent that they should have perhaps been heard in the past.

I cannot see how this simple, ill thought out, and bland grant of power to the Minister will overcome this very complex and most important area of life in this State.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I have been waiting patiently for about one and a half hours to take part in this debate and I must say it has not been a very edifying experience listening to the various speeches. If I may say so, the best we have heard is that from the member for Norwood. Most speeches would have been best left unsaid, particularly that made by the member for Glenelg, which I thought was fairly close to the bottom of the trough.

Mr. Mathwin: Why don't you go home to bed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is an extraordinary thing. I know

that I am not the most popular member in the House and that one thing that other members contrive at is to try to get rid of me. When I am not here there are complaints, and when I am here there are complaints.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has been given the call.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is very kind of you to have done it, too, Mr. Speaker. The Government cannot be blamed for bringing in a Bill of this nature, because it said in its policy speech that it was going to do that. While it has taken 13 months for the Government to do it (the member for Glenelg said "as soon as possible"), the Government's policy at the last election was to establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission.

It does not matter a damn what is in it, or who is on it, or what it has to do: the Government had to establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission. As the member for Norwood has said, the terms of reference are so wide that it may mean nothing. I remind the member for Glenelg that in this area the Liberal Party promised a few other things, too, but there has not been any sign of them yet. The Liberal Party said:

We will encourage the use of suitable bi-lingual teachers, both within the Education Department and within our other schemes. We will ensure that every non-English speaking child will be given special language tuition immediately upon entering school, and this will continue until a satisfactory standard of fluency is achieved. This is recognised as a very much neglected area.

We have not heard anything about that. It was acknowledged in a reply to a Question on Notice that I asked and the Premier said that relevant action, as appropriate, would be taken on that one.

Mr. Mathwin: You want it all done in a couple of weeks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We have had a long time. The honourable member was congratulating himself, his Party, or the Government on acting as soon as possible on what was the simplest thing to do. It could have been done within a couple of weeks. Anyone who has had anything to do with this Parliament can set up a commission overnight. One only has to get out the precedent for the Bill. We set up commissions all the time. Here is another promise:

A Liberal Government will establish an inquiry into the needs in education of migrant children so that they will no longer be disadvantaged. The terms of reference will encourage members of ethnic communities and their leaders to give evidence and make recommendations to ensure that ethnic children who have been brought up in a language other than English will not be disadvantaged in any way within the community.

We have not heard much about that one, either. The Government cannot really indulge in the orgy of self-congratulation that it has done on this matter. The real reason for my wanting to speak and for waiting patiently is to take up the last point that the Leader of the Opposition made. I thought he was going to leave it and not say anything about it. That is the lack of consultation that has taken place between the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs (and I am pleased to see the Hon. Murray Hill sitting in the gallery)—

The SPEAKER: Order! Reference to the gallery is out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought he would like to be recognised.

There has been a lack of consultation between a number of groups (I hate the word "Ethnic": at one time it didn't have the meaning that we have given it in the past few years) and the Government. There have been bitter

complaints about this, and my suspicion is that there has been complaint with some good reason. The Bill was introduced in the Upper House and passed through there before anyone realised that it had come in. It had little publicity. No-one in the Labor Party woke up to it.

My colleague Lance Milne did not know at that time that there were complaints that there had been lack of consultation. The thing had gone through the House before there were complaints and before there was any real debate on the issues, but we have had them now and they are continuing right up to the present time. The Premier, by interjection when the Leader was speaking, tried to suggest that those who complained were unrepresentative, whatever that word may mean, of the ethnic communities.

That seemed to be the purport of his interjection, that people were resigning from the committee, and so on, and he wanted to disparage it and, I suppose, reduce the criticism that had been made. On my information, a memorandum was approved by the committee on Monday night, less than 48 hours ago, complaining about the lack of consultation and the fact that the Premier has been absolutely adamant that he would not change the Bill, despite the fact that these complaints have been made.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Could you explain which committee you are talking about? It would be a help.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. It is the Ethnic Co-ordinating Committee of Mr. Langen-Zueff. He is one of those translators, one of those interpreters about whom we have had so much praise, I think from the member for Glenelg and others. This is what the memorandum says, in part:

Re: SA's Ethnic Affairs commission Bill

The preparing of such a Bill must have been, as is, for example, translation work, appallingly difficult when setting parameters which are to encompass the about 50-60 languages and possibly some 300 ethnic and suchlike communities and associations in South Australia. Without reflecting on Minister Murray Hill's personal application. . .

They seem to have taken not much regard of the Premier in his nominal capacity. The memorandum continues:

. . . if it is not difficult also to imagine that his views may have been overly influenced at times by the usual, so-called prominent community sectors and appointed/self-appointed leaders and "advisers", who painted for him these complex matters perhaps simplistically biased in terms of 'black and white'.

Mr. Hill agreed on 16 September 1980 in the Premier's office to have had quite considerable contact over the past four years and having sent out some 15-20 copies of above Bill (selectively?) up to that date, while his own *Ethnic Directory* displays some hundreds of names of communities, associations and agencies.

That was the very point that the Leader of the Opposition made. The memorandum continues:

Our Ethnic co-ordinating Committee, formed at the end of August this year and representing a substantial cross-section of ethnic/multi-cultural communities and nationality/language groupings, established beyond doubt:

- (a) that a surprising number of sections or 'grey areas' had little or no contact, whatever the extent of the Minister's or our later initiatives;
- (b) that much inadequate, inconclusive or even lack of advice, information, publicity and consultation preceded the formulating and subsequent two readings in August of the above Bill before the Parliament;
- (c) that there appears to be no evidence that any information or consultation thereto was undertaken at least in the major languages (European, Middle East, Asian) for the full knowledge and comprehen-

sion by and for said diverse communities in our society above proposed Bill is intended!

I will not read any more of the memorandum. The Premier can say that these people do not matter, that he will not do anything, and that there was full consultation, but the fact is that many of the migrant groups concerned are very angry about this.

Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He says it is not true. It may be that I am engaging in that same dishonest debating, as the Leader of the Opposition was.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You do occasionally, and it is no credit to you.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, indeed. It is amazing what office does to a bloke.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: You're a good Christian.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let me tell the Premier, through your exalted person, Mr. Speaker, that some migrant leaders have told me that they helped the Liberal Party in its years in Opposition to formulate its policies on ethnic affairs, so called. But, by gum, they did not vote for them at the last election as a result of what has happened. For all the talk of democracy in this place (of course I am the only Democrat here)—

An honourable member: What's that got to do with it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has not got much to do with it at all, but somebody else said something about democracy a moment ago, and I thought that was a good point to follow up. My Party was the beneficiary of the anger of these people and their desertion of the Liberal Party. I am not going to argue with the Premier if he thinks that there has been full consultation and that everyone is happy about that. It suits me and the Australian Democrats. We are happy to let our support grow election by election as it is doing in this way and in many other ways. It is only fair, because of my honesty and fair debating, that I should let members opposite know what is happening.

Mr. Keneally: Is this the comic relief?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I am making a protest.

Mr. Keneally: I hadn't noticed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought that I was doing rather well in making a protest. I am protesting because there has been inadequate consultation with those who are concerned in the matter, as the member for Stuart's own Leader said in his speech, if the honourable member had been listening to it. That is all that I want to say. It is a great pity that, in a matter of community relations as this is, the Government has acted so cavalierly in putting into effect its policy, although only one part of it—the easiest part. It is about time that the Government got on with some of the other things in this area which would be probably of far greater benefit to non-English speaking migrants in this country than this whitewash of a Bill which is superficial and which will probably do no good anyway.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): I do not wish to take up much time of the House. However, having sat and listened to the barrage of attacks launched across the Chamber by the member for Peake, one finds it difficult to sit and not say anything. I want to get some of the facts straight.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. RANDALL: The member for Peake said that we should not interject and should give him a go and let him say his piece and then I would have the opportunity to say mine. The ironical part is that, when I have my chance to speak, the member for Peake is not in the House to listen. He has had his go and has gone home. I am glad to support the Bill. We live in a multi-cultural society. Members opposite and members on this side have demonstrated that

we represent electorates that do have amongst our electors constituents who are from ethnic backgrounds and who are from a broad spectrum.

It is of great interest to me when I participate in Australian citizenship ceremonies from time to time to be able to see the number of ethnic people who are taking that step and making that break with their homeland and acknowledging that they live in Australia, and are prepared to be Australian citizens and take up the responsibilities that that entails. I have made it one of my jobs to encourage my constituents from ethnic backgrounds to take up that responsibility and to understand what it means to live in Australia, to be seen as an Australian and to participate in the democracy that we hear so much about. I am glad to see this commission being set up because one of the things which concerned me in the union movement was that many ethnic people were being manipulated by union advisers, union shop stewards, and did not really understand what unionism was all about. One of the areas that the commission has to look at is advising these people about unionism, putting a non-Party political viewpoint on the role of unions in our society in constructing a working environment. I shall be happy to participate in the submission to the commission to make sure that people have an opportunity to be aware of one of the factors that these groups play in the community.

Ethnic families want to learn the role of the school in the community. Many ethnic families are afraid of the education system. They are concerned when their children are sent off into the compulsory education system because they do not understand what it entails or what their children are being taught. In this society, in which the education system has come to be what is seen as a little progressive and has camps and other things which are not normal for ethnic children to participate in, the families become concerned. It is these concerns that people can take to places like the Italian Information Centre, which is in my electorate and to which the member for Peake referred. The point that the member for Peake did not make and the reason why I believe I got a hearing from the Minister with my deputation is that these people have a different problem from the problems to which the member for Peake was alluding.

The member for Peake was very concerned about the Thebarton Residents Association. If one looks at the Thebarton Residents Association, one begins to ask who are its members and how many members it has. One looks at all the community welfare grants that have been received over the past years. One assesses the value for the dollar poured into the welfare programme through the residents association. One must ask questions about that association. It is not my position to do that tonight, but if the member for Peake wants to carry on his attack on the Minister and his complaints about how hard done by the residents association is, I am prepared to participate in that debate and present facts and figures to the House.

I believe that the Italian Catholic Federation in my area, which is running the Italian Information Centre, has a different problem. The problem is that it has a regular turnover of about 350 people coming through the office on a monthly basis. That clientele has been built up over a number of years. These people, as the member for Peake said, found themselves in an office where they could get advice and information on how to solve their problems. Having found that source of information and having found an ear to hear their complaints and a helping hand to help solve their problems, they returned time and time again. The demands on the people who run the office are becoming tremendous.

We as a Government have quite rightly said that information centres belong at the grass roots level and that that level should determine how the centre is run, who it services and where it is going in the future. Quite rightly the Government has handed control to local government, in my case, to the Woodville council. What concerns me is that when I wrote a letter to the Woodville council to ask them how much it had allocated in its budget towards the information centre, I found that it had not allocated any money. I think it is a challenge to local government to pick up that it must accept the responsibility of community services within its area. I see another council—Henley and Grange in my electorate—picking up that challenge and using ratepayers money to run the information centre. I believe the challenge is for the Woodville council to realise that a significant number of its ratepayers are of Italian or Greek origin. They deserve the community centre in their area.

They need the backing of the council as well as the Government, I strongly support the work that the Italian Information Centre is doing, because I have seen daily a continuing stream of people flow through that office and get the help they need. It is help that I cannot give as their local member, because I cannot speak their language for a start. So, there is one barrier between them and me, the language barrier. Sometimes I wish that I had had the opportunity to study Italian so that I could communicate on a face-to-face basis with these. From time to time we have managed to establish communication and contact. I endorse the Bill and the commission, and what it is trying to do, by supporting the Bill before the House. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said:

In putting forward this proposal, the Government acknowledges the usefulness of the interpreter, translation and information services to the ethnic communities that have been provided by the Ethnic Affairs Branch, which was established by the previous State Government. While these services will continue, the Government feels there is a need for a more broadly based and authoritative body through which people from ethnic communities can work out their problems and become involved in the social and economic life of South Australia.

