

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 October 1979

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

PETITION: NET SCHEME

A petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia praying that the House would reject any legislation which would enable the Government to adopt the proposed north-east railway transit route through Botanic Park and along Victoria Drive was presented by Mr. Webster.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 1 496 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels opening their bars on Sundays were presented by Messrs. Abbott, Becker, Keneally, Langley, Mathwin, Payne, and Webster.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 124 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to ban and destroy the worst pornography, enforce tighter restrictions on all forms of pornography, remove restricted pornography from newsagents and delicatessens, and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr. Ashenden.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: BANK OF ADELAIDE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Now that the shareholders have voted on the proposition that the Bank of Adelaide should merge with the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group and a number of statements have been made about the wisdom of that choice, about the events which have led to it, about different positions which the Government should have adopted, and about actions to prevent the shareholders' choice from being put into effect, it is desirable that I make a second Ministerial statement on this matter.

It seems to me that there are many matters which are appropriate subjects of political debate; for example, the Budget is one, and I expect the debate on it to be highly political in the normal way. However, while there is room for genuine differences of opinion about many aspects of the troubles of the Bank of Adelaide and the present move towards merger with the A.N.Z. Banking Group, and it is to be expected that these views will be aired, it is most undesirable that the issue be made a political football. I will attempt to deal with the issue factually and unemotionally and, as far as I am able, avoid what might be thought of as Party political comment.

It is appropriate at this stage to consider why a State Government should become involved in an issue such as the troubles of a commercial bank and its subsidiary. I

believe there would be a fairly widespread view that a State Government might involve itself in this kind of issue if the public interest justified it. In the present case, the two main elements of the public interest which are in most people's minds are, first, the probable loss of employment opportunities and, secondly, the loss of those intangible benefits which flow from the presence of the head office of an activity and, in particular, the head office of a major financial institution. It is not possible to quantify those intangible benefits in the way that one may quantify the effects on employment.

For a Government to act in the wider "public interest" would be quite different from acting in the narrower interest of shareholders or of directors.

In the normal course, Governments should leave the interests of shareholders and of directors to be determined by commercial and market considerations, and in these narrower areas should not interfere. There may be genuine differences in view as to how a Government might act in seeking to further the public interest.

There are two points of difference, however, between the present Government and the present Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that there are 1 400 jobs at stake. Whilst I can agree that jobs are at risk (and perhaps a substantial number), I cannot accept that the A.N.Z. Banking Group can or will carry on the volume of business presently conducted by the Bank of Adelaide without retaining a large proportion of the staff currently employed.

This is not to underestimate the importance of the employment factor. I am sure that both the Government and the Opposition agree that it would be desirable to retain all of the jobs. However, it is appropriate that I clarify this particular issue.

The other point of difference, already on the public record, is that the present Leader of the Opposition, as represented by the Hon. Mr. Sumner, has urged an amalgamation of the Bank of Adelaide with the State Bank of South Australia.

As all members will be aware, the new Government is opposed in principle to proliferation of the public sector, and is particularly opposed to Government expansion that masquerades under the guise of lending support to an ailing section of private enterprise.

As to the approach of the Government, let me mention three things, as follows:

- (1) the proposition put before the Government by friends of the bank and modified after receipt of expert advice;
- (2) the Holmes a Court proposal; and
- (3) the possible entry of an overseas bank.

As to the first point, the proposition put before the Government by friends of the bank, I understand that this scheme was discussed with the previous Premier, and I mentioned this in my Ministerial statement last Thursday.

The previous Premier also made arrangements for the proposition to be examined and tested by an expert independent adviser responsible for reporting to the Government and only to the Government.

I followed through with these matters, and it was after consideration of the proposition and after consideration of the expert advice thereon that I decided on the extent to which modifications to the scheme suggested might be appropriate and the extent to which I could indicate in Parliament the amount of Government support that appeared appropriate.

The Leader of the Opposition has said that the former Premier planned to provide a Government guarantee for loans to the company if it were shown that there was a reasonable chance of F.C.A. trading its way out of difficulty within two or three years.

I wish to inform the House, however, that neither the previous Premier nor the present Leader of the Opposition has seen the report of the adviser. In the view of the present Government, and after consulting that report and other evidence, the most appropriate course of action in this respect was outlined in my last Ministerial statement.

As to the second point, the Holmes a Court proposal, this was put before me only on Wednesday of last week, the night before I made the Ministerial statement. I believe that the previous Premier would have been likely to have given Mr. Holmes a Court the same hearing and attention as I gave him. Whether he would have seen the proposal as a workable fallback option, I do not know, but I think it is a reasonable guess that he would have done so.

As to the third point, the possible entry of an overseas bank, it is now on the record that I went to see the Prime Minister in an effort to get an exemption from the Commonwealth Government's policy so that it would be possible for an overseas bank to take a major interest in the Bank of Adelaide and that I was unsuccessful in my approach. This also I referred to in my Ministerial statement.

The situation today is one in which the shareholders have exercised their choice, and they have voted by a significant majority to accept the offer of the A.N.Z. Banking Group. The proposition was carried by 74 per cent in number of the shareholders represented and 89 per cent in value of the shareholding represented at the meeting.

The procedure now is that the scheme of arrangement, having been approved by the appropriate majorities of shareholders (both in number and in value), is filed with the Corporate Affairs Commission and with the Supreme Court.

The Supreme Court has the responsibility for deciding whether or not the scheme of arrangement should be approved. The Corporate Affairs Commission may require alterations to the scheme before approval. Parties who have an interest may appear before the court to make submissions if they so wish.

The general procedure which the Corporate Affairs Commission is likely to follow in this case is the same procedure which it follows with all other schemes of arrangement. The Corporate Affairs Commission's responsibility is to peruse the scheme of arrangement to ensure that the requirements of the Companies Act are complied with. The commission may appear before the court to provide such assistance as the court may require with respect to the scheme of arrangement. In such cases it appears before the Supreme Court to act in the capacity of a friend of the court.

If a scheme is not consistent with the requirements of the Companies Act, then the commission has a duty to draw this to the attention of the court. Members will note that this statement is confined to recent events. As to those past events which gave rise to the troubles of F.C.A. and the Bank of Adelaide and as to the decisions by the managements and boards of directors which are now being called into question, I believe that comment by me today would be quite unproductive.

The SPEAKER: Order! I note that the honourable Leader of the Opposition seeks to introduce matter. I will recognise him on completion of Ministerial statements.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The committee appointed last year to report on the rehabilitation and compensation of persons injured at work has issued a discussion paper inviting public comment on various matters being considered by the committee. Workers compensation payments currently amount to more than \$1 000 000 a week in South Australia. The new Government had no hesitation in reaffirming the terms of reference and membership of the committee, which is to submit for consideration a proposed scheme with the following objectives: first, the rapid rehabilitation of the injured; and, secondly, compensation that is fair to both employers and employees.

Since it held its first meeting in August 1978, the committee has received and considered almost 50 submissions. However, although it has received considerable evidence, both written and oral, there are some issues which have been addressed in only a few submissions but upon which the committee would like additional response. In addition, there are several issues for which considerable evidence, both for and against, has been received. The committee, therefore, decided that further comment and reaction on these matters would be beneficial to its deliberations. The committee has set out in its discussion paper the issues on which it invites further comment and hopes that, by giving the paper wide circulation, adequate opportunity will be given to all interested persons and organisations to contribute further to the committee's considerations.

The Government welcomes this action by the committee. A copy of the discussion paper is being sent to all those people and organisations who have already submitted comments. However, the committee has invited all interested persons and organisations, whether they have previously made a submission, to comment on the specific matters they have raised. It is already evident from the committee's work that greater emphasis must be given to rehabilitation, rather than mere compensation for injured workers. It will also be necessary for the Government to decide whether the present system can be amended or whether a completely new system, perhaps with an autonomous statutory authority to co-ordinate prevention, rehabilitation and compensation activities, should be introduced.

At the moment, the Chairman, two members, and the research officer to the committee are in Canada, consulting with people experienced in the Canadian system, including Government officials, employer and union representatives. Afterwards, the Chairman and the research officer will examine the way in which the New Zealand compensation system has worked since it was completely changed in 1974. I commend this paper to all members of the House and invite their comments. I draw to the attention of the House the copies of the paper that have been circularised to all members of Parliament. If members would like additional copies, I shall be only too pleased to supply such copies.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OVERSEAS TRAVEL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: On 12 October, the Advertiser contained a rather misleading reference to the Treasury line "Overseas visits of Minister, Minister's wife (where approved) and officers". The article implied that \$33 000 would be expended on an overseas visit by me,

and speculated that I was to incur more in this area than had any other Minister.

What the Estimates did not clearly show, and what the *Advertiser*, with respect, could not have been expected to understand, was that this line comprised a provision for outstanding expenses from an overseas visit by my predecessor and his wife, plus a larger amount for proposed visits to the Middle East and North Africa by Department of Agriculture officers.

In the latter context I point out that the expected outlay of some \$30 000 will be partly recouped from existing contracts and any new arrangements resulting from those visits. In keeping with my policy for overseas projects work, such contracts will be negotiated on a firm commercial basis and, in addition to any financial returns to the Government, hopefully there should flow to the South Australian private sector increased opportunities for the sale of products.

These considerations aside, I wish to state quite plainly that it is not my intention to undertake a visit overseas this financial year, although I may need to follow up our inter-country projects during 1980-81.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to move for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable me to move a motion without notice.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members, I accept the motion.

Mr. BANNON: I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion without notice:

That, in view of the significant body of informed opinion in the community which believes that the Bank of Adelaide can be retained as an independent financial institution with its headquarters in Adelaide, and because of the need to maintain and develop employment opportunities in this important area of the private sector, this House calls on the Government to provide guarantees necessary for loans to preserve the Bank of Adelaide and to take such steps as are necessary to enable the Bank of Adelaide and the Finance Corporation of Australia a reasonable chance of returning to financial viability.

I have moved for the suspension of Standing Orders because I believe that the Ministerial statement by the Premier on the Bank of Adelaide situation must be dealt with in this Parliament forthwith. It contains assertions, implications and reflections upon the handling of this matter by the previous Government, which is now the Opposition. For those implications to be allowed to ride in what is currently a matter of high controversy and publicity—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I rise on a point of order. The Standing Orders provide that there should be no debate on the question in seeking the suspension of Standing Orders. I would submit that the Leader of the Opposition is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: I cannot accept the point of order. The mover of a motion for suspension is given the opportunity to explain the content of the matter that he wishes to bring before the House. I will be listening closely to the information that the Leader is giving. If he transgresses that expectation, I will draw his attention to the Standing Order to which reference has been made.

Mr. BANNON: I was saying that the Premier's statement, which has just been made, contains matters

which must be dealt with forthwith in this Parliament. That is the reason why we are taking the somewhat unusual step of moving for the suspension of Standing Orders rather than coming back to this matter later in the session or at some other time. Obviously, the meeting of shareholders of the Bank of Adelaide yesterday has not really clarified the issue but has added to the confusion. The vote was clearcut but there was considerable sentiment against it in the meeting.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable Leader to come back to the reason why he requires suspension, not the total substance of the argument that he wishes to develop if suspension is provided.

Mr. BANNON: I will do that, Mr. Speaker. In view of the confusion that I think that decision has created, the Government's attitude must be stated clearly today. Parliamentary opinion must be gained on this matter and I am seeking a suspension so that that opinion can be resolved and put on the record to assist both those who have been following the issue, and the shareholders who were at that meeting. There has also been talk of a Supreme Court action. It is vital, if people are to know whether to proceed in the courts on the question of this merger, that they should know the Government attitude. An expression of opinion from this Parliament would be of considerable use and of importance to them. Further, as the decision was taken yesterday, those parties wishing to take legal proceedings must act expeditiously. In order to give that opinion, this Parliament must act expeditiously and debate and resolve the matter today. The situation has been drifting for some time. Debate was impossible last Thursday; the Premier made a statement then and the Opposition did not move then for the suspension of Standing Orders or for a debate on that issue. We have done so now as a result of what one might call the Premier's supplementary statement. This was impossible last Thursday because of the nature of the business and, indeed, the nature of the statement. I think the issues today are much clearer. The divisions between the various parties are much more clear cut. This is the first available opportunity—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Leader to come back to the fact that I have asked him to explain, that is, why there is an urgency, and not to explain the substance of the argument that he will use if he is permitted to proceed.

Mr. BANNON: I recognise that this is indeed a grey area and it is difficult to make a ruling on it, but I assure you that I am attempting to confine my remarks to the subject matter, which is the suspension of Standing Orders. The point I was making was simply to say that this was the first available opportunity in this House to debate the matter. Therefore, I believe that the suspension is appropriate.

Banking and finance are not areas in which speculation should be allowed to drift. I agree with the sentiment that, where possible, matters of this delicate commercial nature should not be argued in the political arena. Therefore, where there are speculation and argument, it is unhealthy to let them drift: they should be resolved here and now. I put that forward as a strong reason why this House must be given the opportunity to debate this matter in the terms of which I have given notice. I urge all those members present to debate this matter: no more. My motion seeks to suspend Standing Orders and at this stage all I am asking is that the House allow that suspension, because without it there will be no opportunity for this House to voice its opinion on what is a lively and current issue today.

Those who support the motion for suspension are not necessarily expressing their attitude on its merits. We understand that, but I am urging all members of the

House, particularly those opposite, to allow this matter to be aired and to allow proper debate to take place. Whether this motion is eventually passed in the form in which I have moved it or whether it is amended in debate is not the question: the question here and now is that, having heard a statement from the Premier and having in mind the statement he made last Thursday, we must be given an opportunity to debate the issue. I ask no more than that.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I oppose the motion for suspension of Standing Orders. Before members opposite get too excited, I say that I do this on two grounds. First, the normal practice of the House (and the Leader has been in this House long enough to know this) is that, when a matter which has obviously been thought through before the House sits is to be brought up by the suspension of Standing Orders, it is at least the custom to inform the Government that suspension is requested. In most cases, I would say, there would be no question at all but that the suspension would be agreed to in those circumstances.

However, in this particular case I believe there is another and far more important reason to oppose the motion. The Leader is rather confused, and that is apparent in his reasons for moving the suspension. He says, first, that the meeting of shareholders yesterday has produced nothing but more confusion, and then he goes on to say that the issues have become clearer. I am not certain how he is moving and how he thinks debating this motion in this House will solve the problem. The important thing is that, in my opinion, it would be totally improper to debate this issue in this Chamber at this time.

The procedure which has been adopted, and which I have followed carefully in the statements I have made to this Chamber, is that, following the decision of the shareholders (and that is where this decision must lie entirely), two parallel lines of inquiry are now taking place as a matter of course. I have outlined them in my statement.

The Leader says that there is talk of a Supreme Court action on this matter. This matter must go to the Supreme Court. The scheme of arrangement will be considered by the court. At the same time, it will be considered by the Corporate Affairs Commission, which has a duty to examine it to see what should happen. These inquiries are proceeding now and I am not sure that the entire matter should not be considered *sub judice*. I think it is important, in those circumstances, where there is a set procedure, for the matter to go before the Supreme Court and for it to be investigated by the Corporate Affairs Commission. In my opinion it would be totally improper for us to debate this issue in this House.

The SPEAKER: I will put the motion for the suspension of Standing Orders. Those in favour say "Aye"; those against say "No". There being a dissentient voice, a division must be held.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, L. Arnold, Bannon (teller), Max Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, and Wright.

Noes (25)—Mrs. Adamson, Messrs. Allison, P. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Webster, Wilson, and Wotton.

Majority of 6 for Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

QUESTION TIME

SANTOS LEGISLATION

Mr. BANNON: Will the Premier explain his and his Government's intentions regarding the future of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act? When introducing the Bill for an Act to regulate shareholdings in Santos Limited, the former Minister of Mines and Energy (Hon. H. Hudson), said the Government's decision to introduce the legislation was based firmly on the requirement to secure stable future development of our energy resources, to maximise the likelihood that the Redcliff petro-chemical scheme came to fruition, and to prevent gas prices rising in such a manner that both existing industrial activity and future industrial development were put at risk.

During the ensuing debate on the Bill, the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) said the Bill was an attack on the spirit of enterprise, endeavour and initiative that had put South Australia on the map. He said the Bill announced to those South Australians who had no jobs that the Government of South Australia was prepared to retain high levels of unemployment rather than encourage new investment, new jobs, and renewed prosperity in the State.

The then Leader of the Opposition, now the Premier, went on to say that the Santos Bill placed South Australia squarely on the list of high-risk places for capital investment, a list which included such progressive centres as Haiti, Chad, San Salvadore, Afghanistan, Iran and now South Australia. He concluded by saying that South Australia's economy would continue to languish in torpor as long as measures such as the Santos Bill were presented to Parliament.

On 21 September, however, the Premier was reported as saying that the Santos Bill would not be repealed, and the *News* reported that Mr. Alan Bond's hopes had been dashed by the new Premier. Was the Premier misreported? If not, can he explain his change of mind and clarify the Government's position?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Government's position in this matter is quite clear: it has no present intention of repealing the Santos legislation.

GOVERNMENT'S MANDATE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Premier say whether he is aware of claims made by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government does not have a mandate for all of its policies? At the declaration of the poll for the District of Ross Smith, and on other occasions, the Leader of the Opposition has been reported as saying that the combined A.L.P. and Australian Democrat vote exceeded the Liberal Party vote, thereby denying the Government a mandate for those aspects of its policy not supported by both the A.L.P. and the Australian Democrats. I ask the Premier whether these comments attributed to the Leader are correct.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased that the member for Eyre has asked me this question, because I have been rather concerned about some statements by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to these matters. I assure the honourable member that the Leader is most definitely incorrect in indicating that this Government does not have a mandate for its policies.

The mistakes made by the Leader in arriving at his conclusions were: first, he was impatient and did not wait for the final figures as, he should know, is a necessary

precaution at any time; secondly, he omitted the National Country Party figures from his calculations, even though the Liberal Party and the Country Party are in agreement on certain policies opposed by both the Labor Party and the Australian Democrats; thirdly, he ignored completely the results of the election for the Legislative Council. The Leader should have done his homework or at least been a little less impatient. The fact is that in the elections for the House of Assembly, Liberal and Independent Liberal candidates received 353 727 votes, or 48·14 per cent of all formal first preference votes.

Endorsed Labor and Independent Labor candidates received 305 375 votes or 41·56 per cent of all formal first preference votes. Australian Democrat candidates received 60 968 or 8·3 per cent of formal first preference votes. National Country Party candidates received 14 012 or 1·91 per cent of formal first preference votes. The remaining candidates received 675 or .09 per cent of formal first preference votes.

The combined Liberal and National Country Party share of all formal votes was 50·05 per cent, compared with a combined Labor Party and Democrat vote of 49·86 per cent. A clear majority of primary votes was therefore cast in favour of the two political Parties which urged the development of our vast mineral resources. After making the necessary adjustments in the seats of Semaphore, Flinders, Mitcham and Mallee, the final preferred vote for the Government was in excess of 55 per cent and, correspondingly, the preferred vote for the Labor Party was less than 45 per cent.

The results in the election for the Legislative Council were even more formidably opposed to the Leader's claim of popular support for his cause. In that House, the Liberal Party secured 50·64 per cent of the formal vote, the A.L.P. 39·73 per cent, the Australian Democrats 6·5 per cent, the National Country Party 1·06 per cent, and other candidates 2·08 per cent. So, even before the distribution of preferences in the Council election, the Liberal and National Country Parties together secured 51·7 per cent of the total formal vote, compared with 46·23 per cent for the Labor Party and Australian Democrats. The difference between the two, if the Leader insists on seeing it this way, was a majority of 40 035 votes. After the distribution of preferences in the Council election, the Liberal Party secured 52·03 per cent, the Labor Party obtained 40·53 per cent, and the Democrats 7·44 per cent. In other words, an overwhelming majority of 29 675 preferred votes supported the Liberal Party, and this majority does not include the preferences of the Australian Democrats primary vote.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: The Labor Party took an all-time thrashing.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed it did, and there was a record vote for the Liberal Party. On the best advice available, at least 55 per cent of those uncounted preferences of the Australian Democrats were awarded to the Liberal Party, thereby resulting in a two-Party preferred vote in the Legislative Council of 409 808 votes for the Liberal Party and 320 409 votes for the Labor Party. In the terms defined by the Leader of the Opposition, that margin represents a majority of 89 399 for the Liberal Party's policies.

BANK OF ADELAIDE

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Premier table in the House the report that he referred to in his Ministerial statement concerning the Bank of Adelaide, that report which was commissioned by the previous Government and conducted

on behalf of the Government by Mr. Rick Allert, a wellknown accountant in Adelaide, and which was not available to the previous Government prior to the recent election? It is important for the House to understand the reasons behind the calling of this inquiry. I think all members would want to see what was contained in the report, because that is the crux of the matter.

It is true, in spite of what the Premier has said, that there was a great deal of public interest (and I maintain that that public interest still exists) in the future of the Bank of Adelaide. The Premier would be fully aware that my involvement in this matter occurred first at the invitation of the person employed by the bank to advise what course of action should be followed. I did not hesitate to involve myself immediately, and indeed I travelled to Sydney on a Saturday afternoon to meet the Federal Treasurer, Mr. Stone (Secretary to the Treasury), and officers of the Reserve Bank, together with members of the Bank of Adelaide, to see whether some solution could be found to what appeared a serious problem.

Great pressure was being exerted at the time, because the Federal officials and the Reserve Bank officials were afraid that a run on the bank would start. So concerned were they, that they had lodged about \$40 000 000 in the Reserve Bank in Adelaide to cater for that run. Together with members of the deputation from the Bank of Adelaide, I explained to the officials that they did not understand the people of South Australia, and that such a run was unlikely to occur. That proved to be the case. I think my action was a catalyst, because I said that the Government was prepared to become involved to the tune of \$10 000 000 at that stage in rescuing F.C.A. It was not the Bank of Adelaide with which I was involved at that stage, but F.C.A. The involvement of the Australian Banking Association in raising the funds was not a decision of mine, but of the board of the Bank of Adelaide. The board got the A.B.A. involved. I was happy about that. Indeed, if South Australian companies had become involved in raising that money—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Hartley to explain, as briefly as possible, the reasons behind his question to the honourable Premier.

Mr. CORCORAN: I respect your ruling, Sir, but it is important that members should have some background knowledge of events leading up to the commissioning of this inquiry.

As I said, the Government at that time was interested to the extent that it was prepared to supply up to \$10 000 000 in order to rescue F.C.A. The decision of the A.B.A. was to rescue not F.C.A. but the Bank of Adelaide; therefore, the Government opted out because it did not want to get itself concerned with the Bank of Adelaide at that time. I was a party to that scheme of arrangement and felt bound by it. I later learned to regret the fact that I was bound by it, but I was bound by it and could do nothing to break the arrangement and did not intend to do so. I want to impress on the House the fact that at no time did I try to bring politics into this matter, as the Chairman of the bank board will verify. He knows that early in the election campaign I asked him to come and see me, together with the General Manager of the Bank of Adelaide; in fact, the deputy came with him. This happened after I had invited—

The SPEAKER: I appreciate the information that the honourable member is giving the House, but I again draw his attention to the extent of debate he is introducing.

Mr. CORCORAN: I will not be much longer, Sir. This meeting occurred following an invitation to very prominent business people in Adelaide, together with the Under-Treasurer, to investigate ways and means by which

the Government could assist in retaining the identity of the bank and retaining F.C.A. as at present structured. I see no reason not to name those who attended the meeting: Mr. John Uhrig, Mr. Bill Hayes, Mr. Vin Kean and the Under-Treasurer (Mr. Ron Barnes). These people deliberated on the matter for several days and advised me that they thought it was necessary, sensible, and reasonable to retain the Bank of Adelaide along with the F.C.A., in its present form. I then set up this inquiry, with the agreement of the Chairman of the Bank of Adelaide and the Assistant General Manager. This fact is important; they said that they would facilitate the inquiry in every possible way. We then set up this inquiry, and the people who advised me were confident that that inquiry would reveal that the F.C.A. could trade its way out of its present difficulties in about two to three years.

I am asking the Premier to table this document so that the members of the Opposition as well as members of the Government can satisfy themselves that the situation is such that what has been outlined cannot be achieved. If that could have been achieved, I was quite prepared to introduce legislation in this House in order to give a guarantee necessary—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now moving far away from giving the reason why he wants the report tabled. If he proceeds in that way, I will have to remove his leave, and call on the Premier.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am saying that the reason why I want the report tabled is that I think every member of this House should be satisfied that the situation is such that F.C.A. is not supportable by Government guarantee; we cannot achieve that unless we are privy to the report. As I see nothing to prevent the Premier from doing this, I ask him to do it.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can understand the member for Hartley's concern about this matter. Indeed, I would go further, and say that the stance that he adopted throughout the time that he was associated with this very vexing and difficult problem was a credit to him. Let me say that if I had been in his shoes at that stage and faced with the agreement which was necessary by the Reserve Bank, the associated banks, the A.N.Z., and the Bank of Adelaide (which in fact effectively tied the hands of the members of the board), I would not have relished the thought. I can thus understand his concern.

I can also understand exactly how much time he put into this project, because since I have taken up this office I would say that nearly a third of my total working time has been taken up with considering the Bank of Adelaide's problems, and listening to people who have come with propositions, ideas and thoughts on the matter. I have listened to everyone who has come forward, because it has been of vital importance to South Australia, as the member for Hartley would agree, that we do have every possible piece of information at our finger tips. The member for Hartley referred to the possibility that there might have been a run on the bank at that stage. I am quite certain that the integrity of the bank, the safety of the depositors' funds, and the reputation of the banking system in South Australia have been at the heart of the deliberations of both the former Government and this Government.

As to the report which has been prepared, the fall-back proposal which I outlined in my statement to this House was based on the findings of that report. I felt it was absolutely necessary to put that before this House, and before the people, not in detail but in principle, together with the scheme put forward by Mr. Holmes a Court, so that the shareholders of the bank would know that fall-back positions were available to them. I think that was a

responsible thing to do, and I am quite certain that the member for Hartley, had he been in this office, would have taken exactly that step. The point is that the shareholders have had their meeting. They did have that information before them in principle, and they have decided overwhelmingly on a course of action which will now have to go to the Supreme Court and to the Corporate Affairs Commission. That being so, I will certainly consider the request made by the member for Hartley whether that report or part of that report can be made available.

URANIUM

Mr. WEBSTER: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy give the House any information about the latest views of the International Energy Agency on the role of uranium in future world energy supply requirements?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yesterday in Canberra I attended an energy conference which was addressed by eminent speakers from overseas and Australia, during which information on this matter was given. The conference was addressed by Dr. Ulf Lantzke, who is the Executive Director of the International Energy Agency. He made a considerable impact on that conference. I had a chance not only to hear his speech but also to have a brief conversation with him afterwards, and he emphasised to me that steady development of nuclear power is an indispensable component in balancing future energy supply and demand for industrialised countries as a whole. He said that, if public resistance was to limit completion of even existing plans for nuclear power development, the industrialised countries will require another 7 000 000 barrels of oil a day in imports by 1990. By the year 2000, this will rise to 15 000 000 barrels a day. Dr. Lantzke said that this was an unacceptable prospect given the current oil market outlook.

Mr. Keneally: He's obviously not around.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: He is an eminent world figure. In his speech to yesterday's conference, Dr. Lantzke made the following point very forcefully:

Nations and their publics must face the fact that if nuclear power is not available in those countries where it is needed and other sources are not developed at a sufficient rate necessary to make up for nuclear shortcomings, then economic activity will suffer from an unavailability of energy supply.

