

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 7 November 1979

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

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SCHOOL STAFFING

In reply to **Mr. PETERSON** (16 October.)

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Public servants taking long service leave are normally not replaced if their duties can be temporarily performed by other staff. On the few occasions where duties cannot be so absorbed, arrangements are made for temporary replacement staff.

Whilst school assistants are not employed under the provisions of the Public Service Act, they are covered by the same general conditions of employment relating to long service leave for public servants. The Director-General of Education is currently investigating this matter with a view to determining guidelines for equitable implementation of the replacement policy.

BUS DESTINATION SIGNS

In reply to **Mr. MATHWIN** (25 October).

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Reasons for not having destination names on buses are as follows:

- (a) increased number of destinations cannot be accommodated on roller blinds;
- (b) the name applies only to the final destination and not to intermediate suburbs;
- (c) the name is often not correct due to extensions of service; and
- (d) a route description has been placed on bus stop poles to assist commuters.

An electronic destination sign has been developed by the South Australian Institute of Technology in conjunction with the Government. A prototype has been constructed, and investigations are continuing into its applicability for Adelaide buses. The State Transport Authority has been asked to re-examine the question of having destination names on buses.

PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 141 residents of South Australia praying that the House would legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hon. D. C. Brown, Dr. Hopgood, and Messrs. Millhouse and Olsen.

Petitions received.

PETITION: GAWLER PROPERTIES

A petition signed by 47 property owners and electors of the corporate town of Gawler praying that the House would request the Minister of Lands to have a

reassessment made on properties situated in the Corporation of Gawler so that current market sales were reflected was presented by Mr. Evans.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HOTEL HOURS

Petitions signed by 201 residents of South Australia praying that the House would oppose any legislation to permit hotels to open their bars on Sundays were presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson and Messrs. Bannon and Evans.

Petitions received.

QUESTION TIME

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

Mr. BANNON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy categorically exclude the possibility of a uranium enrichment plant being located in the Adelaide metropolitan area or its immediate environment?

The third interim report of the Uranium Enrichment Committee states, at page 2:

The committee's further studies have indicated that a site in the Spencer Gulf region may not necessarily be the best location for the enrichment plant.

Further down on that page:

Accordingly, the concept and estimates herein can be applied as far as enrichment is concerned to any other site in South Australia, including the Adelaide metropolitan area or its immediate environment.

In this morning's *Advertiser*, Dr. Brian Kehoe, Business Development Manager for Urenco-Centec, the European enrichment consortium, said the South Australian plant would be adjacent to a sizable population centre, but he refused to name sites "that had been considered". Dr. Kehoe said that possible sites will be discussed by the South Australian Government and Urenco in about four weeks. The Minister has said that work will start on the enrichment plant in 1980. He is meeting the European enrichment consortium, Urenco, in four weeks, yet today he issued a statement which began:

The Government has no proposal before it, nor has it considered one, for the siting of a uranium enrichment plant.

In view of those facts, can we have the categorical assurance that I have requested?

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Let me make one or two comments for the edification of the Leader of the Opposition, who might not be quite up to the historical aspects of this question. Regarding an enrichment plant based on the gas centrifuge method, which is the one examined in detail by the Uranium Enrichment Committee, I should like to quote some words to the Leader of the Opposition, as follows:

The gas centrifuge system of proving has a great many advantages for Australia, and involves far fewer questions of danger of pollution of any kind than does the gaseous diffusion process.

If the gas centrifuge system is used, South Australia has few problems at all in relation to it. There are no problems with regard to thermal pollution, waste or water. What is more, it would be within the possibilities of the future development of power in South Australia that this system of uranium enrichment could be used here.

Those were the words of Premier Dunstan in this House on 17 June 1975, when, to use the Leader's words, he was

Gung Ho on the question of uranium. Let the Leader digest that for starters. The former Premier, Mr. Dunstan, was convinced of the suitability of the centrifuge method from environmental and economic points of view. Obviously, he needs to speak to his protege, because the type of question just asked shows that the boundaries of the Opposition's irresponsibility in this matter are extending daily. The Leader suggests that I am hiding facts, yet it was the Labor Government which concealed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: And yet it was the Labor Government which concealed the first and third reports of the Uranium Enrichment Committee, which they commissioned, and which released the second report only because it was leaked first to the *Bulletin*.

Mr. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable Deputy Leader to withdraw that unparliamentary remark.

Mr. WRIGHT: I withdraw.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that the Leader of the Opposition has made a statement to the press to the effect that he was going to ask this question, so one would be rather foolish not to anticipate that he might even keep that promise. The Labor Party, now in Opposition, is so bankrupt in ability and initiative that it seeks again to raise fear within the community on the basis of statements by a man who is not willing to be named. These famous leaks which are coming to the press daily are from some high ranking official in the Department of Mines and Energy who is unnamed. I make it clear that the Government has not considered any proposal for the siting of a uranium enrichment plant at the moment. The Government will be having talks within the next month with the European consortium, Urenco-Centec, which will consider primarily what type of plant should be built. These talks will follow discussions between Urenco-Centec and the Uranium Enrichment Committee carried out while the previous Government was in office, with its full knowledge and under its full control. The Opposition, when in Government, had these reports for two years, and now members opposite are expecting categorical decisions within six weeks of our coming to office. When this Government is in a position to give detailed consideration to a site, the public will be informed. There will be no clandestine operation of the type members opposite have been so notorious for.

The public will be given full opportunity to make submissions as part of the environmental impact procedure. I also point out to the Leader that there is a whole section of the Third Enrichment Report, if he has read it in full, given over to the environmental aspects of enrichment plants.

Mr. Keneally: Roger, you are terrible.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am not half as bad as you lot are. That is all I know until that stage is reached. I suggest the Leader stops following in the footsteps of the member for Elizabeth in seeking media headlines based on nothing more than a calculated and deliberate attempt to induce fear in the community as a means of covering up his Party's absolutely indefensible and irresponsible attitude on this issue.

WORKER'S TRANSFER

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Industrial Affairs investigated the claim made by Mr. Bob Gregory, Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council of

South Australia, reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday, as follows:

We already know of one case where a worker has been forced to transfer about 200 miles from his place of employment in Adelaide to Port Augusta without guarantee of accommodation.

The article in which the claim was made was in reference to the reported opposition by the United Trades and Labor Council to the present Government's proposed interdepartmental transfers and secondments to private industry.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Yes, I did see the report in the *Advertiser* yesterday. I spoke to the Secretary of the Trades and Labor Council about that report. He informed me that the person concerned was employed in the Public Buildings Department. I immediately carried out an investigation within my department. Having ascertained the name of the employee involved, I spoke to him at some length about exactly what had occurred. I can assure the House, first, that the person concerned (a Mr. Francis) volunteered to transfer (and I stress "volunteered" to transfer) from Adelaide to Port Augusta.