That is the crux of why we, as a State Government, believe that the service needs to be expanded. While the previous Government did make a token effort and put something into operation, this Government has assessed a broadening need to be satisfied, and that is what the Bill is all about. I strongly support the Bill.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I, too, am in general support of the Bill before us and take some pleasure in noting that it contains within it two amendments moved in the Upper House by the Party I represent. So, it is a Bill that has been modified by the Australian Labor Party. It is a pity that it was not modified in some other ways by the other place, but they are aspects that can be attended to in about two years time. The achievements of the previous Government have stood out loud and clear in the debate tonight in the area of ethnic affairs. The previous 10 years has shown clearly the commitment that the A.L.P. has had to ethnic affairs. In reality, the Bill is nothing more than an attempt by a Johnny-come-lately Government to show itself as having some degree of concern.

The past 10 years has seen support for ethnic radio in the community, the ethnic grants advisory committee, the ethnic festivals grants advisory committee, the Education Department Migrant Advisory Council, and various other committees of that nature, as well as a much broader philosophical approach by the then Government in trying to reach out to represent and protect the interests of all

people within the State.

One particular area I raise as an example to show in what way the previous Government was committed to a better understanding and a better level of communication between all people within our State. I refer to the teaching of languages within our education system. Languages are taught in the primary and secondary systems, and this is a very vital part in enabling people within the Anglo-Saxon community to understand more of the language and culture of the ethnic minorities, and also a means of helping the many people in the ethnic minorities more fully to understand their own culture. We are aware that many young people in this State whose parents were non-English speaking in origin are not able to understand fully the language of their parents. The efforts undertaken by the Education Department to help them understand are commendable.

The information I will quote comes from answers to Questions on Notice that I placed in the first session of this Parliament and in the present session, namely, No. 903 in the first session and No. 562 in the second session. With regard to Matriculation language courses at the secondary level, in 1969 only six languages were available to students, namely, French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, and one Asian language, Japanese. At that time 815 students were studying those languages at the Matriculation level. In 1979 there had been a vast improvement, because the six languages had grown to 16 languages, namely, Polish, Dutch, French, German, Hungarian, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Greek, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, and Malay. This represented a tremendous increase that spread out into a much wider range in the community. The number of students studying those languages had increased by over 50 per cent, to 1 337.

The same picture appears in the primary level. In 1969, only four languages were taught in only seven primary schools in this State. The languages were French, Greek, German, Pitjantjatjara, which had only just come into being as language in a school in 1969. In 1979, after 10 years of the Labor Government and its commitment to ethnic affairs, the situation was vastly improved, as the number of languages had gone from four to 11, namely, French, German, Greek, Italian, Yugoslav, Dutch, Indonesian, Japanese, Malay, Pitjantjatjara, and Admanatara. Not only that, but the number of schools covered by this programme had gone from seven to 97 primary schools. That is a tremendous effort.

I know that the Premier will raise the matter that, in the first year of his Government, further improvements were made of a certain order, and that is correct. The one language added was Ukrainian. We have a substantial Ukrainian community in this State, and that language deserved to be added to this list, and another 16 schools were added. This does not take away the fact that the major growth in this area took place in the past 10 years, from seven schools to 97 schools and from four languages to eleven languages.

Within the Salisbury electorate, exactly the same growth in language study has shown itself in the primary and high schools. I am particularly interested in the increasing of the means and avenues of communication of all people in the State, an increasing of the degree to which people feel that they can participate within South Australia from whatever origin they have come. My district, as members will know, contains a great many people of ethnic minority origin. About 15 per cent of the people in the electorate are Italian in origin, and there are also Greek communities, Spanish communities, Yugoslav, Bulgarian, Dutch, Maltese, as well as many others. In my time as the

member for that district, I have made considerable effort to try to contact as many of the communities in the electorate as possible.

Mr. Mathwin: How many British?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I noticed earlier that the member for Glenelg referred to the member for Napier and said that he possibly had door-knocked on him. I realised, when he said that, why many English people fear things that go bump in the night. The contact I have had with people in my community indicates that they are very concerned about the type of service that can be provided for them by the Government, but also about the sorts of service they can provide their own community, and the kind of assistance they would like to receive from the Government in helping them provide those services. This is a matter to which I will return later in Committee, because I do not believe that we have clearly outlined this matter in the functions of the Bill in the same way as is done in the New South Wales legislation.

One or two points have been touched on in relation to this Bill on which I will elaborate and to which I hope, the Premier will respond. First, we have had some difficulty trying to define "ethnic". Indeed, the term "ethnic affairs" has one interpretation in the Bill and a slightly different interpretation in the New South Wales legislation. The difference is interesting, and perhaps even significant.

What do we mean by "ethnic"? The point has been raised, I think somewhat fatuously that we are all ethnic, which is true in a strict sense. I think we can all accept that the purpose of this Bill is more importantly directed at ethnic minority groups: those groups which, perhaps for want of numbers, are not able to get full access to all services of the community or which do not feel fully a part of the community in the same way as those of us in the majority group are able to feel. I know from personal experience that it is very much harder for the Paraguayans in Salisbury (and there are some) to have full communication with others. Not only do they have the limitation of language (although they share the same language with other Spanish speaking people) but also they have cultural needs and realities peculiar to Paraguay that are not shared by many other countries. So, that is important when talking about ethnic minorities. It is somewhat soreheadedness for people to say, "I am ethnic, too. Why does not my majority group receive some sort of assistance?"

The other point that was raised relates to Aborigines, who represent an ethnic group and, more important, an ethnic minority group. I should be most interested to hear from the Premier what communication he has had with the Aboriginal community in regard to what it thinks about this Bill. Earlier this evening, a point was made (I think by the member for Fisher) that Aborigines are catered for. They have the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs with (to use his words) "his small department". Without digressing too much, my feeling over the months gone by (which feelings are shared by many Opposition members) have been that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and his small department have not very adequately been handling the needs of the Aboriginal community. In many regards, it seems that that Minister and his department have been more adept at saying what they cannot do and what is not within their sphere of responsibility than they have been at saying what is and going about taking action to follow it up. I hope that the Premier will comment on that matter so that we can know in what regard Aborigines have been contacted and also what their responses have been.

That raises the other point of the contact made with other ethnic groups. The Leader of the Opposition clearly

expounded the way in which that contact does not seem to have been sufficient at this stage, and said that many more efforts could have been made to contact all community groups. When that point was repeated again a few moments ago, the comment "How can a member of Parliament know everyone in his electorate?" came from the Government benches.

We are dealing not with a 47-man commission (which should be more able to respond to people throughout the State) but with an eight-man commission, comprising seven part-time members and one full-time member. Those eight members must cover the geography of the entire State, and I should have thought that that was a point that the member for Mallee would understand clearly, because he is always talking about the geography of his electorate.

The other point is that the communities are spread all over that area and, in many cases, come from different parts of their country. It is not necessarily reasonable to presume that all people in the Italian community in South Australia have the same needs, aspirations, or whatever. For example, many Italians in my electorate come from a certain part of Italy, and in other electorates they come from different parts of Italy. Also, they had many differences within Italy when they were there, and those differences are no less so in this country.

Mr. Randall: But the languages are.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Basically, the language is very different. The dialect is so strong that it almost ranks as a separate language. One can say the same thing in relation to other parts of Europe. In Spain, for example, there are at least two major languages, and dialects of some significance as well.

Mr. Mathwin: That's like people from Yorkshire and London.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I think the honourable member will find that the differences in dialect are a little greater. Even though the honourable member fails to understand the sense and wisdom of the member for Napier all the time, that is more a lack of understanding than of comprehension of language on the honourable member's part.

One of the points raised in another place which has not been touched on very much this evening but which should be dealt with is the matter of worker representation on the commission itself. The Leader of the Opposition in another place referred to this as being an important question. The commission will be responsible for a paid staff as well as for a voluntary staff, which will be co-ordinated in its activities throughout the community. In a sense, that paid and unpaid staff will represent quite a wide spread of people and opinions, and it is only fair that they should have some access to the commission. It is a pity that the Government has not seen the wisdom of incorporating such a position on the commission.

One other point that should be raised (the member for Fisher responded to it a little) is the matter of statutory authorities. To a certain extent, inasmuch as the Government has perceived that ethnic communities in South Australia have a need, it has realised the wisdom of creating a statutory authority. The Government realises, seemingly at long last, what the Opposition has known for a long time, namely, that needs sometimes exist that demand the appointment of statutory authorities.

Perhaps this may represent the dawning of a new day for the Government: it realises that its paranoia with statutory authorities in the past was unreal and unfounded. I congratulate the Government for this. It is a very healthy sign.

I now refer to the matter of helping to meet the needs of

the ethnic community. One of the avenues of meeting those needs is none other than members of Parliament ourselves. We must assist many times in dealing with constituents' problems. Indeed, the member for Henley Beach has said how difficult it is when constituents sometimes come in and members are unable clearly to communicate with them. It can be quite difficult. Of course, we have the telephone translation service, which I certainly have used on occasions, as I am sure other members have done.

I note in this debate some other ways in which I believe that further assistance could be given by members, with a little help coming from the Government. First, I think that it should be possible to provide short courses, either to members themselves or to their personal assistants (or both), providing them with basic vocabularies (I am not talking about teaching an entire language) in the most common languages applying in a member's electorate. For example, I would be quite keen to learn perhaps a 500-word vocabulary in, say, Greek or Italian for my electorate, as that would be invaluable to me. I do not think that this would be particularly difficult to organise. We have the personnel in the State who could do it, and it would not involve demanding, intensive, lengthy courses. It would need nothing more than a few afternoons or evenings in each case.

Alternatively, I know that electronic aids are available, electronic dictionaries that translate from various languages, available at a not too expensive cost, that might also be made available for a cost of \$250 for the basic unit, plus \$40 or \$50 for each language module. That could be made available to members with the languages relevant to their electorates. I would not need all the languages in my case, but there are one or two which I feel from past experience would be useful.

Another thing which would be of great assistance, and I hope that this is an area that the Ethnic Affairs Commission will be charged with very quickly in its life (or "as soon as possible", in the words of the member for Glenelg), is of ensuring that as many documents as possible produced by the State Government will be translated into other languages. I am sure that other members, like myself, already display a wide range of Commonwealth publications printed in a variety of languages. To date it has not been possible to expand that into the State publications to a great degree, but I hope that that might be done in the future. It need not be done in the way in which it was done for Commonwealth publications. Each Commonwealth publication has basically the same artistic and printing format, which may be rather expensive. We could limit the artistic and printing format to the English edition and have offset produced sheets of quarto paper in the other languages to go with it—much cheaper, I would imagine.

Mr. Schmidt: Are you saying that people of other languages are inferior?

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: I am talking about cost-cutting to try to ease the Budget of the State. Obviously it would be better to have the same style for everything, but for the one or two people who speak some very infrequently spoken language in my electorate it would be unreasonable to demand the high-cost production of the normal run of pamphlets.

It would also be of assistance if the Government or the commission could ensure some way in which we, as members, could have access to translation facilities, to translate articles that we could make available to the ethnic press when we wanted to make a point about assistance we could offer, or something we have been able to do for them in the nature of a constituent matter, a local

electorate matter. The only option at the moment is to go to commercial translation facilities, and that involves a very expensive outlay not within the reaches or realms of most of us.