The thrust of that conference was in relation to energy conservation, and much useful information was given during that conference. Even if all conservation measures were achieved, and Dr. Lantzke mentioned some of these, nonetheless, whether the Opposition likes it or not, we are in the nuclear age. I think Dr. Lantzke's comments are given added weight when we take into account today's announcement that Iran and Libya will increase their oil prices beyond the ceilings imposed by OPEC.

PECUNIARY INTERESTS

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Premier reveal whether or not senior officers of the Department of Trade and Industry own or have owned shares in the Western Mining Corporation and any other companies currently engaged in the exploration for uranium in South Australia, and whether the Minister of Industrial Affairs has yet disposed of his shares in the Western Mining Corporation following statements accredited to him on radio the day after I had

questioned the Premier in this House on Ministers' pecuniary interests? Last Thursday, the Premier gave information regarding the Cabinet instruction to Ministers to disclose any such interests they have and to take immediate steps to dispose of those interests. The Premier did not answer those parts of my question relating to any pecuniary interest of senior mines and energy officers and members of the Government's Uranium Enrichment Committee. I should like a reply on that matter today.

In reply to my question, the Premier said (and I quote from *Hansard*) that he took the question very seriously "because it is most appropriate". The next day, however, the Premier was quoted in the *News* as saying that the Opposition had not wasted any time in dragging its politics down to the gutter level, and he specifically referred to my question concerning pecuniary interests. How questions can be both appropriate and at gutter level is something that perhaps the Premier will explain at some stage. I seek an explanation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As to the specific question on the matter of the shareholdings of the Minister, I would assure this House that the Minister has now disposed of his shareholding in Western Mining Corporation. I make absolutely clear that I do not know the shareholdings of senior officers in the Department of Mines and Energy, nor do I know the shareholdings of the members of the Government's Uranium Enrichment Committee. However, the personnel of that department and that committee has not changed in any way since the former Government was in office. Nor did I hear any such request put forward before the vote was taken in this House in March 1977.

Mr. Wright: That was your responsibility to ask that question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is an interesting comment. Apparently it is all right when the Labor Party is in Government.

Mr. Wright interjecting:

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This might perhaps explain why I was moved to make the comments I did about what the Deputy Leader said. I might also make the comment that it was the Australian Labor Party which refused, when in Government, to bring public servants within the ambit of the pecuniary interests Bill. I find the question of the Deputy Leader extremely interesting in the light of the attitude then expressed.

I will inquire as to the interests of those officers. Whether or not I disclose them to the House is another matter that deserves great thought and attention. I simply make the point that it was the Labor Party itself, when in Government, which refused to bring public servants under the pecuniary interests Bill. Members opposite ought to get their ideas sorted out.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The honourable Minister will have an opportunity to make any personal explanation at the conclusion of Question Time, but not now.

CHANNEL DREDGING

Mr. OSWALD: In view of the breakdown in the dredging being carried out by a contractor employed by the Coast Protection Board, and as the summer boating season is about to commence, can the Minister of Environment say whether the contractor will be able to meet his contract completion date or whether the department has other plans in train to clear the channel,

thus solving the sand-drift problem along our metropolitan beaches once and for all?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am very much aware of the honourable member's interest in this matter, and I know that he has written to my department. I understand that a reply is in the post for him. I am told that the contract was let on 8 June for the dredging of sand and for the excavation of a channel in the underlying clay. Unfortunately, there have been numerous and extended delays in the programme as a result of rough weather conditions. I am also told that the contractor has had a small dredge on site for a couple of weeks or more, but it has been virtually impossible to operate it. As soon as conditions improve, I can assure the honourable member that the work will be able to recommence. The completion date depends on the weather, as the honourable member would appreciate, but it is now expected that it may not be until about mid-December.

Although during this time boat operators might expect some inconvenience, it is hoped that they will understand the position (and I am sure that they will understand), as does anyone whose activities are affected by the sea and the climate. Delay will, in turn, mean that successful completion of this work will be in the best interests of these people in the long term. I am also told that the sand dredged from this channel will be placed on the beach at North Glenelg, and will make an immediate improvement to the boating access and to the beach. I assure the honourable member that I will have a detailed reply for him in the post almost immediately.

CLOTHING INDUSTRY

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Can the Premier say what efforts have been taken or are proposed to be taken by the State Government to intercede with the Federal Government to avert the loss of 5 000 jobs in the clothing apparel industry in South Australia? About two months ago, the employer's group, the Australian Federation of Apparel Manufacturers, approached various people in the community, including many members, asking that they intercede with the Federal Government to prevent the adoption by that Government of the Industries Assistance Commission's Report on the clothing apparel industry. Briefly, that report suggested a radical restructuring of the local clothing industry and severe changes to the tariff structure covering clothing apparel. According to experts in the field, the net effect of such an action would be that, if the report was implemented, about 5 000 jobs in South Australia would be lost. Given the comments made by the Premier and by other Government members about the job gains that they would effect, this is an important matter on which they should be commenting and taking action with the Federal Government.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am most grateful to the honourable member for giving me the opportunity of reassuring the House that every step is being taken to avoid such a calamity as he has outlined. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has already forwarded a submission to the I.A.C. on this very subject. We certainly share the fears held by the honourable member and, I presume, by his colleagues. Further, I have sent a letter to the Prime Minister expressing in the strongest possible terms our opposition to any relaxation of the protection afforded to the clothing and apparel industry in this State and throughout Australia. The honourable member may rest assured that every step has been taken that could be taken at present and, when I meet with the Prime Minister again

in about two weeks time, I will take the opportunity of reinforcing my submission personally.

WATER STORAGES

Mr. RANDALL: Will the Minister of Water Resources indicate to the House the storages of the metropolitan reservoirs? The outlook for South Australia appears bright, not only politically, but also economically and as far as our resources go. With summer ahead of us and a wet winter behind us, I am sure that South Australia faces that brighter outlook with much confidence, happiness and joy within the community. I seek a reply from the Minister so that South Australians may know the content of the Murray River water in our reservoirs and the cost saving that will be achieved by the Government in the pumping programme.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The question is indeed important. Figures are provided to me daily as to the storage of the metropolitan reservoirs, particularly at this time when we are looking at the effects of increasing salinity in the Murray River and the degree to which we have to use river water in a dry summer. Only about a month ago, South Australians were expecting pumping costs to total about \$6 000 000. This sum was given to the House by the previous Government not long ago.

I am pleased to be able to say that, as a result of the good rains we have had in the past two or three weeks, pumping costs alone have been reduced by about \$2 000 000, which is a significant saving to the taxpayers of South Australia. Holdings now stand at 92·2 per cent of total capacity; most of our major reservoirs are full. I have a statistical table of the actual storages and capacities of the metropolitan reservoirs, and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

METROPOLITAN ADELAIDE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

Return for 24 hours Ended 8.30 a.m. 16/10/79

Supply	Capacity	Rain	Storage	Increase in Storage in 24 hours	Intake and Distribution				Remarks— Adelaide maximum shade temperature 15.8°C Hancock Road U.S. ML Warren Storage 5 080 ML Increase 0 ML Swan Reach No. 1 P.S. 0 ML *Evaporation loss (a) Reservoirs—natural intake only (b) Estimated Using Horndale
					Intake to System (a)	Consumption (Offtake)	Losses Including Evaporation	Consumption Plus Losses	
	ML	mm	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	ML	
River Onkaparinga—									
Mount Bold	47 300	1.0	47 149	60					
Happy Valley.....	12 700	0.4	12 700	-38	174	139(b)	7	155	
Clarendon Weir.....	320		317	-3		4			
River Myponga—Myponga	26 800	0.0	26 800	0	15	8	7	15	
River Torrens—									
Millbrook	16 500	1.4	16 500	0		14	4		
Kangaroo Creek	24 400		24 400	0	123	18	3	100	
Hope Valley.....	3 470	0.0	3 322	23		59	2		
River Little Para—									
Little Para	21 400	0.0	19 540	65	71	0	6	6	
River South Para—									
Barossa	4 510	0.0	4 208	-36	284	31	2	42	
South Para	51 300	0.0	37 510	278		9			
River Murray—									
Mannum	220		160	23	0	0		0	
Murray Bridge.....	520		466	-11	0	0		0	
Swan Reach					0	0		0	
Recharge and Transfer Out					0	0		0	
Taken into storage from pipelines						-12		-12	
Totals	209 440	—	193 072	361	667	261	45	306	

Taken into storage from pipelines	Murray Bridge—Onkaparinga Pipeline	Mannum—Adelaide Pipeline and Millbrook P.S.	Recharge and Transfer Out
ML	ML	ML	ML
0 into Mount Bold from M.B.—O.P.	0 into Mount Bold	0 into Millbrook	0 to recharge from Little Para
0 into Happy Valley from Myponga	-11 into pipeline storages	23 into pipeline storages	0 to Warren
0 into Millbrook from M.—A.P.	5 to Murray Bridge Town	0 transfer to Warren	0 to Hindmarsh Valley
0 into Kangaroo Creek from Millbrook	1 to Onkaparinga Valley Scheme	4 to Onkaparinga Valley Scheme	
0 into Hope Valley from M.—A.P.	0 to sundry offtakes	3 to sundry offtakes	
0 into Little Para from M.—A.P.	4 to Nairne-Mount Barker Scheme	14 Millbrook Tanks Meters	
0 into South Para from S.R.—S.P.	1 Balance	-30 Balance	
12 into pipeline storages	0 Murray Bridge No. 1 P.S.	0 Mannum No. 1 P.S.	
		14 Millbrook P.S.	

SCHOOL STAFFING

Mr. PETERSON: Is the Premier aware that public servants, when on long service leave, are not being replaced, and of the difficulties that this is causing, especially in schools? Problems caused by this arrangement have seriously affected the abilities of a high school in my district to conduct practical science and chemistry experiments. As the only laboratory assistant at the school has gone on long service leave and has not been replaced, the staff of the school has tried to cover the short-fall in their own time, but unsuccessfully. This is seriously impairing the ability of the school to conduct science classes. In the last term of the school year, it is an unfair and unjust situation.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On the surface, the situation explained by the member for Semaphore seems undesirable, particularly in regard to matriculation classes and especially because exam time is near. I am grateful to the honourable member for bringing the matter to my attention. I will have a report prepared and will contact the honourable member to see what can be done to rectify the situation.

O'HALLORAN HILL CENTRE

Mr. SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether he has examined an application by the Meadows council for a grant of \$60 000 towards the cost of a recreation centre on Candys Road at O'Halloran Hill? I raise this question because I have been approached by Meadows council, which made application to the previous Government in May 1978. However, before an affirmative answer was given, the former Government saw fit to prorogue Parliament and thus neglect the needs and aspirations of the community. The origination of the project was the result of fruitful action by an individual. Subsequently, Meadows council took up the aspirations of the community and, with several interest groups, including the O'Halloran Hill Youth Group, Braeview Primary School, and Braeview Progress Association, went ahead to raise the necessary funds for the project.

The total cost is estimated at about \$138 000, and will include facilities for sports like basketball, badminton and volleyball. The centre will contain toilets, change rooms, a bar, and community rooms to be used by the community at large. Meadows council had to apply to banks to raise the remaining money for the project and these applications are in abeyance at the moment. Therefore, it is imperative that the council receive an answer from the Minister as to whether the grant is forthcoming.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I congratulate the member for Mawson on the concern he is showing for his constituents. He also made representations to me on this matter. True, Meadows council has applied for a grant. The total cost of the buildings, as the member has said, is about \$170 000. I am pleased to tell him that I have approved a grant of \$60 000 for the purposes for which the council wished it. I add, for the benefit of the honourable member, that one of the most pleasing aspects of this programme is the fact that Braeview Primary School will have access to the centre. This is the kind of sharing of resources of which this Government approves.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ABBOTT: Will the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, say what changes the Government proposes to make to the

Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill and why it proposes to make them? It has been reported (and the Premier indicated this on *Nationwide*) that the Government intended to weaken the Bill recently considered by a Select Committee. The Bill was introduced last November and, if passed, would confer inalienable land rights on the Pitjantjatjara people. The measure includes provisions for the creation of a new land-owning entity conferring corporate ownership on all those Aborigines and their descendants who have rights, duties and obligations, by Aboriginal tradition, to the land. If the Bill is passed, the Pitjantjatjara will have full powers of management of their lands and will be guaranteed rights over mining and other developments on their land.

The Pitjantjatjara told the former Premier (Don Dunstan) that, if they were not guaranteed their rights over possible mining developments, the legislation would not confer genuine land rights and would not be worth proceeding with.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill, which lapsed with the prorogation of Parliament before the elections, will be reintroduced before Parliament during the 1980 sessions. However, I have already entered into discussions with the Aboriginal peoples, including their representative, Philip Toyne, of Alice Springs, who visited me a few days ago. I reassured him that, before any changes were implemented and before the new Bill was drafted, I would do him and his people the courtesy of discussing the matter with them. I outlined two major areas of dissent and I reaffirmed that those matters would be discussed with the Aboriginal people before the new legislation was introduced.

At 3.16 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S SHAREHOLDINGS

The SPEAKER: In calling the honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs for a personal explanation, I indicate that it is important any comments made by a member when making a personal explanation be pertinent to the matter complained about.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I wish to make a personal explanation concerning my shareholdings in general because reference has been made to them in this House by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. When the Liberal Party took office, the Premier immediately asked his Ministers to dispose of any shares that they had; I took appropriate action immediately. It is only fair that I point out to the House that I have disposed of my small shareholdings in a number of companies. I purchased these shareholdings while I was a public servant, in the Department of Agriculture. This occurred during the mining boom of the late 1960's and early 1970's. I bought a small number of Western Mining shares. I am prepared to disclose to the House that on 3 December 1970 I bought 40 Western Mining shares; since then, those shares have been split. The total number of shares was 110. Those shares were sold on 3 October, and, to show how petty I think the whole issue is on the part of the Opposition, I point out —

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is now commenting.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: The shares have been sold, and sold at a loss.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's Speech:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the Session.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 3)

(Adjourned debate on second reading.)
(Continued from 11 October. Page 40.)

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): In introducing this Bill, the Premier reminded members that normally two Supply Bills are introduced each year, but, because of the intervening elections, introduction of the Appropriation Bill has been delayed; it is therefore necessary to ensure Supply while the Appropriation Bill passes through both Houses of Parliament. The Premier said the Bill before the House was expected to provide sufficient funds to cover expenditure until debate on the Appropriation Bill was completed and the Bill was assented to. That being the case, it is important that the Supply Bill be dealt with expeditiously. The Opposition offers no objection to the speedy passage of this Bill.

It is most important, in the case of an Appropriation Bill, particularly with the first Budget of a new Government, that the House spend a considerable time examining the financial implications of that Budget. Of course, that will be done in detail. This Supply Bill ensures that there is adequate time, in the words of the Premier, to deal with the Budget appropriately. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on members to speak, I indicate that contributions to the debate in grievance will not be regarded as a maiden speech by a new member on either side of the House. I think that is fair, having regard to the 10-minute limit. In due course, in speaking in the Budget or the Address in Reply debates, members will have their contributions regarded as their maiden speech.

Mr. BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): One of the indicators as to the style and priorities of a Government is the way in which it organises itself administratively. Public administration is a matter of considerable academic study, and a matter of great interest and importance to all of us who are practitioners of government. The way in which a Government organises itself ensures whether or not its programme can be carried out effectively, and it signals to the people precisely where that Government sees itself going. So, it was therefore a matter of considerable interest, when the new Tonkin Government came to power, to look at the way in which the new Premier

allocated portfolios and organised the Public Service structure.

Clearly, in the term of any Government, changes, variations and amendments are made to administrative arrangements, and that happened over the time in which the Dunstan and Corcoran Administrations were in office. However, when one looks at the way in which the new Premier has organised himself administratively, there is considerable cause for concern about the style and priorities of the new Government. After all, it is a Government that made much play of the fact that it believed in efficiency, co-ordination, and communication, and that it was seeking to ensure that the Public Service worked efficiently and effectively. One would have thought that the administrative arrangements made by the Premier in the allocation of portfolios to his Ministers would reflect that campaign rhetoric. There was considerable and constant noise on this subject from the then Opposition during its years in the wilderness. When stuck for something to say, the present Premier, and those who now sit with him on the front benches, would often revert to wild allegations about Public Service waste and mismanagement. They would call for a cost-benefit approach, and attack the number of Ministers, the departments they administered, and the number of departments.

It is significant that, when he was Leader of the Opposition, the Premier opposed vigorously a Bill to increase the size of the Ministry by one, and yet on the Opposition front bench beside him and in another place were 13 shadow Ministers, surely an indication by the then Leader that that was how he perceived public administration being organised. It was even more significant that, the Ministry having been increased by one, the shadow Ministry was increased by one, to 14, and I think we are waiting somewhat breathlessly to see when the new Premier decides that the time is right for him to announce the creation of an extra Ministry to bring his Ministry up to 14, the number he had as a shadow Ministry immediately prior to taking office.

As Leader of the Opposition, the Premier said that he would change the situation of waste and mismanagement, and improve organisation and administration. In the Address in Reply debate in July last year he told the House that his Party was preparing working plans for the proper management of Government departments on an efficient cost-benefit basis. I recall quite vividly one phrase in his policy speech when, looking piercingly at the camera, he said, "We must smarten up the style of Government."

It is interesting that these remarks were being made about a Public Service that enjoys a high reputation, both interstate and internationally. Some of the public administration initiatives taken in this State as a result of internal investigation, training programmes, and, in recent years, the Corbett Committee of Inquiry, have been looked on favourably and commented on with approval by other Public Services. Some of the changes instituted in our public administration in South Australia have been adopted by Public Services in other States, even in those presided over by Governments of a different political complexion from that of the Labor Government that was in office here. I think that, when the then Leader talked about smartening up the style of Government and preventing waste and mismanagement in public administration, he was barking up the wrong tree.

Now he is in Government, and the people of South Australia can see the results and call for the appropriate performance, based on the statements made by the Premier when in Opposition. Unfortunately, the Minister-

ial and departmental arrangements he has announced, which are now in effect, seem to be simply a catalogue of confusion and expediency. They are a haphazard arrangement designed to accommodate an unbalanced Ministry, rather than to provide the most effective and efficient structure for the Government. It is public administration based on the theory that as many country members as possible must be accommodated in the Ministry, and some way must be devised to make them look credible in the portfolios they hold.

It would seem very much as though the situation occurred in which the Premier sat down and looked at those he had available to appoint to Ministries, first having laid hands on country members to invite them into his Ministry, and then tried to find some way to fit them into the framework of Government. We know that a number of skilled and prominent spokesmen in Opposition have been omitted from the Ministry in Government. There was the Opposition Whip and spokesman on tourism, recreation and sport, the member for Fisher, who had made some impact in the community speaking in those areas. Obviously, he had gathered some expertise and had taken on the leading role in developing Liberal Party policies in those areas. He has been overlooked, and the Ministry in relation to tourism, recreation and sport could not be seen as a cohesive Ministry. The elements in that have been split up, as I will describe later. In Government, our Administration saw tourism as separate from recreation and sport, but it is interesting that the member for Fisher, who would so easily have fitted into that area in which he was identified in the public mind, was omitted and prevented from serving in that Ministry.

There is the example of the member for Hanson, who had made something of an impact on financial and other affairs. One would have expected him to be included in the Ministry, having eventually made it into the shadow Ministry prior to the election, but that was not to be. He has been given a consolation prize, namely, chairmanship of the Public Accounts Committee. There is something extremely ironical about that, since the member for Hanson had championed the cause of the Public Accounts Committee as being a committee that should not be in Government control and should be chaired by someone from other than the Government Parties. Yet there he is, finding that not only is he out of the Ministry, but that he is in the humiliating situation of having to accept a position as Chairman of a committee of which he believes a member of the Government should not be Chairman. I am sure that, in the case of the member for Hanson, this would not be for venal motives and that he has not buried his principles in the matter of the chairmanship, but nevertheless he has done it.

Then there is yourself, Mr. Speaker, formerly a prominent spokesman on the Liberal benches, and overlooked when the Opposition finally managed to reach Government. I believe that in your present capacity your service to the House and the Parliament will more than outweigh the service you may have given the people if you had been in the Ministry. I think it is a service of equal value, and we welcome your election by this House to the Chair.

Let us look at some of the more unusual and incongruous arrangements of departments that have already been the subject of public comment. Some people see public administration as a specialised matter that really excites only bureaucrats, public servants, and academics. That is not true. The way in which a Government organises its administration indicates the way in which it wants to govern, and what its priorities are. Consider some of these arrangements. There is the health portfolio,

involving the responsibility for our hospitals, linked with the responsibility for the development of tourism.

Then there is the amalgamation of recreation and sport with transport. There is the placing of the Chief Secretary's job and the responsibility for correctional services alongside the responsibility for the fishing industry and marine. There is the split up of a Ministry in which rural affairs were co-ordinated into two Ministries, again, to provide a space for another country member to enter the Ministry and have some air of credibility about him.

There is the association of the two extremely important areas of community welfare and consumer affairs under the one Minister. There is the fatuous title adopted by the Premier himself, of Minister of State Development, with the real responsibility for State development apparently lying with the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who is now responsible for the former economic development portfolio. There is the confusion surrounding the planning and housing policies; under the previous Government it was co-ordinated; now it is with the Minister of Environment and with the Minister of Local Government. Is it with the Minister of Local Government for no other reason than the Minister's being a former real estate agent who wants to keep his hand in? It is that sort of combination that makes one really question the way in which the Premier has tackled this vital matter of public administration. It does seem very much to be a question of allocating portfolios in terms of expediency, in terms of allocation to persons who may have vague experience in an area to lend a vague credibility. The absurdity of some of these combinations would be amusing if they were not, in fact, making the Public Service structure quite inefficient. That inefficiency is being promoted for the sake of the Premier's political considerations.

Let us look at some of the changes in detail. When I say that the Public Service is rendered inefficient by them, I think an exploration of these various combinations, their placement and the way in which they operate will make that quite clear. I have mentioned health and tourism; what could they possibly have in common, except that perhaps some modern hospitals look like high-rise hotels? Does the Government see our hospitals as a tourist asset, or that tourism will contribute in some way to the health of our community? Both of these are important areas. Health in itself consumes so much of the public Budget, it is of such importance to State administration that there is an extremely strong argument for its standing alone, for it fully occupies one Minister. If there is in fact to be some ancillary portfolio or function, it must be such that it will not consume too much of the Minister's time and energy, distracting him from that extremely important area of health.

The Corcoran Government correctly saw tourism as of key importance in the development of our economy. Consequently this portfolio was placed with the Minister of Economic Development. The correctness of this allocation has been brought out recently in the findings of a recent report, which was issued by the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs, on employment prospects by industry and occupation. We all know the stark facts of the employment situation today; the decline of manufacturing industry employment; the closing down of job opportunities in the public sector, particularly in service areas such as teaching, in hospitals and so on. Significantly, the tertiary sector still shows the greater opportunities for increased employment, and within that sector one finds the industries which relate to the development of tourism, the service industries, one of the few areas of expansion—of employment opportunities and

economic opportunities. For example, in the area of restaurants, hotels, and entertainment there has been an increase of approximately 30 000 jobs since 1971. Clearly, it is a growth area, and it is linked very much indeed to economic development. The very headlines in the newspaper today announcing that a \$50 000 000 hotel, which has been negotiated by the previous Labor Government over some years, is to go ahead is an example of the importance of that industry and an example of the economic aspect that that industry has. Now it is to be linked with our health and hospital system; clearly that is quite incongruous and ineffective.

Let us look at another of these strange combinations, that of recreation and sport with transport. I believe that that combination, which is to take the recreation and sport division of the former Community Development Department and place that in the transport area, is absurd and in fact offensive to the thousands of sportsmen and women who have come to expect service from that division and fairly progressive, well-financed programmes of development.

Mr. Evans: Don't you ride a bike as transport?

Mr. BANNON: The honourable member interjects that riding a bike is transport, and it is also recreation and can indeed be sport. Perhaps there are some other analogies; for example, one could say that in order to get to a sporting venue or function we have to drive along a road or take a bus, and that to the extent that one travels to sport and recreation it should be associated with transport to enable us to get there. I thank the honourable member for his interjection because it does point up the quite extraordinary combination of functions that we have in that case.

It is interesting to look at what sort of expertise might be brought to bear on the efficient administration of sport and recreation as a division of the Department of Transport. The Director-General of Transport is an extremely well-respected and well-known expert in the field of transportation. I am not sure precisely what are his credentials to oversee the portfolio of recreation and sport. I do know that he is an avid soccer fan, as I have seen him at the soccer on a number of occasions. Perhaps this section of sport at least will get some attention under the new combination. As to general credentials in this area, I am quite sure that Dr. Srafton himself would be the first to deny that his field of expertise is sport and recreation. He is a transport expert and should not be saddled with the responsibility for a division that deals with something completely alien and separate from his primary function.

Under both the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments recreation and sport was seen in recent years as part of the community development function. It was linked with that package of functions of government which served the community, which assisted community groups and organisations and which ensured that the quality of life of people in the community was improved. The approach of putting recreation and sport, libraries, information services, and the functions of local government all within the one sphere of portfolios has been strongly supported. The Local Government Association, considering the fourth R as they call it, recreation, saw that as being a vital part of community development. I do not recall in that report any reference to its relevance to transport needs in our community. Recreation is not a game to be played with; it is a serious undertaking, a vital component of community services, and something in which local government must be deeply involved if it is to serve residents adequately.

If one looks at the abolished Community Development

Department, one can see the way in which the previous Government sought efficiently to co-ordinate all those services and fund sources that the community looked to for support. Local government itself as a component of that community development process was vital. Now there is a separate Department of Local Government. What does that department do precisely? What relation it now has to facilities such as libraries and other areas that are associated with it is still most unclear. One could argue strongly that local government has not been strengthened by being established as a separate department; indeed, it has been weakened because it has been taken out of that network of portfolios which in fact enabled local government to respond better, to join in Government partnership programmes, and to get services on the ground in the community more effectively and efficiently.

I think most local members in country and city areas who came in contact with the Community Development Department and who saw its correlation with local government, recreation and sport, the arts, and libraries would agree that to break that up can only turn the clock back. By spreading those functions and throwing them around amongst other areas of government, it can only render Government far less efficient and less able to serve the people of South Australia adequately.

That is one of the tragedies of the administrative arrangements that have been made: the destruction of a department which was being hailed throughout Australia as being a step in the right direction. Out of it has been ripped a number of components. Local government has been weakened by being set out on one side, on its own. Does that mean that local government will be driven back to its old situation of simply looking after regulations, rates, roads, rubbish and all those so-called basic services that local government provides? Does it mean it will lose its impetus as a community government?

What will happen to the community development boards? We are told that if local government wants to have something to do with them, if it wants to establish them itself, it may, but there is no guarantee that that will be done because the chief element in the community development boards, Government participation in partnership with local government, has been lost. They are now out on a limb waiting to see what will happen to them. That is a most unfortunate situation for a major community initiative that has been taken in recent years. Local government has been weakened in that sense.