Secondly, I point out to the House that Mr. Francis informed me that at no stage had any threat to sack or retrench him been made if he failed to relocate to Port Augusta. It would appear that the report in the *Advertiser* was quite incorrect. I will certainly be communicating that to Mr. Gregory. I also point out that Mr. Francis was, in fact, extremely pleased about the fact that the Public Buildings Department gave him the day off with pay to go to Port Augusta. Furthermore, the Public Buildings Department is assisting him, through the Housing Trust, to find suitable accommodation at Port Augusta.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will take no heed of interjections, which are out of order.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Finally, I point out that the procedure for transfer of Government employees from one department to another clearly lays down that no person will be relocated from one city to another without the agreement (and I stress, "without the agreement") of the employee involved. If that occurs, the Government will cover the cost of removal and make sure that suitable accommodation is available.

URANIUM REPORTS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy, in the non-clandestine way he just outlined he intends to operate, and in the interest of providing the public with all the facts, table the reports and dockets of the Department for the Environment and the South Australian Health Commission referring to the work of the Uranium Enrichment Committee and uranium mining, and any other memoranda dealing with uranium matters prepared by Mr. Bruce Guerin when he was Director of the Policy Division, and, if the Minister will not operate in that non-clandestine way, why not?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I will examine the matter.

PLUTONIUM

Mr. WEBSTER: Has the Minister of Mines and Energy noted the apparent dissatisfaction of the member for Elizabeth with the report given to this House yesterday about the handling of plutonium from Maralinga, and will the Minister further educate the honourable member?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am delighted that my reply so interests the Opposition. I noticed a statement by the member for Elizabeth that I had avoided the issue of whether or not a core sample containing plutonium dust was logged into the core library and subsequently sent to Lucas Heights. He suggested that the one photographed contained plutonium. If Standing Orders had allowed, I would have been more emphatic in my reply yesterday to the member's absolutely baseless allegations. His credibility suffers even further, if that is possible, from the following report of my department:

The core referred to by the member for Elizabeth was sent to Lucas Heights at the request of the Australian Ionising Radiation Advisory Council. Any sections containing residual plutonium had previously been removed on site at Maralinga.

As I said yesterday, all samples indicating any alpha radiation were removed and sent to Lucas Heights; none was sent to Adelaide. The report continues:

This is further confirmed by an examination of Mines Department records which show that certain sections of the core concerned—

that is the one that was worrying the member for Elizabeth in this morning's paper—

were missing when it was logged at Glenside, and these same sections correspond with those listed in the AIRAC report as containing residual plutonium. AIRAC were interested to make their own independent examination of the balance of the core—

that is the section which came to Adelaide with the plutonium excluded—

because of any bearing this could have on the earlier observed distribution of residual plutonium. The core was photographed before trans-shipment to Lucas Heights so that the scientists there would have a record of the undisturbed core in case there was some disturbance of the material in transit.

Mr. Duncan: So I was right and you were wrong.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You were wrong.

Mr. Duncan: You misled the House yesterday; you said that it had been discarded.

The SPEAKER: Order!

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Health say why Mr. Bruce Guerin was removed from his position as Executive Commissioner of the South Australian Health Commission before a successor to the Chairman (Dr. Shea) had been found, and why such haste was necessary in recalling Dr. Shea from leave to facilitate Mr. Guerin's removal, at a time when Dr. Shea has announced his intention to resign from his position soon?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Deputy Leader asks why the new Chairman of the Health Commission has not been announced; it is simply because a new Chairman has not been chosen, but that matter has no relevance whatsoever to the position of Executive Commissioner, which is not a statutory position. The position of Chairman is a statutory position, and the Government is considering who will be the successor to the present Chairman. The present Chairman is still in office. There was no haste on any account. He is on leave, and has been recalled. Any suggestion of haste is quite unfounded and without any grounds whatsoever. Dr. Shea is and has been the Chairman, and he will continue to be the Chairman until the Government accepts his resignation shortly so that he can take up the position of Assistant Director of

Community Psychiatry in the Mental Health Services of the Health Commission.

NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Environment say what is the present situation with respect to the salaries of national park rangers in South Australia? A short time ago, considerable concern existed among rangers in regard to a long-awaited increase in their salaries. I understand that an increase was granted, and that later there was some doubt about whether they would actually receive it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: This issue has had a long history of indecision and doubt (I suggest through no fault of the rangers' claim itself) stemming back to August 1978. During this period, extensive inspections were conducted by the Public Service Board in conjunction with the Public Service Association and the Department for the Environment. Many parks were visited in order to ascertain the true state of affairs during this time. Following this in-depth investigation into the work of rangers and inspectors in the National Parks and Wildlife Division of the Department of Environment, the Public Service Board and the Public Service Association agreed to salary increases for rangers and for senior rangers.

The increases take into account changes in the work value of the officers, and were based primarily on new and increased skills in the areas of land and wildlife management, administration and finance, communication and public relations, on-park interpretation of the educational and recreational significance of parks and reserves, fire control, and policy interpretation. The new salaries were published in the *Government Gazette* on 1 November. I am happy to be able to allay any fears of the national parks rangers at this time.

Finally, I say that the work of loyal and dedicated national parks rangers is extremely important in the management of parks and reserves in this State. Members of the public are travelling in the outback, and visiting parks in far greater numbers nowadays than was the case a few years ago. This increasing use of the most scenic and interesting areas of our State puts far greater emphasis on the work of rangers and the tremendous work they are doing. Therefore, the work of rangers is considered to be most valuable, and their increase in salary, gazetted last week, is a reflection of this fact.

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. HEMMINGS: Will the Minister of Health clarify her statement that "virtually all of the recommendations of the Auditor-General and the Public Accounts Committee Report had been implemented or were in train", and can she give this House details as to the changes in budgetary arrangements, organisational structures, the long-term role of the commission in regard to hospitals, and the shift to non-institutionalised care? Will a full-time Chairman be appointed or is it the intention of the Government to retain the position of a part-time Chairman?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I shall be happy to provide the honourable member with details of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee that have either been implemented or set in train. As soon as I took office in the Ministry of Health, I questioned the Executive Commissioner about this aspect, and I was assured that most of those matters were well in hand. Immediately prior to what I expected to be the debate on the health

lines of the Budget, I asked for a detailed briefing and was once again assured that virtually all of the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee Report and the Auditor-General had been put into effect or were in train. Some, of course, having been set in train, will take some considerable time to implement fully. I am happy to make those details available to the honourable member.