I want to touch on quite a few points in Committee; I will not touch on them now, but there are one or two other points I wish to make at this time. I was dismayed by the comments of the member for Fisher when he talked about discrimination against Asians by non-Asians. Inasmuch as he was putting forward the thesis that all peoples in the world are capable of discrimination against others, I accept the point; that is so. But lamentably, he said, "discrimination by Europeans, in particular by southern Europeans, against Asians" takes place. That was of grave concern to me. As one who has had much contact with southern Europeans within my electorate, I know that not to be so. That it is claimed they exhibit more discrimination against Asians than any other community I find to be insulting and it is shameful that a member of this House should cast such a slight on those people. There are people in every community who discriminate and practise racism. It is in itself a racist comment to presume that one community is more like that than another.

One need only look at the way in which many people from this region settle peaceably and in racial harmony throughout the world. The example of the Spanish holds itself high in that regard. The other point made was almost that migrants coming to this country should be grateful for any help that they receive, that they get here what they would not get overseas, that if we went to live overseas we would not get anywhere near the help that these people get here. Again, this is a very lamentable comment to have been made. It is a pity that we have had to be subjected to such a comment.

I have had the good fortune to travel on many occasions, particularly to Europe, and I have even had the fortune or otherwise to meet a colleague of the House on one occasion. I have found that, while there may not be statutory provisions in many of the Parliaments overseas to ensure that migrants are aided and helped, there is in many cases a genuine friendliness and openness in the community to see that that assistance is given. I can vouch for many more examples of where I, as a person not speaking the local language, have received genuine and complete assistance than I can cite examples where this has not been the case. I know that there are agencies in many of those countries that do very much to try to assist migrant workers who are perhaps the major migrant component in most European countries, for example. I can cite examples in Switzerland, Germany, Sweden or Austria. It is a pity that a member of this House should try to denigrate those aspects of what those Governments are trying to do.

Furthermore, I think the point was missed that many people in other countries speak English as a second or third language, and that automatically makes it easier for one of us choosing to settle over there, whereas we do not speak Italian, Spanish, French, German, Yugoslav, or Greek as our second, third, fourth or fifth language. Therefore, the statutory provisions are essential here. I suggest that the member for Fisher should look no further than to see the number of English people, for example, who settle in the non-English speaking countries of Europe in their retirement, for example, and find that very conducive.

Two other points I wish to raise briefly in the short time left to me concern the Kilkenny Migrant Information Centre and the Ethnic Affairs Branch. While applauding the aim of the Ethnic Affairs Commission, it seems to me a great pity that the Kilkenny Migrant Information Centre

will not be able to rely on further funding from December this year. I have had contact with people who have benefited from assistance given by that centre. I can quote from a SACOSS news supplement briefly describing the situation as follows:

This centre, which has two full-time and three part-time workers speaking seven languages between them, have emphasised their great concern over funding. They had received a grant of \$10 000 to support the centre until December 1980 from the Local Government Department, but have been notified that no funding will be available after that date.

That is a great pity. Just at the time we are trying to build machinery to assist, we find that one of the arms into the community that can provide that assistance is being undermined, is being cut down.

The other point I wish to make is with regard to the Ethnic Affairs Branch. I note that branch offices have been established at Felixstow, Berri and Whyalla. Perhaps the time is right to consider the establishment of branch offices in other places—the northern suburbs, for example, within which my electorate lies, where there are many people whose primary language is not English, who have difficulty with English, and who could well benefit from a branch office of the Ethnic Affairs Branch. There are very many people—150 000 people in the metropolitan area north of Grand Junction Road, a great many of whom speak a language other than English as their first language. That, I believe, would justify the existence of such an office in that area.

As I said before, I support the Bill. The record of the previous Government over the past years is exemplary. It clearly indicates just where our philosophy lies, and I believe that the ethnic minority groups within the community responded well to that and appreciated just how significant the assistance was that they were getting from the Australian Labor Party. Were we still in Government it therefore would not have been necessary, I believe, for the commission to be established, because our record was proven. But the present Government feels that it needs a show piece and needs something to at least attempt to win the hearts and minds, to use the phrase that has been used elsewhere by other Governments, of the ethnic community and to establish some sort of credentials.

Whatever its political motives, our effort on this side will be to ensure that the community itself benefits from the full achievements of the functions and the objects that the Commissioners lay down. We will be monitoring it in the years ahead, reading its reports with great interest and, more importantly, listening to our own communities within our own districts to find out how well served they are by this commission and in what ways their day-to-day existence is being improved. For my part, and I am sure I speak with the concurrence of many of my fellow members, I give the Government notice that we will be wanting to see that these functions and objects are supported fully and wholly by the Government in the years ahead.

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I wish to begin my remarks in this debate by dealing in great depth with all the valid points made in regard to this Bill by the member for Glenelg. Having done that, I want to turn now to the actual Bill with which we are dealing. I have yet to be convinced that this Bill that we are debating in the early hours of the morning will have any effect or benefit on the ethnic people of South Australia. I find it a very sorry thing that the Government of the day has seen fit to put this type of legislation before us when, on the other hand,

it expects the ethnic people of this State to put up with cut-backs in spending in areas such as education, health, welfare, children's welfare, and so on. I suggest that there would be more benefit to the ethnic people of this State if the Government ignored this Bill and reconsidered its current policies on financial matters.

For example, the Government is apparently so concerned about ethnic people in our community that it saw fit recently, through its Federal colleagues, not to support the full-time operation in my district of the Good Neighbour Council. That office played an important part in benefiting ethnic people generally, especially those in my district. I repeat that it is a sorry thing to find the Government introducing this type of legislation, yet denying the ethnic people of this State what I believe to be their just rights.

I want to deal with comments made by the member for Henley Beach, who I believe was indulging in some horseplay. For example, he raved on at some length about ethnic people not knowing what trade unions were all about. I put up for quite some time with people like the member for Henley Beach telling me that ethnic people were controlling trade unions. The honourable member cannot have his cake and eat it too.

Clause 12 is the crux of the legislation, because it spells out the objects of the commission, the first object being to promote greater understanding of ethnic affairs within the community. I have found by experience (and I have had a fair bit of experience with ethnic people my own district), that ethnic people benefit by being encouraged to be involved in their particular communities. The commission's second object is—

to assist and encourage the full participation of ethnic groups in the community in the social, economic and cultural life of the community;

Perhaps some do not realise, although I have realised for some time, that in most communities ethnic people believe quite seriously in maintaining their own culture, isolating themselves in their own communities. I suggest that that is a good thing. We do not want to lose sight of the fact that their particular culture, within a community, should be maintained at all times. That is a situation that this country has been able to attain, and it should remain. The commission's third object is—

to promote co-operation between the various ethnic groups within the community;

As I have said, ethnic people are inclined to pursue their own individualism. Overall, I believe that the commission should not interfere in this respect. I understand that the commission is to encourage local government participation. In my district local government has participated well in maintaining understanding and close co-operation with ethnic people. The city of Whyalla, at the peak of its development, comprised about 60 nationalities, including Scotsmen. To a large degree, the ethnic people of Whyalla have maintained their individual cultures, and the Labor Party has always had a policy of encouraging ethnic people to work in the community.

That is a function that should be continued by this Government. Perhaps the Premier in his reply will say whether the Government intends to encourage that participation by ethnic people in their communities. With the great migration programme involving my electorate back in the 1960s, came the ethnic people who, in my opinion, brought very great changes not only to Whyalla but to the State as a whole. For example, the ethnic people brought a change in the drinking laws and other social laws. This State had archaic social laws. It was to a great degree the influence of the ethnic people on our community that brought about that change.

I can vividly recall the Dunstan Government introducing changes in the social and drinking laws of the State, and this was largely brought about by ethnic people. Ethnic people in the community also brought about a great change in the eating habits of Australians generally, as well as in our dress habits. It seems to me that the ethnic people in this State have brought not only their own cultures to us but also a great change in the Australian culture, and I believe it is a change for the better. They have also brought great changes in the sporting field. Some of the sportsmen representing Australia at the Moscow Olympics were ethnic people, who have also played a very great role in our work force. However, I cannot find anything in this Bill that will improve the situation of ethnic people or help solve their problems.

Australians were only too pleased for ethnic people to migrate to this country to join our work force. We learnt something from those people. We have found that ethnic people have played a very important part in accepting leadership within the community. The Australian Labor Party has always stressed that it does not want window-dressing, but I am suggesting that this is exactly what the Bill involves. Actual involvement by Governments in the activities of ethnic people is what is required. The difference between this Government and the former labour Government, as an example, is the donation of \$5 000 that was given by the former Government to the ethnic community in the city of Whyalla to begin what that community had been endeavouring to start for some time in the way of a broadcast over the local radio station 5AU. This programme and the whole exercise that has taken so long to bring to fruition is in severe and drastic jeopardy.

In fact, I suggest to the Premier that it will not go on for much longer. There is no way that it can be funded. The Federal Government has been approached by me and by the ethnic people, and no funding is available. If the Premier is serious about assisting the ethnic people and getting them involved, as he says he is, then let him put up the money. Let us find out whether the Premier is prepared in his generosity to donate another \$5 000 and perhaps go a little further and make a grant of \$5 000 a year so that this exercise to which I have referred can continue. The Premier may laugh: all I am saying is that if he is fair dinkum about this Bill, if he wants ethnic involvement, and if he wants to assist ethnic people in our community, then I suggest that he could give far more assistance to ethnic people by doing as I am suggesting.

Radio 5AU goes to all the West Coast, all the North of the State and most of the North-East of the State. There is a real need for this facility, and it is a positive programme that I have mentioned, something that has been wanted for as many years as I can remember. These people have had the opportunity of getting the project off the ground by means of a grant, but it obviously requires not only a grant but a continuing subsidy. It obviously needs funding by some means, and I ask the Premier to consider what I have said so that hopefully not only will he be, by this Bill, establishing a commission but also he will be doing something real for the ethnic people of this State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I point out to the member for Whyalla, who contributed so vigorously, succinctly and wisely to this debate that the grant of \$5 000 to which he referred for Whyalla, while it was promised by the previous Government, was honoured by this Government and came out of this Government's funds, so I hope that he will forgive me for being just slightly amused by the remarks he has made.

Mr. Max Brown: Come off it, you're not impressing me.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is one other problem. That is, that the honourable member does not impress me

very much when he says that the Ethnic Commission will not be beneficial to the people of this State. I must be honest and confess that I do not have a great deal of regard for the member for Whyalla's opinions. I do not set great store by them. I have recently renewed my acquaintance with an overseas study on tourism prepared by the member for Whyalla and presented to this House. It is an interesting document and an interesting reflection on the member for Whyalla's opinions on foreign countries and migrant populations. I will go no further.

There has been a great deal said tonight, and I think this has been a well worthwhile debate in only one or two specific instances. Certainly we have had contributions which have been positive from this side of the House. I would like to pay a tribute to, and congratulate, the member for Salisbury, who made one of the best speeches I have heard in this Chamber for some days. He made a positive contribution. He talked a lot of good common-sense and did not simply toe the Party line and regurgitate, as so many of his colleagues did, the same old story over and over again. He behaved well for much of his speech, which deteriorated towards the end only to the extent that he descended to following the Party line, but in the first part of his speech he was positively statesmanlike, and I congratulate him on that.

Certainly, there is, as he acknowledged, on occasion, a need for an authority, and I will go into that in a little while. The basic premise which he canvassed in the early part of his speech was that people wish to help themselves and that there are migrant communities which can help themselves and which should be encouraged to help themselves. The Government's role in those cases is to help people help themselves. He talked about the definition of ethnic affairs. Yes, indeed, they do basically refer to minority ethnic groups. It was only then, when he talked about the lack of consultation, that his contribution fell off somewhat. I point out to the honourable member that a translation service is available to all members of Parliament, provided it is not used for the translation of political material but for the translation of information.