Recreation and sport has been ripped out of that area, a place where it had an important co-ordinated role along with a number of other functions, and it is placed next to transport. There is a new Department for the Arts, and again I would argue that by this means the arts have been weakened, because they will be seen as something separate, something distinct from the general process of community development. It may indeed aid the elite aspects of the arts, the opera company, and so on, to be in a separate department, although I think that is questionable. The organisation of such companies has always been such that it does not matter particularly by which department they are serviced, but what it will mean is a considerable set back to the community arts programme. It will create problems because the element of co-ordination will be lost. It is not just the Opposition that is saying that the community development function was valuable. I remind members that the Northern Metropolitan Region of Local Government Associations is on record as saying:

The Premier's action in grouping the portfolios of community development, local government and recreation and sport under the one Ministerial responsibility is both

welcome and appropriate.

The group of councils in the area of the former spokesman on local government, the member for Goyder, the Yorke Peninsula Local Government Association, said:

The Premier's decision to place related community responsibilities under one Minister indicates the Government will not relax its efforts to strengthen the role of local government.

There was approval in the field, and I have quoted from a metropolitan region and a country region. Many other examples could be produced to indicate how local government perceived its role in partnership with these other functions, and how welcome it was for them to be placed in one department. Now there has been a split, they have been scattered to the four winds, and the result can only be inefficiency.

Another ragbag type of portfolio is that of Chief Secretary, Minister of Fisheries, and Minister of Marine. Here, surely, is one that has been cobbled together to give someone a job to do and make him look credible. A judgment has been made that looking after our fishing industry has nothing to do with the development of primary industry as a whole. Rather, it is about the maintenance of jetties and handing out of licences; it has been put next to marine. Clearly, the functions of a Department of Marine and Harbors which are involved with port facilities and containerisation are part of an integrated transport system, but they have been dragged assunder from that, taken from the association with transport and placed into an association with fisheries. There is a common element indeed—water (indeed, salt water in this instance)—but in that case why is water resources a separate area? The answer is that there is no logic in this at all except to give a particular Minister something to do.

Why, indeed, split fisheries away from the general area of agriculture and forests—the primary industry package of portfolios? The same types of people are involved and they have similar problems. To have an efficient, co-ordinated and comprehensive policy in these areas requires them to be placed together, but we now have a Minister of Agriculture on the one hand, looking after agriculture and forests, and there is also now a Minister of Fisheries, an extra Minister, who is also Chief Secretary. As Chief Secretary he is responsible for police and prisons. How that fits into a package of portfolios dealing with fisheries and marine one simply cannot say. I am sure the Premier cannot answer the question except to fall back on the expediency of looking at whom he had to try to fit into the jobs, because he did not have much talent.

Clearly, country representation has been well looked after in this Cabinet because portfolios have been structured so as to ensure maximum country participation; the urban interests have been left at the post. That can perhaps be explained on the principle that the Party in Government today had very few metropolitan members before the previous election. Now it has some, and it has to accommodate them somehow. It is interesting to read in the press that already they are champing at the bit, waiting in the wings. Some of the new members are thirsting and eager for a portfolio (I can see a couple of them now, who have already probably been counting heads; it has not taken more than a few days in this House to realise what their chances are), and they are probably urging the Premier to look at his administrative arrangements again to introduce some metropolitan element so that they will have a chance to get into the Ministry. There is no threat of a Liberal/N.C.P. split while country Ministers have these functions in the way they have, but to say that that is

efficient public administration would be quite wrong.

The Premier is also Minister of State Development. That is an imposing and important title; indeed State development is important. However, what resources has he to deal with that? He does not have a Department of State Development. The former Economic Development Department has been abolished and put into a department under the control of the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs responsible for it, or is the Premier responsible? We are not sure. Apparently this title of "State Development" is purely a window dressing, public relations exercise. There are no resources; the title does nothing except massage the ego of the Premier, allowing him to attend a few business functions and claim that he is tremendously concerned with State development. Meanwhile, all the work is being done somewhere else by another Minister.

"Housing" has been dropped from the title of the Department of Planning, and just as the break-up of community development has scattered to the four winds those functions which are to do with the physical resources and the community facilities, so the split-up between planning and housing (and in addition there is the area of water resources, another portfolio created for a country member) has meant that the physical resource planning, the infrastructure group of portfolios combined by the previous Government, have also been scattered to the four winds. This can only result in waste and inefficiency.

Who looks after housing policy and planning, which are so closely inter-related? We now have a Minister in this House who is looking after the environment and planning matters, and in another place a Minister is looking after housing. He has grabbed housing for himself, perhaps based on his previous occupational experience, which may have continued into recent years; I do not know. He can comment perhaps on that in answer to questions that have been put to him. Clearly, there seems to be a large measure of expediency in separating housing from the planning area of Government policy.

Responsibility for prices has been dropped from the consumer affairs portfolio and it has been stuck amongst the responsibilities of the Minister who looks after community welfare. Surely community welfare, in terms of State responsibility, looms large, requiring considerable Ministerial attention. The area of consumer affairs, (formerly prices and consumer affairs) has many legal implications. It is an area that would be best associated with a package of portfolios held by the Attorney-General because of the legal aspects of it. It is indeed held by a legal man, perhaps as a sop to the fact that he is not Attorney-General, and grafted on to that has been community welfare, a most unfortunate juxtaposition of portfolios.

There have been one or two other examples of window dressing, and Aboriginal affairs is one. What resources has that Minister got? It is tacked on to the end of education. Perhaps it makes some sense that Aboriginal affairs should not be seen as a welfare issue, and indeed in the previous Government we tended to treat it in that way. I would argue probably that its best and ideal place is in the community development area because that is where the Aboriginal community, as a community in our society, could best be dealt with, but it is tacked on to education.

I am suggesting that the priorities of this Government, the importance it has placed on public administration, shows it up as being completely expedient in its attitude, and the result of its arrangements will be waste and inefficiency in the Public Service.

Mr. WRIGHT (Adelaide): I have only 10 minutes in

which to speak, and I have reluctantly decided to devote such time to Rupert Murdoch and his colleagues. I would not have necessarily wasted time on this individual, and it is difficult to develop any major speech in only 10 minutes. Therefore, I will speak about some of the bias that appeared in the *Adelaide News* paper during the recent election period.

It is an Australian fact well known by those who follow politics that he has been famous for many years for creating a situation whereby Governments are defeated or elected. Only recently in New South Wales he was responsible for creating the biggest majority in the Lower House for any Party in that State's history. On that occasion, he supported the Labor Party because he had been promised certain things. There is no question about that now, and we are well aware that those promises have been fulfilled.

Knowing that it was impossible to extract any promises from the South Australian Labor Government, he decided that it was about time to do it over, and he certainly did. Unquestionably, his bias came through many times—none more startlingly than when he issued the *News* of Wednesday 5 September, under the front page headline of "\$40 pay shock: South Australian Government backs rise". That was probably the most biased statement about me to be made during the election.

On page 4 of the *News*, he decided that he had to try to square up, by saying that the South Australian Government (and this is the impression that he tried to create in the minds of South Australians) had gone to the Federal Arbitration Commission and supported a \$40 a week increase for metal trades employees: nothing was further from the truth. That statement appears in large print. Also on page 4, in small print tucked away at the bottom of a column, he decided that he ought to put in the press the reasons that the South Australian Government had put before the Arbitration Commission. There were five basic reasons for our intervention, four of which were as follows:

Rates and metal trades areas are too low, when compared to other areas of employment.

Relativities between metal trades grades have been eroded over the past four to five years and must be restored.

About 170 000 tradesmen have deserted industry to take on other jobs, and these jobs must be made more attractive or Australia will lose its trade skills.

Any wage rise granted by the commission must be within the wage indexation guidelines.

To prove that bias, on 7 September (two days later) that renegade of the Australian press had, on the front page of the *Australian*, an article under the heading "New South Wales backs pay fight but not a \$40 king-hit". In the article he said that, any increase as far as the New South Wales Government was concerned had to be confined to wage indexation. So, how can one justify the two articles? If his headline in the *News* had been the same as in the *Australian*, I would not be complaining about his editorial position. However, this was a clear attempt to confuse the public in South Australia by saying that the Labor Government had supported a \$40 a week increase for metal trades employees. No sane Government would go to any court supporting any increase in rates of pay, and this is what the Government did, on my instructions. The Public Service Board was clearly instructed not to support any sum, but to place the facts before the court, as the Government saw them, namely, a lack of tradesmen, caused by men leaving the industry, and the need to restore wage relativity. I do not recoil from that. Anyone who does not understand the position as regards metal trades payments ought to examine the position.

Undoubtedly, there has been an erosion of wages over the past four or five years, and the Government was trying to restore some relativities so that we could have tradesmen to carry out our tasks in this State. However, we were not allowed to do that honestly. The *News* had to create a position of bias in support of the Liberal Party in this State by trying to confuse the people of South Australia about what the Government was doing. It may be said that I am beating a dead horse, and to a large extent I am. Normally I am not one who has been supercritical of the deal I have had in the press. Previously, I have been given reasonable treatment as a Minister and as a member, and I pay homage to those journalists who have printed things I have asked them to print. On this occasion there were journalists who were extremely dissatisfied with the conduct of the executives of the *News*. I also have been told by some journalists that on the night of the election Rupert Murdoch bothered to ring the new Premier at midnight and congratulate him.

There is little doubt, if that is true, although I have no evidence of it, that the Murdoch machine was working against the Labor Party and certainly as much as it could in favour of the Liberal Party in this State. Although they have been successful on this occasion, I wonder whether they will be successful again, and I wonder whom they will support at the next election. Will the Liberal Party bow to them and give them their wants? I hope not, and I have enough trust in the Government to think that it will not be kow-towed to by the Murdoch press, and I hope that it carries out its obligation in this regard.

I give a warning that, if people like Murdoch and others who control the press and advertising in this country are allowed to determine the fate of Governments, as on this occasion, it is a sorry state for Australia. The Labor Party has reached the stage of examining the position as regards other newspapers. I will make two quotes from the *Newcastle Morning Herald* of 21 September (six days after the election). I understand that the editor of this paper was here during the currency of the election and expressed personally to several people that he had never seen such bias in an Australian newspaper in his 40 years as a journalist. He went even further: he went back to his own paper and printed two reports. There is also another report that I cannot find. These two reports, to a large degree, support what I have been saying about the misconduct in the way in which the *News* carried on in the election campaign. He said:

As if this were not enough, the Australian Labor Party was then met by two flanking movements in close support of the Liberal Party's frontal attack on the theme, "Let's make this State great again".

These are strong words from a fellow pressman. The article continues:

The first was a ferocious anti-Government campaign by Mr. Rupert Murdoch's afternoon daily, the *News* and by the *Sunday Mail*, the editorial policy of which is controlled by Mr. Murdoch's executives.

I would not agree with him in that statement: I think the editorial propaganda is controlled from New York, where this man now lives. He goes on:

As regards the handling of factual reportage that went with it, this was a questionable campaign.

Here is the editor of another newspaper questioning the activities of the *News* in this State. Not only the Labor Party questions the activities of this newspaper: another paper also criticises the *News*. It is a sorry state of affairs when one newspaper criticises another about matters of this kind. Mr. Jacobs stated further, on 17 September:

Both sides of politics had come to believe, until Saturday night, that whatever preliminary arguments might be

mounted against early elections, once the campaigns start people don't bother much about the timing issue. But in South Australia voters remained angry—reinforced by consistent—

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

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): It is a pleasure to rise and take part in this debate for the first time from this side. It has been interesting to listen to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whingeing about the treatment received by the Labor Party. One should reflect for a few minutes about what took place. The Labor Party drew the electoral boundaries in this State.

Mr. Slater: Say that again!

Mr. GUNN: The Labor Party drew the electoral boundaries, drew up the terms of reference, and had charge of the affairs of this State for nearly 10 years. The Labor Party also decided to call a snap election. Because it has been clobbered, it is whingeing. It is obvious that that Party is not prepared to accept the will of the people. Members on this side, regardless of whether we liked it, sat in Opposition for nearly 10 years. I can understand that members on the opposite side are unhappy about the situation.

Mr. Mathwin: Very teasy.

Mr. GUNN: Yes, very teasy, but members opposite will have to get used to the idea. One of the realities of political life is that one has a period in Government and there is nothing surer than that one will be in Opposition some day. I am pleased that we on this side look forward to staying here for a considerable time, because the people of this State have had a good taste of socialism. It is obvious from the way the people reacted that they do not want any more socialism for a long time to come.

I want to bring to the attention of the House some problems faced by my constituents because of the policies of the previous Government. During one of my recent regular trips around my district, I was approached by a small business man who owned a small service station-roadhouse and also a small shop. He told me that he had to have 22 licences to run those two small establishments, which meant he also had to fill out 22 returns. He was dealing with various Government inspectors who were hounding him, checking up on his activities, and generally making life damned miserable for him.

Mr. Slater: What were the licences for?

Mr. GUNN: I will tell you the sort of businesses he ran. If you think the procedure was right, you can justify it to the people of this State. On the question of why people will not invest money in South Australia, one answer may be because of the nonsense that has to be put up with. The businesses I refer to were a small service station and a small grocery shop. The member for Stuart lives not very far from where they are situated.

Another constituent conducts a small shop in a holiday centre; he must have nine licences to carry on his business. He must have statutory declarations signed by a justice of the peace and he has to pay a licence fee or a fee for a permit in regard to most of the nine licences. Would the Premier be prepared to examine the operations of all statutory boards and committees that have been set up, many of which have been filled with ex-Labor politicians in order to provide them with jobs? Will the Premier find out whether it is possible to reduce the number of committees and boards that currently operate, and whether some licences can be abolished? Perhaps the functions of some statutory bodies or boards could be amalgamated.

I also want to bring to the attention of the House the

activities of the Motor Fuel Licensing Board, which was set up to control the licensing of service stations in this State. One of my constituents has recently constructed a good service station at Marla Bore (which is a considerable distance north of Coober Pedy), which has created jobs. I think that all honourable members would want to support his action.

Mr. Keneally: Have you been there?

Mr. GUNN: I have certainly been there.

Mr. Keneally: There would not be too many jobs there.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member can make his contribution later.

Mr. GUNN: Such as it will be. I want to explain to the House the difficulties my constituent faced. He had to wait 21 months before the Motor Fuel Licensing Board would grant him a licence, even though there was no opposition to his having a licence. In normal circumstances, one often finds that, when an application for a fuel licence is made, other people in the vicinity object to the granting of the extra licence. However, on this occasion there was no opposition whatsoever, but the licence was delayed for 21 months. I understand that the cost to the fuel company was in excess of \$4 000 regarding the obtaining of the fuel licence.

My constituent was disgusted with the activities of, and the nonsense carried on with by, the Chairman and the other members of the board. My constituent felt that the Chairman of the authority acted in a juvenile way. I call upon the Minister to examine the file in relation to the granting of a fuel licence at Marla Bore so that he can see for himself the difficulty with which my constituent was faced in obtaining a licence so that he could operate his business and serve the public.

Mr. Slater: The member for Stuart?

Mr. GUNN: No, I will leave him in peace. During the election campaign, we had an interesting debate on the development of South Australia's mineral resources. The mood was friendly, and I do not want to say more than that about the member for Stuart. On another occasion I will examine the role of the Labor Party and its policy on the uranium issue. I was interested to read an article on the front page of the *Advertiser* of 19 June, headed "Hudson and Duncan clash on uranium". Perhaps on another occasion I will speak about the whole argument, because it is illuminating and I am sure that members opposite will be interested. As members opposite should know, it was a well-known fact that the then Minister of Mines and Energy was a supporter of the mining and export of uranium, as stated in this report.

Mr. McRae: He used to get upset.

Mr. GUNN: Perhaps he did, and it was interesting to note the reaction. This reinforces what I am saying. Mr. Jacobi also was a strong supporter of the mining and export of uranium. Honourable members opposite must appreciate that, when the mining and development of South Australia's uranium industry are discussed and opposed, they must put forward to the people of this State, and to other countries in the world that are short of energy, a viable alternative for the production of electricity. In my view, there is no viable alternative in order to meet the future demands of electricity in many parts of the world if the nuclear industry is not developed and continued. I hope that honourable members will have the opportunity to visit some parts of the world, like Scotland, France and Germany, where there are no alternatives to nuclear energy.

Mr. Keneally: What about the six members you want to send over?

Mr. GUNN: I will speak about that in the future. Let me tell the member for Stuart that the members of the present

Government support the mining and export of uranium. We do not need convincing; we are quite confident that the course of action we are about to take is proper and that it is in the best interests of the people of Australia, and the people throughout the developed world who need a continuing and reliable supply of electricity. If members of the Labor Party can find a viable alternative source, I shall be happy to discuss the matter with them.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): First, I congratulate you, Sir, on your election to your high office and I congratulate the member for Eyre on his election to the high office in the Parliament to which he has been appointed. I know that, following the break, he has come back in sparkling form.

I wish to acknowledge to my electorate the honour of being elected for the fifth time as the member of the South Australian Parliament for the District of Playford. The fact that there have been five elections in fewer than 10 years perhaps goes to explain the undoubted community resentment at the calling of the last election 18 months early. I have never taken for granted the fact of being member for Playford, nor the fact that in the previous four elections the A.L.P. Government was returned.

I think many factors contributed to the downfall of the Labor Government. One was the calling of an election which the people judged unnecessary. Another was the great concern felt in the community over the state of the economy, which, partially or substantially (whether rightly or wrongly for this purpose is irrelevant), the people blamed on the State Labor Government. Yet a third was the community reaction against what was perceived as the undue influence of left wing ideology in the trade union movement and in the Labor Party. Finally, I think the determined newspaper attacks of the Murdoch press and some of the deplorable activities of the bus drivers, added to the other factors, produced the result.

It is quite clear that the A.L.P. accepts the verdict of the people and, equally clear, it will have to take very close stock of numerous of its policies and attitudes. I have no doubt that, if this is done, within a short period of time it can regain Government. At this early stage we are already a stable, hard-working, and loyal team. We have our eyes wide open and we are not simply an Opposition; we are already an alternative Government.

It was an election of extremely vigorous advertising, to say the least. Biased though it was, I accept the right of people to put their point of view strongly. Even in this very objective context, there were, however, some matters that really annoyed me. One was the disgusting advertisement based around a simulated picture of an armed robber, which was meant to imply that the upsurge of such criminals was the fault of the Labor Government. Any reasonable person will surely take offence at such appalling bad taste.

Far worse, for different reasons, were the large placards displayed by the Liberals at polling booths in Playford and other places with the motto "Vote Labor and we'll all be out of a job". Very sadly, our region, not being one of the privileged regions of Adelaide, has a very large number of unemployed young people, and a number of them, I know, were desperate enough to read in explicit terms the implied promise "Vote Liberal and we'll all have a job".

Now, that is a promise which, sadly, cannot be honoured. I take no joy in saying that. All the mineral development in the world will not solve the problem of unemployment here or in other States. Even more sadly, not only will these same young people grow thoroughly disillusioned with the new State Liberal Government, but, I suspect, also dangerously angry about the whole system. Sadly, the problem of unemployment could be solved with

a medium-term sacrifice in taxation and a reduction of the living standards of all of us with a job, with a view to providing employment for all, but no such thing was promised; none of that was attempted—just a bland statement.

Standing behind the vicious advertising campaign was an unholy alliance between the Murdoch press, various employer groups, and the conservative Parties. I now have no doubt, if I ever did before, that these groups are in fact the conservative parallel to the grouping of the unions and the Labor Party.

Often we have heard in this House of the evil alliance between the trade union movement and its political wing, the Labor Party. Now we see, exposed for everyone to behold, the alliance between the Liberal Party and the employer and other groups. Soon, I will talk about what kind of people they are—not very nice people at all. How often have we heard about this alleged freedom of vote and freedom of principle that Liberal members have. We who have been here over the past few years, when we all think back, recall the nice, responsible, decent people, such as Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Geddes, and others, who did follow their conscience and were axed, either by pre-selections or by being forced into retirement. We recall all of those things.

I come now to my specifics. How often have we heard the Liberals condemn us, as people influenced by the unions. Now I, as one who has always been prepared to speak against irresponsible unionism, and having been in many a Donnybrook because of it, say that the employer groups will be a harder master to the Liberal Party than the unions have ever been, or even tried to be, towards the Labor Party. These people are in the game of making money, and they spent plenty. Are we really asked to believe that the day will not come when the orders will come from North Terrace and Pirie Street to recoup the losses and pick up a tidy profit?

Anyone who followed the course of the election campaign must strongly speculate that at the end of the first week News Ltd. (and effectively that is Rupert Murdoch), moved far away from political comment and became a political actor. In that first week the then Opposition made very little headway. I believe that Murdoch, learning the Liberals were getting nowhere, decided to do it for them, and for that purpose set up the employer groups to do the axe work. To be blunt, I am saying that, not finding a story, he instructed his paper to go out and manufacture one and then write it up afterwards. Regrettably, the Labor Party should have known all about Rupert from its days of collaboration with him in 1972.

One wonders at the motive. It is true that his mania for power would urge him along. I suspect, however, that, apart from the pleasure of making and breaking Governments, he may well have been assisting Malcolm Fraser to somehow set the scene for an early Federal election. Then again, I should be interested to know his interest in the mining industry. Certainly, it would be very interesting to know how much the mining companies kicked into the fund. Murdoch was certainly successful in getting together the powerful and wealthy group of employers, who, in the dirty tricks area, would leave the unions for dead.

We should bear in mind that, whereas the unions and their officials are known and seen, these groupings deliberately hid in the darkness, and I am suspicious of people who carry out their business dealings in the dark. I have substantial evidence before me, from a source I believe absolutely honest, that the "Bandit" advertise-

ment was paid for by Adrien Brien Ford, but if you saw the advertisement you never knew that. All you saw was the ubiquitous name Mr. Buick (ironic in that context) as the person authorising it. I do not deny the democratic right of this company to pay for this advertisement. But I think that over 100 000 members of the A.L.P. in this State also have democratic rights and I would hope that all of them, if they share my feeling, will join me in boycotting this group. I would like to know in what way the Ford Motor Company is involved. After all, if it is, why pick on Adrien Brien alone? On the other hand, if it is not, it may be that, having got the facts, it will disallow such an underhanded merchant.

Finally, may I briefly mention one or two examples of the double standards of this pious group of employers. We recall the high principle espoused by that rather grubby group known as the retail traders. How earnestly they attacked the vicious men of the Trades Hall; how well they contributed to the Liberal Party; how good their advertising agents were (no doubt their fees written off as a tax loss). How impressed we would have been if we did not know the truth.

More experienced honourable members will recall this group as the very ones who blackmailed and threatened union officials to subvert the cause of justice in the case of the retail managers. Less experienced members should turn up my grievance speech on this topic. Any interested person should know their record profits. Any shopper would know how they reduced the manpower in their relentless search for more profit. Any intelligent person would note, with disgust, the odious way in which they parade as benefactors of the community. Finally, most people would, I think, agree that only a despicable trader would indulge in the tactics they do of misleading advertising to induce those who cannot afford it to buy, at highly inflated prices, goods they do not need. We would not be surprised to learn that these upstanding gentlemen were joined by some of the lower classes of the A.M.A. in threatening and browbeating their employees into voting for the Liberals. They can hide some of their business in the dark, and well they might, but they will never hide the stench. And, when the time comes, these are the people who will come to collect their reward from this Government and, knowing the price, their demands will be high.

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): First, I thank the House for the opportunity to speak in this grievance debate. The Leader of the Opposition seems to be as much out of touch with what is happening outside this Chamber as I seem to be with what is going on inside it at the moment, certainly in relation to the various portfolios that he rambled on about, and particularly about the functions of each one, and in comparing the past Government's mismanagement and performance with a hypothetical conclusion on what might happen in the future. Those remarks apply especially if I look at the reference he made to local government. In the analogy he made and the fears he expressed he gave the impression that most people were concerned with rates, roads and rubbish. I believe that is a total misconception of what the people think of local government.

In fact, he believes the former Government set up the ideal system for local government and its relationship between the Minister and the people. The rapid rate with which regulations came forth during the former Government's term of administration gave vent to certain feelings within local government. We can look at a some points of that. On the question of the litter laws, it was all very well for a Government to put forward policies on

litter legislation. It did not bring any wherewithal with which local government could attempt to carry out that legislation.

What happened was that the Government left local government with a situation where there was a law but it was a law without any teeth, in the sense that there was no money to finance people to administer the law. The same could be said of the dog legislation. What was the point of that if local government did not have the wherewithal to go out and police it?

We come now to the Planning and Development Act, particularly in relation to the areas of land on which people can build their homes. Legislation was brought in for various councils indicating that people could build only on one-third of the size of the property they had. That was all right in the old days when people had large properties. As the size of the property was cut down, what we ended up with was one-third of the size of a small block and people had to go to two storeys to try to build a reasonable home.

In addition, they had the problem of having to pay something in the region of \$20 000 for land in reasonable suburbs and then having to build homes which were perhaps up to \$60 000 or \$70 000, thus creating a home worth \$80 000. When it came to the tirade of legislation they passed they certainly did not give the wherewithal to local government to carry out the law and responsibility.

I am interested in the philosophy of the Leader of the Opposition on the portfolio of tourism. In the past 10 years, I have been very interested to see the number of portfolios that took on the aspect of tourism. If I remember rightly, 10 years ago the Premier himself had the portfolio of tourism tacked on to the end of his other four or five. This is a very interesting point when we look at tourism. Most people do not realise that by the mid-1980's tourism will be the world's largest industry; that is not just a pipe dream: it is already taking effect in many parts of the world.

In Italy, it is the largest operation and industry. Last year that country had something in excess of 38 000 000 visitors. In the United Kingdom it is now the third largest industry where last year they had in excess of 10 000 000 visitors. It is a growth industry all over the world. Looking at the question of tourism within this State, we wonder why in the past 10 years we have not seen greater growth in the tourist industry overall.

One asks this question, because, when looking at the figures and facts of people travelling overseas from this State, we suddenly realise, through research, that more than \$38 000 000 is spent by South Australians travelling outside the State of South Australia. This makes one wonder what encouragement is being given for those people to stay within Australia and South Australia. Looking at the figures Australia-wide, we find more than 1 000 000 people going overseas each year and if we look at the probable expenditure of those people overseas, one wonders how much is being done now and has been done in the past to encourage those people to come to South Australia and see this State first.

From the growth of the various resorts, one wonders again just how much attention has been given to the growth of the industry within this State. We find various people saying that this State has not much to offer tourists. To that I would simply reply—rubbish! This is probably because people have not even bothered to go outside the city to see what the State has to offer. I believe that, when we see the way in which the tourism portfolio has been handled, we see that it certainly has not been given any credence whatsoever as an industry for this State.

I think what the Leader of the Opposition was trying to

get across was to try to point out perhaps his own inadequacies and those of the Party in the past in not being able to find somewhere for the portfolio of tourism to go. It does not matter as far as the person is concerned; what does matter is the policies that were adopted. It may be that the Opposition may be quick to criticise and ask what we are going to do. We are not talking about what we are doing now, because we are looking into the future. We are asking what the present Opposition did in the past, because it certainly did not show South Australia what tourism could do for the State.

Looking at the income possibilities of tourism, which is something people do not easily grasp, overseas earning capacity for tourism is such that last year the United Kingdom earned about \$800 000 000 from tourism. It may be that in the years to come we will see a total visitor intake in this country of 10 000 000 people. Of that 10 000 000, 1 000 000 may come to this State, which may bring as much as \$800 000 000 of income into the State. Tourism will be a major force to be reckoned with. One true thing that the Leader of the Opposition did say was that it was a growth industry as far as manpower was concerned. He underestimated his thoughts on that; the previous Administration has always underestimated this thought.