Regarding the other details he requested, I think that, if he reads the Government's health policy (and I am pleased to make a copy available to him, although I imagine he already has access to one), he will find that the policy in relation to managerial responsibilities of boards and hospitals is clearly set out. The third matter he raised was that of the Chairman. When the announcement of the new Chairman is made, there will be, at the same time, an announcement made as to whether the position will be full-time or part-time.

PRAWN FISHING

Mr. BLACKER: Will the Minister of Fisheries say whether the Government intends to take action to alleviate the problems experienced by the St. Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen? An article in this morning's *Advertiser*, entitled "A liquid goldmine may collapse", clearly outlines the problems being experienced by the St. Vincent Gulf prawn fishermen and their inability to catch fish of any size and in any number. The problem being experienced by these fishermen has been brought to the attention of the South Australian public and of the former Government several times. However, it is now becoming quite evident that the economic viability of this fishery is in doubt, and it could in fact be wiped out of existence if some action is not taken.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member for Rocky River has intimated to me that he is also interested in this question, so the answer I give will apply to both members.

Mr. Kenelly: What about the Questions on Notice?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The present question deals with a specific matter; I have not seen anything on notice about the specific problem. I am aware of the article in this morning's *Advertiser* and also of the problems which the prawn fishermen are facing in relation to the reduction of stocks in the St. Vincent Gulf. The fishermen in that gulf claim that the decline in their catch is due mainly to the extra effort in Investigator Strait. This claim is based on the premise that prawns migrate from Investigator Strait into St. Vincent Gulf.

Following research activity in Investigator Strait carried out by the Department of Fisheries this year, there was no evidence of a causal link between the stock in Investigator Strait and St. Vincent Gulf. In fact, of the 13 000 tagged prawns released, only a couple had migrated into the St. Vincent Gulf. The majority migrated farther west in Investigator Strait. There is evidence, however, of migration in the other direction, namely, southwards.

It is also evident when we compare the level of effort with open-access prawn fisheries overseas that this area is still relatively lightly fished. These findings together suggest that the problems of reduced stock may therefore be related to environmental factors rather than levels of activity. I have had discussions on this matter with the Acting Director of Fisheries, and it appears more likely that the reduction of stock in St. Vincent Gulf is due to a low level of recruitment of post-larvae into nursery areas. Research is now continuing with the *Joseph Verco* to sample in-shore areas to determine whether this is the case. It is expected that this will continue for the next three

months, and at that time the Government should have a clear understanding of the situation and therefore be able to make an assessment of the industry.

CHRISTIES BEACH HEALTH CENTRE

Dr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Health give an unqualified assurance that the Christies Beach Community Health Centre is not to be closed down, as is widely feared in that local community, and, in particular, that a permanent appointment will be made of a senior administrative officer to that centre? Two recent events have produced widespread fear in the local community that this centre which provides, I believe, 22 specific services in the health area to local people is likely to be discontinued. First, the private medical practice, which has been a tenant of the centre ever since it began, has announced its intention of vacating the centre and building its own accommodation elsewhere in the district. Secondly, the person who is now acting administrative officer has been recalled to Adelaide, without any indication being given to that person or to the staff of the centre as to what that person's role will be in Adelaide, or about what replacement, if any, is likely to take place. For these reasons many people are putting two and two together and getting an unfortunate answer from that equation.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: It is interesting that the honourable member should seek an unqualified assurance from me when he apparently was unable to receive an unqualified assurance from my predecessors in his own Party. One of the principal reasons why there is uncertainty and difficulty in the area is that the previous Government mismanaged the situation to the point where the staff was frustrated at not knowing what the future would be, and the medical practitioners in the area got so tired of waiting for detailed plans that they finally decided to acquire a site for their own purposes. That is the principal reason why there is uncertainty down there. The failure of the previous Government to act created the uncertainty.

Dr. Hopgood: What are you going to do about it?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I will tell you what I am going to do and what I have already done. First, I can give an assurance that the centre will not close. The lease expires in May 1981 and by then an alternative site will be operating. If that is the assurance for which the honourable member is looking I am happy to give it.

In addition, the question of staffing is being looked at by a working party from the Health Commission and I, at the invitation of the member for Mawson, intend to go into the area and consult with the local people. That is something that I understand none of my predecessors did. I intend to do it to hear directly from the people what their special needs are and to decide, in conjunction with officers of the Health Commission, how these needs can best be met. It appears there is quite a bit of uncertainty to be cleared up, uncertainty which was created by the failure of the previous Government to act and to advise the local community in such a way that it was sure of what was going to happen. Instead, the completely uncertain situation caused the local doctors to act as they did.

GLENELG TRAM

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Transport say whether his department has many plans to take part in the forthcoming celebrations to mark the fiftieth anniversary

of the commencement of the tram service between Adelaide and Glenelg? This anniversary, which is to occur soon, is of great importance to the city of Glenelg and to the history of South Australia generally. I understand that the trams are still painted the same colour, possibly by the same paint, as they were 50 years ago.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: In fact, the date of the first tram service to Glenelg was 14 December 1929, so the fiftieth anniversary will be on 14 December this year. The State Transport Authority, which is one of my agencies, and not my department will take part in the celebrations. It intends to have a week-long celebration between 10 and 16 December. Included in this celebration will be the bringing of some of the old trams and rail vehicles from the St. Kilda Museum. They will be on show and I believe people will be able to have rides on them.

I had the privilege a few weeks ago to launch the golden tram, which was the tram specially decorated by the S.T.A. to mark this golden jubilee. It is a magnificently refurbished old tram which, except for the golden paint on the outside, was brought to the standard to which the trams were originally built in 1929. I was rather disappointed, when I launched that tram by driving it, that Mr. Moults-Smith of the Omnibus and Tramway Drivers Union did not ask me to join his union. I have always wanted to be a member of a trade union to perhaps influence unions in the right way of conducting their affairs.

Mr. Mathwin: To put them on the right track.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, as the honourable member mentioned. All in all, I look forward to the celebrations and I hope the member for Glenelg will be prominent in the celebrations, as I am sure he will be.

Mr. B. GUERIN

Mr. TRAINER: Will the Minister of Health say whether any Ministerial direction or advice was given to the commissioners of the South Australian Health Commission prior to the meeting which decided on Mr. Guerin's removal? Where will Mr. Guerin now be located? What role will he perform? Will the Government honour its public assurances that no public servants will in any way be financially embarrassed by the Government's quote administrative unquote changes?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The answer to the first question is "No". The answer to the second question is that those matters are the responsibility of the Public Service Board, and I have no doubt that those responsibilities will be fulfilled in the way the honourable member and everyone else would wish.