This service is free of charge to members of Parliament and all that the honourable member needs to do is approach the Ethnic Affairs Branch or the Ethnic Affairs Commission, and they will be delighted to help him. I point out that the other concern he expressed about the Kilkenny Information Centre leads me to point out to him that that centre has been funded to the extent of \$10 000 to the end of this year. The Woodville council has been offered the opportunity to take over responsibility for that centre. If it takes over that responsibility, funds will be made available from the Government for the council for that purpose.

Mr. Lynn Arnold: From the State Government?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. The concern, I do not doubt, is sincerely felt, but it is without foundation. I think that the member for Salisbury made one of the most sensible contributions to this debate. I cannot say very much about the member for Mitcham, except that he gave total support to the Leader, and that seemed to be the gravamen of his remarks. He was totally and absolutely behind the Leader and, as such, was once again in a bad position indeed.

Mr. Bannon: He was laughable.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, he was laughable, and I am glad that the Leader realises the danger of having the member for Mitcham behind him. The member for Peake, I believe, was well intentioned and showed concern, which I am pleased to be able to reassure him about, as I have reassured the member for Salisbury. His discussion was somewhat confused, but I suspect that the whole situation

has been somewhat confused because there has been an interaction of people from the Thebarton council, Thebarton Residents Association, and nobody has mentioned Filef tonight, but it comes into it and, also, the Thebarton Community Centre interim board. That, I think, probably explains why there have been some of the misunderstandings which have been mentioned. I will certainly be talking about some of the specific matters he has mentioned a little later when I deal with what the Leader had to say.

Mr. Plunkett: Are you going to pay the bills?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is one of the things I will be able to reassure the honourable member about, because he has not understood, and, I suspect neither has his Leader. The member for Norwood expressed a concern, once again for no apparent reason, and no-one on the other side has been able to advance a fundamental explanation as to why they doubt whether the commission will be effective. Many people have said so, but no-one, as yet, has advanced a clear positive reason. The member for Norwood was much the same. He expressed a concern that it might not be possible to find people who are representative of all the various ethnic groups. I agree that it will not be easy to do so, but the honourable member himself is a representative of a wide spectrum of the community, and I think he does his job reasonably well, as well as anybody in this House does as a local member (I think we all work very hard on that), so I cannot really accept his argument on that. Indeed, he went further and more or less answered his own question when he virtually explained that the appointment procedures that have been adopted are, in fact, quite appropriate, because the intention is to appoint people who are known to have a broad knowledge of the communities concerned and who have credibility and standing within those communities so that they cannot represent but contribute to the affairs of the commission. They will be representative of the broad community and they will contribute in their own right, but they will not represent in the Parliamentary sense. I believe that the member for Norwood very capably supported the provisions set out in the Bill. I am grateful to him for doing that.

I must say that I regret the approach adopted by the Leader. He spent much of his time being rather less than complimentary about the present Government. I believe that it is rather unfortunate that he totally dismissed any possibility at all that anyone other than members of the Australian Labor Party could possibly have any concerns for the ethnic communities. I am sure in this matter I will have the total support of the member for Mitcham, because I believe that all members of Parliament, whether members of the Labor Party, Australian Democrats, or Liberals, are genuinely concerned about the difficulties which ethnic people have in our community as part of our multi-cultural society.

To stand up and spend an inordinately long time saying, as the Leader did, "Only we are concerned and only we have ever done anything and now that there is a new Government, it is only a sham—

Mr. Millhouse: He was full of self-congratulations.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He was, and it does him no credit.

Mr. Bannon: Its a pretty good record.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, and I was about to say that the previous Government's record in this matter was good and I am not in any way detracting from this. I cannot understand the insecurity that is evident in this obsession in having to say not only "We are good" but "You are bad", because that is what the Leader did, all night.

Mr. Bannon: No, I just said you weren't doing anything of substance. I didn't say you were bad.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the Leader has made my point for me. I can give the House an assurance (and I have no doubt that the Leader probably will not take a great deal of notice of it) that we are equally as concerned as he is or as the previous Government was with the affairs of the ethnic community, and to say that the A.L.P. is the only really concerned body is obviously not true. It obviously reflects still some bitterness. It certainly is not statesmanlike, and I believe it smacks a little of vote catching and insecurity.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't think they would have caught many votes tonight.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am certain that the member for Mitcham is quite right. I regret the attitude that has been adopted. The other thing is that the A.L.P. apparently criticises the formation of this commission on the grounds that it is yet another authority, whilst the member for Salisbury fully and properly admitted that there are special occasions when there is an exception to every rule, and to say that we are not going to form more authorities is very different from saying what we do say, namely, that we are going to reduce the number of authorities, but it will not stop us from forming an authority where one is necessary. The Leader obviously has understood only half of the policy and is adopting the rigid attitude of saying, "There must be no more."

Mr. Bannon: Well, tell us about the ones you are going to abolish.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That sort of gimmick will not get the Leader anywhere, either. Apparently, the Party here does not support a commission and the New South Wales Government does. Indeed, the New South Wales Government by and large has done very well with its commission. We have had in our policy, as members know, the formation of a commission for some two elections. The fact that New South Wales is larger and South Australia is smaller in population is well known to all of us. That did not come as a surprise from the Leader, but to say that, for some reason or other, because South Australia has fewer people we do not need a commission or to say that the problems experienced by minority groups in our society are somehow less important or less serious than those experienced in New South Wales seems to be a spurious argument, if every I have heard one.

Indeed, the problems of smaller migrant ethnic communities, the smaller people who lack the total support of a bigger group of their own kind, could well be greater, as research has shown. That argument does not hold water, either. Whether communities are large or small, what matters is what is done to help them. I think the Leader said that. I agree that the help is best given through a commission that will, perhaps, as an exception, if the Leader cares to call it that (the exception that proves the rule), enable ethnic communities to be relatively self-sufficient and set their own destiny and their own course as far as possible.

The Leader has implied that this scheme is something imposed on ethnic communities by bureaucratic decree. I think he said something of that nature. I do not agree. I think that this sort of activity and initiative should come from the communities themselves, and we have in South Australia ethnic communities who are well capable of organising themselves and looking after themselves. All that they need is some guidance and some special services from Government or community organisations for the people who are less able to help themselves.

That is why consultation was conducted in very great detail indeed, and for the Leader, so ably supported by the

member for Mitcham, to deny that there was consultation is, I believe, a mistake, because consultation there was. I can only say that I believe that the Leader should exercise care when he is making claims based upon individual reports without checking to see what the standing of those reports is within their own community. That is, I think, essentially something that must always be done.

I will refer briefly to the question of the Ethnic Co-ordinating Committee, to which the Leader and the member for Mitcham have referred. The members of that committee (and the membership has varied quite considerably over the past few days) claim to have been formed in response to concern within the ethnic community that the South Australian Ethnic Affairs Commission Bill was prepared with "no meaningful participation or consultation with ethnic groups and population" and that the Bill passed the Legislative Council with "indecent haste".

Despite the claim by the Ethnic Co-ordinating Committee that it represents the concerns of the majority of ethnic people in South Australia, it has become quite clear that it represents the views of a small number of individuals only. Clearly, it does not represent (and I suspect perhaps some members of it do not respect) the views of the ethnic community, who overwhelmingly have endorsed and welcomed the concept of the commission and the Bill.

It appears that there were some six members on that committee. It is also apparent from recent events that there have been great divisions within that committee and certainly no unanimity. I, with the Minister Assisting the Premier in Ethnic Affairs, met the committee on 16 September. One member of the committee acted as spokesman. On 21 October that member insisted that he did not wish to be associated with the committee any further. He advised that he had not attended any meetings of the committee since 16 September. On 27 October another member advised that he wished to dissociate himself totally—

Mr. Bannon: Who were they?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thought the Leader knew them all. The member wished to dissociate himself totally from a press release issued on behalf of the Ethnic Co-ordinating Committee. That member is now talking about demanding another member's expulsion from all further meetings. The important thing and the thing that the Leader is trying to cover up is that the committee, when it came to see us, was asked, having spoken to us about the need for consultation and, indeed, having been given an assurance that the Bill would not be proceeding through this House for some five or six weeks, to set down a submission to me, as Minister of Ethnic Affairs, setting out suggestions for improvements to the Bill and what the committee thought ought to be in it.

The committee was asked to canvass the groups that it said it represented and to put its thoughts down and send them to us. I undertook at that stage to consider them so that at this stage, an appropriate time, they could be incorporated if the submissions were worth while. That deputation, having agreed to do that and, therefore, further debate would be delayed for about five or six weeks to enable us to look at it, has not submitted a thing. That was six weeks ago, and we have not heard from the committee in any positive way. We have had one or two requests for additional copies of the Bill. However, we have not heard anything at all from them of a positive nature. So much for the Ethnic Co-ordinating Committee.

Mr. Bannon: What about the events of 22 September?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I regret having to make those comments.

Mr. Bannon: Wasn't that possible?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, it was not. I regret having to make those comments but I nevertheless believe that we should take these things in context and make sure that they remain in perspective. There has been, on a number of occasions, a claim made (and I think it is only one claim) by members opposite that there has been insufficient consultation in respect of the proposed Ethnic Affairs Commission. The Government rejects that claim totally. The Minister assisting me in ethnic affairs rejected this accusation in another place when it was made at the second reading stage, and the Minister's explanation was not challenged at that time, and there are no grounds to do so today. I think it is important enough to go through the history of it. Members will recall that the proposal to establish an Ethnic Affairs Commission has been the central feature of the Liberal Party's ethnic affairs policy since 1977. The member for Mitcham was kind enough to read some other parts of the policy.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you going to do anything about them?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: They will be attended to in due course.

Mr. Millhouse: Well after the next election, I would think.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would not suggest to the member for Mitcham that he should count on that. Since 1977, the general concept of the commission has been discussed at great length and on innumerable occasions amongst all ethnic communities. From such discussions it has become patently clear that ethnic communities in this State generally endorse the concept of this commission. Indeed, it is of interest (and there was some pooh-poohing of this idea) to realise that the Liberal Party's proposal for a commission in 1977 received the endorsement of the A.L.P. in New South Wales. Soon after gaining office in that State it set up such a commission.

Mr. Millhouse: You are not suggesting that they copied your policy?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No, I suggest that it endorsed our policy by doing exactly the same thing. For some reason or another—and I have noticed this before—the New South Wales Labor Party does not seem to get on with the views of its colleagues here.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I suggest that the honourable Premier relate his remarks to the clauses in the Bill.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. Since September last year (a date that I will come back to later because members opposite have placed great emphasis on that date this afternoon and this evening, and well they may do, as I do), the Minister assisting has made considerable effort to consult with leaders of ethnic groups and a variety of individuals in South Australia to promote discussions in the community on the formation of the commission. Those people cover a wide spectrum of ethnic groups, and discussions were not limited to only the larger communities. There were a number of meetings between October last year and June this year. On each occasion they were attended by a large number of interested people to discuss the proposed structure of the commission. The Minister, as the Leader acknowledged, used his frequent attendance at ethnic functions (and he has been assiduous at doing that) to acquaint people with the role of the commission and to gauge people's reactions. We have had media releases on a number of occasions from my office and the Minister's office to advise of the progress being made with the establishment of the commission and to stimulate discussion.

The Minister spoke on SEBI earlier this year. He has written to 15 major ethnic organisations informing them of

the preparations in hand to establish the commission and inviting nominations and the interests of nominees for the various voluntary advisory committees to be formed when the commission became operational. Over the past year the Minister has visited Sydney on two occasions to consult with the Minister responsible in the New South Wales commission and also the Chairman of that commission. An officer of his department has visited Sydney on another occasion to speak to other officers. They found that the New South Wales commission has won general acceptance and approval from the ethnic communities in New South Wales, and its efforts to involve people of ethnic backgrounds in contributing to the decisions which affect them have been most successful.