Normally, it takes three visitors to provide employment for one person to service those visitors. Therefore, if we talk on the basis that some time in the future 1 000 000 visitors may visit the State we are talking about a possible work force of 300 000. It is an industry that cannot be kept under the bushel for much longer; it is growing quickly. By the mid-1980's, it will be the world's largest industry. I believe that the Leader of the Opposition, in trying to shake down this Government in talking about the various portfolios, is only showing his naivete about what has happened in the past.

What is important is that this Chamber has realised that tourism will grow and that it will be beneficial to this State. I hope that the Chamber will realise that the successful ventures undertaken in this State by various enterprises in the realm of tourism will be of great benefit to us in the future.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): Before the last member spoke, we were listening to the member for Playford, who, I think rather unhappily detailed to the House some dubious and shonky practices that were indulged in during the recent State election by the Liberal Party and also some of its supporters.

I want to use my time today also to detail to the House what I regard as a dubious and shonky campaign that occurred before and during the election period, conducted by some organised groups in the community and also by the Liberal Party, in an endeavour to destroy the South Australian Land Commission and also to use it as an election issue.

This was, of course, a campaign to try to put back into the hands of private developers the opportunity to make large profits in the sales of land, an opportunity that had been denied them for several years because the Land Commission had been operating in the market place, and because the Commission had operated in a way in which one would have expected the Liberal Party to support it, because it was operating in competition with private developers.

That is one area alone where one can only wonder at the kind of principles which apply in a Party that professes to support free enterprise and competition in the market place so that the operation that follows will, as it were, work out its own course of action, one of the principles

that they have always espoused. Yet, when this actually happened in relation to the supply of land available to people who had aspirations to become homeowners, despite the fact that they stood for that principle, a concerted and organised attack was made on the Land Commission.

Probably one way to test whether the Land Commission was operating correctly, that is, for the benefit of the people in South Australia who wished to be able to continue to buy land at reasonable prices that they can afford and on which to build houses, would be to look at the periods of land sale activities and an equivalent period during the years before the Land Commission was established in South Australia.

Between July 1971 and June 1975, the average price of building allotments in growth areas in South Australia rose by more than 100 per cent, while at the same time the consumer price index rose by 42 per cent. Yet, the Land Commission was established during 1974-75, and in the following four years between 1974 and 1979 land prices in growth areas increased by an average of 52 per cent, whereas the c.p.i. rose by 53 per cent. Before the Land Commission was established, the cost of land in growth areas sky-rocketed by more than 100 per cent in four years. Yet, when the Land Commission entered the field, the cost increased by marginally less than the increase in the c.p.i. over the same period. Those figures speak for themselves, and illustrate whether the Land Commission was operating successfully and correctly.

Another argument advanced against the commission was that it was not being managed well. However, I am sure members opposite would not object if I suggested that the way to see whether or not an enterprise was being managed well would be to examine its sales records. In 1978-79, sales to private builders and individuals were lifted by 79 per cent, at a time when land sales were certainly not increasing generally. The commission was able to lift its sales by 79 per cent, and the commission increased its share of the market from 10.7 per cent in 1977-78 to 25 per cent in 1978-79. The total sales were 549 blocks to private builders and individuals and 234 to the Housing Trust, making a total of 783 in that year.

Probably the biggest effort made by the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Liberal Party (I have probably put them in the correct order, because their interests were not quite so co-ordinated and organised as were those of the first three organisations to which I have referred) was in relation to the commission's indebtedness and an alleged inability to pay back loans that had already been entered into. Although I could refer to many newspaper reports relevant to the period to which I am referring, I will quote only one to make the point. A report in the *Advertiser* on 28 August 1979 stated:

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Goldsworthy, said yesterday the commission had become a multi-million dollar monument to Labor Party mismanagement. It was running up a long-term debt of more than \$200 000 000.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: When the honourable member has been here a little longer, he may learn to extend to members the courtesy of hearing them without interjecting. The true position is that, despite what was said in the report to which I have referred, the total indebtedness at present is \$87 500 000, made up of Commonwealth, State and sundry institution loans, together with a capitalised interest to that time, which applies. The condition of the loans covers deferral of repayment of the principal and interest for the first 10 years, the capitalisation to which I

have referred, interest rates, and long-term bond rates and if in any year, revenues are insufficient to meet debt repayments. The Financial Agreement between the State and the Commonwealth provides that payment of shortfall does not have to be met and that the Commonwealth will make adequate provision in relation to the State's obligation. At the minimum, this provision would represent a carry-over line of credit.

What is the actual position? The repayment of Commonwealth loans is due to commence in 1983-84 with a figure of \$4 060 000. The South Australian Land Commission's liquidity at present is \$14 000 000, rising to \$18 000 000 next year, \$24 000 000 in 1981-82, \$26 000 000 in 1982-83, and \$28 000 000 in the next year, during which the repayment of \$4 060 000 is required.

There is no doubt that organisations such as A.S.L. and Cambridge Credit would have loved to be in the same position as the Land Commission with respect to liquidity and loan repayments. These repayment projections have been formulated on a basis which assumes that the commission will get only an annual market share which is less than its entitlement in proportion to its total land stock in growth areas. Further, on an average commencement figure in the Adelaide statistical district of only 5 900 houses a year, that is less than projections put forward by the Indicative Planning Committee on Housing, which operates between all States and the Commonwealth. It is clear that the campaign which was set up was designed to use distortion, myth and straight-out untruth in order to achieve a result that would return to the pockets of those people who support the Liberal Party in South Australia (many but not all of the private land developers) the opportunity to go on making the profits they made before the Land Commission was established and before it acted as the stabilising force in the community with respect to land sales, which is its proper role and function and which was approved by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Mathwin: That's rubbish, and you know it.

Mr. PAYNE: The honourable member opposite does his best on McNally and he ought to try to stick to that.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): One David Tonkin, now the Premier of this State, journeyed to the Noarlunga regional centre on 2 October officially to declare open this initiative. He delivered on that occasion a speech which was extremely political in tone and which was not received well by those in attendance. He was probably fortunate in that he was not heard very well because many people were milling around and no-one was taking much notice of what he was saying, which was probably just as well.

I think that many people took exception to the fact that the Premier took this opportunity to make what was a blatantly political speech. In addition, he made a fool of himself because the sorts of thing he was saying were, "Let us put behind us the lost 10 years that we have had," and "Let us go forward to the future together," and so on. We have heard this often enough before. The Premier was flogging the old theme of business confidence and investment being low under Labor.

What was quite ridiculous about that speech on that occasion was that he was officially declaring open what is, in effect, a monument to the confidence that the business community in South Australia had shown in investment during those Labor years. Let us for a brief time recount the history of the Noarlunga regional centre. It is, of course, far more than simply the Colonnades shopping centre, which the Premier was then opening. Before the Colonnades was completed, the city of Noarlunga had its headquarters in the centre. The terminus of the railway line from Adelaide was in the centre, and the St. Vincent

Youth Centre had been established there. Also, a tavern was in the course of construction at the time and the T. & G. tower is still being built.

It is mooted that a college of further education will be established in the centre. I sincerely hope that the present Minister of Education is committed to that project. In the past, he was rather critical of my being rather over-enthusiastic about building great palaces, as I think he called them once. However, I remind the Minister that much Commonwealth money is committed to this project if it goes ahead. Moreover, it is important from the point of view of my constituents and their training for skilled trades, which skill they will need in future years.

Also, a good deal of medium-density housing is to be established adjacent to the centre, so the regional centre is far more than simply a shopping centre. Nonetheless, it was always seen that the shopping centre was critical to the development of the regional centre. It will give life there, give the area a heart, and attract people to it.

Quite apart from being the local member for the district for the past 10 years, I was also intimately associated with this development, having been Minister of Housing for about 18 months in the Dunstan Government. During that period the late Mr. Alec Ramsay put to me two propositions, which I approved and which have been a fairly critical part of the development of the centre; one was the way in which the South Australian Housing Trust would continue to have a piece of the action (if I may use that term) in the ongoing development of the shopping centre, and the other was the way in which a more flexible system of zoning would operate for the area of the Noarlunga regional centre, a sort of mini city of Adelaide development. Both of those things were approved and have gone ahead.

Critical to the whole thing, however, was the ability to attract private investment into the centre. Obviously, although the trust would continue to have an intimate involvement in the whole development, as the subdivider of the total area and as some sort of partner in the venture, it was not going to put up the bulk of the money for the development of the centre. It was important that a private investor be attracted to the scheme. That occurred, but it occurred not after 15 September 1979 but more than 12 months before then. It occurred as a result of the initiatives of the Labor Government, and in the face of demographic projections which were indicating, as long as 15 months ago, that there would be nowhere near the number of customers in the city of Noarlunga that had been assumed when the planning for the Noarlunga regional centre got under way.

I have examined those figures. At present, the population of the city of Noarlunga is 58 000 people. When the Noarlunga regional centre was first mooted in the very early 1970's, it was still, in those pre-Borrie Report days, part of the conventional wisdom that one used the population projections that were embodied in the 1962 town plan, a copy of which is just outside this Chamber if any honourable member wants to check the figures that I have in front of me.

Those projections as to population growth went back in time a little. In 1961, the city of Noarlunga had a population of 5 495 people. It was predicted that the population would be about 30 000 people in 1971, 92 000 in 1981, and 154 000 in 1991. There were times when larger figures than that were used by people like Mr. John Byrne, who was responsible for a lot of the design of the centre, but that was by casting the net wider to include places such as Meadows and Willunga. The important thing about these figures is that, if one likes to draw a graph of these figures and to interpolate them in order to

get some idea of the projected population in those days, one sees that there would have been a population of about 75 000 people in the city of Noarlunga in 1979. That was the thinking in those days.

However, people believed those figures 12 or 18 months ago when these investment figures were being taken. They could see that, although Noarlunga would continue to grow, the projected growths of earlier years were not going to take place. In fact, there is a short-fall of 17 000 people in the population. I do not deplore that, but the people knew that and, nonetheless, made the investment decision. They also knew that development would continue to occur on Beach Road and the Main South Road at Morphett Vale.

It was, therefore, quite a coup for the Government and the South Australian Housing Trust to attract that investment. Despite that, the Premier went to Noarlunga and suggested to one and all that the past 10 years have been wasted years and that people have not been prepared to make investment decisions. Let a Mrs. J. King of South Payneham have the final say in this matter. She was reported in the *Advertiser* of 5 October this year, as follows:

Sir—Congratulations to Mr. Tonkin, the Chamber of Commerce and the Retailers' Association. Just over three weeks ago we were told this State was on its knees. Business confidence was at an all-time low. Today, after a short car trip, I have found The Gallerie, Colonnades and a new multi-story office block, owned and financed by an insurance company. In The *Advertiser*, (2/2/79) the Manager of the insurance company said, "The undertaking of such a large project as the Noarlunga Centre was a good sign for South Australia's economy. The heavy investment by financial institutions indicated the faith they had in the State." Not a bad three weeks work. Who is kidding whom?

So say all of us!

Mr. SCHMIDT (Mawson): I am aware that this is a grievance debate, and it has obviously turned out that way. It saddened me to hear the member for Baudin make the comments he made. I thank the honourable member for Baudin for making his seat available on the train to enable me to travel to the Colonnades for the opening of that wonderful shopping centre. The Colonnades, as he is aware, is situated in the heart of his electorate. Unfortunately, although the honourable member did not see fit to attend the function himself, he seems to have all the information on hand to enable him to get up and speak convincingly about the so-called not-so-well-received reception of the Premier. If the honourable member had been present, particularly to see his constituents happily walking around that magnificent shopping centre and making full use of it, he would know that the people applauded spontaneously many of the comments that the Premier made during his opening speech. The honourable member would also be aware that the Premier gave credit where credit was due; in no way did he intimate that, by waving a magic wand, in three weeks the new Government could establish a magnificent centre like that. Again, I thank the member for Baudin for making available to me his seat on that train to enable me to attend and see my own constituents in that area, which abuts his district. That shopping centre serves us both well.

It also grieves me much to hear the Opposition making great grievance about its so-called press coverage. This seems to be the only recourse they have for their own poor campaigning. Again, if I look at my own local paper, in the whole three weeks of campaigning, the member for Baudin and the former member for Mawson had only one advertisement to tell people what they were doing,

namely, repeating what they had said in 1977. Yet, they said that it was a deplorable newspaper which did not give the Opposition its fair chance. However, if the Opposition is not prepared to inform the people and to give them the information they are seeking, little wonder that they get a poor hearing. Who is at fault? Is it the paper or the member submitting the information so that the populace may become more acquainted?

It also grieves me that they were so out of touch with what was happening in that area. All they could do was talk about the splendid things about which they had spoken in 1977. In the ensuing two years, they had not come forward with anything more positive, and that is evidenced by the way in which the Opposition is speaking today. It is not coming forward with anything positive: all it can do is knock and criticise and make innuendo about character and various other things. It steers away from anything positive.

Returning to the Premier's comment at the Colonnades opening, the member for Baudin would have known had he been there that the Premier was merely reiterating some of the wishes and desires of the community, namely, that it is looking for a more positive future, not merely something economic or physical in growth, but an attitude. It became apparent, as the member would know, that an attitude was certainly non-existent in his own district as well as in my district. He also admitted that projected figures were way out of line with what was anticipated. He said that they were anticipating a population of 75 000, whereas we have only 58 000. Obviously, Government planning has not given the required stimulus. Otherwise, the Colonnades might have been opened earlier and the honourable member would have had the opportunity of being a sitting Minister and attending the opening himself. However, that was not to be, because of the then Government's decline in its planning projects and attitudes, towards the whole growth of South Australia and towards what it saw as the will of the people.

The member for Baudin would also be aware that countless new homes have been going up for sale in that area, because of an exodus of people from that southern area. Had they been prompted to stay there, as we had hoped, we might by now have reached the projected figure of 75 000 people. Again, people had become so disillusioned with what was happening in the State and in the south; they had a Cabinet Minister who was supposedly in touch with the boys up top, but who could not give them the things they required. Little wonder that there was a feeling of despondency and of lacklustre in that area. The results proved otherwise for the then Government, which was promptly told that the people in the southern area required something better than they were receiving.

Regarding the Colonnades, which the honourable member raised as the main topic in his contribution, he would have noticed, had he been there, the air of enthusiasm and confidence and the gaiety in the step of people as they moved around that magnificent building. The entire shopping centre has had magnificent support since the opening day, and I know that it will continue to have that success. The people in the south are prepared to get up when the chips are down and show that they are not going to be knocked around, but will make the most of what they have. They are doing that now, and we look forward to any future development.

Again, I pay credit to the former Government for some of the plans it had made in that area but, had it done its work correctly and more efficiently, those projects would have been there much sooner than was the case, because it merely used many of these facilities as a political toy to

bandy around, and allowed them to come into existence when it suited the Government politically. One might hypothetically speculate whether it was not the former Government's intention that it should allow these projects to remain in abeyance, because of a possible election that might be called early in an attempt to increase their mandate.

However, the former Government found that its political manoeuvring backfired on it and put it into oblivion. Unless it can come up with something more positive, that oblivion might be their resting point for the remainder of the time in Parliament of some of the younger members.

The south is a rapidly growing area, with enthusiasm and potential. The councils, the people, the business community, the community at large, and the groups within the community all know the necessity for positive forward planning and a positive attitude towards life. They are a good indicator to the former Government of how to go about keeping South Australia alive.

Finally, I draw the attention of the member for Baudin to the fact that, if he was really keen about his constituents in that area, he would not have relied on secondhand newspaper cuttings of people who came from other areas of the city, such as Payneham, which is a long distance from where we reside. He should have known how delighted the people in the south are with the entire project there and how spontaneous the almost 100 000 people were when the opening speech was delivered and during which the Premier said how positive the whole project was. He would have known that the secondhand information he quoted was sheer nonsense. I trust that, in future, he will keep his ear to the ground and in touch with the people in the area.

Mr. DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity of congratulating you on your appointment, which I supported with great vigour and with a certain amount of glee.

I will spend the brief time available to me in going over a few of the matters related to the sad demise of the Bank of Adelaide over the past few months. I will raise a few matters which I do not think have been dealt with publicly, either by the press or by the gentlemen in the community at large who have lamented the slow but sure decline of that once great institution. The matters with which I wish specifically to deal are not related to the role of the Government so much as to the role of the board of directors of the bank and of the Finance Corporation of Australia. I believe there has been an extraordinary cover-up in this area.

One has only to read the financial press and the reports dealing with the whole sorry tale to see clearly that there are many unanswered questions. Many spokesmen from both sides of the controversy, many of the financial spokesmen and many of the financial journalists have raised questions about just what went wrong, and why things have continued to go wrong, and they have referred to the many unsolved problems concerning the Board of Directors.

One has only to read through some of the material in the financial press to see the questions raised, including questions asking why the directors allowed F.C.A. to pour 90 per cent of its assets into speculative real estate areas; why the board did not go to its own shareholders to try to relieve the situation; why have the Federal authorities directed the Bank of Adelaide shareholders as they have; and why they have deprived them of their right to look for a higher rate of return from an alternative source, even if from an overseas bank?

To find an answer in this area one needs to go to what has become known as the "Mother's Day Massacre", that sorrowful meeting at which the Reserve Bank set down the conditions under which it would be willing to mount a rescue operation. Since then there has been a nice cosy little arrangement between the Bank of Adelaide, F.C.A., the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group Limited and the Reserve Bank.

Many people in the community cannot understand why the Board of Directors of the Bank of Adelaide has not taken a tougher stand in this whole matter and has not acted like a real entrepreneur by trying to find a way out of the difficulty in which it had got itself, lock, stock and barrel. Why was it not able to do this? The basic answer to that question is that, because of the strong ties between board members of the bank and the Adelaide Club, nobody seems to be prepared to stand up and say that the board of the bank was basically a bunch of incompetent nincompoops in the way that they ran the bank and the way they tried to get the bank out of its recent difficulties.

Notwithstanding the future of the bank, and the future of the takeover bid by the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group Limited, I want to know, as indeed every honourable member should want to know, what steps will be taken to investigate the activities of the board of the Bank of Adelaide and the board of F.C.A. There is strong evidence to indicate that the F.C.A. board breached the F.C.A. trust deed. That allegation should be investigated. I believe that that is known to the Corporate Affairs Commission, but I do not believe that any investigation is being undertaken at this time. Why not? That is the question that the people of South Australia should have answered. Why is no investigation being undertaken into the activities of the directors?

Similarly, why is there no inquiry into the activities of the directors of the Bank of Adelaide. Over a long period, I believe that they have been in breach of the Companies Act. Since the Bank of Adelaide became the full owner of F.C.A. there has not been one occasion on which the annual return from the bank to the Companies Office (now the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission) has shown an audited consolidated balance sheet, and that is a breach—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Why didn't you do something about it when you were Attorney-General?

Mr. DUNCAN: I did. There was an inquiry set up.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Where is the report?

Mr. DUNCAN: The Minister will find the report in the Department of the Corporate Affairs Commission, and no doubt it is available to the Attorney-General. I want to know, now that the matter has been settled to the extent that it has been settled, when will some action be taken about these matters. It was a delicate matter before yesterday, as the Minister would know, because there was a chance of a run on the Bank of Adelaide. That chance now seems to have been removed, and now we ought to see a little bit of action in respect of the people who were basically responsible for the situation that exists today—the scandalous situation existing today.

I can do no better than to take my text for this comment this afternoon from the former head of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry S.A. Incorporated, Mr. Colin Branson, who is not particularly a friend of the Labor movement. At yesterday's meeting, Mr. Branson said:

We are being led to the sacrificial altar so as to save the integrity of the directors.

I would have put it slightly differently and said that it was to save their skins. I do not believe that, regardless of the outcome of the take-over bid by the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group Limited, these gentlemen should

be allowed to get away with what they are trying to get away with.

There should be no cover-up. A nice little deal is being done by the old-boy network, the Reserve Bank, the A.N.Z., and the Board of Directors of the Bank of Adelaide, to protect them from their basic incompetence and probable negligence in the way that they have recently conducted themselves as the Board of Directors of the bank. Not only were they incompetent and did they get the bank and F.C.A. into the situation in which they are presently, but the directors have shown incredible incompetence since then.

I am told that the money that has been lent to the Bank of Adelaide by the consortium of Australian banks has been lent at 10·5 per cent interest, a fair thing in the circumstances, I suppose. I understand that the bank has taken up \$40 000 000 of the \$60 000 000 that was made available. The extraordinary thing is that the Bank of Adelaide directors were too damned incompetent to ensure that the way in which they borrowed the funds ensured that the bank received protection of section 51 of the Income Tax Assessment Act so that interest payments could be deducted from the bank's income tax assessment. That allegation should be checked out. I have been told by responsible members of the business community that that is the case, and this situation shows a lamentable lack of judgment and an incredible amount of incompetence on behalf of the board of the bank.

Many people have wondered why, on the one hand, Alan Scott, a wealthy South Australian, is prepared to invest a vast sum (I think he invested more than \$300 000 in trying to buy a significant interest in the Bank of Adelaide over the past few weeks), when on the other hand the Board of Directors of John Martin and Company Limited and the board of the Australian Mutual Provident Society (I do not know whether it is the local board or the national board) decided to support the proposal for the take-over by the Australian and New Zealand Banking Group Limited.

The only rational reason that I have heard advanced is that Alan Scott and his supporters are not current directors, are not in the hot seat of looking down the barrel in regard to prosecutions, and therefore do not have to worry about their own skins, whereas the directors of the Bank of Adelaide, who are also associated with the Australian Mutual Provident Society (Sir Arthur Rymill) and John Martin's (Peter Wells) are in the gun in this fashion. That is a strong reason why I believe they have acted as they have.

I believe that there has been an incredible cover-up in this whole matter, and I join with the member for Hanson in demanding a full inquiry into what has gone on in this area. The Corporate Affairs Commission should investigate the whole of the actions of the Board of Directors of the Bank of Adelaide and the then Board of Directors of F.C.A., and bring down a public report so that the sort of matters that I have raised this afternoon can be thoroughly canvassed to see just what steps should be taken to punish the people who are basically responsible for the situation in which the Bank of Adelaide and F.C.A. find themselves at this time.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I wish to raise the hardy annual that comes about at this time of the year regarding the replacing of the Proclamation Day holiday with a Boxing Day holiday in this State. Such a situation has recently been granted at Whyalla after great representations, I presume, from the member for Whyalla, so that Whyalla shop assistants will get a holiday on Boxing Day. The situation will arise in which there will be a different

public holiday in Whyalla than will apply elsewhere in the State. In fact, there will be no recognition of the historical significance of Proclamation Day, which is important in the history of this State.

Members interjecting:

Mr. MATHWIN: The member for Napier was brought over some time ago at the cost of the taxpayer.

Mr. HEMMINGS: At least I wasn't deported.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member would not know the significance of Proclamation Day. South Australia was proclaimed by the first Governor of this State, Captain John Hindmarsh. The ceremony was held on a hot Saturday afternoon at the Patawalonga Creek at Holdfast Bay. Of course, since then, the great achievements of the pioneers have followed. An article about Proclamation Day by David Mayo and Mr. F. W. Richards states:

By common usage in the State of South Australia, the third day after Christmas Day in each year is distinguished by the name "Proclamation Day". That day is the anniversary of the occasion, 28 December 1836, when Governor Hindmarsh caused his first official proclamation in the territory, upon which he had just effected a landing, to be promulgated. It was his first gesture of official significance to those intending to form the new community in (and upon) that territory. The gesture followed within a few hours of the entry by him and his companions. They were not, however, the first white intruders to take up residence in the area. For some years prior to their landing there had been settlers at Encounter Bay and on Kangaroo Island.

That article reveals the significance of Proclamation Day and its importance to my electorate and the electorates of my colleagues whose districts abut my district. There is now a mass of Liberal members along the coast, as the Opposition well knows. The Government has the strength on the western side, with its new and past members from that area in this House. The Opposition might shiver in its shoes at the strength the Government has along the coast of South Australia.

Mr. Abbott: Did Captain Cook ever visit McNally?

Mr. MATHWIN: I know that the former Minister has had a rough time. Proclamation day at Glenelg is a great day. Much organisation has been done by the Glenelg Council over the past years, helped by the local community, community groups, and service clubs, who spend a lot of time trying to assist people on that public holiday. The service clubs try to stimulate interest and to raise money for local charities, and they have been successful. Why people should want holidays on days of convenience rather than on days on which something important is signified within the State beats me. As I have said, the question about the Proclamation Day holiday is raised every year. I am sure the member for Hanson and my other colleagues along the western coast will support me and the council in opposing any move to do away with Proclamation Day in this State.

A lot has been heard from members of the Opposition about what happened at the last State election. Members opposite are sore, and I suppose they need to be, that the Labor Party lost the election. It must be realised that the Labor Party is now in Opposition in this place; it is on the other side of the House. Members opposite can scream and whinge as much as they like about what happened at the election, but the fact remains that the Labor Party lost the election because of the policies it put to the people of this State. The Labor Party tried to socialise the whole of South Australia.

Mr. Wright: I'd like to socialise you.

Mr. MATHWIN: Maybe you would, Mr. ex-Minister. A

lot has been said in the press about the advertisements put into the election campaign by big business. However, nothing has been heard from the Opposition about money spent that was contributed by trade unionists who are good Liberals. In many cases, people in this State have to join trade unions or they cannot get work. Part of that money paid to the Labor Party in sustentation fee is used to fight elections. At times, certain unions call for political levies, and that money is also used for the political advantage of the socialist Party of this State. Nothing has been heard from the Labor Party about this shocking situation. People are forced to join unions, no matter what their political outlook, and part of their union dues goes to support a Party which they do not support. The money is used by the Labor Party in any way it wishes.

I would like to hear from some of the massive number of members of the trade unions, of whom there has been an influx into this House at the last election, about how they feel. With the fresh blood there might be some fresh ideas. Some of the new members might be ashamed that good Liberal money is used to pay for election advertisements and political action by the Labor Party to help it move to this side of the House. I do not know how much has been spent, because one of the greatest secrets in the world is the balance sheets of trade unions. If one wants to look at a balance sheet, one has to go to the Industrial Court. You are not allowed to take it away, but you can look at it, if you have the permission of the Commissioner. All companies in South Australia have to make their assets public. The balance sheets of companies are available for all to see. This is not the situation regarding trade unions in this State.

The Parliamentary Library is supposed to keep every union rule book applying to this State: that is the law. However, only one rule book is available—the builders' labourers' rule book. There is no other rule book available in the Parliamentary Library, yet anyone who prints books of that nature must, by law, submit them to the Parliamentary Library. If any member opposite tries to look at a rule book in the library, he will find that none is available. Anyone who wants to look at the balance sheet of a union must go to the Industrial Court and seek permission to peruse it.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I direct the attention of members to the statement made by the Premier at the opening of the new workshops at the regional headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Service Unit at Royal Park on 4 October, in response to the opening address. On that occasion, Mr. Peter Pickering, Senior Administrative Officer for the South Australian Health Commission, requested additional funds from this Government for the erection of a therapeutic swimming pool to assist the rehabilitation of patients using that centre. The Premier stated, in part:

I have three new words in my vocabulary since becoming Premier: The first two words are "how much" and the third word is "No".

What hypocrisy, particularly in light of the Premier's expressed appreciation to the management and staff for their efforts in assisting patients to return to a useful role in the work force and society.

This is the type of statement and hypocritical attitude that one has come to expect from his Liberal colleague, the Prime Minister, who is undoubtedly one of the most divisive and disliked Prime Ministers in the history of this country. Seemingly, the Premier has taken a leaf out of the Prime Minister's book by his bleating and shedding of crocodile tears at every given opportunity but, when it comes to helping the average worker, the Premier backs off.