SHACK SITES

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Lands say what is the Government's policy in relation to shack sites, particularly in areas previously classified as non-acceptable sites? The Minister would be aware of the concern expressed in the community in the past few years at what appeared to be an inflexible policy carried on by the Lands Department in relation to people who had shack sites and who were ordered that, after a certain date, they would have to remove their dwellings. Can the Minister say what is the exact position that is to be put into effect?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: On Monday last, the Government determined its policy in relation to shack sites. I know that the member for Eyre has been especially interested in this area for some time, as he was largely

responsible for the preparation of the Liberal Party's policy on shack sites prior to the recent election. The new policy retains the most acceptable aspects of the previous Government's policy, which was announced on 27 August, and also the very desirable aspects of what was contained in the then Opposition's policy, as announced prior to the recent election. The honourable member is particularly concerned about non-acceptable shack sites, and he has asked where the Government's policy will leave those shack sites and owners. In cases where indefinite retention of the shacks may lead to public disadvantage in future, the present shackowners will be given various options: first, retaining ownership and use of the shack for life (that is, the lease would not be terminated or the shack removed until the death of the shackowner and any surviving spouse); secondly, within five years from 1 January 1980, selling the current lease and shack in order to capitalise on his/her asset. (In the event of a sale, the new lessee would be given a fixed-term lease of 15 years which is a sufficient period to attract fair payment to the present shackowner. At the expiration of this lease the shack would be removed); and thirdly, any shackowner who has not exercised the option to sell his/her interest before 31 December 1984 under the second option above may sell his/her interest after 31 December 1984, and the purchaser will be granted a miscellaneous lease terminating in 1999 (for example, a purchaser in 1990 would receive a miscellaneous lease for nine years). At the expiration of this lease the shack would be removed.

I believe that the present policy determined by the Government will include the advantages of the previous Government's policy and those of the policy as announced prior to the State election by the then Opposition. I believe that this will satisfy the majority of people involved in shack ownership and all interested persons in South Australia.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. KENEALLY: Will the Premier give a categorical assurance to the House and to the people of the northern Spencer Gulf area that Government negotiations for a petro-chemical plant in South Australia will be based on the site's being at Redcliff? In reply to a question I asked on 31 October, the Premier said that the matter of the site was still negotiable with Dow Chemical.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is totally impossible for me to give a categorical assurance about what is likely to be the result of negotiations, as I would have thought that "negotiating" meant that all sorts of terms and conditions could be under discussion. As far as I know, the Redcliff site is the only base under consideration.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier obtain for me a detailed statement outlining the estimates and payments to non-recognised hospitals, institutions and other bodies, and can this information be included in future Budget documents? In the Auditor-General's Report of 1978, attached to Appendix IV was a detailed list of hospitals, non-recognised hospitals and institutions. Estimates of grants and actual grants to these various organisations, including the Crippled Children's Association, the Home for Incurables, South Australian Blood Transfusion Service, and the Anti-Cancer Foundation were included.

This information is particularly valuable to similar organisations as a guide to the Government contribution in those areas. It would also be a valuable indicator of Government policy assisting these health and welfare organisations.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the honourable Premier to answer the honourable member's question, I indicate that the Chair is aware that a question couched in similar terms was placed before 12 noon today by the honourable member for Napier and will be a Question on Notice next week.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, I take it that there is nothing to preclude me from answering that question.

The SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I shall be delighted to get a list and a report, as the honourable member requests. I think that the Minister of Health would agree with me that the budgetary arrangements and the details supplied in the current document are far from satisfactory. I made that point during the debate on the Estimates. There is much value in knowing what degree of Government support is given to various charitable institutions, non-recognised hospitals and institutions. I would certainly like to see those figures made available to honourable members. I hope that, in future, when we adopt a revised system of examination of the Budget and Estimates documents, such details will be available. I point out to the House that, in those circumstances, it is hoped that, with the Budget and Estimates Committees, the various departments, the Ministers responsible for them, the people responsible, and the departmental heads themselves, will be available to provide those details to the Budget Committee and Estimates Committee as they are requested. Certainly, I think that it is a desirable step. In the meantime, I will take steps to get that report for the honourable member.

Mr. BECKER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. You pointed out that my question cut across a question placed on notice before 12 noon today. In the past, I have placed Questions on Notice in the hands of the Clerk and, because questions of a similar nature were asked in the House, my questions were ruled out of order and not allowed to be placed on the Notice Paper. I was not to know that anybody had placed a similar Question on Notice. Therefore, I cannot see how that question can go on the Notice Paper. I ask for a ruling on this matter.

The SPEAKER: I think, in answer to the honourable member's point of order, that, when his question is viewed alongside the question that I am aware was placed on Notice, there will be sufficient difference to allow the Question on Notice to proceed. I made the statement that I made earlier because there was considerable negotiation with the honourable member who placed the Question on Notice and, in the best interests of the Notice Paper, of the Ministerial staff, and the requirements of Parliament, the negotiations which took place before that question was accepted required much discussion between the honourable member and me. I want to make it quite clear that there was no information passing from the Chair, or from the officers at the table, which would have caused any person to believe that the honourable member for Hanson was aware of those negotiations or of the content of that question.

It is a delicate situation, and to my knowledge it has not come before the House in quite this way previously. As honourable members can approach me and find out about the nature of the comment I have made, I think that they will understand that it was necessary for the Chair to protect the interests of the honourable member for Napier.

Mr. BECKER: On a further point of order, Mr. Speaker. May I explain that I had no idea that a question had been placed on the Notice Paper.

The SPEAKER: That is appreciated.

COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTRE

Mr. WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Health say where the Government will construct the new community health centre for the Noarlunga and Christies Beach area and whether it will be publicly or privately operated? In her reply to the member for Baudin, the Minister conveniently ignored the substantial provision made by the former Government in this year's Loan Estimates for construction to begin on a new community health centre to be built near the proposed Christies Beach Hospital. The former Premier announced that the new centre would replace the temporary centre at Dyson Road and said that a project planning team, with representation from local government and the management of the existing centre, would be established to undertake forward planning.

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: That project planning team has been established. The Health Commission's working party is consulting with people in the local area. I am unable to say at this stage exactly where it will be located, other than that the plan is to have the alternative site ready by May 1981. Obviously, if I knew what was to be the location, I would tell the honourable member now, but that would rather cut across the work of those who are looking for the most desirable site. I think it best to wait to hear what the working party has to say before I announce the precise location.

CLUSTER HOUSING

Mr. RANDALL: Can the Minister of Environment say whether the Government has any guidelines applicable to cluster housing? My question arises from my involvement in local government, whereby I have seen applications made to local government for cluster housing. It also arises from a report in a recent issue of the *West-Side* that states that the Henley and Grange Council has before it an application for cluster housing. The Town Clerk (Ron Nash) is quoted as saying:

The development offers the contrast of medium density housing with economic use of land and attractive surroundings with common land included.