The views prompted by the Government's efforts to involve people in discussing the commission, its role and function, were considered and evaluated carefully by the Minister assisting and by the Government generally. Indeed, it has had a great deal to do with influencing the form of the Bill as it is now presented to Parliament. It says a great deal for the proposed success (and I have no doubt that it will be successful) of the legislation that in its present form it is very much like the New South Wales legislation. For members opposite to say what they have said I believe exhibits a pettiness which again does them no credit. Perhaps I should just refer to the Leader.

Copies have been distributed to ethnic organisations and to many individuals. Copies were all submitted with a request to send comments to the Minister assisting the Premier, and the responses which have been received to date have overwhelmingly congratulated this Government on the initiatives that it has taken to establish the commission. There have been some references to the New South Wales commission and generally there has been an acknowledgment of the benefits that are expected to be gained by the formation of a commission. There certainly has been a great deal of support for the proposal to form a series of advisory committees.

We have, as a Government, consulted thoroughly on the provisions of the Bill, with the provision for advisory committees by themselves. Built into the Bill is another system for on-going consultation. The ethnic communities again will be represented and will be invited to advise. Even in the Bill as it is structured there is provision for on-going consultation. I believe that any claim that the Government has been proceeding with undue haste or has failed to consult or is imposing a structure by bureaucratic decree on communities that do not want any part of it are quite spurious and without foundation. It is impossible to consult with everyone in the community on a measure such as this. It is not possible to do so.

The whole point is that there are nearly 250 000 people of ethnic background in this State. One could technically go on consulting for years until one had spoken to everyone, but that is not exactly the way to reach any sort of analogy. It is not the view of the responsible ethnic organisations and the people who have been deeply involved. There is no satire in any way in this.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I regret that the Leader sees fit to behave in this way. I make the point that there has been a tremendous amount of consultation, and to suggest otherwise is simply clutching at straws. I do not know what the motive is. The basic purpose of this legislation is to provide a measure of self-management, to remove ethnic communities from dependence on Government as far as possible. This is the major purpose of the Bill, to allow them to go about helping themselves but to provide the background and support where it is necessary. The

previous Government's record, I have already said, was good but it had nearly 10 years to do it in. It should have been good—there would have been something very wrong if it had not achieved something in that time.

For goodness sake, surely it will grant this Government, after just over 12 months, an opportunity to do something positive, too, without tearing down, criticising or rejecting our proposals out of hand.

Mr. Bannon: We're supporting the Bill, and I said so.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is the trouble, because the Leader's speech did not reflect it, and neither did any Opposition member's speech, other than the responsible speech we heard from the member for Salisbury. The Leader made the point that he supported the Bill, and proceeded to tear the commission to pieces, and so it went on. The Leader tends to have a dollar each way on most occasions, as he did on this occasion. I will deal briefly with our own record.

Mr. Bannon: You couldn't.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We have not got a record, according to the Opposition. We do not care, and we have not done anything. That is ridiculous.

Mr. Abbott: It's not a church; it's a Parliament.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is a very reasonable statement. We have appointed additional information officers following the Galbally Report, and additional interpreters, particularly in areas where there have been none, such as in the small central European language groups. We have taken in a large number of Vietnamese, and we have doubled the grant for ethnic language schools. There is no point in going on with the sort of pettiness of the Leader. I have made a point, whenever I can, of acknowledging the work of the previous Government, to pick up a point he made. I may occasionally omit to do so, and if so, I apologise. The Leader's colleagues appreciate the recognition that I give members of the previous Government when acknowledging the work they have done in the past; indeed, at the opening of Wakefield House, the former Premier was most appreciative of the acknowledgment that he had.

Mr. Bannon: His presence shamed you into saying so.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader believes that I was shamed into acknowledging someone's contribution by that person's presence, I am beginning to feel even sorer for him than I have felt for some time. I will talk about one or two specific items, because I believe they should be cleared up. I come back to 15 September 1979. Since then, we have been told that the Thebarton Community Centre has been cancelled, and there has been a cutting off of funds. It is important to recognise that this is not exactly the truth of the matter. The building was not about to commence, as the member for Peake obviously believes; otherwise he would not have said it. It was not about to commence, because the previous Government, being faced with a total estimated cost of that project of \$5 000 000, found that it was unable to do it. The honourable member may be aware that the former Premier (the member for Hartley) had undertaken a cutting-back programme at that stage. The decision was made before this Government came to office.

Mr. Bannon: That's nonsense.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader, being the Minister directly responsible, ought to know that.

The Hon. H. Allison: He axed the—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: It was cut, because expenditure ran wild at Parks.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Parks is one of the reasons why Thebarton got the chop. I will not dwell on the past.

Mr. Plunkett: Tell us what you have done since 15

September?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is exactly what I will do for the honourable member, because I know that his concern is surpassed only by that of the member for Henley Beach for his community.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Why don't you come down and tell them at Thebarton?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have been to Thebarton, and the Deputy Leader ought to know that, if he is so well aware of what goes on. The Thebarton project is continuing in the scaled-down form that had been decided on by the previous Government. It has not been dismantled, and it will not be dismantled. It is continuing under the aegis of the local council, and \$100 000 has been made available, \$70 000 of that for staff.

Mr. Plunkett: "Is being made available": what has been made available?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thought that is what we are talking about. That money has been made available, and the project will continue but this time, instead of the Government calling the tune and creating a dependence on Government, it will be local government that takes the responsibility for it.

Mr. Hemmings: So the people will pay, not the Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have always believed that Government funds come from the people, anyway, but apparently the member for Napier has not caught up with that yet.

Mr. Plunkett: That's why they are increasing the rates for most people in the Thebarton area.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am afraid that rates have gone up in most local government areas. Funds are being made available from the State Government through local government. I know that there is an ideological barrier to this matter: the Opposition does not like the idea of a Government giving away its responsibility to local government, to the grass roots, as the member for Henley Beach said, at a point where the administration is closest to the delivery of the services. That is most important in social welfare theory. This exactly what is being adopted as a plan.

Mr. Plunkett: Why don't you come down to Thebarton.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has had his call.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can only reassure the honourable member that funds are available, that funds will continue to be made available through local government, and the project is continuing. It is important to know about information centres, too. The Thebarton council is receiving \$12 000 a year for the information centre. An Italian information officer is employed, as the honourable member would know, with a Greek-speaking officer to be added, I understand, soon. As far as the Findon centre and the Findon Catholic community are concerned, the member for Henley Beach, who is most assiduous in looking after their needs, has already dealt with that matter.

Discussions are going on for improved service through Woodville council support, and there is a general appreciation by that organisation of what is being done. The information centres will be supported. If the Woodville council decides to take up, for instance, the Kilkenny information centre project, funds will be made available from the State Government to the Woodville council to cover that expenditure. We are talking not about a cut-back of funds but about who is going to administer those funds and provide them. Under our policy, local government will pass those funds on to local groups, because we believe that that gives us a better

measure of control over what is done with those funds.

I believe it is a great pity that the Leader of the Labor Party in this House should allow Party politics and bitterness to enter into his speech. He obviously reflects the attitude of his Party. It is a matter for some regret, because it seems clearly to indicate that the A.L.P. believes that there is a need to compete in this area, instead of co-operating. Most of his speech was directed at self-praise and denigration of this side of the House, without much regard for the truth. I believe that ethnic communities are becoming far more aware of the petty politicking that is indulged in by some few members of the A.L.P. and, unfortunately, I have to classify the Leader with them. Many sincere people in the A.L.P. believe, as we do, that we should be working together to provide the help and assistance necessary.

There should be a little less of what is being done now and more of a statesman-like approach to the problems and specific needs of our South Australian ethnic communities. I repeat that members opposite could well take a leaf out of the member for Salisbury's book in relation to the South Australian ethnic communities for whom we, and the total South Australian community, have the greatest respect.

It is a pity that the Leader of the Opposition does not show the same respect for these people by being positive, less carping, and trying to be a little more sincere, and, most of all, accepting that in his approach, others, too, are concerned. The great need, as far as I am concerned, is not to dwell on the past but to concentrate on the future.

I commend this Bill to honourable members. I express my thanks to the many leaders and members of various ethnic communities who have contributed so much to our consultations and have expressed their approval and gratitude for the Government's actions.

Finally, I believe that we owe a significant debt of gratitude to the members of our South Australian community who are of ethnic origin. Our South Australian way of life is very much richer for the customs and culture that they have brought and the contributions that they have made. It is the Government's aim (whether or not the Opposition cares to co-operate is up to it) to preserve and strengthen our multi-cultural way of life, and that is why we have proposed this commission. It is a most important move for the ethnic communities in particular and, I believe, for South Australia generally.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

HOLIDAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 October. Page 1393.)

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I believe that I should draw to the attention of all members that this Bill, unlike the most recent one that the House has been debating, is an amending Bill of four clauses and, therefore, the debate is quite narrow compared with that which is permissible on a new initiative.

The Hon. J. D. Wright (Adelaide): Thank you, Sir, for that advice. I am delighted that at long last we have reached this amending Bill, which already has had a rough passage, having been adjourned at least three times today. We were told earlier today that the Bill would come on for debate some time in the afternoon; later, we were told that it would come on after dinner; then, we were told that it would come on a little later; and finally, it has come on for

debate at 2.35 a.m.

One must try to determine exactly what has occurred in relation to the debate on this Bill being postponed from time to time. I suppose one can deduce certain things from the antics and attitude of the Government, which, after all, has the numbers in this House and can cease operations in it at any time it likes or let members go home at any stage that it wants to. If the Government does not do that, it is prepared to sit here probably until 5 a.m. or 6 a.m. if it intends to finish this Bill.

Mr. Lewis: No, 7 a.m.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not care whether it is 8 a.m. I will do my best to keep you here until 8 o'clock, if that is possible. One can only deduce from the Government's antics that there was some ulterior motive in not bringing this Bill on for debate earlier today, and I think that that ulterior motive may have had something to do with the member for Mitcham. Nevertheless, I suppose that as the Bill progresses we will know what the member for Mitcham proposes to do, and we may learn the truth from the Government regarding its attitude.

The Bill is in two parts. The first amendment is designed to change the Commemoration Day holiday, and the second is to give certain authority regarding the date of celebrating the birthday of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. I have no objection to that. It is a reasonable proposition, and the right ought to exist to proclaim that holiday. I accept the Minister's explanation, and make no complaint about that area of the proposed amendments.

However, I will not be so willing and able to concur in the major part of the legislation, namely, changing Proclamation Day or Commemoration Day, whatever one likes to call it. It is clear in my view, and in that of the people with whom I have had an opportunity of discussing this Bill, that the Government's action in this regard is and will be a recipe for industrial activity in this State. I hope that I am wrong about that. However, it seems to me that persons, whether or not they are members of trade unions, who have enjoyed the two holidays over a long period of time will be deprived of a holiday.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: Which unions are you referring to?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will get to that, if the Minister of Industrial Affairs would like to keep quiet and behave himself once in this House, not interjecting and trying to put me off my task. The Minister will find out about that matter as I progress with my speech, which will be an extremely long one. I have made up my mind about that.

The tactic probably is that I will be the last speaker tonight. I cannot see the Minister's going through until 6 a.m. or 7 a.m. on this Bill. If that is the tactic, members will be here for a long time listening to me, as I have a lot of material here, and I will go through it all. So, Government members will pay the penalty for that.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: We realise that the Labor Party has been trying to filibuster for the entire evening.

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

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Sir, for your protection from this bully.