No doubt this comes as no surprise to my Labor Party colleagues who over the years have witnessed the gyrations and somersaults of the Premier. In particular, I refer to the Premier's statements on the mining of uranium and the take-over bid for the Bank of Adelaide. In the industrial sphere, the Federal Government, supported by the Liberal Party and big business in this State, has waged a relentless attack on the trade union movement and the average worker's living standards. One has only to cast his mind back to recent events that have taken place in this country for examples, such as the introduction of the CEEP and CERR Acts; the Federal Government's anti-union legislation which states, "These new provisions are designed specifically to protect job security, safety and health and welfare of Australian men and women and their families"; the implications of the Federal Budget, with reductions in health, welfare and education, just to name a few; health insurance increases; increasing the price of oil to world parity; and increased unemployment. I could go on and on, yet this Government, when in Opposition, had the temerity and the gall to place all these ills at the feet of the ordinary salary and wage earner, and the trade union movement.

Although time does not permit me to elaborate on these issues it is worth while to examine some of the aforementioned proposals of the Federal Government, which is supported by the Liberal Party in this State. Where is the job security in this country, or this State for that matter? The recent attacks by big business and the Liberal Party in this State on the previous Labor Government's proposed legislation to ensure security of tenure for working men and women was strenuously opposed by the Premier and his Parliamentary colleagues. Obviously members opposite have not experienced the shock and trauma of being told by management on picking up one's pay that your services are no longer required.

What about the savage increases in taxation in the last Federal Budget? The silence from the Liberal Party in this State was deafening. What about the increases in health insurance premiums which, added to higher doctors fees, will increase the consumer price index by 1.5 per cent? Assuming that the prediction in the Budget papers is correct that the increase in employment will be one per cent, and unemployment will continue to rise to an estimated 550 000, does the Federal Government's new scheme, which requires families to provide financial assistance for their teenage children whilst they are undergoing job training, fit in with the Premier's secret plan to overcome the unemployment situation in this State. Obviously the Liberal Party policies in this country are aimed at denying unemployment benefits to those persons who, try as they may, still cannot find employment.

Further, on employment, members opposite are invited to read the booklet *Beyond Employment*, which is a statement on human labour prepared by the Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace for the Catholic Bishops of Australia. I enjoin all members opposite to read page 13 of that booklet which, under the heading "What must be done", states:

The essential long-term problem concerns the distribution of wealth. We have already seen that Australia is a very wealthy nation and that this wealth is concentrated in the hands of a minority of its members. We have also seen that another minority, the unemployed, and others who are disadvantaged, miss out on a fair share of our national wealth. A change in the attitudes and goals of society must involve a new means of distributing wealth. If we redefine work in terms of service, we will be able to recognise the

contribution each person makes. We must then, as a society, guarantee that those contributions are rewarded. The problem of unemployment does not arise because we are a poor society. On the contrary, we are on the whole a rich society.

These are not the words of the trade union movement or the Labor Party, but those of the Catholic Church. On page 8 of the same booklet is the heading "Attitudes towards the unemployed". This is summed up in the first two lines, as follows:

Unemployed people are victims, victims of structures over which they have little control.

During the election campaign, the Premier and big business tipped the can on the Labor Government and the trade union movement, but the fact of the matter is that the financial ills of this country and the increasing unemployment are due to the incompetent and financial mismanagement of the Australian economy by the Premier's Federal colleagues.

In an article in the *Advertiser* last Tuesday, it was stated that the Deputy Premier of this State is to attend the first National Energy Conference in Canberra for consideration of Australia's energy problems and policies, as well as some of the measures that may be taken to improve Australia's energy position. Yet members opposite are allowing the Federal Government a free hand to carve up the railway network in this State. The railway system is recognised as the cheapest mode of public transport, yet not one word has been spoken by the Deputy Premier to protect the railway system and railway workers in this State.

What has happened to the transfer agreement Act provisions which protect the railway system in this State? Obviously the Minister of Transport is complying with the wishes of his Federal Minister, and one has only to peruse the statements made by the Australian National Railways Commission management to visualise what will happen to the railways network in South Australia under the banner of the State and Federal Liberal Governments.

Members on this side of the House, during their period in Government (and I refer to section 9 of Part II of the Railway Agreement (South Australia) Act of 1975), ensured that the interests of railwaymen and women, small businesses, farmers, and small townships were protected from savage cuts that the Federal Government, through the A.N.R. Commission, wished to introduce in this State.

As I have said, since being elected, this Government has kowtowed to the wishes of the Federal Minister for Transport (Mr. Nixon), in agreeing to the reduction of railway services in this State. Is the State Minister of Transport aware of the corporate plan of the Australian National Railways Commission and the effects of that plan on the community of South Australia? The Federal Government has already drastically curtailed funds for capital works within the A.N.R.C., and among other things is looking at and has already implemented a reduction in passenger services; a reduction in branch line operations; and the curtailment of services where allegedly effective demand is lacking.

On the question of the interpretation of the phrase "where effective demand is lacking", I raise the following question in closing: Is the Minister of Transport qualified to interpret the various Acts of Parliament? If the answer is "No", did he obtain a legal interpretation before giving the Australian National Railways Commission the authority to cancel services on the Port Pirie line and between Wallaroo and Moonta? If he has not obtained a legal opinion, will he do so, particularly for section 9 of Part II of the Railway Agreement (South Australia) Act, 1975?

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

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): During this grievance debate I have sat and watched with interest the new members and some of the older members opposite who were obviously prepared today to give speeches in this House, because many of them have had their speeches typed up enabling them to follow them through easily. I draw attention to the fact that new members on this side have not had an opportunity to prepare their speeches. The speeches given by new members on this side today will not be our maiden speeches, and we will wait and see whether speeches made by new members opposite are regarded as maiden speeches. The speeches made by new members on this side of the House will not be nicely typed up on printed paper for us to read to the House. Those speeches will be made off the cuff about grievances we want to bring before this House.

One of the predominant points made today by members opposite was that the Liberal Party represents only big business. I am proud to stand here as the member for Henley Beach and say that I come from a trade union background. I even have my trade union membership card with me to verify that fact. I want to demonstrate to the people of South Australia that the Liberal Party represents the whole of the community, and not just one sector of it. The Liberal Party has representatives from the trade union movement right through to big business and the investor. The whole ambit of the community is represented by the Liberal Party's philosophy.

The result of the election is an indication of the community's feeling about the philosophies of the Labor Party, and of the community's loss of touch with its members of Parliament. That was evident in the district in which I live. The Labor Party was sure it would win the seat of Henley Beach — so sure that, after door-knocking for only the first week, its members spent the rest of the election period in air-conditioned comfort in the electoral office awaiting the results of the election.

The election result is an indication of the amount of work that the respective candidates are prepared to do in the area. In Henley Beach, three new candidates were put up. I took the approach that I believed was essential for communication with the community. I got out and met the people and talked to them. If we believe that we are representatives of the community in this House—and we all believe that, I think—surely we should be representing the ambience of the people, talking to them and listening to them. Members of other Parties decided to await the election result behind closed doors, and they deserved the result that they got. I believe the result in Henley Beach will be built on, and I think we can entrench ourselves as we go along.

The member for Glenelg stole some of my thunder when he spoke about his approach to compulsory unionism, which was one of the main thrusts which motivated my becoming a political candidate. I believe in freedom of choice, and that is the philosophy on which I stand in this House. I believe in the right of the individual to have freedom of choice, to be able to say "Yes" or "No". I believe that the trade unions fulfil a major function in the community. They have a role to play, but, if they abuse it, as many do, they will lose that responsibility. The problem is that the trade unions are abusing their responsibilities and members are saying that they do not want to belong to such unions. They wish to withdraw their membership and to cease paying their fees. Unfortunately, under the previous Government they were

told that, if they did not join the union, they could not have a job.

I have sat many times on boards and bodies employing people. One of the questions asked on the application form to be filled in was whether or not the applicant was prepared to join the appropriate union. If someone had the gumption and the conviction of his thinking and said "No", he was excluded from consideration. While compulsory unionism builds up union membership, it also creates a backlash. Such a backlash is being felt now, and people are opting out of the trade union movement, a movement which is there to serve working-class people. Those people are choosing other alternatives and the 1980's will show how those alternatives will be put into force.

I believe the trade union movement will undergo a dramatic change if it is prepared to accept that responsibility. If it is not, it will suffer the consequences, as the Labor Party has done. If change takes place, better communications will be set up with employers. That has been a problem. Trade unions in today's community do not communicate effectively with employers; unfortunately, employers sometimes do not communicate effectively with trade unions. The challenge of the 1980's for members of Parliament and for the community is to learn to communicate at all class levels. If better communication channels can be set up, problems will be reduced and conflict in class struggles, sometimes fostered by members opposite, will be lessened.

I omitted to mention that the other candidates campaigning in my area suddenly appeared out of the blue at election time. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be seen to be working in the area from the beginning. My involvement was in local government, and I saw the impact on local government of the policies of the previous Government. I saw the effect of the cutbacks, making it difficult for local government to operate, and the lack of recognition of local government as a grass roots body operating at community level, while recognising community development boards, made up of representatives of the community. At the same time as local government councillors were making decisions, consultative bodies and boards were making social and welfare decisions, so the community was being torn apart. There was no recognition of local government, and so it began to play a minor role; some people have said that it only collects garbage and looks after roads.

Local government has to face the challenge of the 1980's, and it must recognise that the community is demanding of local government social services, libraries, better facilities, and community services which I think local government can provide. If we listen to the Budget debate, we will find how this Government's philosophy will encourage and help local government to carry out those philosophies.

Another problem in local government relates to the so-called \$1 000 000 spent in the western districts to provide library services. It was a great ploy and much was made of it. The library services were supplied, but now, two years later, the money has stopped because of the approach of the previous Government to the situation. They provided a foot in the door, and asked the community to try it out, knowing that, having done so, they would want it, and back-up funding was not provided. Now, the councils which have mobile libraries are getting letters to say that funding is running out. Decisions must be made, and it will be interesting to see how local government copes with the problem.

The previous Government lacked foresight in planning. Cluster housing is a new concept, but South Australia is

behind the eight-ball. Victoria and Queensland have been sufficiently progressive to see the future for cluster housing, and they have legislated for local government to determine cluster housing developments. In South Australia, we are behind the times. I believe that the present Government will look at cluster housing as a major initiative.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): As I listened with interest to the comments of the member for Henley Beach about freedom of choice, I thought he must have had a shock earlier this afternoon when he found that freedom of choice was to be denied him in deciding questions in this House, when he was unable to support the Opposition when it wanted to debate matters in connection with the Bank of Adelaide. Some of his remarks about the library services in the western suburbs were patently ridiculous, and I expect that such criticisms will be more fully rebutted later.

I congratulate the member for Albert Park on his contribution, and I congratulate members opposite who have spoken in this Chamber today for the first time. All were certainly much better than was the member for Glenelg. If he proved nothing else today, he proved quite clearly that the electors of Glenelg have a remarkable sense of humour. I am sure that members who have been in this House for a few years realise that I am not one who would lightly applaud a conservative or Liberal Government for anything, and one can applaud them for very little, certainly on the State scene.

However, an initiative was taken by the Federal Government, which I applaud and which I intend to speak in support of here today. That initiative was in relation to the provision of training and jobs for Aboriginal people. Yesterday at Port Augusta the Federal Minister for Employment, Mr. Viner, launched a scheme to provide training and opportunities for employment for Aborigines. This is an extremely important programme, and I would have thought that the State Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (a newly created portfolio) would have attended this meeting. However, he was not there. The purpose of this programme is to equip Aboriginal people with the skills to enable them to enter the work force and to encourage employers to provide opportunities for them. I understand that a programme recently mounted in Dubbo, New South Wales, was quite successful, to the extent that 140 new jobs were provided for Aborigines in that area.

Some people may wonder why the Federal Government has decided to implement such a programme in Port Augusta. Port Augusta has a population of about 16 000 people, 10 per cent of whom are Aboriginal. Of those 1 600 Aborigines in Port Augusta, 150 are in the work force. The unemployment rate amongst non-Aboriginal people in the Spencer Gulf area is 8 per cent, whereas for Aborigines it is 50 per cent, and that is a very critical statistic indeed. However, as bad as it is, it is a great improvement on the situation 10 years ago, when more than 90 per cent of Aboriginal people in that area were unemployed. There have been some dramatic improvements in the lot of Aborigines. Ten years ago the mortality rate amongst infants was 10 to one, as against the mortality rate for non-Aborigines. That has improved to between four and five to one. Aborigines now have a life expectancy of about 20 years less than non-Aboriginal people. While these statistics are improving, they still leave a great area of concern for the rest of the community.

One factor concerns me about this programme, although it is a programme that I support (and I agree completely with the remarks made yesterday by the

Federal Minister at Port Augusta). However, it concerns me that Port Augusta has an employment base between 70 and 74 per cent of which relies almost solely on Government, both State and Federal. This percentage is higher than in Canberra or Darwin which are well known as Government cities. For the programme to be a success, it requires Governments to radically change their employment policies towards Aboriginal people. I challenge the State Government to support its Federal colleagues in this programme and to ensure that all State Government departments operating in Port Augusta improve their ratio of Aboriginal employees. I do not know that this is going to be such an easy thing for them to do, because we have a high unemployment rate amongst non-Aboriginal people, and there will be some resentment amongst the community if people believe that Aborigines are getting jobs that ought to be open to everybody.

However, the Federal Government has provided a subsidy that will allow Government departments to employ Aborigines in jobs that might otherwise not be available at all. I implore the State Government to take advantage of this, as I implore the Federal Government to take advantage of its own scheme. I do not want to be cynical in my approach to this programme, because I am very hopeful that it will succeed. I have been speaking on this subject in just about every Address in Reply debate for the past nine years. It is a subject that the Labor Party, when in Government, was unable to come completely to terms with. I imagine that the public attitudes are such that it will be a very difficult task for the current Government to perform adequately. Nevertheless, this is no reason why efforts cannot be made, because Aboriginal people have quite adequately proved that they are as competent as anyone else in the community to do the work that is available in any of a wide range of jobs.

I thought that it was a reflection upon the community, in Australia in 1979, that the Chairman of the National Aboriginal Employment Development Committee, Mr. Miller (a gentleman from Queensland), was forced to speak to the meeting yesterday and say that Aboriginal people are quite competent; they can drive heavy plant and work in industry. For a gentleman in that position, at a gathering of people in South Australia, to be forced into making such patronising statements about a group of people who we know have the skill and ability to pursue a wide range of occupations is a reflection on what he might see in Queensland or what the average Australian attitude is to employing Aborigines.

In Port Augusta we have about 400 to 500 Aboriginal children at school. The largest Aboriginal primary and secondary schools in South Australia are both based in Port Augusta. Unless these children can look to the work force and see people of Aboriginal descent placed in jobs that carry some status, there is no way that we can say to those children, "If you work hard and perform well at school, jobs are available to you when you leave." Their simple reaction to that would be, "Where are they, show them to me and I will believe you." Within the Spencer Gulf area we have to discriminate in favour of Aborigines in relation to jobs. We have to prove, particularly to the young girls at school, that when they leave school there are jobs available to them where they can get dressed up and go to work, work with management, knock off with management, and be seen as being part of management. It is easy to find jobs for Aborigines in low-skilled, and low-paid jobs in foundries, and as fettlers, etc. However, we do not see these people represented in the commercial area, and we do not see them represented in the administrative section of our Government departments.

My plea to the State and Federal Governments, as it was

to the previous State Government, is to take advantage of their own programmes and show an example to the private sector in the Spencer Gulf area by employing Aboriginal people in jobs carrying status and a reasonable return for the effort they put in. That is the only way we can help these people out of the predicament in which they find themselves and in which we have in fact placed them.

Mr. PLUNKETT (Peake): I will confine my remarks on this occasion to one particular issue that is of considerable importance to the people of my district, namely, the future of the Thebarton Community Centre. This centre is a project of vital importance to thousands of South Australians who live in an area which, until the past few years, has not enjoyed the quality of community services to which other areas have become accustomed. The former Labor Government, during its term in office, took decisive steps to ensure that the people who lived and worked on the western side of Adelaide could enjoy a quality of life comparable to that in other areas. For example, in 1977 Don Dunstan announced emergency assistance for the library development in western Adelaide, and this programme has been an unqualified success. The Parks Community Centre is almost fully completed and is already providing much needed facilities and services. In July this year the former Minister of Community Development (John Bannon) announced that work would commence on the Thebarton centre in December, following a call for tenders in September.

This announcement raised the hopes of a great number of people in the Thebarton area who have been working towards seeing the centre as a reality since 1973. It is not an exaggeration to say that there was excitement at the prospect of the centre starting to take shape. However, September has now passed, and tenders have not yet been called. This will, of course, mean delay, which is understandable, given the problems of changeover in Government and administration. But it would be tragic if the project were abandoned or chopped about so that the original concept of the community centre became unrecognisable. The proposed centre at Thebarton will comprise a 600-student school, welfare centre, community meeting places, cafeteria and a multi-purpose sports and recreation complex. As with the Parks centre, the facilities are planned for maximum community use. Indeed, much of the centre could be utilised for up to 16 hours a day throughout the entire year. The philosophy behind the centre is that wherever possible community facilities should be planned for multiple use by the people. This makes good economic sense, as it avoids unnecessary duplication of facilities and saves the taxpayer money.

Furthermore, the planners at Thebarton had clearly in their minds that schools in particular should be open to the community. Again, this makes sense at the basic level of dollars and cents. Schools, apart from anything else, represent an enormous capital investment by our society. To leave them empty when the community wants and needs the facilities they offer makes no sense. The former Government actively pursued a policy of opening schools. I am pleased to see that the present Minister of Education committed himself to a similar approach in the policy which he released during the recent election campaign. I hope he can impress upon his colleagues in Cabinet the importance of the Thebarton concept of openness and multi-use.

The proposed community centre at Thebarton is a bold, exciting and innovative approach to education and to the provision of welfare services and recreation facilities. But there is a very real fear among the electors of my district that it is under threat. This project is not one that has been

hastily thrown together. In fact, it has been the result of careful planning over a period of six years. During that time the local community and resident groups have been involved and consulted every step of the way.

This process began with the distribution to all households of a pamphlet outlining the project. The pamphlet was printed in three languages. This is important, because 70 per cent of the pupils at Thebarton school are from either Greek or Italian families. The pamphlet contained a return prepaid postage section which enabled householders to indicate the facilities they believed necessary. The replies were followed up by intensive house-to-house interviewing.

Following the investigation, a Thebarton Residents Association was formed which has been very effective in publicising the design and concept of the centre. This has enabled a continuation of local involvement throughout the planning process. When the architects did have some ideas and plans, meetings were held with local residents, with an open invitation to change what had been drawn up. The people took that up, with the result that more sports, performing arts and social space were provided for in the design.

I have recounted this in some detail because I would not want members to wrongly assume that this centre was the result of isolated planning by people remote from what was needed by the community. Far from it; the people were involved, and their needs were paramount. But the Government did not lose sight of its wider responsibility to the whole State. As was proper, the project was submitted to the Public Works Committee for examination. The committee examined the proposal between July and September last year. Its report was presented to this House on 14 September 1979. I would like to quote from the summary and recommendations of that report. The committee concluded:

The Thebarton Community Centre is an excellent example of inter-departmental and community co-operation. It is an attempt to provide urgently needed facilities for an identifiable metropolitan community at a cost which will be less than if the individual components were provided separately.

The Thebarton complex has the potential for improving the quality of life in the Thebarton community and providing a concrete example of rationalisation of Government expenditure on necessary community facilities. Along with the Parks Community Centre, it is being viewed as an exciting pilot project—not only in Australia but also overseas.

The committee's principal finding was that there is a need for the construction of a community centre at Thebarton. The committee particularly noted that the local council, community associations, and many private individuals had been closely involved with the planners in the development of the proposed centre. It also noted that all witnesses to the committee were strongly in favour of the project proceeding as planned. That consensus among the community has not weakened since September last year. If anything, there is now a stronger desire for the centre to proceed. Nor has the urgent need to which the committee referred diminished. Again, I would suggest that the need now is perhaps greater. Members should particularly note the committee's conclusion that the project would provide services at a cost less than that of proceeding in a piecemeal fashion.

Prior to the election, the Labor Government affirmed its support for the Thebarton Community Centre and set dates for the calling of tenders and commencement of construction. The community was, and is, fully behind the project. The Public Works Committee has endorsed the

project and drawn attention to its unique potential. Legislation under which the Thebarton and Parks Community Centres were to be administered has been drafted. What remains now is for the present Government to carry through with the project and thereby ensure that people in the Thebarton community have the centre they need and for which they have planned and worked over past years.

I turn now to the remarks made by the members for Glenelg and Henley Beach. I had to ask whether the member for Glenelg was a new member. I was surprised at his contribution. I thought he was a new member, and I felt sorry for him. I was President of the Australian Workers Union prior to coming here and the things he had to say about unions are not correct. I can supply him with a balance sheet, audited twice a year, from the Australian Workers Union, South Australian Branch, and a copy of the rules of that union can readily be obtained. The member for Henley Beach has probably been a scab in his own union for many years, but I will have more to say about that at a later date.

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

Mr. LEWIS (Mallee): First, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office, and I acknowledge the champion contributions to this debate that have been made by my colleagues who have preceded me. I refer to the remarks made by the member for Peake, who grieved about job opportunities for Aborigines. I would support that view in general principle but not in the racist terms in which he put it. We are not apartheid; we do not believe that skin colour means that anybody should have a disproportionately advantaged or disadvantaged position in this community. We believe that everybody has a right to a job. Accordingly, we believe in equality of opportunities, whether as self-employed individuals or as employees of a firm. I wish the honourable member would understand that the policies of his Party have been more destructive to the job opportunities of people of any race in this State than has anything else. I wish he would also understand that we intend to rectify that situation, especially in the Spencer Gulf region to which he has referred. It will not only be Aborigines in that locality who will be able to get employment but also all Australians who want work.

I turn now to the statements made by the member for Peake about the Thebarton community centre; that is a wholly appropriate thing for any community to aspire to. Nonetheless, I ask him how much money was paid as expenses in distributing those pamphlets. Were those done, as they were in the suburb in which I live, by volunteers, or were they distributed at taxpayers' expense by people who were paid wages? What was the response to that pamphlet? He did not mention that at all.

Mr. Plunkett: I will do that later.

Mr. LEWIS: I invite you to do that. The honourable member said a door-knock was conducted. Was it in connection with the Labor Party's election campaign, or was it genuinely inquiring into the need for a community centre as felt by the people there? The honourable member said meetings were called, but he did not mention how many meetings were called or how many people attended. I wonder whether that is on the record anywhere. Nonetheless, I see that as the wholly appropriate thing for any community to do, so long as the people do not lean on the back fence and look at someone else's efforts and say, "We are going to have a community centre and you are going to pay for it."

I come now to some matters that concern me. First, I

refer to the odour that I have to suffer every morning as I enter the tunnel from the car park. I know what is to be on the luncheon menu that day, and I know as I go home that other people have lived in this building, because the air-conditioning at that point happens to be incapable of eliminating the odours from the recycled air. On some occasions the air smells so fetid that one imagines that it might have come from an eighteenth century prison. If there is something that can be done about that, I am sure it would lift the tone of this place somewhat, at least in physical terms if not in political terms.

I turn now to questions that have concerned me about my electoral district and the effort that has to be made to give it anything like the representation that members opposite are able to give their districts. When one compares some metropolitan districts, which have an area of only 10 square kilometres, with the Mallee District, which has an area of 34 800 square kilometres, one realises what distances have to be travelled to visit country electors. The people in the Mallee District are particularly disadvantaged in comparison with other large country electorates or those more remote, because there are no additional travel allowances in connection with my district. Facilities provided in connection with another district help that district's representative to do his work efficiently, whereas I have to drive myself everywhere I go. To make the calls that I have been asked to make since being elected I have spent in excess of \$1 000 on fuel alone, and I have averaged more than 30 hours a week behind the wheel in order to do it. If I could spend the bigger part of that 30 hours working in consultation with my constituents, I am sure I could give them a better quality of representation in this Chamber. I am sure that the situation to which I have referred leaves them in a disadvantaged position in relation to constituents in other electorates.

My second point in relation to my electoral district is that there are hundreds of miles of road which in bad weather are unsafe. There are not only the so-called sealed roads; for instance, the road from Murray Bridge to Karoonda; from Lameroo to Pinnaroo; or down the Coorong. The former Premier said he had had the misfortune to come off that road; I think that that was his expression. At any rate, the vehicle he was driving left the road. My impression is that it is difficult for motorists to stay on the road. None of those roads was given any consideration by the previous Government. So much for the way in which that Government cared for such people. Some unsealed roads were made from substandard materials, which were forced upon the councils as a result of cost constraints. No-one should be expected to put up with those conditions. There would be a hue and cry if that were to be the case anywhere near the centre of Adelaide.

The next point I would like to turn to is the plight of Tailem Bend, which has been the Cinderella of the towns along the river. Coincidentally, it happens to be the place most likely to be considered central in the whole electoral district, though I cannot say that it is geographically so. That happens to be the hundred of Lewis adjacent to Coonalpyn in the area of the Coonalpyn Downs District Council. At Tailem Bend all the children who wish to attend secondary school are loaded into buses every morning and driven to Murray Bridge; after school, they are driven home, yet there are more pupils from Murray Bridge and surrounding districts than attend a good many other area schools in this State. I believe that that is appalling. It would help the people of Tailem Bend tremendously if they were given a school of their own; the die is already cast in relation to that proposition, but the previous Government refused to do anything about it.

Also, because there is no central place in the Mallee District, people in that area are unable to find any place to which they naturally gravitate for access to their member of Parliament, unless it is in Adelaide. That is why it has been necessary for me in the interim to keep the electorate office in Parliament House. That is regrettable, and it is something that I intend to try and rectify in the future, God willing and this House willing. It would be unfortunate if the people in Mallee were not given the kind of representation which equals that given by others.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): It has been said that most people can face adversity, but the best test of a person's character is to give him a position of power. In the short time since the election on 15 September, the Premier and his Government have amply demonstrated their character: the Premier is already equivocating on a number of promises made during the election campaign. He has already said that there were bold statements in relation to so many additional jobs to be found in South Australia. I think the theme was, "Make the State great again," but I am not sure how to spell "great". It could be "grate" as in the days of Tom Playford. The statements of our friend the Minister of Education have also been equivocal. The entire Ministry has reneged on a number of promises made during the campaign. The Premier now says that it will be some appreciable time, probably 12 months or so, before any signs of additional jobs will be seen in South Australia.

Another matter I raise is the abolition of land tax. We now find that abolition of land tax, on the principal place of residence, will not come into effect until the next financial year. That was not part of the Liberal Party's policy. It did not state a particular time; it said that it would be introduced immediately. Abolition has been deferred until the next financial year, and there is a difference. It seems, that, on many of the promises made by the Premier and his colleagues, their feelings towards the promises have already waned considerably, and the feeling in the community towards the Government has also waned considerably. The honourable member may laugh as much as he likes, but the honeymoon is over; it has been the shortest in history.

Members interjecting:

Mr. SLATER: The Government has gone back on its promises. We can even say that it was unfaithful on its wedding night. I quote from page 821 of *Hansard* of 12 September 1978, when the then Leader of the Opposition spoke on the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (No. 2) regarding the appointment of an additional Minister. The Leader (now the Premier) referred to the Bill as the Bannon benefit Bill, and said:

The Premier fails to convince me and, I suspect, all other members on this side of the House (and probably he cannot convince his own members) of the real need for this new Ministry. None of those grounds as outlined by him is persuasive in any way. I am also totally unimpressed by the rationalisation of numbers in this Cabinet with those in Cabinets of other State Governments.