The report also states:

The developers, Konto Nominees, spokesman Greg Molfetas said the plan was something like strata title buying.

The difference is that instead of buying a small plot, our buyers will take a share in the whole development.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the honourable member's question and concern. We have spoken about this matter previously. My department is examining this matter at present, and I shall be pleased to bring down a full report for the honourable member so that he has the details he requires.

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Health say what are the terms of reference for the Health Commission's newly announced extended care policy and planning review group, and whether this group will examine the current situation at the Home for Incurables?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: Obviously, I do not carry those details in my head, but I will provide the honourable member with the terms of reference. Regarding the Home for Incurables, I announced yesterday that I proposed to seek the co-operation of the board in establishing eligibility criteria for admission to the home, because I believe it important, in the interests of the taxpayer and of the very best care of patients (and I do not put those two matters in priority order) that, where we have extremely high capital cost and high operating cost institutions which provide highly specialised care, there must be rigid criteria for admission to ensure that only those in genuine need of the specialised services provided have access to those services, and that people who can be cared for by other community services at far less cost to the community receive those other services, rather than taking up beds that should rightly be reserved for those who have special and sometimes unique needs.

AIR QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. OSWALD: Will the Minister of Environment say whether a decision has been made relating to the transfer of the administration of the Air Quality Control Unit from the responsibility of the Minister of Health to the responsibility of the Minister of Environment?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I thank the honourable member for his question, and I am pleased to be able to tell the House that Cabinet has approved the transfer of the administration of the Air Quality Control Unit from the responsibility of the Minister of Health to the responsibility of the Minister of Environment. This will enable the control of air pollution to be handled as part of a general environmental safeguard policy for the people of South Australia. I believe that a whole new approach towards the management of environmental contamination should be looked at as a matter of urgency. My department is examining existing legislation in operation elsewhere in Australia and is also examining the Victorian environment protection policy for the air environment which has been under public review for the past four months.

Discussions regarding the transfer commenced some time ago because of a growing need to consider the broader environmental implications of air pollution in addition to the health aspects. There are distinct advantages in linking the air pollution control function with the assessment of development proposals currently undertaken by the Department for the Environment. With its broad interest in management of environment quality, the Department for the Environment is the logical arm of the South Australian Government to exercise this function. This transfer will also enable a reassessment of the existing Clean Air Committee and the role of the Air Pollution Appeals Tribunal.

Regulations were proclaimed recently under the Health Act, and they require the approval of the local board of health, for burning at rubbish tips and also to control open burning other than at a tip. These regulations will now continue under my administration. However, the regulations do not cover the burning of domestic wastes on domestic premises, and it is thought desirable that this problem be tackled through a public education programme. While controls on burning may be implemented during periods of air potential alerts, the primary thrust, I would suggest, should be through an educational programme that will demonstrate the hazards associated with burning during such periods.

HEART DISEASE

Mr. O'NEILL: Will the Minister of Health say whether the Government, as part of its preventive health care programme, intends to proceed with the previous Government's plans to establish a pilot heart disease programme involving mobile units, to enable people to check their heart condition, along the lines of the T.B. vans that have been so successful in eradicating that disease?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: That kind of programme is presently conducted, and I understand conducted extremely efficiently and well, by the National Heart Foundation. It is the Government's policy, wherever possible, to encourage voluntary groups and at the same time to make sure that the efforts of voluntary groups are properly co-ordinated and receive Government support where possible. I would want to consult with the National Heart Foundation before I announced any Government programme in relation to this matter of mobile units, and I think we would certainly want to give every possible opportunity to make sure that the excellent programmes conducted by the foundation are given the promotion that they need. Anything we can do to alert people to the dangers of heart disease, to catch the disease in its early stages and ensure preliminary checking, we will certainly do. The honourable member has raised a matter on which I have not been fully briefed. I shall be very pleased to find out what plans the Health Commission has for working with the Heart Foundation and to advise him what these plans are.

DRUGS

Mr. SCHMIDT: I draw to the Chief Secretary's attention an article which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* on 21 October 1979 in which it was reported that heroin addicts in the southern districts of Adelaide had been the victims of torture when they had failed to pay for their supplies of heroin. Will the Chief Secretary say whether it is a fact that such incidents of torture have occurred and, if it is, what steps have been taken to stop them? Is a particular organised group involved and, if so, have the members been identified and arrested? Also, can the Minister give an assurance that investigations will be continued to ensure that the community is protected from such violent activities?

The SPEAKER: I call on the Chief Secretary to answer, but not by way of comment.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I am aware of the report, and inquiries have already been made by the South Australian Police Force into this matter. I have been informed that during 1977-78 the drug squad detectives became aware that there was an increase in heavy narcotics use in the southern suburbs of Adelaide, including the Morphett Vale and Christies Beach districts, and that the major suppliers were two brothers. Preliminary inquiries revealed that one of the brothers was obtaining heroin supplies from a Sydney source, transporting it to South Australia, and distributing it through his brother amongst addicts. A number of enforcers were employed to ensure that prompt payment was made.

Following a full-scale investigation by members of the drug squad, the organiser and his associates were prosecuted for various offences involving drug trafficking. All men have been sentenced to between four years and seven years imprisonment for possessing heroin, except for one, in which case there was insufficient evidence to commit for trial, and another man is currently on remand until 10 March 1980. No reports of torture have been made

to police by the alleged victims, and inquiries which have been conducted by detectives have failed to reveal their identity.

It appears that these allegations of torture refer to the era when the abovementioned organised group was active in the Morphett Vale-Christies Beach district. I can assure honourable members that inquiries are still being conducted into the remnants of this drug trafficking group and other illicit drug suppliers, and it will continue.

PARA DISTRICTS HOSPITAL

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Health say whether the Government intends to proceed with the establishment of the Para Districts Hospital? If it does, when will construction begin, and will the hospital be publicly or privately owned and operated?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: The Government will not be making any decision on the Para Districts Hospital in the same way that the former Government would have taken no decision until the working party, which, with a group of consultants from the United Kingdom, is conducting an investigation into the total health needs of that area, has prepared its report. That report should be ready early next year. I understand that an interim report will be available in December. There is no thought of making any decision on the matter until that report is available.

ROAD WIDENING

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Transport bring down a report (in February next year if need be) on the Government's intentions in relation to the Highways Department's tentative road-widening plans? I have in my district many roads that the Highways Department intends to consider for road widening, but it will not give any definite details to the owners of the properties concerned. One couple has told me that they wanted to sell their home last May. They had a contract for \$25 000 signed, but after the contract was signed the Highways Department told the intending purchasers that it might require six metres from the frontage of the property, so the intending purchaser opted out of the contract. In the meantime, the young couple had signed a contract for another property, and they had to carry bridging finance until October. That cost them many thousands of dollars.