Mr. Bannon: That's not right, Jack. Bullies have got some substance sometimes, you know.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Well, I will withdraw the word "bully". I was making a point when I was so rudely interrupted by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, as I am interrupted so rudely by him most times when I get on my feet in this House. I am sure that the Minister does not like me, but the feeling is quite mutual, in any case. The Minister of Industrial Affairs is not doing his Party or his

sleepy eyes any good, because the more he interrupts me the longer my speech will run; that is without question.

I was trying to make the point when I was interrupted that those members or non-members of trade unions who have enjoyed these two holidays for many years in the past will now clearly be deprived of one of those holidays. Of that, there is clear evidence that I will give to the House in a moment. However, before doing so, I refer to the objection by the Trades and Labor Council. I have a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Rodda, Chief Secretary, Co-operative Building, 90 King William Street, Adelaide, on 8 August 1980.

Mr. Abbott: Has he replied to it yet?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: If the honourable member is patient, like the Minister of Industrial Affairs should be, he will find out whether there has been a reply. The letter states:

Dear Sir,

re public holidays, 28 December, Commemoration Day.

The United Trades and Labor Council, at its meeting held on Friday 1 August 1980, considered a report from the Executive Committee which endorsed a decision of a meeting of unions affiliated to the United Trades and Labor Council, which was convened to consider press reports of a proposal by the Government of South Australia to amend the Holidays Act so that Commemoration Day, which is usually celebrated on 28 December each year, will be celebrated on 26 December.

The council expressed its opposition to these proposals to change the Holidays Act so that Commemoration Day, which is normally celebrated on 28 December each year, will now be celebrated on 26 December each year. Our council took this decision because currently approximately 50 000 people are able to celebrate the holiday on 26 December as well as 28 December. If your Government was to amend the Holidays Act as suggested, those workers would be deprived of the public holiday which they now celebrate on 28 December, as they already have 26 December as a public holiday.

It is the United Trades and Labor Council view that this change in the Holidays Act will enable the employers to make the appropriate approaches to the Arbitration Commission, which would then agree to the employers' application for deleting Commemoration Day from those awards. Accordingly, we request that your Government does not amend the Holidays Act by transferring the celebration of Commemoration day to 26 December each year.

Thanking you for your co-operation and assistance,

Yours faithfully,

R. J. Gregory

I have introduced this letter for two reasons. First, I have learnt from the member for Mitcham that it is good to produce letters in this place and to give evidence at first hand. Secondly, I have been informed by the Trades and Labor Council that the Chief Secretary has not replied to the correspondence. I think that that is disgusting. It is the height of ignorance. The Minister may hide behind the excuse that the Minister of Industrial Affairs has had some discussions with the Trades and Labor Council. I accept that that is proper, and I do not say that it is not true. Nevertheless, the Chief Secretary, not the Minister of Industrial Affairs, is the Minister responsible for the Holidays Act. That responsibility lies clearly in the hands of the Chief Secretary, as it did in my time as Minister of Labour. I did not like it, and I proposed to the Government on several occasions that it should be under the control of the Minister of Labour. However, Ministers like to retain their own castles, and I was not able to get it into my portfolio.

However, that does not excuse the Chief Secretary.

There was a clear mandate and an onus on him to have responded to the correspondence from the Trades and Labor Council. It is a shame. On his own admission in this House when a no-confidence motion was moved against him quite recently, he said that he was quite surprised that a nice man like himself could be attacked in this way. A nice man would answer correspondence. A sincere and genuine man would answer correspondence, even if the reply was not going to suit the people who were getting it.

The Minister is at fault, and he should have replied to the Trades and Labor Council, the organisation in this State responsible for looking after the whole of the trade union movement. It is more important than is any other organisation in this State representing workers. It holds just as much importance as, if not more importance than, does the Chamber of Manufactures or any of the employer organisations representing people on that side of the political fence. Had he received the letter from any of the employer organisations, I am sure the Minister would have replied to it. He was wrong in not replying to the Trades and Labor Council as he would have replied to employer organisations.

Let us deal with the people who are affected by this legislation. The Minister of Industrial Affairs showed some mild interest when he attempted to get me off the track in this debate, asking what and which unions were affected by the legislation. I will quote the figures. If this debate had been called on when it was ordained to come on, I had intended to table the statistics, but I have no intention of doing so now. I am going to read them to the Parliament. The document relates to the total number of South Australian workers who receive both 26 and 28 December as paid holidays. In the Australian Insurance Employees Union—

Mr. Lewis: Are you sure you've got it straight?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Perhaps I could get some advice from the member for Mallee, who might be able to tell us something about dingoes. I do not want to upset him. As I said the other night, we are quite good friends, and we should keep it that way. In the Australian Insurance Employees Union, about 30 per cent of the members, or 1 000 members, would lose by this legislation. In the Australian Workers Union, at B.H.A.S. at Port Pirie, 1 900 workers would lose. In CAGEO, the Commonwealth and statutory authorities, including the Australian Railways, 34 000 people would be affected. I see a look of amazement on the face of the member for Hanson, but the figures provided to me speak of 34 000 members in that organisation. Of South Australian teachers in the D.F.E. section, 1 300 will be affected by the legislation. In the Federated Storemen and Packers Union, 3 471 members will be affected. Under the Transport Workers Union general award, 300 will be affected, while 2 000 members will be affected under the State award. That is surprising because, until the figures were provided, I would not have thought that the State awards would have such a drastic effect. The Transport Workers Union has probably about 12 000 members in this State and about 25 per cent of them are affected—2 000 in one area and 300 in the other. This legislation will drastically affect members of that organisation. In the Waterside Workers Federation, and including other waterfront employees, 1 040 members will be affected. The seamen do not get public holidays.

Mr. Lewis: Dairy farmers?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thought I would leave that for the honourable member to check. I am sure he will make some effort in this debate to look after the dairy farmers and that he will have all the figures.

The Federated Storemen and Packers Union indicated

that it had about 3 471 members affected by this legislation, and the union spells out the whole area where its members are affected, as follows:

Award	No. of Employees
Steel Distribution	100
Bulk Liquid Terminal Storemen and Packers Agreement	3
S & P Container Depots award	60
S & P General Stores Federal	1 000
State	1 000
S & P Grain Stores Award	40
S & P Kodak Australia	5
S & P Material Handling (Brambles) Award	30
S & P Oil Companies Award	100
S & P Oil Etc. Stores Award	10
S & P Oil Refinery Award	120
S & P Philip Morris Agreement	3
S & P State Retail Warehousing Agreement	100
Associated Co-operatives Agreement	300
S & P Skin and Hide wool stores award	100-200
S & P Wool Selling Brokers and Repackers	300-400
Total	3 471

The "100-200" and "300-400" are dependent, I suppose, on what casual labour is being employed at that stage. I use that example because it provides the evidence needed in this argument. Concerning the Australian Postal and Telecommunications Union South Australian Branch, the information that I have is as follows:

The following staff are, to the best of our knowledge, the approximate total of Commonwealth Government employees in South Australia. The figures as to Government department employment are those provided by the Public Service Board. The figures of employment in statutory authorities are only approximate, but we believe substantially correct.

Australian Government Department Employment Departments:

Aboriginal Affairs	35
Administration Services	564
Electoral Department	55
AGPS	4
Attorney-General's Department	118
Business and Consumer Affairs	360
Trade Practices	10
Defence Department	3 658
Education	74
Schools Commission	10
Employment and Youth Affairs	558
Finance	30
Foreign Affairs	19
ADAB	10
Department of Health	260
Archives	22
Housing and Construction	644
Immigration	79
Industrial Relations	14
Industrial Relations Bureau	17
Industry and Commerce	1
Post and Telecommunications	64
Australian Broadcasting Tribunal	5
Primary Industry	273
Auditor-General	31
Ombudsman	2
Public Service Board	30
Productivity	80
Patents Office	3
Science and Environment	32

Australian Government Department Employment—continued	
Bureau of Meteorology	126
Social Security	1 234
Trade and Resources	25
Transport	995
Stats	245
Tax	1 139
Veterans Affairs	1 077
	—
Total	11 903
Statutory Authorities	
ANR	10 000
ATC	9 000
APC	3 300
	—
	22 300

(Signed) F. K. Willis

Secretary-Treasurer (A.P.T.U.)

Members can see that there is sufficient evidence that there are, as claimed by the Trades and Labor Council, between 45 000 and 50 000 workers in this State who are to be deprived of the holiday, perhaps not this year, as the Minister pointed out in his second reading explaining, but certainly in the ensuing years, and the effect in the future is obvious to me. One can understand the reaction of trade unions in this area. I certainly can because, irrespective of what it is (it may be a good motor car, a cricket bat, tennis racquet or a good condition in industry), if one loses something that one has always had, it is an irritant.

For that reason, I believe that members of trade unions in this State have every right to be up in arms about this Government's action. I say that advisedly, because I do not believe that the Government needed to take action as drastic as that which it has taken. There are other ways around this legislation, but the Government has told the T.L.C. that this is what it is going to do. There has been no meaningful consultation; there may have been some type of discussion, but certainly the council was not listened to. It was merely told the circumstances of the Government's action. I can understand the council's feeling about this matter.

Mr. Mathwin: What is the alternative?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am getting to the alternative. The T.L.C. was told by the Minister of Industrial Affairs what the Government's policy was. There was no negotiation at all, and there was no moving from that position. The Government set up a stance in that matter, and that was it so far as the Government was concerned: it was not willing to listen to the cries for help from the T.L.C. in this area. The Government had determined what it was going to do, and I point out to the Minister that, if he continues to use the high-handed action that he has used in this matter, he will be heading for a downfall, because the T.L.C. will not accept this sort of policy from the Government. If there is going to be no negotiation, consultation or ability to move away from the stance that the Government takes, then it is heading for disaster which will occur much sooner than its present term in office expires, because this sort of action is abhorrent to the trade union movement.

The Minister is not held in high regard over his refusal to answer that letter and to enter into any negotiation. I say unequivocally that the Minister who is responsible for this legislation should have been the Minister talking to the T.L.C.

Mr. Bannon: They must have had a split between them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I do not know whether or not they had a split or whether the Minister of Industrial Affairs said he would talk to the T.L.C., but it was the

Chief Secretary who should have had those discussions.

Mr. Mathwin: Tell us the solution.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: In his explanation, the Minister said that he had been approached by many trade unionists and many employers in this State. The Minister has not named the many trade unionists who have requested him to change this holiday, and he has not mentioned the employers, either. However, the number of unions that have been in contact with me apart from the T.L.C., which is the official voice of the trade union movement, would far outweigh any of those organisations or associations, apart from employers organisations, that would have contacted the Minister. I am prepared to put money on that, because it is obvious to me that there is dissatisfaction about this matter.

If the Minister was on a course, which he says he was on, of assisting those many trade unionists and employers over this obstacle, why did the Minister not do what was done in 1969, when the Hon. Steele Hall was Premier of this State and a similar situation occurred? At that stage, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris was the Chief Secretary in this State.

I am not going into the good or bad aspects of the Hon. Mr. DeGaris. I simply mention the fact that as Chief Secretary at that time he gave advice to the Government of the day which I think was very proper advice. On that occasion a proclamation was made which merely exchanged the holidays for that year. It is clear in the Act that the Minister has the right to proclaim holidays and change them if he so desires. I have checked the Act today, and that is a fact. I refer to the *South Australian Government Gazette* of 11 September 1969. I might add that on that occasion much more notice was given. It is now 29 October, whereas the earlier proclamation was dated 11 September, and on that occasion there was probably discussions before that date, so much earlier notice was given by the Minister then. I think that at least a respectable amount of notice should be given. Many people have already made their holiday arrangements which would now have to be changed because of what the present Minister is doing.