Later, he said:

We have just been subjected to the recitation of what has been termed in the press a "belt-tightening Budget", and it seems ironical that immediately afterwards we should be considering further Government expenditure in the setting up of a new Ministry. The arguments will not hold up and I cannot support them. The expenses involved in the setting up of a new Ministry are considerable. These include office accommodation, necessary staff, and the upgrading of staff that will be necessary. I noted that there is to be a freeze on numbers in the Public Service, but there is no mention whatever of a freeze on the money to be paid to those

officers. A car, an expense allowance, and all of those things are also involved.

Yet, it is interesting to note that the new Government has 13 Ministers. Here again, it has gone back on its word. On other occasions when we have debated amendments to the Constitution Act under which additional Ministers have been appointed, the then Opposition has opposed such appointments vigorously. Now, with 13 Ministers, there are not sufficient jobs. There are some disappointments on the Government side. A notice has appeared in the press recently in respect of Government cars. The Government is to change from L.T.D. to Holden Commodore cars, and there will be a substantial saving in fuel and costs, etc. However, I have heard that the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee (the member for Hanson) will be provided with a Government car.

Mr. Keneally: The Public Accounts Committee will investigate.

Mr. SLATER: I hope that the committee will investigate and that the member for Hanson will show a good deal more enthusiasm for this committee than he did for the Industries Development Committee when he was a member. If he arrived, he was always late, and left early. He usually brought his own lunch; he would have a Coke and a ham sandwich while the meeting proceeded. I hope that he will be more assiduous to his duties than he was when a member of the Industries Development Committee. The waste management watchdog of the Opposition is now to get a Government car. How hypocritical can one get!

Mr. Mathwin: He'll buy his own lunch, too, will he?

Mr. SLATER: I hope so! Knowing him, he may be able to wangle that as well. He may be able to get a free lunch from the Government Frozen Food Factory. One person who supports the Premier's cut-backs and the so-called swinging of the axe (I am not going to run a guessing competition, about who it may be) is our famous friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Fraser), who unyieldingly supports the economic strategy of the new South Australian Government. Heaven help us if that is the case. Here again, we find that the kinds of promise he made when elected have not been kept, either. His Government also was unfaithful on its wedding night.

Our friend from Henley Beach made some remarks about the Liberal Party's philosophy. He was well astray because, to me, that Party's philosophy is basically "private wealth and public squalor". This has been demonstrated in respect of the remarks made prior to the election and the actions that will be taken in respect of the Public Service. Despite it having been said that there will be no cut-backs in staff, you can bet your life that there will be a cut-back in the Public Service to the detriment of services provided to the community generally. Can any Government member tell me when a private enterprise Government has ever provided good housing, good health services, transportation, or schools—all the things the average citizen wants? Never, and no private enterprise Government is ever likely to.

Members interjecting:

Mr. SLATER: Nowhere in the world does a private enterprise Government believe in providing such services, because such Governments are wedded to private wealth. The majority of electors in South Australia have elected a Government wedded to the principle of private wealth. Regarding the measures it has introduced in the Budget, such as succession duties and gift duties, whom do they help?

Do they help the workers? They do not: they help the affluent people, and that is the principle in which this Government believes. It believes that the abolition of

succession duties will not help the ordinary people.

Mr. Mathwin: It will help you and your children.

Mr. SLATER: It will not help me. I am not wealthy, I will never be wealthy and I do not want to be wealthy. That is not my principle, but the Government opposite believes in the principle of private wealth and public squalor. All the tax concessions that have been announced will only help the wealthy and affluent people. It is under this guise, under the old trick called "private enterprise",—

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

Mr. SLATER: —that no such things exist.

Mr. OLSEN (Rocky River): First, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to your high office. It was not my intention to speak in this debate but, after listening to some of the comments that have been made by members opposite, I am compelled to do so. It is interesting to note a despondent Opposition, casting around for a scapegoat for the election defeat of 15 September. Why we are on this side of the House and the Labor Party is on the other is quite understandable. It is no good bringing in red herrings like the Murdoch press, the vested businessmen and other groups of people, because it was quite realistic for the rest of the community to accept, understand, realise, and cast their votes accordingly.

The Labor Party when in Government pushed those people to the brink of taking unprecedented action in this State against continuation of those policies, which have retarded South Australia. The Liberal Party vote, for the record (and I repeat it for the benefit of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition) was the highest preferred vote ever recorded in a House of Assembly election since compulsory voting was introduced in 1942. The two-Party preferred vote for the Liberal Party in the Upper House reached almost 57 per cent.

What precipitated this stunning Liberal victory? Why did we receive the greatest vote recorded for a political Party? There is a number of reasons, and they start at the beginning of the campaign. I believe that the Australian Labor Party took every wrong turn during the course of the campaign, unlike the Liberal Party. It was obvious that the Dunstan finesse was gone. The strategy originally concentrated on personalities and Federal issues. However, the Labor Party was unable to adapt and did not have the capacity to conduct a personality campaign such as South Australians had seen previously. The campaign was started without professional market research, relying rather (one believes) on newspaper reports about confidential surveys, on Morgan Polls, whose sample in South Australia is so small that the error rate rises to rather significant proportions.

With arrogance, the writs were issued, and a Government that had been in office for nearly 10 years had become complacent. Its only legislative programme was coming home to roost. Those are the reasons for the rejection of the Labor Party at the recent election. The Party in Government at that time ignored signs of sectional discontent; it proceeded with amendments to the Conciliation and Arbitration Act. If there was anything that would precipitate action such as we saw from the business community, it would be that legislation, yet, in the face of it, the then Government proceeded.

Many other factors were the basis of the downfall of the Labor Government. Two profound issues were underlined during the campaign. People remembered the Salisbury affair, and people were cynical and had had enough of early elections in South Australia. It is reasonable to

comment that early election disenchantment usually disappears within the first seven to 10 days of an election being called. However, without clear reason, the Labor Government was unable to bury that as an issue throughout the campaign period.

The other factor that precipitated the significant swing in the community was that the pace of change in the past decade had been too great for the various sectors of the community to digest. In many cases it was radical change, change for the sake of change, not necessarily change for the better. We certainly need a legislative holiday from that type and pace of legislation. Equally, we as a Government, need to indicate in rather concise terms which Acts will be investigated, repealed, or left alone.

Turning briefly to the future, the Liberal Party needs, as a Government, to instil confidence in the people of South Australia, to regenerate consumer confidence, and to unlock the massive bank deposits in this State to ensure a consumer-led recovery. Business has now a Government that will get off its back and get out of its way, a concept that must be demonstrated in practical terms by this Government and not by over-regulation as we have seen in the past.

Whereupon, business then has the responsibility to seize the opportunity for advancement. In other words, a psychological recovery that has three facets, which are all interdependent. One of the other aspects behind the Labor Party's defeat was our firm, direct and positive approach during the campaign, and the positive policies espoused by the Liberal Party, which established it in the eyes of the electorate as a viable and creditable alternative Government. That is directly associated with the future economy and the future prospects for business and job opportunities in South Australia, two factors that are interdependent.

We were able to put forward a positive front to the people, yet our opponents opted for repeating, day after day, the cardinal sin of responding to the Opposition during the campaign. We were first off the rank with our policy speech, with positive policies that we would implement for the people of South Australia. The then Government reacted on a daily basis to our positive policies. Why was that? It did not have any positive policies left to put forward. The Government had not considered them. It was complacent and had not conducted door knocking. Why was that? Because the then Government considered that, in some of its marginal seats, where it had not conducted door knocking, it had a divine right to rule, and that the mere election would return it to office, as had been the case at numerous past elections.

The soul-searching now must be directed at yourselves and at the legislative programme undertaken by the Labor Party over several years, not at the people who have, through necessity, responded in a practical way and in the only way that they could to ensure their own future, which was looking so dim under the previous Government.

I was proud to listen to the presentation of the Budget last Thursday, for it incorporated the specific policy promises made by the Liberal Party before the election of 15 September, and showed a Government starting out on the right course, honouring its promises to the people of this State. In so doing, the Government will be seen as a Government that can take South Australians into the 1980's, and one that will accept the challenge of the 1980's and provide a better environment in which business can operate in this State and, therefore, a better lifestyle for the people in South Australia.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): First, I congratulate you,

Sir, most sincerely on your election to the position of Speaker. I can do so with an open heart because I voted for you. Members opposite all seem to be congratulating you but we know that there were only two defectors. I am still trying to work out who the defectors were. Perhaps one of the defectors was the member for Glenelg, because he does some very irrational things from time to time. In the time available to me, I should like to enlighten the House on the double standards practised in this State, and in fact the whole of Australia, by the media and in part by the South Australian Liberal Party. I say, "in part" because the Liberals have found themselves in the position of not being masters of their own destiny. Now, the tail is firmly wagging the dog.

You, Sir, and other Liberal members, were at the declaration of the poll for the seat of Napier. I know that you, Sir, are a great admirer of mine, because you made an effort to attend. As I said at the declaration of the poll, some Liberal members are uneasy about the position in which they have been placed in regard to the media. The media has taken on the role of shaping people's opinions, and the policies of the Liberal Party play little or no part in formulating any opinion of the people of South Australia.

Regarding the comments made by the member for Rocky River, I intend not to discuss the role of the media regarding double standards practised in the last election but to confine my comments to other areas. Let me give the House a classic example of double standards being practised by the media, when the media acted to protect members of Parliament whose actions had become questionable, and where the full weight of the press had been brought to bear acting, not only as prosecutor, but also judge, jury and hangman. I refer to the action of the press, especially the Adelaide News, regarding the alleged activities of Mr. Ian Sinclair, the former Federal Country Party Minister. On 27 and 28 September, under the heading "Gutter Politics" the editorial in the News, dealing with the Finnane Report on Mr. Ian Sinclair, stated:

Australian politics, it often seems, lurch from sensation to sensation and involve not matters of great public policy but charges and counter-charges against individuals.

Given the nature of this poisonous personality game, it is hardly surprising that so many talented people contemplate a political career, shudder and follow another course.

I think all members would agree with that. It is rather surprising that the News should say that. On 28 September, under the heading "Put up or shut up" the News stated:

A fundamental principle of law in this country is that a person is innocent until proven guilty. That has been ignored in the case of Mr. Ian Sinclair. While, as we said yesterday, the charges against him are of such gravity—

The SPEAKER: Order! The matter that the honourable member is now debating is before a court and, even though it is not in a court in South Australia, the matter might be considered to be *sub judice*. I will listen closely to any comment that the honourable member has to make in this regard, and I may call him to order and ask him to cease discussion on this subject.

Mr. HEMMINGS: I will bear that in mind, Sir. The editorial to which I refer continues:

Despite the loud denials of the New South Wales Attorney-General, the suspicion remains that political considerations were the most important ingredient in the way the matter was handled. The Labor Party has been milking this issue for all it can get.

The media played more or less the same role when Mr. Lynch, then the Federal Treasurer, was implicated in the Victorian land deal scandals—pious utterances of

prejudging the innocent. The media even played up Mr. Lynch's so-called hospitalisation.

The attitude of the media in the period 1973 to 1974 in regard to the Whitlam Government, and especially to Jim Cairns, can be compared to its present attitude. No crimes were found to be answerable by law, and no case was ever brought successfully against anyone. The actions of the media against Federal Labor Ministers in that period has put the Sinclair affair in the kindergarten league. Make no mistake, the Liberal and Country Parties in Canberra and in this House, to use the pompous words of the *News* editorial, "milked the issue for all it could get". The media destroyed Jim Cairns. He was not guilty of any crime, although perhaps impropriety, but the media destroyed him. It was implied that there were sexual implications. No matter how dirty the tactics of the media, they stopped at nothing.

In Mr. Sinclair's case, however, the media's line was "put up or shut up". The end result in relation to Mr. Sinclair is that certain action has been taken against him by New South Wales courts. Since the announcement regarding those summonses, I have looked patiently in the *Adelaide News* but I have not seen one editorial dealing with this matter. That perhaps shows that double standards are being practised by the *News*. The Premier obviously approves of this double standard attitude in his approach to questions of possible pecuniary interests of his Ministers. In the *News* of Friday 12 October, the Premier was reported as saying:

"The Opposition has not wasted any time in dragging its politics down to gutter level," the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, said. He was commenting on attacks by the Opposition in both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council at the resumption of Parliament yesterday. He continued, "There is no reason to question any members of the Government on pecuniary interests," he said.

We have to take the Premier's word for it: there is no reason to doubt the pecuniary interest of the members of his Cabinet. The report continues:

"This was one of the first things we talked about when we came into office. I have no doubt at all that, if there has been or could be any conflict of interest, members of the Government are quite clear on their responsibilities to resolve that conflict of interest forthwith. "I am waiting now on a report from them that they have done this."

As the Deputy Leader said during Question Time today, there is nothing improper in a member's asking questions concerning the pecuniary interests of any member of this House.

Regarding the practice of the *Advertiser*, the Premier's reply, reported in that paper on Friday 12 October, was in line with the comments made in the House, but in the *News* of the same day the Premier had obviously received his instructions, possibly from Mike Quirke, acting on Rupert Murdoch's instruction, to come out in the way he did, using the term "gutter tactics".

I should like to think that the way the Premier reacted to questions about pecuniary interests was a lapse on his part, but somehow I have my doubts. I believe that the Premier's statements reported in the *News*, and written by Mike Quirke, will faithfully follow the Murdoch line and that there will come a day when the Premier will find, to his cost, that he is unable to get the tiger off his back.

I should like finally to comment on the remarks made by the member for Henley Beach. He proudly waved his union card and was proud of the fact that, before he came into this House, he was a member of a trade union. I sincerely hope that the A.T.E.A. will immediately rescind his membership. The honourable member made the point, as did the member for Glenelg, who has told us time and

time again that he was a member of a trade union—

Mr. PAYNE: He told us that he was expelled.

Mr. HEMMINGS: That is right, he was expelled from a trade union. Like all true Labor members, when we were defeated in the last election I decided to read *Power Without Glory* again, because it shows the influence that other people can have on Governments of the day. There is a very good quote at the start of Part I, which relates to the situation surrounding the member for Henley Beach. I recommend the quote, which is by Charles Kingsley and which is as follows:

A working man who deserts his own class, tries to get on and rise above it, enters into a lie.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to refer to a couple of programmes that have already been mentioned today. One is the programme mentioned by the member for Stuart, namely the Aboriginal training programme and the launching thereof by the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Ian Viner. Yesterday about 150 people, including employers, public servants, people involved in Aboriginal affairs, people involved with community colleges, officers of the Commonwealth Employment Service, representatives of other Government bodies (no doubt I have missed some groups) were involved in and actively endeavouring to promote a campaign for the employment of Aborigines. This scheme has some considerable merit, at least in theory, and I hope that in practical terms it works out to be effective.

In Port Lincoln (these figures were mentioned tonight on television) the employment figures for Aborigines are very bad. However, in recent months the community college in that area has run an Aboriginal pre-employment programme for young Aborigines. I regret that in the final analysis that pre-employment programme took into account the services and requirements of Aboriginal males only. Three young Aboriginal ladies applied under this scheme but, for one reason or another, they withdrew before the scheme began.

Initially, eight Aboriginal lads between about 16 years and 19 years undertook this programme. An officer of the community college took it upon his shoulders to give these lads some pre-employment training by presenting them with opportunities and experience in work procedures. He arranged for a number of employers to hire these lads on a subsidised basis. He made sure that the lads were punctual, that they were clean and that they lived up to the requirements of the job that they undertook. From an analysis of that particular programme, one could not say that it was anything but an outstanding success.

Of the eight initial applicants who started the course, six completed it and came through with flying colours. Five of those lads went straight into employment, and I am reasonably confident that the sixth lad will, because his references are quite good, get a job if he has not already got one. The whole aim of the programme was to give these lads experience and an education that they would not otherwise have received. In other words, it was trying to provide them with some of the basic elementary things, as we know them, because these lads who, through their normal upbringing, would not have had an opportunity to avail themselves of such a scheme.

The scheme was so successful that the same instructor Mr. Ian Starr, has commenced an adult Aboriginal pre-employment programme styled basically around the same procedure. It is not for any specific reason that it is just for males: it just happens that the only applicants for this course were adult males. Having seen the benefits that their children or nephews have received from the scheme, they have seen fit to undertake the course themselves. The

course is fairly rigid and demands self-discipline from the individual; nevertheless, the ultimate results have been proved. It is very gratifying to see that at least some concrete effort has been made and, more important, that results have been achieved.

Similar courses could probably be extended beyond the Aborigines to take in the European community as well, because a generation gap is developing, and a number of younger people are missing out on pre-employment requirements and elementary attributes that are so necessary in job applications. In this respect, I refer to the simple process of applying for a job vacancy when one crops up, the way in which one dresses, speaks and behaves when attending a job interview. These aspects are covered and have proved to be very successful. In one case, a lad taken on as an apprentice cook is undertaking an apprenticeship programme, which is highly commendable.

The member for Gilles said something about succession duties tonight. Succession duties is a topic that is very dear to my heart and, because I come from a rural community, that is understandable. Many individuals and families have been driven to the wall because of succession duties. I would now like to make one particular point on this topic, although I could make several points. Succession duties apply only to people who are cut off in the prime of life. A parent who owns a farm and wants to hand that farm over to his son will, if he lives a normal life span, have worked his way out of the farm and the lad will have worked into it by taking over the farm payments and buying his father out. If the father lives his normal life span, succession duties are not paid. They are payable only when people are cut off in the prime of life, say, in their forties, when their children are young and the mother and her children are not in the position to take on the farm.

Therefore, succession duties is purely a sectional tax that hits those people who are not in a position to be able to rearrange the estate and the affairs of their breadwinner so as to avoid such a tax. Any person who is able to live out his normal life span does not pay succession duties, but will work his way around them. I assure members that, if an individual knows the day on which he is going to die, he will never pay succession duties. Succession duties has been completely discriminatory because it hits those people who are least able to help themselves, and that is the very crux of the matter. I intend to make a number of other comments about succession duties in my Address in Reply speech.

Since the election numerous people have asked me about the future of daylight saving. Many people believe that, because there has been a change of Government, we will automatically see the abandonment of daylight saving. I will be requesting a clear statement of policy from the Premier about the Government's policy on this matter. It must be borne in mind that those people who live in outlying areas are considerably disadvantaged by daylight saving.

Mr. Keneally: The extra hour of sunlight fades the curtains in the afternoons.

Mr. BLACKER: Those people who live in outlying areas and who must travel a great deal and must put their children on school buses in the early hours of the morning find that their children have extreme difficulty in putting up with what amounts to a very long day.

I take the point raised by the member for Stuart, who said that the extra hour of sunlight fades the curtains. That is a well-worn "joke"; it is rather a sore point. I have nothing further to add except that I shall be seeking from the Government a clear undertaking on its policy on daylight saving, because so many people have contacted

me in the expectation that it will not be introduced in the coming season.

Mr. TRAINER (Ascot Park): I add my congratulations, Sir, to those of members who have already congratulated you on being elevated to the Chair. I commend all those members who voted for you on their perspicacity in making such a choice.

Mr. Max Brown: All those on this side.

Mr. TRAINER: Yes. I took a great deal of interest in the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and other members concerning the role of the Murdoch press during the recent election campaign. Some members opposite, unintentionally or otherwise, misinterpreted what was said on this side. We have not been highly critical of the press in general; we have levelled our criticism at the Murdoch press in particular, and for good reason. I suggest that the member for Mawson either did not understand the comments made on this side or got his newspapers mixed, because I cannot recall anyone on this side referring to the local Messenger Press. The Murdoch press alone has come under extreme criticism from this side for its unethical conduct in the election campaign and during the preceding 18 months.

I am not claiming, as was suggested on the other side of this House, that it was the Murdoch press alone that contributed to the defeat of the A.L.P. on 15 September. There were other factors—the expensive and quite scandalous media campaigns of the groups fronting for the Liberals, for instance. There was what I suspect was an orchestrated bus strike, and there were other factors, but the Murdoch press made it impossible for the A.L.P. to overcome those difficulties.

During the course of the campaign, in an attempt to combat the avalanche of anti-Labor material appearing in the Murdoch press, the then Deputy Premier, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, quoted an old dictum which I think goes back to the English Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, who referred to the press as exercising the prerogative of the harlot through the ages—power without responsibility. This phrase used by Baldwin (pardon the pun) has become hoary with use, but it is still quite appropriate.

How insulting! Fancy Hugh Hudson comparing the Murdoch press to a harlot. In retrospect, this was a mistake and probably cost us the massage parlour vote!

The biased outlook of Murdoch's News Limited has not let up since the election. Shortly after 15 September, I was approached by the *Sunday Mail* to continue the column which had been written until then by the former member for Norwood, Greg Crafter. At that stage, it was not implied by the management that there were to be any strings attached to writing this brief column. On Thursday 27 September, I submitted my first article for the 30 September edition of the *Sunday Mail*. I chose a topic in response to a disgraceful and outrageously incorrect series of attacks that had taken place on the links between the trade union movement and the Labor Party. When I wrote my thoughts on the matter, I believed that an article in the *Mail* on this topic would be particularly appropriate, because Max Harris, in the *Sunday Mail*, had been, until the businessmen's advertisements appeared, the major propagator of the myth of the Trades Hall march on to North Terrace. What happened to my first submission as the Labor Party spokesman in the *Sunday Mail* political column? It was rejected by the *Sunday Mail* as being too political.

Mr. Max Brown: What did that mean, I wonder?

Mr. TRAINER: I don't know; I cannot make them out. It was too political, in their opinion. No A.L.P. column appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 30 September, and it was

7 October before the management of the *Mail* agreed to publish it. It seems that the Murdoch press has not let up on its attitude to us simply because of the result of the election in which it played a decisive role.

Members opposite have been highly critical about our objections to the conduct of some sections of the press, particularly the Murdoch press. We are a bit rotten on what happened. If the roles had been reversed, I will bet that members opposite would have had a lot to say about it if it had worked against them. If they had copped the bucketing we copped from the Murdoch press in the past 18 months, building up to a crescendo in the period before 15 September, members on that side would have had a lot to say.

Mr. Randall: It was a reflection of the community attitude.

Mr. TRAINER: You're joking! Members opposite might not be fair dinkum, but that is how it goes. Any political theories which talk about election campaigns being waged as a fair competition are made an absolute farce when one political Party has to operate in the sort of environment we had to operate in with the Murdoch Press. It is a totally imbalanced competition. It is like a football match in which one team has to kick against the wind for the whole four quarters.

I turn now to a serious omission in the policy of the Liberal Party, both in its campaign and in the short period since it has been in Government, and that is the subject of technological change. One of the most disappointing aspects of this Government's programme as we have heard it for the next three years is that, so far, it offers no sign of any awareness of the difficulties that rapid technological change pose for our community. Since this Government is so much a carbon copy of the one in Canberra that has shown not much interest in the subject, that is hardly surprising.

The Fraser Government has done very little to help our country cope with the problems of technological change. Indeed, the only step it took, namely a low-key *ad hoc* committee of inquiry into telecommunications technology, was taken only as a result of an industrial dispute initiated by the working men of the union the member for Henley Beach claims to belong to, the Australian Telecommunication Employees Association. It took an industrial blow before Fraser could take any interest in the subject. What is more, the Fraser Liberal Government has initiated policies which have actually aggravated the situation by encouraging companies to replace men with machinery. Peddling the same line as the Premier, namely, that there is a linear relationship between amounts of investment and levels of employment, Rod Carnegie, that friend of the working man, of Conzinc Rio Tinto of Australia, praised the Fraser approach on an A.B.C. interview last year. Mr. Carnegie, from his cosy position in life, was sure that investment and employment were closely related. The Federal Budget, he said, should retain the 40 per cent investment allowance for business firms at all costs, even if this had to be done at the expense of education and welfare; in fact he was very much in favour of cutting down these things he felt made the community a bit too soft.

Unfortunately, investment in equipment does not necessarily lead to lower levels of unemployment: it can just as easily lead to higher levels. New equipment replacing old can mean the introduction of a degree of mechanisation that means that, say, 10 men can do the work that 12 men did previously. What happens to the two who have missed out, the two surplus workers? They are unemployed, and no longer available to buy products. The manufacturer then has difficulty in selling his products because of the lack of purchasing power.

We hear much about productivity. The word is bandied around in journals and newspaper articles, and everyone talks to a certain extent about productivity, but I am not sure what is meant by it. Does it mean a greater output from the same number of workers, or roughly the same output from a decreasing number of workers? If it is the latter, we are in strife, because the purchasing power that is required to buy products will vanish, too. It cannot mean greater output from the same number of employees, because we have factories and plants working far below capacity at the moment. What is the point of greater output from a motor vehicle production line if the firm cannot sell all the cars it already produces and has its plant working well below capacity? If technological change is to mean fewer employees, and fewer people receiving wages, where will the purchasing power come from to buy the goods resulting from the increased productivity?

Mr. Keneally: It's catch 22.

Mr. TRAINER: As the member for Stuart points out, it is a catch 22 situation. On 8 August the former Premier issued a press statement containing two significant items on this subject. The first announced the then Government's intention to establish a data processing co-ordinating board to ensure that the introduction of computer technology into the public sector took place on an orderly basis. The statement reads:

The function of the data processing co-ordinating board will be concerned with the overall management of data processing capacity throughout the public sector. It will advise the Government on the purchase of new equipment and ensure the efficient deployment of capacity. This meant that if a system was being under-utilised in one area of Government it should be capable of being utilised in another area.

The second of the items in that press statement announced the intention of the then Government to establish a standing committee on technological change to identify significant new technological advances which were likely to be utilised by the public sector, and make recommendations for any new retraining, redeployment or other measures to facilitate the introduction of any particular technological advance, to liaise with the Data Processing Co-ordinating Board, and so on, and the present Government has done nothing and will do nothing.

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

Mr. WEBSTER (Norwood): Regardless of the comments made by the member for Napier, I would also like to offer you my congratulations, as I am sure all members on this side of the House would, on your elevation to the Chair. Most of the discussion today seems to have been centred around the previous election. I take this opportunity to congratulate my colleagues on some of the things that they have said on this, their first opportunity to speak. I have noted with some interest the comments that have been raised on the other side of the House, particularly in light of the comments made by the member for Playford, who said, "We have had five elections in the last 10 years in this State". Norwood has had six elections in the last 10 years, which is an average of one about every 18 months.

It would be remiss of me not to mention something about the previous election in the face of comments made, particularly in view of the austere speakers who have made them. Let us look at the real reasons for the result of the election of 15 September. The then Premier, Mr. Corcoran, was questioned on a number of occasions, both by the press and by members of this House, about whether

or not there was any likelihood of an early election. There was press comment as early as May this year as to the possibility of an early election, but on each occasion a negative answer was forthcoming. As most members were aware, a Federal Budget was to be handed down in August. I suggest that most members opposite expected a very tight and hard Budget, which would give them an excuse to call an early election.

However, when the Budget was delivered, much to the surprise of members on the other side, it was not as bad as they expected it to be. Nevertheless, within one or two days an election was called. The reason was not, as was expected, that the Budget was so horrific: it was that the Leader of the Labor Party, the then Premier, announced to the people of South Australia that he had never had the opportunity of being elected by the people as Leader of the Government. I am sure that it never entered his mind, even a day before the polls were released, what the outcome of an election would be in South Australia. The polls said that the Liberal Party would not only lose the election but also that we would lose an extra three seats. I am told that members opposite were so confident of winning that certain members waved goodbye to members on this side of the House when Parliament was dissolved for the election.