In October the Highways Department changed the approach it was making by telling the owner of the property that it no longer wanted six metres from the property. The property was placed on the market in October, and the young couple had lost thousands of dollars. I know of many other cases, as do other members, where the tentative plans of the Highways Department are affecting the value of properties and the possibility of selling properties. The people concerned believe that this is an injustice which the Government should correct. Will the Minister take up this matter with his Cabinet and bring down a report next year explaining how the Government will rectify the problem and the injustice that exist to many thousands of property owners in this State?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The member for Fisher will be pleased to know that I have already asked the Highways Department to present me with a detailed report on this matter, because the member for Todd two or three weeks ago brought a similar case to my attention. This matter disturbs me. I appreciate the problems of the constituents of the member for Fisher. If the honourable member would like to let me have the details of the cases to which he refers, I shall be pleased to have them looked

at on an individual basis. I shall be happy to see that the honourable member gets the report on the whole question of the Highways Department lien on properties adjoining these roads. I would hope to have it before February, but I will see what happens.

HEALTH COMMISSION

Mr. McRAE: Will the Minister of Health clarify her Government's election promise to establish regional co-ordinating committees reporting directly to the Minister representing all concerned with health care and community welfare? Will these committees replace the existing health service advisory committees and the functions of community development boards that directly relate to health matters?

The Hon. J. L. ADAMSON: I would have thought that the Government's undertaking was perfectly clear and required no clarification. It is obvious that, if the Health Commission is going to fulfil its function of co-ordination and if we are going to ensure that there is the minimum possible duplication and waste in the delivery of health care services, we must make sure that people get together and are aware not only of the programmes that they are carrying out but also of complementary and supporting, and possible parallel, programmes that other people are carrying within certain areas. That will be the function of these regional committees. They may well embrace more than one community consultative council, and they will certainly ensure that the work that is presently being done in the co-ordination of regions is reinforced and that the widest possible information is available to both the Government and the voluntary bodies on which their planning can be based.

At 3.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

WHEAT STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Wheat Stabilisation Act, 1974-1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill is designed to ensure that the complementary Commonwealth-State wheat marketing arrangements can continue without any hitch during the Parliamentary recess preceding the resumption of the present session in February. The position is that the Commonwealth is in the course of preparing an Act to replace the Wheat Industry Stabilization Act of 1974. It is not entirely clear, at this stage, what complementary provisions will be required on the part of the respective States. If the new Commonwealth Act is brought into operation during the Parliamentary recess, between the date on which this House rises soon and before it resumes again in February or thereabouts next year, it may be desirable for this State to make complementary alterations to its legislation to ensure that the scheme as a whole will operate smoothly.

This Bill makes provision for the necessary changes to be made expeditiously by regulation. It is envisaged that any such regulations would be supplanted by legislation to

be introduced during the February sittings. Accordingly, the Bill provides that no such regulation shall have effect beyond 31 March 1980. Before referring to the clauses, I would like to point out that the Government believes that the prices for stock feed and industrial wheat should be fixed by the Australian Wheat Board and that the market place should determine those prices.

It is appreciated by the Government that the Australian Wheat Board is the authority which fixes the price within the Commonwealth and, accordingly, within each of the States, and we believe that commercial good sense will prevail at that marketing authority level with the Australian Wheat Board. Even if the occasion should arise when the community at large, or any part of it, is exploited, there is even further public protection incorporated in the current and proposed wheat stabilisation legislation in this country. Section 8 of the old Wheat Stabilisation Act refers to the specific powers of the Minister for Primary Industry, to the extent that that Minister may intervene where cases occur or are identified in which the Australian Wheat Board has over-exercised its authority or has exploited the community in price fixing.

As a result of discussions recently with the Minister for Primary Industry, I am assured that the intent and the content of section 8 of the old Wheat Stabilisation Act will be maintained and incorporated in section 18 in the new legislation presently before the Commonwealth Parliament.

I appreciate the co-operation of the Opposition in this matter, because it is somewhat unusual that we should be seeking to introduce a Bill at such short notice, but, in the interests of the wheatgrowers and the consumers of the various varieties of wheat, we must act swiftly in taking action complementary to that taken by the Commonwealth Government on behalf of the industry at large.

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The Opposition is quite overwhelmed by the devastating logic of the Minister's argument. We support the Bill, and we are prepared to let it pass through all stages.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must inform the honourable member for Playford that, regrettably, the form of suspension sought by and granted to the Minister requires that the honourable member should take the adjournment. A further suspension will be required in due course to allow the Bill to pass through all stages. I ask the honourable member for Playford to seek the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. McRAE: I ask that the debate be adjourned, with the understanding that the Opposition will agree to an adjournment on motion.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The national campaign to eradicate bovine tuberculosis and bovine brucellosis has pointed up the need to make amendments to the Cattle Compensation Act in a number of different areas. These may be summarised as follows:

- A. At present compensation is paid for cattle condemned for tuberculosis at routine slaughter, in addition to positive reactor cattle ordered

for slaughter. It is understood that the provision was originally made in order to protect owners of infected properties from undue discounting of their cattle by meat operators. Now that freedom from tuberculosis has been achieved throughout most of the State, payment of compensation for such cattle is tending to deter owners of infected herds from fully co-operating with eradication procedures. It is therefore no longer desirable that compensation be paid for non-tested cattle condemned at slaughter.

- B. Unavoidable delay in preparation and processing of claims for compensation, particularly of brucellosis reactors, has caused financial hardship to many cattle owners. It is desirable for payment of agreed market value to be made without delay from the fund. Subsequently the residual meat value will be paid into the fund. Where residual value exceeds agreed market value the excess will be paid to the owner.
- C. To expedite tuberculosis eradication in remote areas the use of trained lay personnel is necessary. Section 15a(1) precludes payment of compensation unless cattle have been tested by a registered veterinary surgeon. It is therefore desired that section 15a(1) be amended to allow for payment of compensation for cattle tested by lay personnel.
- D. Under the Act expenses incurred in the slaughter and disposal of animals may be reimbursed to the owner. There are circumstances where disposal of cattle by burial on contract is required. Where several owners are involved, division of costs is difficult. Authority is needed for the fund to pay the contractor direct.

Moreover, during the past year cattle prices have risen substantially. In view of the buoyant state of the fund it is appropriate to increase the maximum compensation that may be paid in respect of any one animal or carcasses. To allow for flexibility in the future, it is proposed that this maximum should be fixed by regulation. No regulation will be made without proper consultation with the industry.