Mr. Millhouse: Assuming the Bill gets through.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The Bill may get through this House but the other place is a different story. The *Government Gazette* of 11 September 1969 refers to the "Holidays Act, 1910-1959: Substitution of public holiday in lieu of day appointed," by command of the Hon. R. C. DeGaris, the then Chief Secretary. The Minister had the right to do that in 1969, as the present Minister has the right now. It is a very simple action. In fact, if the Minister had wanted to do that he need not have brought the matter into this House. There is no reason why it had to come here at all. The Minister could have substituted the holiday for this year only, and no-one would have complained about that; everyone would have been on side provided that it reverted to the *status quo*.

If the Minister did not want to take such action and was trying to achieve what he said he was trying to achieve in his second reading explanation, then there must have been some other reason. There must be an ulterior motive somewhere. Was it to help the trade unions? Was it to help the employer organisations? If he wanted to help the trade unions and employers he could have taken the action that the Hon. Ren DeGaris took which I have just described. That would have been a very simple action for him to take, and it would certainly have had my support. I would have made no objection to that; the proclamation could have come through, and I would have said nothing about it, nor would have the employers or the unions, as they were quite satisfied with the action of the Liberal Government in 1969. Whom, then, is this to assist? It can only be one

particular organisation.

Mr. Lewis: The fruitgrowers!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It could be the fruitgrowers as well, or it could be the farmers that the honourable member often talks about. The honourable member can believe what he likes. However, I believe this was introduced to help the Retail Traders' Association. I think that association is the nigger in the woodpile and I think I have hit the nail right on the head. I have had some experience in this area during my period as a Minister. Whilst it was not my responsibility to police the Holidays Act, I certainly took part in discussions on this matter in Cabinet. The Retail Traders' Association protested to us on many occasions that it wanted these holidays fixed up. I am left without any doubt that the Minister and the Government are giving a sop to the retail trade in this State. What are they giving it for? They are giving the sop for the role it played prior to 15 September last year.

Mr. Mathwin: What was that?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The job rot campaign and the money thrown into the election campaign for the Liberal Party.

Mr. Mathwin: That's not nice of you, Jack, to think about that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It may not be nice but it is a fact. I am not trying to be nice tonight; I am trying to be factual and honest. One must reach that conclusion, as no other conclusion can be reached. I am convinced that this piece of legislation is a sop to the R.T.A. I have looked at a 70-year calendar in an attempt to ascertain what effect this situation has on the holidays in the this State. If one studies the calendar it can be seen that a change of public holiday from the 28 to the 26 would be of convenience or advantage for only nine years. So for the other 61 years there is no advantage or change in the situation. In fact, the situation occurring now has not occurred since 1969 so the 11-year break there is clearly obvious, and the 70-year calendar is near the mark. To obtain an advantage for nine years out of 70 years, I do not think it was sufficient or proper for the Government to have moved in this area to the detriment of other people in the community.

I will now mention something about Proclamation Day itself. The Premier has been talking about the flag and using terms such as "Back up South Australia" and "Our State's great, mate", all of which seem to have commenced at or about the election last year.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is now about to give us a speech on Proclamation Day. I have had a look at the Holidays Act, and nowhere in it can I find reference to Proclamation Day.

Mr. Millhouse: Come on! We all know that's 28 December.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The honourable member, in taking the point of order, is presuming what the Deputy Leader might be going to say, and it is not for the Chair to answer a presumption.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Once again, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to you for protecting me from the bully, the Minister of Industrial Affairs. I do not care very much what we describe this holiday as, whether we describe it as Commemoration Day or Proclamation Day. It certainly has that usage in the community. I do not think anyone disputes that fact. When did it start? When did we get some first indication about this day? As I was saying when interrupted, we have been preached to by the Premier about the things that made this State great, our traditions, our flag, and we have been provided with a tie with the piping shrike on it. All of these things are important in our

life style, as is Commemoration Day. I believe that the Government needs to be consistent about what it is saying, because on the one hand it is prepared to throw out the window for ever the recognition of that particular holiday. I will come back to that in a moment.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The member for Glenelg needs to be careful about his own position.

Mr. Mathwin: I'm in front by 5 000 votes.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: We will see how the honourable member votes on this Bill, because he may be putting himself in an awkward position. Let us go back to the very beginning of commemoration. I have been able to ascertain from my research that the first commemoration of the establishment of South Australia was held on Thursday 28 December 1837.

Mr. Mathwin: What time was it, Jack?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am going to get to that, too. I have all the answers tonight. I am going to get to the exact time, and the time it finished as well.

Mr. Becker: What are you holding there?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The *Gazette* of that day. I will table it if the honourable member wants to see it. I am going to read something from it first.

Mr. Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will get the call in due course.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The *Gazette* states:

PUBLIC DINNER TO THE GOVERNOR.

On Thursday, 28 December, being the anniversary of the landing of the Governor and the proclamation of the province of South Australia, a public dinner was given to his Excellency in commemoration of that event.

At four o'clock—

I have given the time, it was 4 o'clock.

Mr. Mathwin: I have it down here as a matter of fact.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The *Gazette* continues:

Forty-eight of the most respectable gentlemen of Adelaide assembled at the court house and received the Governor in the most cordial manner.

They were very well-mannered people that day, because they received him in a cordial manner.

Mr. Millhouse: They weren't always as well mannered as that.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: They are not now, as we can see by the conduct in this House tonight. We should look at the guests on that occasion. Among the guests was His Honour the judge, the resident magistrate, T. Bewes Strangways, J.P., the Reverend Bingham Hutchinson, J.P., G. Stevenson, J.P., Captain Lipson—

Mr. Mathwin: Not old Captain Lipson!

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Captain Lipson was R.N., so I imagine he was from the Royal Navy. The list continues with Captain Watts, Captain Nixon, Captain Warming—a lot of captains here, John—all Pommies, I think.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to always refer to members opposite by their correct titles. I also ask the Deputy Leader to tie the remarks he is now making to the clauses of the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I thank you, Sir, for your advice on both accounts, but I am sure that this is connected with the Bill. I have got into the habit of calling the member for Glenelg the member for Glenelg and I was quite wrong in calling him by his Christian name. That will not happen again, inside or outside the House. I will call him the member for Glenelg all the time. I cannot make mistakes then. The guest list continues with Captain Watts, Robert Tod Jones, Handcock, Barnard, Thomas, Hallett, Malcolm, Johnson, Bright, Oakden, and a number of other gentlemen, who did not get names. The *Gazette*

then states:

His Honour the Judge took the Chair and Messrs. Gilles and Wyatt officiated as croupiers. An excellent dinner of four courses and dessert was served up by Mr. Lee of the Southern Cross Hotel. After the cloth was removed the Chairman proposed Her Majesty's health which was drunk with great cheering and enthusiasm. "Her Majesty's Ministers" (cheers).

I am not going to bore members with the rest of that, Sir, except that later it states:

Mr. Wyatt returned thanks in a neat speech, and said he hoped at the second commemoration of the constitution of the colony to have present a native who might thank the colonists for himself and his brethren (cheering).

Mr. Speaker, I think that auspicious occasion was the first occasion on which Commemoration Day was actually celebrated in this State.

Mr. Becker: What about the holiday.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I will deal with that in a moment if the honourable member will give me time. For the interest of the honourable member for Glenelg, who asked the very pertinent question about what time this celebration finished, they finished the celebration of the first Commemoration Day—

Mr. Mathwin: At 11 o'clock.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: —at exactly 11 o'clock. As I said, that was in 1837. Looking at the *Government Gazette* of Thursday 24 December 1840, I find in the Government notice dated 23 December 1840 the following:

Friday next being Christmas Day, and Monday the 28th instant being the Anniversary of the Establishment of the Province of South Australia, all the public offices will be closed on those days.

By His Excellency's command, Robert Gouger, Colonial Secretary.

Chas. Sturt, Assistant Commissioner.

Mr. Becker: When is the first time it was a public holiday?

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: The importance of that particular document, in my view, is that those people understood that it was something important and something sacred—the fact that this colony had been founded and that it ought to be commemorated in our history. It has been commemorated in our history ever since that day way back in 1840. This State has enjoyed the public holiday and the facilities that go with that holiday, the ceremony at Glenelg. An editorial appeared in the *Advertiser* recently regarding the celebration of this particular day. There is something about this holiday that most South Australians want and look up to. The participation, as I said, at Glenelg has been of significance, and I have been there myself. I know that other members have been there also. I believe that the Minister's words were that the Glenelg council is amenable to this change. That appears in *Hansard*, so I cannot see the Minister being able to evade that sentence.

I have read it two or three times to ensure that that is the situation. Today I have telephoned the Glenelg council to

find out whether it was "amenable". That is a strong word and is saying that the council agreed to the proposition for the change in this particular holiday.

Mr. Millhouse: It does not go as far as that. I picked that up.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I am coming to that. I spoke to the Town Clerk today and he informed me that the council is not amenable about the situation. The council told me that, at the deputation to the Minister, the Minister was told clearly that the council wanted to commemorate 28 December and would continue to do so.

Mr. Mathwin: And I'll be there to help them.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Of course, and so will I if I have the opportunity. I think the important thing is that this House has been misled by the Minister, because I am informed that the Mayor of Glenelg and other officers there told the Minister that, if there was to be a change, if that was the decision of the Government, they would have to accept it. They have not access to this Parliament.

Mr. Millhouse: They have some members, though.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Yes, and they ought to be speaking on the council's behalf. In those circumstances, the Government was advised that the council would have to accept that situation if the Government decided to make a change, but that is not being amenable. We could not place it any higher than that the council was saying that it did not want the Government to do that but, if the Government did it, the council would make its own arrangement about the celebration of 28 December.

The council did not want the change and is not amenable to it. It accepts it because it had no alternative, for the reason that the Government had made up its mind on what it was going to do. The Government had a simple alternative—to have proceeded as the Hall Government did in 1969, which would have received the full support of everyone in South Australia. The Government chose not to do that and be heavy-handed about the situation.

The Government has the Trades and Labor Council completely offside with this decision, and that is bad enough. It is also denying about 50 000 members of unions and non-members who have enjoyed the holiday and no longer will be able to enjoy it. Last but not least, the Government has placed itself in a position of being at a disadvantage with Glenelg council, which is not amenable to the situation and accepts the position only because the Government has forced it on the council. It is almost a total objection by those people who are affected. I give notice that I will be moving an amendment to this legislation.

Mr. MATHWIN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 3.24 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 29 October at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 28 October

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

PORTUS HOUSE

324. **Mr. CRAFTER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment: What was the detail of the statistical information which was the basis of the recent public statement that the justification for demolition of Portus House, Gilberton was the road accident rate at the *Buckingham Arms* intersection?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The Minister of Environment was expressing a personal opinion when he said, "Anybody that has used that intersection would also appreciate that it is an extremely dangerous intersection; that traffic congestion has been a major problem in that area for a long time."

SURREY DOWNS HIGH SCHOOL

357. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Has the construction of Surrey Downs High School been deferred and, if so, what, on current enrolment trends, is the probable deferment period?

2. Is it a fact that the City of Tea Tree Gully had agreed to commit \$500 000 to the development of joint school-community facilities on the site?

3. Are such facilities needed and, if so, what plans has the Government for assisting the city to provide them in some other way?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The construction of Surrey Downs High School will not proceed. The project was abandoned in July 1979, during the time of the previous Government in favour of a secondary school at Golden Grove if an additional secondary school were found to be necessary in the area in the near future.

2. Yes. However, the City of Tea Tree Gully withdrew its support for a joint scheme after consultation with the South Australian Land Commission, which favoured the development of a community centre at Golden Grove.