Mr. Keneally: They didn't all come back.

Mr. WEBSTER: I would suggest that a lot more did not come back from the other side of the House, that is, if you can count on all your fingers and toes. We have heard a variety of reasons from the other side of the House as to what went wrong. I would like to suggest some of the reasons for the result at that election.

The people in South Australia, at the election, put into physical action what they had been verbalising over the past years as to the conduct of the previous Government. They were very concerned as to what was the real state of the economy in South Australia. Why was South Australia getting something like 2 per cent of the private investment in Australia, whereas we have 9 per cent of the population in Australia? Why had there been more than a 500 per cent increase in State taxation during the nine years of the Labor Government? The people of South Australia were becoming concerned as they had been concerned in the past, and these were the questions they were asking. They wanted to know what was the real state of the economy in South Australia.

They were also asking what was the real role of the trade union movement in South Australia. Was the Labor Government in control of the State or was it taking a directive from the trade union movement? Mr. Corcoran said that the calling of the election was completely his own decision. I suggest that that may not have been the case and that the directive to call an election came from higher up, particularly when the Party strategists saw the result of the polls: "Here is a perfect chance for political opportunism; we can jump in for a further three years; let's do it." The people of South Australia asked: "Who is running this State—the trade union movement or the Labor Party?" The people got sick of being told the trade union movement, and therefore the Labor Party, was representing the worker, while the Liberal Party was representing only the rich and the powerful. They have had that propaganda pushed down their throats for too long and the election results show that the people no longer believe that, and have now rejected it.

The people were also asking what was happening about the increase in violent crime. If anybody on the other side of the House was prepared to look at the situation and at the figures, I am sure that they would have been absolutely staggered. I, with some of my colleagues, spent some

months digging the figures out on the increase of violent crime in South Australia and also the marked reduction in the clean-up rate of violent crime in South Australia. We were then requested to submit these figures to the then Attorney-General. It amazed me that he did not have them himself.

The people were asking about succession duties. It is all very well for the member for Gilles to say that succession duties do not affect him. I suggest that they do affect him. They affect the great majority of people in the middle section of the community. If the member for Gilles owns a house or wishes to leave it to one of his children, succession duties will affect him. Most people in the community strive to buy a house. After we have finished our working life, most of us would like to leave what we have worked for to our children. Succession duties affect the community as a whole.

The previous Government said, "We cannot afford to remove succession duties." The real facts showed conclusively that we could not afford to continue with succession duties. If people had looked at the figures of money leaving Tasmania, for example, and going to other States that did not have succession duties, they would have realised that this State could not afford to have succession duties. Similarly, people were asking about gift duty and the development of Roxby Downs. These questions were being asked by the people before the last election, and they were the issues on which people voted. We hear nothing about those questions from members opposite. They come up with one belated excuse: "It was not our fault, not our incompetence." They initially blamed the vicious campaign of the press, but have now reduced that down to the Murdoch press. Members opposite have said, "We admit that the Labor Party has done a deal with the press before." They therefore assumed that the Liberal Party worked on the same basis, but that is not the case.

The election results on 15 September reflected the will of the people of South Australia and their lack of confidence in the ability of the Labor Party to continue to govern this State. I was interested to hear the member for Ascot Park give as another possible reason for his Party's defeat orchestrated bus strikes. During the election a lot of people came to me, particularly Italian speaking members of the community, and said that they had been told that the Liberal Party had paid bus drivers to go on strike.

I often wondered where that rumour originated. Other members are suggesting that we orchestrated the bus strikes, but I am fairly sure now that that rumour may well have started with people who should have known better and who should regard the people of South Australia as having more sense. The previous Government might well have had the people of South Australia anaesthetised for the past 10 years, but I think it fell into the trap of thinking that the people were complete idiots.

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

Mr. O'NEILL (Florey): I rise to express concern about the increasing attacks on individual workers and their legitimate trade unions in the name of economic policy. Whilst it is true that the Federal Government has pursued an anti-trade union line for years now, South Australian workers and their unions were insulated against those pressures by the policies of the preceding State Government.

It was disconcerting, therefore, to read in the *Sunday Mail* of 7 October last that the Premier is an "unyielding supporter of Mr. Fraser's economic strategy". According to the Federal Government, the main cause of present economic problems is pressure from the trade union

movement for more wages. That allegation, of course, is untrue. It is well known that the deterioration of Western economies, and consequent loss of jobs, is caused rather by the erratic international economic climate and advances in technology which make workers redundant.

As the causes of our unemployment and industrial problems are not local, the Premier will be no more able to provide immediately the 7 000 jobs he promised to young people in South Australia than the Prime Minister has been able to keep his promise to overcome the national unemployment problem.

I draw the attention of the House to the following extract from the Commonwealth Banking Corporation newsletter of 17 September 1979, which states:

The gradual recovery in employment in 1978-79 could be in danger of faltering in the short term. Recorded unemployment could reach a new peak early in 1980, boosted by the influx to the labour market of school-leavers.

The term "recorded unemployment" does not account for thousands of people known as the "hidden unemployed", nor those unfairly excluded from the records by the statistical juggling of the Federal Government—the "non-persons" of the Fraser regime.

If the Government in Canberra understands world economic problems, it certainly disguises the fact well. I quote from the Committee for Economic Development of Australia (CEDA) Report of 30 September 1978, entitled "Growth". Therein Mr. D. Ronald Daniel, Managing Director of McKinsey and Co. Inc. of the U.S.A., one of the world's leading business consultancies, said of the economic problems of the Western world:

The factors which favoured and fostered economic growth in the 1950's and 1960's—20 years of uninterrupted growth, but which have already deteriorated in the 1970's, are not likely to re-emerge by the mid-80's. We see a continued divergence of national economic interests and no new economic order developing in this time.

So much for the Premier's chances of effecting a resurgence of the South Australian economy to the extent necessary to provide the 17 000 jobs he has promised. Regarding pre-conditions for economic recovery, Mr. Daniel went on to say:

... the possibility of a very strong political leadership coming to the fore in several major countries—strength of political leadership that we have not seen for many years and that is not easy to develop in today's multiple constituencies and interest groups.

This hypothesis raises very sinister possibilities. "Strong political leadership" is a term used by the media in reference to the Premier of Queensland, the Premier of Western Australia, and the Prime Minister of Australia. It is also used in current reference to nations where martial law exists, and it was used in Europe in the 1920's and 1930's in respect of Mussolini and Hitler. Unfortunately for Australia, the "It can't happen here" syndrome causes people to ignore the very considerable evidence which points to the subtle acquisition of absolute power being achieved by conservative elements in this country. Their aim is domination and control of the majority by an elite minority.

Many people do not wish to contemplate the possibility of a totalitarian regime in Australia. However, let us look at a few of the developments under the Fraser Government. First, there is the establishment of the Industrial Relations Bureau. In January 1975 the Prime Minister wrote to some employers in respect of what was needed in industrial relations, as follows:

... an effective return to penal provisions, a powerful industrial police force type of operation and an elaborate framework for settling disputes that would make direct action

virtually impossible within envisaged new industrial legislation.

The proposal was one of the most sinister ever suggested for use against the working people of Australia. The Liberal Government would seek for itself wide dictatorial powers to impose industrial controls reaching down to the very workshops and offices of Australia. Trade unions would have to submit to a range of severe restrictions in carrying out their legitimate functions as representatives of workers.

The terms of the original legislation would make unions taking any decisive actions guilty of "unfair acts", and prosecutions could be launched against officers and rank-and-file unionists. Only pressure from the trade union movement, the Federal Opposition, and even from some employers who understood the inherent dangers, forced a considerable watering down of the final Bill.

Secondly, let us consider the Fraser Government's ASIO amendment Bill. The Government rejects judicial audits, it rejects Parliamentary and greater financial accountability, stands firm on the much criticised and very wide definition of "subversion", and refuses to allow the Bill to go to a Select Committee. Why is its attitude so arbitrary? Perhaps the *Advertiser* of 24 September last provides a clue in the concluding paragraph of the editorial, which states:

The Government, like ASIO's admirable head, Mr. Justice Woodward, is not immortal. It is prejudicing security when it creates a situation that gives ASIO, if it wishes to be sure of retaining its proposed wide charter, a direct interest in the survival of the present Government.

A Prime Ministerial spy force perhaps? Thirdly, consider the very disturbing revelations regarding the letter of Mr. Justice Staples reported in the *Advertiser* of 12 October last. Here, a respected judge of the Australian Arbitration Commission (a Deputy President, no less) likens the proposed changes to the position to "the judges in pre-war Germany who simply acted out their office in a train of events that culminated in legal conclusions that Jews and Communists were no longer citizens". The report quotes the following:

The amendments were produced in secrecy, not appropriate in a law-making field in which the prime concern should be conciliation of conflicting interests.

It continues:

One of the key practices of totalitarian and authoritarian regimes is to dissolve trade unions and to put puppets in their place.

The reaction of the Federal Government was very interesting. The Prime Minister immediately cast doubts upon the integrity of Justice Staples, because he was appointed by a Labor Government. Does this Government support the suggestion that only judges appointed by Liberal Governments have the necessary qualities to properly fill the office? In the light of the foregoing, how can any genuine democrat be complacent? How can anyone who opposes totalitarian government think "It can't happen here"? Not only can it happen, but the process has already begun. One has only to look across the House to see on the Government benches advocates of the random interference by police in the affairs of people who have broken no law; the "dabbing in" of one's fellow citizens to the police (and even the police do not support this); the censorship of books and other communications; the compulsory carrying of identification cards; and the open wearing of sidearms by ordinary police officers.

Whilst in Opposition many members criticised sentences handed down by judges sworn to decide each case on its merits in a fair and legal manner. They will undoubtedly claim they were not trying to coerce judges. Nevertheless

that is one legitimate interpretation of their actions. Those symptoms of totalitarianism should be a warning. I ask Government members to reassess their values and reverse their direction before they, along with the majority of ordinary Australians, become victims of the authoritarian minority.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your elevation to the position of Speaker of this House. I also congratulate your Deputy, the member for Eyre, on his elevation to the position of Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. Many Opposition members referred to the recent election campaign, particularly to the way in which the Murdoch press used its publications to promote what it thought was a rightful cause. What Opposition members did not say was that they, as a Party, became complacent. They became cocky (to use an Australian term) and sure that they could win under any conditions and that they could hoodwink the people of South Australia. They had a silver-tongued orator who led them for some time, and his silver tongue had the capacity to sell nearly anything to the people. While members opposite had that orator, they had an asset through which they could gain power and could hoodwink many of the citizens of South Australia. When that orator was lost, they had to fall back on the policies and practices that they had used for nine years. Then came an election campaign where personalities did not count; where people suddenly realised there was trouble in South Australia; where our population growth rate was the lowest in Australia; where our percentage of unemployed people was the highest in Australia; and where people were leaving the State because of gift and succession duties in particular. If they were not leaving as a family or as individuals they were taking out of the State their assets and investing them in other States because there they were not subject to vicious taxes on hard-earned capital.

At the same time, the average working man or salaried person or small business person was locked into a depressed State. They were locked into a position where they could not capitalise on assets they owned or partly owned. If they owned a home in part and had a substantial mortgage, they could not obtain from the home a big enough equity in real terms to enable them to move to another State and start again. They were in a worse position than they were when they began to put together their assets. One of the Leaders of the Party opposite, the Hon. Frank Walsh, said in 1963 that home ownership was the cornerstone of democracy. If the Labor Party believes in democracy it must believe in home ownership. It set out to destroy the opportunity for home ownership in this State by making it impossible for people to get jobs or for the State to progress.

The feeling in the community was reflected by the news media. Members opposite argue that the news media led the community attitude, but I believe that the media knew that businessmen were fearful of another three years of socialist Government; they were fearful that they would not survive and that they could not compete with the neighbouring States, let alone South-East Asia. The average person in the street realised that, if business disappeared, jobs would disappear and they would not be able to sell their assets and would be locked into a depressed State. It was obvious to the people, whether they were people on a salary, people on piece work, or subcontractors, that they would be trapped in a situation if they had three more years of socialism. They decided that it was time for a change, and they gave us the highest vote ever polled by any Party in the history of the State.

Mr. Slater: We have heard that before.

Mr. EVANS: And the honourable member will hear it again. Some members opposite, when in Government, tried to blame Mr. Fraser for the ills of this State. As a Party, we believe that there has been too much regulation and too much Government interference with business. If business is frightened off, job opportunities are lost. The Labor Government set out to have as many Government instrumentalities and statutory authorities as possible. It had a clothing factory, the State Government Insurance Commission, and the Frozen Food Factory. The Government Printer was setting out to move into every possible area of printing. The previous Government had the State Transport Authority take over as many private operators as possible. Members know that the Labor Government's long-term intention was to interfere with private enterprise as much as possible. They wanted to have a hotels commission that could deal with every area associated with tourism. The intention was clear. On the other hand, the Liberal Party's aim is to restore confidence in the State, and we will do it, but at the same time we would like to have some of the freedoms back.

The member for Florey referred to identity cards. Some people may speak about identity cards, and I am one person who supports them. Did he say that he would disagree with his own Party's view that people should have a membership card in a union before they could get a job? Does the honourable member suggest that people should be able to get work without belonging to a union? The honourable member would not suggest that. Under that member's regime a person cannot get a job in the Public Service or in local government using unemployment relief money unless the person is a union member. Who is talking about identity cards in a police State? If a person did not join a union, Big Brother would say that that person would not be allowed to work. That is the sort of thing that came from the Labor Government, whose members are now in their rightful place on the Opposition benches. We believe in freedom of association. We believe that a person should be able to decide whether to belong to a union or not. Some people speak of the benefits that unions may fight for, but there are other benefits worked for in a union to which people do not contribute but gain benefit from. If we think about that, we realise the many areas that that covers.

Some people talk of the right to strike. I believe that there should be a right to strike; that individuals should be able to withdraw their labour if they so wish. However, if another person wishes to work, no-one should be able to interfere and stop him from working. Why should he not work if he wishes to work? Surely the right to work should be on the same basis as the right to strike. Surely we all support that right. The member for Ascot Park referred to the way in which modern technology affects job opportunities. I sympathise with the honourable member, because he is right. However, can a State say that it will not move forward and that it will stop in the back-woods while its South-East Asian neighbours are improving their technology? They are our main competitors.

Do we stay in the back-woods and say that we will not have any technology and that we will go back to using shovels, instead of front-end loaders? Of course not! We know that, if we are going to compete on world markets, we have to move with the times. We have to find a method of overcoming the problem by creating jobs in other areas; for example, jobs involving service to the community and in sport and recreation. There will be the same sort of wealth in the community; it just means the reallocation of resources in different directions. We all know that that has to be the case. We should not kid ourselves that we can stop technology in this State and hope that other countries

or States will do the same. They will not. If we do not progress, we will have no export markets. About 1 400 000 people do not take a lot of servicing in commodities. We would be in a difficult situation if we thought, as a State, that we could have a self-sufficient economy without having any outside connections.

Mr. PETERSON (Semaphore): Mr. Speaker, I convey my congratulations to you on your appointment as Speaker. I also remind the member for Glenelg that not all of the western electorates are Liberal; he commented that they were.

I now comment on the Coast Protection Board's performance in the Semaphore District, which is unique, in that it is practically surrounded by water; it is almost an island. As I interpret the Coast Protection Act, all of the water and beach in the area comes under its provisions. However, we do not seem to see much result of the board's activities. We have provided recreation areas on the beaches and along the river for many people of the State. The area provides a popular seaside resort, particularly as the beaches are safe for children. The two jetties in the area are used by fishermen from throughout the State and by people generally as a promenade for recreation purposes.

I read the other day about the prevalence of snakes: I could cite a kilometre of snake-infested scrub at Taperoo. Nothing has been done about that over the past few years. I could also cite about 10 000 tonnes of stinking seaweed in which no-one seems interested. It would appear that the Coast Protection Board is not interested in Semaphore, Taperoo, Largs, or the area generally. From the new North Haven development south along the beach, the area covering the Largs and Semaphore beaches, the amenities and facilities have been badly neglected and abused over the years. The previous Taperoo Lifesaving Club, now the North Haven Lifesaving Club, was forced to move from its site because its members could not get to the water. As far as I know, the club has received no compensation, and it does not appear likely that it can expect any compensation or assistance.

We have a rowing club on the Port River, but its members cannot get their boats to the water during certain tides. All these things do not help anyone. How do we obtain help from the board? I have examined the Act, and I quote from it, as follows:

"Coast facility" means any building, structure or works—

(a) for the use or enjoyment of those who may resort to the coast.

The duties of the board appointed under the Act are as follows:

(c) to develop any part of the coast for the purpose of aesthetic improvement, or for the purpose of rendering that part of the coast more appropriate for the use or enjoyment of those who may resort thereto.

An amendment provides:

to manage, maintain and where appropriate develop and improve coast facilities that are vested in or under the care, control and management of the board.

Not much of that has been done. The definitions appear to be clear enough, but no-one takes any action. There is nothing aesthetic about the beaches to any visitors or residents in the area. If anyone wishes to use the facilities (which I take to mean change-rooms, showers, toilets, etc.), I wish him luck. They are not present or they are dilapidated. All of this contrasts with the continuing improvements being made to other metropolitan beaches. I read in the *Sunday Mail* recently that \$500 000 had been spent to cart sand to other metropolitan beaches in order

to make them more attractive. Although that sand came from my district, we did not receive anything for it. What have we done wrong? What has happened to the benefits supposedly emanating from the board? What will the new Government give us? All we want is a fair share, nothing fantastic. Money should be spent on the beaches in my district. As I say, we have the safest beaches, and they were once the cream of metropolitan beaches, and were used by everyone. They have been allowed to deteriorate. It is the board's responsibility to assist us and to provide satisfactory facilities for the residents and for visitors from throughout the State and Australia, as well as overseas.

Another problem in the area of which the Minister is aware involves Semaphore Road, which is right in the middle of the district. One almost cannot go into or out of the district without crossing that road. At one time, it was the key road in the district and the commercial centre of the area, but this road has been allowed to deteriorate until it looks like Berlin in 1945. Use of the railway line down the middle of the road was discontinued about a year ago. A group known as SCORE has been trying to save the line, and I respect its views. The group has cleaned up the line periodically, but it still needs attention. As the line is deteriorating day by day, I would like some answer in this regard from the new Government.

Potential exists in the area for development plans, but the interested parties will not spend money in the area as it is at present. With fuel shortages and rising transport costs, we need Semaphore Road in the district. Money is available for development if the road can be repaired. We have public transport problems on the peninsula and a high percentage of aged people and pensioners. It is a long thin district, and all transport must travel up and down without any radiating effect. Most transport travels in corridors, thus causing problems for the aged people and pensioners who must walk to the public transport routes. We may need a rerouting and rescheduling of public transport in the area to suit people's needs. As we have a large community of older people, many of whom live in accommodation for the aged and attend aged persons' clubs on the peninsula, all we ask for is that public transport services be examined with a view to rescheduling and rerouting them to satisfy their needs.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): First, I offer you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, congratulations on your election as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees. I also offer my congratulations to Mr. Speaker on his election. There will be some comments that I wish to make on some of the points raised by other members today. I will do that later, if time permits. The main topic that I want to discuss today is solar energy and the part that it could play in this State, if only the Government of the day had enough sense to realise the vast potential that exists.

During the election campaign, the present Government made much of the fact that it wanted to provide local jobs and energy for a hungry world. It believed that one of the best ways it could do this was by mining and enriching uranium in this State. However, a substantial amount of information is available to suggest that that would not provide anywhere near the number of jobs, nor would it provide adequately or satisfactorily for the energy needs of the world around us, especially the dire and desperate needs of the Third World, that section of the world that certainly cannot afford the vast capital needs of nuclear energy.

Therefore, I turn my attention to the solar energy industry and the potential that would have for us. Already, many countries are embarking upon solar technology industries. In fact, certain companies in Australia,

including South Australia, are already involved in this sphere. The major countries involved include France, Germany, Austria, the United States of America and, perhaps surprisingly, the small African country of Niger.

I hope that this State Government, in using the resources available to it through the economic development facilities of the Premier's Department, the Minister of Mines and Energy and other Ministries, including the Minister of Housing, would try to stimulate resources in this State to establish a solar industry in South Australia. I refer to the possibilities that a solar technology industry would have for South Australia. For a start, if one looks at the world as a whole, solar energy provides each day 10 000 times the amount of energy used each day by all of mankind in the form of fossil fuels. Over 10 000 times the amount of energy used is supplied through that one means.

We also know from the United States Department of Energy that the cost factor involved in generating electricity from solar energy is decreasing all the time, and is decreasing at impressive and rapid rates. It was only in 1975 that the cost per kilowatt to produce electricity from solar energy from a solar cell was about \$30 000. In 1979 that cost has been reduced to \$6 000 per kilowatt and the department speculates that in 1982 it will cost \$1 000, in 1985 it will cost \$500, and by 1990 it will cost \$100.

That cost will make solar energy truly competitive with all other forms of energy that we will have available to us. That will mean that the uranium industry will be totally redundant because, whilst it may be cost competitive, it will not become competitive in respect to safety. Many people have said that solar technology just will not provide in the short term, between now and the end of this century, the amount of energy that will be needed by the countries that are desperately energy short.

I refer to the facts raised by the Bariloche Foundation of Argentina, which has been studying the energy needs of that fast developing country in its climb from a serious stage of under-development, and needing perhaps more energy than many other countries. At this stage Argentina gets only .8 per cent of its energy requirements from non-conventional forms of energy, the principal non-conventional form of energy being solar energy.

That foundation, operating for the Government of that country, has speculated that by 1995 it is highly feasible and possible that 11 per cent of the energy demand could be provided by non-conventional energy sources, and that, by the year 2010, 30 per cent could be provided from such sources. A more important and telling fact is that even at this stage, and in the early 1980's, 41 per cent of the energy demands from rural areas of Latin America could be supplied by non-conventional energy means.

Already, in many parts of the world non-conventional energy, particularly solar energy, has achieved astounding penetration. I have mentioned the small African Republic of Niger. That small republic has taken a leading step amongst the 151 nations of the world by insisting that all new Government buildings should provide for solar energy in the provision of air-conditioning, water heating, and the like.

California, a far wealthier State, has also introduced similar regulations, but perhaps the most astounding country is the small republic of Cyprus, which is regarded by United Nations officials as the most advanced solar energy State in the world. One-quarter of its domestic and industrial energy consumption is provided by solar energy, principally because of the extensive use of solar hot water heaters. Therefore, because of this penetration that is already being achieved in solar energy around the world, many of the world's industrial powers are realising the

potential that lies open to them to capitalise on this source of power for their own industrial economies.

I have referred to some of the countries that are involved in this area, and I will now refer to a few individual cases. In an effort to try to boost the solar technology in its own country, the Federal Republic of Germany is supporting a project whereby the German Government is totally turning over a Mexican village to solar energy. Every aspect of life that involves energy consumption in that village, apart from automobile use, will be turned over to solar energy—cooking, water-heating purposes, desalination, pumping for water, radio, fish processing, cold storage, and domestic appliances.

Likewise, there are many other production possibilities. France, Germany and Austria are all investigating the production of small-scale engines for the production of electricity from solar power. In a world that will need electricity generated in small communities, in vast thousands or millions, that is a very important step. Windmills are another important area, and it is interesting to note that Australia has for many decades been a world leader in the production of electric generating windmills. Likewise, solar cells are another important sphere. I recall that it is in South Australia that Philips manufactures many of the parts for solar electric cells.

The other sphere that solar energy is involved in is electrical transportation. South Australia has had the Lightburn vehicle and the Flinders University electric car project proceeding over varying periods. Given those demands that the future may have before us and given the present possibilities, I suggest and urge that the State Government, through the various Ministries that I have mentioned, give high priority to using this as an area for investigation, to determine whether jobs can be provided, perhaps meeting the energy demands of the entire world.

If that avenue were followed, we would have the possibility of low capital involvement for each job created as opposed to the situation in the nuclear industry, which is a high capital intensive industry, with high capital cost for each job created, that would put grave strains on the capital potential of this country. I suggest that South Australia has a secondary sector already at its disposal. It already has a secondary base built up over many years and fostered, although the other side would not think so, sufficiently by the previous State Government.

That base should be built upon. South Australia also has climatic and geographic conditions suitable for this type of march into the future. Finally, but by no means least, we have our proximity to the Third World countries that are desperately needing such resources. In many cases they do not have the capacity to produce solar technology. We do. South Australia has proximity and, therefore, we would automatically be ahead in the sales market to sell such energy components to these countries ahead of other nations presently involved in solar development, such as the U.S.A., Germany and France. To give an idea of how vast this market is, the Bariloche Foundation of Argentina has said that if Argentina follows the pattern that I have suggested, a highly feasible and realistic pattern, they will face the following demands in the next 30 years—

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

Mr. MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I was greatly interested in the remarks made by the new member for Henley Beach, who seemed to obtain pleasure from the fact that he was a financial member of a trade union. He waved his membership ticket and said that he was proud to be a member of the trade union movement and also on the Government side of the House. I can only say that I am

quite sure that the trade union will be rather interested in the honourable member's remarks. In fact, he reminded me of a person gone mad, on the basis that he was proud that he was a Liberal member of Parliament and also a member of the trade union movement.

I congratulate the new Speaker. I am pleased that you, Sir, are in the Chair, and that the member for Glenelg is not in the Chamber. I am quite sure that the new Speaker will protect me at all times from uncalled-for attacks, by you, Sir, and by the "member for McNally". I am pleased that the new Speaker has been elected, and I was pleased to vote for him.

I am glad that the Minister of Water Resources is in the House because the newly elected Government has stated in the press the possibility that the promised water filtration scheme for the northern Spencer Gulf area may be discontinued. I am concerned about this, as the Minister would know. Over a period of several years, the Labor Party, whilst in Government, made clear that a programme for water filtration would obtain top priority as soon as financially possible.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The problem was that it was never financially possible.

Mr. MAX BROWN: The new Minister says that the scheme was never financially possible; however, the fact remains that it is now financially possible, as the Minister knows. The former Premier made an announcement during the recent elections that \$25 000 000 would be provided to supply a water filtration scheme for the northern towns, which was welcomed in that area because people there had waited patiently for this scheme to be undertaken for some years. During that time, people who obtained work in the northern cities needed, and used, large quantities of water. Those people put up with poor quality in the reticulation of water during that period. No-one would deny that fact; the previous Government would not deny it and I certainly would not deny it. The present Government should not deny it.

Over those years, many attempts were made to at least improve the standard of water reticulation to the towns in question. I am reminded that, in the 1978 election, in my district, my then opponent (a Liberal, of course) was reported in the local press as saying that, if elected, the Liberals would recycle sewerage ponds and waste water at Whyalla back into the city's water supply. That election promise amazed me. The situation had been examined, re-examined, and re-examined again without success, yet this person advocated the spending of millions of dollars on a project that was outside the realms of possibility. However, a scheme which would benefit the cities in question and which is not outside the realms of possibility in terms of finance is in jeopardy.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Your Party did not include the scheme in its last Budget papers. What are you on about? The Labor Party made lots of noise, but there is no reference to that scheme in the Budget papers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MAX BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased you are back to protect me. Now that the Liberal Party is in power, the Government advocates the squashing of something which would improve the standard of water and which is quite a feasible proposition. Three press statements were made in three newspapers on the one day by the Minister, the local press, and the Whyalla council.