I respect the request by industry in this regard, and I place on record our obligation, as a Government, to consult with industry on this and like matters. Changing the regulation with respect to the compensation amounts payable on a fluctuating basis should be a matter discussed with the industry, and I refer in this instance particularly to the United Farmers and Stockowners Association in South Australia, which is widely representative of the rural industry, and more specifically representative of those primary producers who produce livestock, including cattle.

Clauses 1 and 2 of the Bill are formal. Clause 3 is a drafting amendment. It alters the definition of "carcass" to make clear that it includes portion of a carcass where portion only of a carcass is condemned. This makes the wording of subsequent provisions less cumbersome.

Clause 4 contains several amendments to section 5, which deals with compensation payable to owners of cattle. The first effects a minor amendment consequential on the amendments contained in clause 3, while the second provides that compensation shall not be payable where a carcass is condemned by reason of the fact that the animal was suffering from tuberculosis. The remaining two provide for amendments consequential on the amend-

ments in clause 6. Clause 5 sets out a minor amendment to section 6 of the principal Act, consequential on the amendment in clause 3.

Clauses 6 and 8 establish the new system for paying compensation in respect of cattle destroyed or carcasses condemned. The owner will receive the assessed market value of the cattle (subject to the statutory maximum) but will assign his rights to the carcass and hide. If the owner objects to an assessment of market value, he has a right of appeal to the Minister (and I can think of no more reasonable person to whom he might be required to appeal). If the residual value of the animal exceeds the assessed market value (or the statutory maximum) the balance will be paid to the owner.

Clauses 7 and 9 effect amendments to sections 8 and 10, respectively, of the principal Act, consequential on the amendment in clause 3.

Clause 10 removes the requirement that a person testing for tuberculosis must be a veterinary surgeon. I am not sure what would be the reaction of veterinary surgeons to that erosion of their businesses, but that is how it is to be. Clause 11 provides for an amendment to section 16 of the principal Act consequential on the amendment in clause 3, and clause 12 empowers the Chief Inspector to authorise a payment from the fund covering the cost of destroying diseased cattle. I look forward to the support of the Opposition in the passage of this Bill.

Mr. McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILISATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 813.)

Mr. McRAE (Playford): The Opposition considers this to be a serious matter that should be attended to. The reasons given by the Minister were convincing. Having talked with our various agricultural experts, we support the Bill.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 6 November. Page 761.)

Mr. GLAZBROOK (Brighton): During yesterday's debate, as honourable members may recall, I was trying to project an image to members' minds of the possible future and likely growth of tourism in this State. I was also indicating that in the past the tourist industry in South Australia could have been likened to the story of Cinderella and was awaiting a fairy godmother or fairy godfather to waken it and take a positive interest in it. I also gave a slight insight into the efforts in the past few years of the bureau when compared to those in the private sector, and I indicated that private enterprise had spent \$2 000 000 in the past two years to get South Australians to leave South Australia and visit far away places. Also, I said that only \$200 000 had been spent to get those South Australian tourists to stay and see South Australia first.

I also pointed out that the South Australian Tourist Bureau had spent only about \$150 000 to get people to come to South Australia from interstate, or 36.83 per cent

of its advertising budget. Very few people in this State have devoted much time and effort to promoting the State to any large degree, but I compliment and say "well done" to those who have.

Two local papers, the *Advertiser* and the *News*, have promoted South Australia, and they have done something concrete. Let us look, first, at what the *News* has achieved. If one looks back over the past 10 years one sees that that paper has published a travel supplement as a regular Tuesday feature. Time and space have been devoted in that paper to publicising, selling and promoting South Australia. Last Tuesday week (30 October) it devoted 10 pages to tracing the river voyage of Captain Sturt. Each town, tourist resort and tourist association joined with the advertisers to maximise the selling impact and effort of selling South Australia to South Australians.

The newspapers also give valuable space in editorials and articles to promote the State. This has been a regular feature once a week for many years. The *Advertiser* has established a travel feature page which has appeared every Saturday for countless years. The South Australian Government Tourist Bureau has been approached many times to participate in those weekly features, but has, I understand, declined to do so. The regional tourist associations have urged the newspapers to coerce the South Australian Tourist Bureau to participate but, seemingly, to no avail. The question I ask myself is: "Why?"

It becomes obvious when one sees that, from a budget of \$400 000, only \$800 was spent last year with one newspaper—the equivalent of \$1.95 a day or .2 of 1 per cent of its total advertising budget. This could be construed as blatant hypocrisy of a tourist bureau function. I do not blame the bureau or its staff; I can only blame past policies laid down by past uninformed Ministers of Tourism. Previous Governments have urged development and urged expenditure by others for development of tourist parks, resorts, hotels, etc. They urged promotion expenditure by those whom it seeks to influence and who are based within the State. It suggests that South Australian companies advertise within South Australia urging South Australians to see their State first, yet the bureau was able to spend, last year, only \$1 890, or \$5.91 a day.

This scandalous thumbing at the efforts of others to promote this State clearly indicates that the bureau has been held back. If it had been forced to go any slower, it would have been going backwards. We must not think the bureau is insensitive to these problems; in fact, I can state that the State Department of Tourism is planning an incentive to encourage South Australians not to overlook the travel and holiday opportunities and venues within this State. This item was reported in the hotel magazine which was received yesterday by the Parliamentary Library.

Last Wednesday, a report appeared in one of the dailies under the headline "We chase the rich tourists", which stated:

Adelaide is in a \$1 000 000 campaign to bring big-spending tourists to Australia. The move underlines the importance to Adelaide of a new international class hotel. The campaign—the first major move to bring big-spending tourists from Europe in groups—involves British Airways including Australia in its Speedbird programme. Until now the cheap advance purchase fares have mainly generated what is known as "visiting friends and relatives" traffic which is on the bottom of the spending scale. Britons will be offered three weeks in Australia for \$1 550, including air fares. The holiday includes a coach tour from Sydney to 11 cities and towns. Two days are spent in Adelaide. Departures are in January. Self-drive holidays are offered from \$796 for two

weeks. According to the British Airways General Manager for the U.K. and Ireland, Mr. Jim Harris, the new package holidays demonstrate the strength of the airline's belief in the future of Australian tourism.

The following is the most important part of the report:

"I think the rapidity with which the travel ripple is spreading has taken a lot of people in the travel industry by surprise," he said. "Certainly it is surprising the way U.K. tourists, even with the economy still depressed, are travelling long haul. There has been a strong recognition of the real possibilities of tourism in Australia. I think Australia has a golden opportunity because it has so much to offer tourists."