3. Yes, \$5 000 was allocated in the 1979-80 Budget to draw up plans for the provision of theatre facilities in Tea Tree Gully. A working party established for that purpose has presented its report which is currently before the Tea Tree Gully council. In addition, the Education Department has and is continuing to assist in the provision of joint school/community facilities at other sites in the area. For example, the existing activity hall at Fairview Park Primary School, which was built by the Education Department for a cost of approximately \$80 000, is used by community groups, and the planned hall at the Ridgehaven Primary School, which will cost approximately \$120 000 will also be for shared school/community use.

OPPORTUNITY CLASSES

371. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many schools in South Australia have opportunity classes and how many children are enrolled in them?

2. What is the criterion for enrolment in such a class and what is the average class size?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is not possible to answer those questions exactly in the terms in which they are asked. Although the phrase "opportunity class" is still in popular use, it is not used officially and has not been for some time. Opportunity classes were previously established in primary schools and I have assumed in providing information below, that it is "special education" in primary school with which the honourable member is concerned.

The Department assumes that most "special education" is conducted in regular classrooms by classroom teachers. It is the department's general policy that neighbourhood schools should provide for virtually the whole neighbourhood child population. However, there is a total of 21 special schools catering for 1 427 students, and a further seven Speech and Hearing Centres which are attached to primary schools, and which cater for a further 109 students.

The criterion for enrolment in any form of special education is that the regular class, even with support, is unable to provide adequately for the educational and personal needs of the child. There is no universally applied, "person description" for admission to a special education situation, as regular classes and schools vary in their capacity to provide adequately for their total populations of children.

NORTH-EAST TRANSPORT

432. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: In relation to the proposals for north-eastern area public transport announced by the Minister on 25 August—

- (a) have the proposals been subject to assessment of family impact for the inner suburbs through which the route will go and, if so, what is that assessment;
- (b) what studies have been done on the likely effects of stress on older persons living in the inner suburbs through which the route will go and, if any, what do those studies show; and
- (c) what assessment has been made of the effects of the proposals on property values in the areas through which the route will go and, if any, what does such assessment show to be the effects?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

- (a) A family impact statement was made covering the families living in the area served by the facility and those in areas through which the route passes. The assessment showed that the majority of facilities would be unaffected, disruption would arise for families whose property is required, and there would be isolated impacts from noise and vibration.
- (b) A study of social impacts of transport proposals for the north-east area examined possible effects on a range of income and age groups in all sectors of the transport corridor. The study concluded that aged people would be most likely to be affected by relocation, physical and functional severance and disruption of activity patterns.
- (c) An assessment of impact of a tramway on property values was carried out during NEAPTR. It showed that the effect on property value was negligible.

TEACHER HOUSING

437. **Mr. GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many houses does the Teacher Housing Authority have available for teachers in South Australia?
2. Are any homes owned in the metropolitan area or the outer metropolitan area and if so, why?
3. On what basis is the rent calculated and who determines the amount?
4. For how many weeks of the year is the rent charged?
5. What steps has the Government taken to implement its election undertaking in relation to teacher housing rents?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. 1 935.
2. Yes. Teacher housing is provided to meet the needs in small townships located within the Metropolitan Planning Area; facilitate the release time scholarship programme; meet overseas exchange teachers' needs and to assist with relocation problems experienced by country teachers transferred to Adelaide at short notice. Of the 44 houses held, 19 are planned for disposal.
3. (a) The calculation of rent varies according to ownership of the house. Rents for houses which the Authority leases from the South Australian Housing Trust and from private landlords are set by the trust and the private landlords respectively.
(b) For houses owned by the authority, rents are set at approximately 80 per cent of the rent charged by the Housing Trust for a comparable standard of housing. Annual rental adjustments are recommended by the Teacher Housing Authority on the basis of increases in the housing component of the C.P.I. from one March quarter to the next. The officer in Charge, Housing Improvement and Rent Control Section of the South Australian Housing Trust, determines rental for the authority given the above criteria.
4. Rentals charged to teacher tenants are calculated on 52-week basis and paid over 42 weeks of each calendar year.
5. The Government has already determined not to pass on rental increases due in March and September 1980. The September 1980 decision above has meant the absorption of an additional \$400 000 by the Teacher Housing Authority. It has also been decided not to pass on additional increases anticipated for March 1981. This will provide further effective rent reductions compared with other Government employees.

PEDESTRIAN OVERWAY

479. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. Has the investigation into the beautification of the pedestrian overway near the Salisbury High School been completed and, if not, how much longer is it anticipated the investigation will take?
2. When does the Minister anticipate he will be able to write to the member for Salisbury again on this matter as indicated in his letter of 10 July 1980?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

1. The planting of the ground cover on the exposed cutting faces of the overway was completed by mid-October.
2. I wrote to you on this matter on 21 October 1980.

LETTER TO NEWS

504. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Has the Minister's attention been drawn to the letter on page 18 of *The News* of 8 September 1980 from Julie Esposito of Fullarton and, if so:

- (a) what action has been taken by the Minister;
- (b) will the Minister release any reports he has received on the incidents; and
- (c) what action does the Minister, in conjunction with other Ministers intend to take with respect to criticism from the Fire Fighters Association of South Australia in regard to this type of incident?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows: My attention has been drawn to the letter referred to in the Question. The answers are as follows:

- (a) Following notification of the incidents in 1979 and in 1980 immediate investigations were undertaken on each occasion by officers of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment. Resulting from the findings of the 1979 investigations the operator of the chairlift provided an auxiliary power unit in case a power failure, similar to that experienced in 1979, occurs in future.
The investigation of the 1980 incident revealed that the main defect was the failure of part of a rope grip attaching the chair to the suspension rope. The grip was purported to be manufactured from spheroidal graphite iron but, from preliminary information supplied by AMDEL, it appears the material was of inferior quality. All rope grips as now fitted have been X-rayed and stamped for identification. AMDEL are continuing their investigation on behalf of the Department.
- (b) No. Inspectors of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment regularly investigate accidents and occurrences as part of their normal duties so that similar occurrences can be prevented in future. These departmental reports are not made public.
- (c) All necessary action has been taken as set out in (a) above.

HEAD LICE

550. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health:

1. Who has authority for the control of head lice in schools?
2. Can a school be closed for a period of time on account of a bad infestation and, if so, by whom and for how long?
3. Can a school insist that a child not return to school until his/her infestation has cleared up and, if not, will the Government introduce the necessary regulations to enable this to happen?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The replies are as follows:

1. Principals and parents of students have a dual responsibility with respect to the control of head lice in schools. Under the terms of Regulation 121 of the education regulations, principals are responsible for the management, organisation and administration of the school and the welfare and development of its pupils. Section 137 (a) of the Health Act provides penalties for parents/guardians who do not take reasonable steps to free

their children from head lice infestations and who allow their children to attend school while they are carrying an infestation. When a student suffering from head lice is detected he/she is excluded from school and the parents informed. The student is re-admitted to school when the head lice has been successfully treated. In the case of widespread infestations, recurring infestations in a child or a lack of co-operation on the part of a parent, the principal would usually seek assistance from the School Health Services Adviser of the S.A. Health Commission or the Local Board of Health.

2. Subregulation (2) of regulation 172 of the education regulations permits the Minister of Education to close a school for an indefinite period. Any closure for reasons such as described would occur only after close consultation with the health authorities. As head lice is not an infectious disease it is difficult to contemplate such extreme action as school closure.

3. As indicated in the answer to question 1, the Health Act provides penalties for parents who do not take appropriate action to remedy a head lice problem involving their children. The Education Act and Regulations also permit a principal to suspend a child from school if his/her presence is considered to be prejudicial to the health or moral welfare of other students attending the school. Beyond this action the Minister of Education can exempt a child for a specified period under the attendance provisions of the Act. In view of existing provisions under the Health Act and the Education Act and regulations, it is not considered necessary to introduce further regulatory provisions to deal with this matter.

MOLYBDENUM

553. **Mr. HAMILTON** (on notice) asked the Deputy Premier: What are the commercial aspects of the molybdenum deposits at Alford, near Wallaroo, and in particular—

- (a) what is the extent of those deposits;
- (b) which companies have the exploration and development rights, respectively; and
- (c) what are the uses to which this rare metal commodity can be put?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The replies are as follows: The Department of Mines and Energy has not been advised of any economic molybdenum deposits in the Alford area.

- (a) See above.
- (b) The exploration licence is held by North Broken Hill Ltd., which conducts the exploration programme. Western Mining Corporation Ltd. shares the development rights through a joint venture agreement.
- (c) The principal use of molybdenum is as an alloying agent in the manufacture of a variety of special steels. It is also used in chemical products, catalysts in the petroleum industry, paint pigments and the manufacture of semi-conducting materials.

BUSES

557. **Mr. LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What types and number of new buses does the S.T.A. expect to receive into service in—

- (a) the next eight months; and
 - (b) from then until the end of 1981,
- and how is it anticipated that these buses will be allocated between the various depots?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The State Transport Authority has now taken delivery of 42 new Volvo B58 buses: 41 "express" buses, one "hills" bus.

- (a) In the next eight months it is expected that the remainder of the existing order for 100 buses will be delivered, i.e.: four "express" buses, 19 "hills" buses, 35 articulated buses.
- (b) The need to place further orders for new buses is currently being investigated and companies interested in filling such an order have been asked to register their interest with the authority.

"Hills" buses will be allocated to depots servicing Hills areas and "express" buses will be allocated to those depots servicing long distance routes.

ELIZABETH PAINTING TENDER

587. **Mr. HEMMINGS** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment:

1. Were tenders called for the repainting of the Elizabeth Town Centre and, if so—

- (a) how many companies tendered;
- (b) what were their names;
- (c) who were the successful tenderers and what were their prices; and
- (d) are the successful tenderers paying their employees award wages or less?

2. Is it Government policy to encourage employment conditions that breach the relevant awards?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The replies are as follows:

1. Yes, tenders were invited from six (6) potential contractors for the repainting of Elizabeth Town Centre in August of this year.

- (a) Five (5) companies tendered.
- (b) The names of the contractors who submitted tender prices are:

1. L. Vanucci and B. Pollice of 7 Pembury Grove, Felixstow, S.A. 5070.
2. J. D. S. & P. H. Gibson of 19 Docket Road, Elizabeth Downs, S.A. 5113.
3. W. T. Wells of 32 Cheltenham Crescent, Salisbury East, S.A. 5109.
4. D. D. & S. I. Irving of Box 19, Post Office, Gawler, S.A. 5118.
5. L. & B. E. Varley of Unley Road, One Tree Hill, S.A. 5114.

- (c) It was regarded as essential to carry out the work quickly so that it could be completed before the onset of the Christmas shopping period. The lowest tenderer—whose price was \$51 289—was unable to give this assurance. The successful tenderer was J. D. S. & P. H. Gibson whose price for the work was \$53 000. This contractor was chosen on the basis that the work could be commenced and completed within the specified time.

- (d) The trust does not have information on rates of payments by J. D. S. & P. H. Gibson to their employees.

2. Wages paid by maintenance contractors to their employees is not an area where the trust has ever sought any jurisdiction.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

592. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many primary and secondary schools, respectively, currently offer religious education

programmes, and at what level are they offered in each sector?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Primary Schools

There are 80 schools which have comprehensive religious education programmes. In these schools the programme would be offered across a range of year levels. There are 60 additional schools where one or two teachers or classes have religious education programmes. In these cases, also, there are classes at all levels involved.

2. Secondary Schools

There are 20 secondary schools having identifiable comprehensive religious education programmes. That means programmes of at least one term in length. These programmes are predominantly at Year 8 and/or 9 level.

Additionally, many secondary schools include one religious education topic or unit within a social studies or social education programme. Such segments may occur at all year levels 8-12.