Mr. Gunn: Is this your travelogue?

Mr. MAX BROWN: It is not. The article in the *Advertiser* of 3 October stated that two projects costing \$28 000 000 were under review and the Liberals might axe Labor plans. The last paragraph of that article, attributed

to the Minister, stated:

Mr. Arnold said he was sympathetic to the needs of the people in the iron triangle. The Government was aware the quality of water supplied to the area was generally unsatisfactory. It would act to improve it as soon as the economy permitted.

I can only say that I voice my displeasure about the statement and also my disappointment; in fact, I want to go a little further, for the benefit of the member for Eyre (because he has something to do with this matter), and voice my anger about the situation. I do not have time to talk about all the things that I mentioned but I refer to an article in the *Whyalla News* of October 3, headed "Had useful talks with Premier." It states:

On the question of the future of State Unemployment Relief Schemes, he had said the scheme would cease to operate after those commitments made by the former Government had been met. However, unemployment assistance may be made through other sources.

No-one knows at this stage what "other sources" means. The article also stated that the State Clothing Factory in Whyalla was in jeopardy and that there had been a reduction in Government spending in the Whyalla hospital. I have had experience as an advocate for working-class people in Whyalla for about 21 years. I had useful talks with B.H.P. when that company took everything from those working people. If that is an example of useful talk, I find it difficult to comprehend.

Mr. ABBOTT (Spence): Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues, and indeed all other members, in offering and recording my congratulations to you on attaining the high office of Speaker. After listening to the speech this afternoon by the member for Henley Beach, one would gather the impression that all Opposition members who proudly belong to a trade union are the bad boys and that those one or two Government members who may be members of a trade union are the "goodie-goodies". I should like to inform the member for Henley Beach that my Liberal opponent in the recent election, Mr. Barry Lewis, openly publicised and boasted that he, as President of the Professional Transport Drivers Association, organised that infamous truckies' blockade that inconvenienced thousands of motorists throughout Australia. At the declaration of the poll in my electorate, I did not hesitate to thank Mr. Lewis for advertising that fact, because I think that was responsible for my winning my seat so easily.

I now want to address myself to the training of jobless youths and the scheme to end the payment of the dole to teenagers, about which the Federal Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs (Hon. R. I. Viner) hinted when he recently addressed a national youth conference in Canberra. Although Mr. Viner has since expressed his concern that there was inaccurate media interpretation of his statement and has said that the Federal Government is not contemplating the removal of benefits from young people who are unemployed, he has since stated in Parliament that he believes that the present situation where young school leavers are faced with long periods of unemployment and inaction is unsatisfactory, especially as they are not allowed to receive training or education if they also receive unemployment benefits.

That simply means that, whatever alternative the Government might consider which will improve the employability of young people in their transition from school to work and which involves training and education, they will not receive employment benefits. That is clear, and no other interpretation can be put on it. Mr. Viner's whole argument contradicts itself. In his letter to the

Editor published in the *Advertiser* on 12 October he said, among other things:

An unfortunate aspect of unemployment of young people is that it does not fall evenly across the community. It falls on the disadvantaged.

The earlier young people who lack educational qualifications and basic skills of literacy and numeracy leave school, the more likely they are to be unemployed. The fewer qualifications young people have the more likely they are to be unemployed. Migrants, Aboriginals, handicapped in any way, rural youth—all these factors work against the chance of getting a job.

The basic philosophy behind the thinking is that young people in the 15 to 19 age group should have a comprehensive range of education, training and employment options available to them which makes unemployment in the sense of idleness at the community's expense, an unacceptable alternative.

If a significantly greater number of people were helped through education and training schemes, this would obviously have repercussions in benefits and allowances that young people receive from Government, including the question of family responsibility for those in the education system. Allowances now paid by the Government generally provide for a degree of family responsibility for maintenance and upkeep, where the family has the means.

There we have it: young people should not enter the work force until they are properly equipped to do so. In other words, they should stay at school until they are 19 years of age. There is no point in undergoing any additional training if at the end of it there are not enough jobs for all of those trained people. In my view this is a blatant attempt to window dress unemployment figures. The Fraser Government is not at all interested in creating jobs for young Australians.

I agree entirely with the comments made by the Federal Opposition spokesman on employment when he said that Mr. Viner's announcement was a typical pronouncement, from a Government of millionaires who do not understand the problems of an average family. Already, family relationships are placed under stress and often break down, putting greater pressure on the teenager, who is already in limbo looking for work when jobs are scarce. For the average family, unemployed teenagers become a financial burden, and there is just no way in which a family can cope with another liability such as Mr. Viner's absurd proposal.

As unemployment in our community rises as a consequence of Federal economic policies, the damage that it does to family and community life continues to grow. Who are the unemployed? The official figure for unemployment does not tell the whole story. In addition to those registered as unemployed, tens of thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of other people want paid employment but cannot find it. They include the women who are deterred from entering the work force because of poor prospects; the young people who unwillingly return to school; the handicapped persons who were previously unemployed but are now classified as "unemployable"; the older persons forced into early retirement; and persons of all ages and backgrounds who, in order to avoid social disgrace, deny that they are unemployed. If all those unemployed people were gathered together, they would form the sixth largest city in Australia. If we include their dependants, they would perhaps form the third largest city in Australia.

A letter from Mr. Peter Cochrane, who is from the Politics Department of the Adelaide University and who, I understand, was employed in the Parliamentary Library for a short period, appeared in today's *Advertiser*. Mr.

Cochrane, who made some interesting comments, said:

Improving "employability" does not change the job situation. It merely raises the standard of competition for jobs. The number of losers remains the same. With this scheme the Government narrows the "official" labour market, allowing it to further falsify unemployment statistics.

Instead of calling them unemployed and (in current conditions) unemployable, we now call these young people employable trainees. And as a delegate to the recent National Youth Conference in Canberra I had the pleasure of hearing these full-frontal Viner semantics.

Responsibility for the upkeep of these "trainees" is to rest with their families . . .

The Government's purpose here is clearly to enlarge the class of victims and scapegoats for the present unemployment problem and at the same time to obscure the full dimensions of the problem.

The recent announcement by the Minister for Employment and Youth Affairs (Hon. R. I. Viner) that there was to be a new work test on the unemployed follows on the heels of an earlier announcement by their great leader Malcolm Fraser and his schoolboy Treasurer, John Howard. They said that they did not expect unemployment to be reduced over the next year. So, one may well ask what really lies behind this new string of quite inhumane measures aimed at preventing unemployed people from receiving unemployment benefits.

Mr. LANGLEY (Unley): Like other members, I congratulate you, Sir, on becoming Speaker in this House. I am sure your experience will stand you in good stead and that at all times fair play will prevail. I congratulate new members on both sides on their election to this House; I am sure the debate in this Chamber will be a great experience for them and that they will benefit by that experience. I wish them well. Whatever side one is on, one must abide by the umpire's decision, and I am willing to do so on this occasion, even though I have my own thoughts on the matter. However, I will speak more of that during the course of this session.

Mr. Gunn: At least you can't stop us any more.

Mr. LANGLEY: I do not intend to play in the Murdoch test, because there would be no fair play.

Some members have referred to door-knocking. In that respect, I have had a reasonable amount of experience, but I do not know of any member who has door-knocked the whole of his district in any campaign. Door-knocking does give candidates an idea of what people are thinking and what should happen. In the recent campaign, I covered half of my area within three weeks, and in all three quarters of the area was covered. When I first went out, my friend, who was with me, and I were quite certain that there would be no change in the seat of Unley. However, during the last week of the campaign I thought I could detect a movement. There is no doubt in my mind that this was a result of the media campaign and the lavish advertisements appearing in the press, many of which were untrue, incorrect, and almost libellous. I do not think any member on this side (I am not so sure about Government members) would have liked that to happen to them.

Although they might deny it now, I do not think any member of the present Government thought that his Party had a chance of winning the recent election. I congratulate them on their success, but I believe that there would have been no change in Government had it not been for the media and the lavish advertisements. It was noticeable, too, that the Premier apparently went into a box somewhere, because, as Leader of the Opposition, he was not making any statements. I have no doubt that he was

told to move away and someone else would do the rest.

Mr. Mathwin: He was door-knocking in Unley at the time.

Mr. LANGLEY: That surprises me. I thought the member for Glenelg might have needed some help, but I do not know whether the Leader went to help him. I guarantee that the Leader did not do any door-knocking in his area: towards the end of the election campaign door-knocking made no difference to the result. I admit that I was reasonably lucky to hold my seat in Unley. It was not the worst result I had had there; on one occasion I won by 43 votes, and my heart almost stopped then.

It is hard when one is defeated, but it is even harder when one hears personal remarks about any member. I was most disappointed to read a report in the *Advertiser* on 12 October, written by Grant Nihill, about the former Premier. Every member in this House has a high opinion of Des Corcoran, who has made many friends in Government and in Opposition since he has been here. Some terrible things have been written about him, and I do not know how many times he has been screwed down in the box! However, after hearing him speak today, I am sure the honourable member is back to being his former self. We all know that he suffers. The *Advertiser* report states:

Des Corcoran said nothing when State Parliament got down to business yesterday afternoon. But his silence said it all.

The final realisation that the Labor dream was well and truly over was reflected in the faces of the party's grossly diminished ranks now on the Opposition benches—

I do not think that is correct: everyone took the defeat well—

As the Liberal members sat comfortably, albeit a little tentatively, on the Government benches across from him, no expression was as poignant as that on the rounded Corcoran face.

The former Premier, who lost much more than an election, sat banished—and there can be no other word for it—on the backbench.

His humility seemed even more pronounced by the absence of the shrewd arrogance of his former Minister of Transport, Mr. Geoff Virgo, and the tactical verbosity of his former deputy, Mr. Hugh Hudson.

When Mr. Nihill knocks a person of Des Corcoran's calibre, he is knocking a man who has been in this place for more than 17 years. I am sure I speak for other members when I say that one cannot always be in front, but it is much worse to have such an article putting down a gentleman who has served this State so well.

One of the hardest workers in this House was Mrs. Molly Byrne. No-one in this House could say that Mrs. Byrne did not work hard. She looked after her constituents at all times but, even though she was so close to her people, she was defeated. Naturally, I congratulate the member who won that seat.

When I first moved into the Unley District, it was a rundown area, and the Liberal Government of the day did almost nothing to help the district. After several years, and with the help of the Labor Government which rose to the occasion in my district and in other districts in relation to schools, the situation improved. I hope that the present Government will continue in the path of the previous Government and listen to requests from the district.

Mr. Mathwin: They've blocked off all the streets, and you can't drive a car through Unley.

Mr. LANGLEY: Since the streets have been blocked off, there have been no fatalities, and very few accidents. It was one of the greatest things that has happened in the Unley District.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council notified the appointment of its representatives on the Joint House Committee.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

A message was received from the Legislative Council intimating its concurrence in the request of the House of Assembly for the appointment of a Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, and notifying the appointment of its representatives thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): For reasons which should be apparent to anybody, it is time that people throughout the world, and in particular the Western world (and that includes Australia), left their adolescence and became mature people. As I have said before, unless Australia accepts its responsibility to its region and to its own people we are not only courting disaster, we are deservedly requesting disaster. The fact is that for too long we, and in that I include myself, have closed our eyes to the reality of human suffering in our region and in our own country.

Our contribution to the hundreds of millions that surround us in South-East Asia is less than the crumb from the rich man's table. Millions of children are living in conditions which we would not tolerate for our pigs, let alone our cats or our dogs, and we unfortunately care nothing. We wantonly spend on every form of self-indulgence and luxury while the bodies pile up in the gutters. Our greed is monumental in its proportions. Our real contribution to the solution of poverty in South-East Asia and the Pacific is progressively smaller. This is so, even though there are solutions to the problems. As has been pointed out by the experts, it is just not right to say that there are no solutions to the problems. Hunger can be alleviated by helping people to become self-sufficient and able to support themselves. There is enough land and there is enough knowledge for this to be done. However, unless we are prepared to make a real sacrifice the problem will simply become greater.

At home, our record is none too brilliant, either. The fact is that we have been educated into a mentality that makes the cave dweller look sophisticated. We habitually judge people by their intellect, by their power, by their money, in fact by every standard except the obvious one, that the only claim to recognition any man has lies in the fact that he is human. None of those other qualities are of any relevance against the reality of an impending death, which makes us all common. The fact is that, unless we accept an obligation to act for the common welfare (and

this means considerable sacrifice), we will precipitate this country into an even worse mess.

Just stop to think coldly about it; in my opinion, we are loading what is a straight-out political problem on to the unfortunate unemployed and pensioners of this country. We do this, when any reasonable person knows that unless there is a large-scale migration programme before the end of this century we will have a highly aged population, dependent in the main for its very existence on the ever-declining work force. Ironically, that work force will be the very group we now punish. Just ask yourself what mercy you would expect when those we have treated so badly by our failure of responsibility are asked to assume the burden for us. Well, we created the law of the jungle, so I think we know the answer. If we want to maintain security in the region, and in Australia, and social justice as well, we simply have to meet the cost. Effectively, that means a much heavier and more fairly spread tax burden.

There is a desperate need in this country for the political Parties to halt the desperate scramble for power at any cost and try to tell it like it really is. Surely, decisions can be made on immigration, employment and taxation based upon reality and responsibility. Unless consensus is achieved on some of these matters, we are risking the overthrow of the very democracy which is our greatest pride. People will not accept this evil forever, and why should they? Everybody in the middle ground ought to accept the unhappy reality that extremists of the left and the right are only too happy to spur on the anarchy which is already showing. There needs to be a cleansing of the stables.

Anybody who saw on television not long ago the reaction of the young people in Newcastle ought to recognise the reality of the situation. We in Australia are not just facing a problem of unemployment; that is bad enough. We are facing a problem of total anarchy unless we do something about it. The fact is that all of our present political leaders are hypocrites, absolute hypocrites, unless they get together and stand by what they profess to be their principles. Anything that can help to alleviate unemployment and social injustice in our community must be attempted, and if that requires a halt to the desperate scramble for power federally, in the States, in the coalition Parties, and outside the coalition Parties, well so be it.

Anybody in our sort of society who professes any real demand for social justice must take into account the principles which he implicitly states. Those principles are principles of Christianity, the natural law or whatever one likes to call it. In fact, those principles have been set out by various social justice commissions of the Catholic Church, to which I happen to belong, and also by the Uniting Church and other churches. If those things are not understood, and if our politicians cannot get together and reach consensus about all this, they and we deserve the label that the community puts on us; that is, of grubby hypocrites only interested in self-advantage.

Only today the member for Albert Park drew attention to the recent statement by the Commissioner for Social Justice of the Catholic Church dealing with the question of unemployment. In that statement, under the heading "Conclusion", the commission states:

In resolving the present unemployment crisis there are two obvious options open to us. One is to allow our society to drift even closer to fragmentation. If the tendency of gross inequalities in the distribution of income continues, if the introduction of computer technology continues without planning, if people are not involved in decision-making and if the attacks on the victims, the unemployed, go unchallenged, then we will surely see the beginnings of a disunity in our society that may never be healed.

The second option, the difficult one, is to use the present crisis as an opportunity to begin building a more human society in Australia. The world is not finished. There is a whole future to create. Men and women are free to do the creating if only they can choose the future they want and can break the bonds that prevent that future from emerging.

They go on to refer in particular to the real fact that 7 per cent of the work force not employed is paying for the benefits of the other 93 per cent. That is true. No less a realist than Mr. McGuinness, a contributor to the *National Times* and the economics editor of the *Financial Times*, backs up precisely what was said by the Catholic Commission on Justice and Peace in its document and remarks, with irony, that that somewhat conservative body, I would have thought, had come in for attack for being socialist or even Marxist. He goes on to say that, whilst he would not necessarily agree with the technical solutions to the problem, he agrees with the overall thrust. He agrees with the fact that there is a solution to unemployment, and we are all of us hypocrites (myself included) unless we are prepared to accept the tax burden; there is no other way out of it. Unemployment can be solved; I for one say it can be solved by accepting a tax burden. It is a political problem, not an economic problem. It can be solved if we want to solve it. The fact is that up to date not sufficient people in Australia with jobs are prepared to solve it. While we are left in that situation I cannot blame anybody in the community (let alone the young people) for thinking us what we appear to be, that is, hypocrites and fools.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): The system that we adopted in this House from time to time, and by tradition, is to allow members the opportunity to have a grievance debate. This afternoon demonstrated that perhaps we ought to review the system, because I do not believe that we have ever heard or witnessed such pathetic contributions from an Opposition as we have today.

Mr. Keneally interjecting:

Mr. BECKER: The member for Stuart has nothing to gloat about. I would have thought with all the years he has been in the House he could have made a better contribution than that. As far as what the member for Gilles has said, I will get to him shortly. I commend the member for Semaphore. I do not include him in the Opposition Party. I hope that he will continue to display his ability to grasp quickly the challenge that has been given to him by his electoral district and the problems that face his district. Anybody who can keep the so-called well oiled Labor Party machine and the union cohorts out of the House deserves the highest commendation. I refer particularly to the campaign that was conducted in Semaphore by the Labor Party to promote one of the most notorious trade union officials, Mr. Apap, who also had his court costs paid by the State; he is another one who was a beneficiary of the State. The popularity and ability of the new member for Semaphore has certainly been proved. I wish him well and hope that his constituents will continue to recognise his ability in the future. It proves that the people of this State recognise the opportunity to vote for people of ability within the various districts.

I said the contribution by the Opposition members was pathetic, and it is about time they really grew up. We are sick and tired of hearing what happened on 11 November 1975 federally. That has been bashed to death so many times that the public is now convinced that that probably was the best thing that ever happened, and they will witness that in the next few months. All we are hearing now from the Labor Party is that it was subject to the powers of the Murdoch press; that they were subject to an

unfair press, and members opposite say that this contributed to their downfall. Let me make it clear; the Acting Secretary of the Labor Party hit the nail on the head a few days ago when he said it was simply the fact of calling an early election.

The member for Unley claimed that he door-knocked half of his district in three weeks. If he did so, he must have scooted around, and it must have been a hit-and-run effort. If any one door-knocks properly, he does not just knock on the door and scoot off: it takes at least five to seven minutes at each house. The Opposition should wake up to the fact that it was the calling of an early election that caused its downfall. The matter was well and truly solved within the first few days, and the election advertisements and whatever happened after that did not have much impact. It was the performance of the Opposition when in Government, and of some of its Ministers, that led to their downfall. It was clear that some of the Ministers failed to grapple with the economic situation within their departments, as evidenced by the Public Accounts Committee's report into hospital administration. What a pathetic performance that was by a Minister who failed to comprehend or oversee the operations of his department. It was so poor that his own Party sacked him, and it also sacked the Hon. Tom Casey. That was a back-room coup in the Labor Party which originated in another place. It was these operations, well before the timing of the election, that brought down the Labor Party.

If the Opposition wants to continue to bash the Murdoch press, it should go its hardest. The Opposition can count the number of statements I made to the Murdoch press that were never published, but I am not whingeing about it. The Labor Party's performance was pathetic. The trade union movement has never been able to grow up here and do what it should really do: represent the worker and get a fair deal for him. If the Opposition wants to criticise the member for Henley Beach for having the courage of his convictions because he is proud to be a member of his union, I point out that I led my association, which is now a union, for five years, and know what industrial relations are all about. The Opposition should not brow-beat new Government members, because they have proved conclusively that they were the better candidates in the recent election. They worked hard, and that is where the Labor Party fell down.

Let us look at the democratic newspaper circulating throughout the area but arriving late in my district. Fortunately, some of the copies were circulated after the election, thus showing how well organised members opposite were in my area. I refer to the *Herald*, whose penmanship is that of one of the greatest social democrats who ever sat in the House, dear old Ernest Crimes, a perpetual letter writer before becoming a member.

Mr. Mathwin: He was the fastest milkman in the west.

Mr. BECKER: Is that so. He said:

Des Corcoran needs a public declaration of support so he can feel confident, having been confirmed as Premier by popular vote, about meeting the new challenges of an increasingly complex age.

That was what follow the Leader was all about. Everyone knows that if you follow a military leader he will send the troops over the hill, stand back, watch them get slaughtered, and receive all the glory. The *Herald* also stated:

Terry Groom, elected in 1977, is one of Labor's most promising new members. Les Drury does a big job keeping pace with southern metropolitan development. Greg Crafter, in Parliament for Norwood only six months, has already made his mark.

He was marked, all right; he and the other two were all rolled.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who is the fellow on the front page?

Mr. BECKER: The Deputy Premier, who was responsible for the press statements in the *Advertiser* in the final week in order to make the big switch. As has happened in previous election campaigns, the Labor Party switched at the death knock, and this task was given to him. He was rolled. On the Thursday afternoon he went door-knocking for the first time. Bad luck that he had not spoken to the member for Unley, who predicted that things were in trouble. Let us look at some of the bright sparks who would make their mark in the House.

One heading states "Graham will swing the Mount, some of Labor's new blood." the report states:

Mount Gambier is a country seat that has never strayed far away from Labor. With a new Premier, Des Corcoran, close to its heart, knowing it intimately and responsive to its needs, the city is ready to return to the Government Party. Graham Bath...

What happened? The Government was well and truly rolled. There is then the headline "Government interest in Eyre." In the 1977 election the Government put up two candidates in that electorate. What happened? Both were rolled. There is a suggestion that one of those candidates will bounce back, Barry Piltz: watch out, here he comes, he is going to take the electorate of Eyre. We rolled him, too. I refer to the heading "Anger over brandy excise in the Riverland". What nasty people the Libs are in the Riverland. The report states:

Rolly Telfer, Riverland born and bred, is standing for the marginal seat of Chaffey, which in time has been held by Labor, Liberal and Independant candidates.

I did not know it was a marginal seat. Rolly was going to do wonders, but he was well and truly rolled. The electorate of Henley Beach is the thorn in the side of the Labor Party, which totally misread that electorate. About three or five months before the election the Government decided to revalue all the properties in that area, increasing property valuations by hundreds of per cent, increasing water rates, land tax and everything else. What happened? We rolled them down there. The Labor Party had Don Ferguson as its candidate. Talk about media bias! From the moment he announced his nomination as a candidate, several weeks before the election, every week he had something on the front page of the *Messenger* newspaper: no-one else could get that space. Half his stories were incorrect. What happened? We rolled him, too.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): I would have thought that the previous speaker was in the wrong House tonight: he should have been over in the Playhouse, with those carryings-on. Obviously, he is not concerned about the real issues that are at stake in South Australia. How can the member for Mallee talk in such terms about the people of Tailem Bend as he has tonight? What has he done for railway men in that township? What has he done for business people there? Is he concerned about the people of Tailem Bend? I refer to what happened at some of the meetings there, and the number of petitions that have been run out about the antics of the Federal Government and the Australian National Railways Commission, which is directed by the Federal Government.

I quote from the minutes of the public meeting held at Tailem Bend on 27 August 1979. The member for Mallee expressed concern about the people of Tailem Bend, but what reference does he make to the people there? Page 7 of the minutes contains a statement made by Mr. R. C. Power. I know him personally. I was branch President of the Australian Railways Union, and I know Rodney to be

a sincere person concerned about the township, and a fellow guard in the railway industry. He states:

We have 5 000 signatures to petitions and nearly 1 000 people present at two public meetings at Tailem Bend calling for the services to remain as was. As you said, these services are a Public Service operation and should be funded by the Government, who do not make this approach before you make the cut-backs to get the services funded by the Federal Government instead of cutting them out and hoping that they will come back.

I also refer to the effect on the business houses in Tailem Bend. Members opposite expressed their concern about the number of jobs that may be lost in this State. "Stop the job rot" was one of the slogans of the Liberal Party supporters. Perhaps members on the other side should refer the matter of what will be done in South Australia to their Federal colleagues in Canberra, where they have directed the A.N.R. Commission to reduce the number of jobs within the commission. I also refer to minutes of a public meeting on 21 March this year at Tailem Bend. Hopefully, I will not incur the wrath of the member for Henley Beach when I quote from these minutes, in which Mr. Mathews, speaking in relation to a statement made by Mr. Dyason who was concerned about the deficit of the A.N.R. Commission and how it must be run at a profit, stated, in part:

Tonight from practically every speaker we have heard immense sums running into millions of dollars enunciated; from not one of the gentlemen on the dais tonight have I heard the slightest compassion for the working people, the small farmers, the children of the country people who will not get employment when the rail services are cut.

They speak in terms of profit only. How I can remember when I was a boy the railways ran as a community service and the profit motive was absent; why then has it suddenly become essential that the Australian National Railways will make profits equal to G.M.H., Ansett, I.C.I. and the other monopolies whose servant they are. Now we have heard Mr. Smith talk about the tremendous deficit the railways of Australia force. I heard not one word from him about the millions of dollars which are pumped into Ansett Airways to keep them flying, which is a deficit. Not one word of the millions of dollars the Federal Government pumps into every private enterprise and monopoly in this country, and it is your money, the taxpayers' money, the money of the ordinary people.

Now Mr. Smith began his talk with an introduction of his assembled Commissioners. Let me introduce them again. The chap from Sydney we are told is a representative of the A.M.P.; the A.M.P. is the biggest provider of shareholdings and finances to every company in Australia; Sir Walter Rymill owns scores of square miles out of Penola . . .

The chap from Tasmania whom I have never met is said to

be a representative of the Tasmanian Government; well, Tasmania has had a Social Democratic Government for 30 years and big business there is less imperilled than it was 30 years ago.

Tony Flint, who is a very good friend of mine and a very efficient public servant, and he'll work well for anyone. About 10 years ago he was working for the Highways Department when the Highways Department wanted to carve Adelaide up with freeways and decimate the city . . .

Mr. Smith, who introduced himself said its your commission indeed. I asked Ralph Taylor of the A.R.U. to step forward and to be a Commissioner. The chap from Canberra I have never met but the fact that he was introduced as being very close to Peter Nixon is enough for me.

I hope I will not bore members opposite when I express concern about what is happening within the A.N.R. Commission, and about the membership of that commission. One can read how railways were carved up in Victoria. A few examples make this clear, as follows:

Former New South Wales Liberal Premier Sir Robert Askin joined the board of T.N.T. after retiring from official politics. Similarly, former Victorian Premier, Sir Henry Bolte, joined Ansett Transport Industries as well as a local board of the British shipping multi-national John Squire and Sons and its subsidiary Trans-West Haulage, and the boards of the related finance companies, Associated Securities and A.U.C. Former Federal Minister, Sir Allan Fairhall, is now a Director of Ampol and together with former Queensland Liberal Leader, Sir Gordon Chalk, sits on the board of the big locomotive rolling-stock and road vehicle component manufacturers, Clyde Industries. Former New South Wales Railway Commissioner, Mr. Neil McCusker, became a Director of both Mayne Nickless and Commonwealth Engineering, the other big private manufacturer of locomotive rolling-stock and also a heavy road vehicle component manufacturer.

He then goes on to talk about the men who dictate to Fraser and who make up his business Cabinet. These are the people who are dictating through one of the biggest companies in Australia, T.N.T. One of the persons involved is Sir Peter Abeles, about whom I think we have all heard a great deal. The big road transport lobby in this country is dictating to the Federal Government about what is required for railways. They have done it in Victoria and in New South Wales where they are setting up regional freight depots to cater for the wishes of big transport lobbies of this country.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 17 October at 2 p.m.