It is not the State that is spending \$1 000 000 but British Airways and its Speedbird programmes. Yesterday, a report appeared in the press, regarding Trans-Australian Airlines, as follows:

The first TAA brochure aimed specifically at selling travel in Australia to overseas countries has been released through the airlines overseas offices. About 50 000 copies of the 32-page full colour brochure will be distributed to the airline's general sales agents, tour wholesalers and travel agents throughout the United Kingdom, United States, Europe, South-East Asia, Japan and New Zealand.

The TAA brochure details See Australia holidays which feature the new concept of holiday modules built around the See Australia air fare.

TAA is the first Australian domestic airline to produce holiday modules offering discounted ground content packages for short durations. Destinations covered in the brochure include the Great Barrier Reef islands, Gold Coast, North Queensland, Central Australia, the Northern Territory, Tasmania, New South Wales, Western Australia, South Australia and Victoria.

Our national airline, Qantas, spends about \$2 000 000 each year publicising Australia as a destination, and South Australia also receives a mention in their despatches. So, too, does the Australian Tourist Authority, which spends upwards of \$1 000 000 overseas to push Australia as a destination point. Locally, another of those trying to do something in the tourism field is perhaps the Wirrina complex, which was undertaken by a South Australian co-operative with South Australian shareholders, with little or no help from any previous Administration. It would seem from this that the light in the tunnel is getting brighter.

As the previous article on British Airways investment and some overseas tour operators indicates, it has given strong recognition to the real possibilities of tourism in Australia. We have a golden opportunity, because we have so much to offer. The very essence of the value of this potential winner as an intensive-labour industry lies in the fact that it is worth between \$300 000 000 and \$700 000 000 to this State on the forecast of a 1 000 000 visitor intake. The potential is based on pure overseas visitor intakes, and does not take into calculation any interstate or intrastate visitors. It does not take into account the enormous potential of the convention market, which is one area that has some polish of professionalism about it. It was tragic to see that the previous Government paid only lip service to convention facilities and, when money was short, it seemed to kill the initiative of the need and purpose of a large convention facility.

At this stage, I record my admiration of and offer credit to one Mr. O'Sullivan, who was the driving force behind the convention centre. I quote from a report in which Mr. Connelly, the bureau Chairman, expressed thanks when he paid tribute to Mr. O'Sullivan's efforts, as follows:

Joe O'Sullivan will be sadly missed on the South Australian tourism and Adelaide convention scene, Mr. Connelly said.

He was virtually entirely responsible for establishing the bureau about six years ago, and his special talents, energy and enthusiasm which he devoted to seeing Adelaide as a leading convention city had greatly assisted in placing Adelaide in a favourable competitive position compared with other Australian capitals.

The ball is at our feet to tackle the problem in a professional way by simply learning from those who went before. We must acknowledge the need for conservation, and we must not destroy the very things that make this city and State such an enjoyable place in which to live. Arguments will come forth that tourism will destroy the very fundamental heart of the State we like so much.

Questions that come to mind are "first up, best dressed", and "Who will win the race to lure the tourism dollar to their particular State?" Perhaps the advertising of each State will indicate the attitudes of the various States towards tourism. I note that Tasmania, the apple island, advertises extensively throughout Australia. So, too, do the State of Excitement, Western Australia, which places considerable emphasis on drawing tourists to their State, as well as Queensland, the so-called Sunshine State, which is probably the leader in Australia on tourist activities and development, with Victoria coming close on its heels. The newest in the field is the Northern Territory, whose expenditure is growing fast, particularly with the introduction of new entertainment facilities in Alice Springs and Darwin.

If we accept the Queensland philosophy of the Gold Coast in particular, perhaps our development might include coastal redevelopment. Prime areas for this would perhaps be parts of Brighton, Henley Beach, Semaphore, and Tennyson. Many brochures, holiday papers, and periodicals produced by Queensland place great emphasis on beach-side high-rise apartment blocks and motels. Perhaps similar redevelopment is possible here. However, I suggest that the locations would need considerable consideration as regards transport corridors. In some of the areas to which I have referred there are existing rail links. In others, however, the routes and land are still held by the State Transport Authority, although no tracks exist at present. It would be possible to provide a futuristic system to fit in with the general concept and master plan of development.

The influx of such numbers in tourism will give rise to the need for investment by the State Government, by local and Australian entrepreneurs, and by foreign companies. I note that Queensland's latest development is largely financed by Japanese interests, with a view to attracting tourists from Japan. Obviously, to capture the investment funds and projects, it will be necessary to compete with other States in the race for those tourist dollars. Thus, some concessions will need to be thought out and offered quickly if we are to capture them.

This form of development will, of course, enable us to open up our interior and develop our superb coastal regions to attract the tourist dollar. In doing this, we can lend a thought to ways in which we could offer other entertainment attractions that would go hand in hand with many tourists. It would also mean that we would have a national road link of major proportions, which would be needed, thus giving us a series of four-lane to six-lane interstate and intrastate highways.

Adelaide Airport has, over the past few years, been the brunt of attacks, and some misconceptions have arisen as to its ability to cope with international departures and arrivals. The only real drawback and difficulty is in its limited handling facilities and buildings. At present, there are no facilities to cater for international arrivals or departures in relation to clearance through immigration

and customs formalities. However, it is envisaged that, in the near future, our domestic carriers will graduate to wide-bodied aircraft, and a redesign of facilities at Adelaide Airport will be necessary to cope with the number of passengers that those aircraft will carry. When that transpires, facilities could easily be made available for an upper and lower concourse and, ultimately, provisions could be made for separation of outgoing and incoming passengers, thus leading to the speedy handling of international traffic. The runways are long enough, and the volume of passenger traffic warrants international facilities.

At least 200 000 passengers per annum from South Australia already travel overseas, and the attraction to South Australia, of course, is to end the geographical disadvantage that we have in relation to both cost and destination. This development will help to solve many of our ills of unemployment, for the needs of visitors cannot be met by computers. It is easy to see that computers cannot look after people. The travel industry is a people industry—it needs people. It is not a fictitious pie in the sky business, but exists today.

In Britain last year, tourism was named the third largest industry, catering for about 11 000 000 visitors; in Italy, tourism was the major industry, catering for over 38 000 000 visitors. In the United States of America, tourism is regarded as one of the fastest growing industries and supplements the income on that country's balance of payments, to the degree that the American Government has moved to deregulate the airline industry to pave the way for cheaper air fares and better associated conditions. It is, therefore, only a matter of time before the winds of change reach over shores and tourism becomes the reality. The question of the level of fares is sometimes an issue within Australia. I point out that the fare level in Australia is equal to that in many other parts of the world. In fact, overseas visitors have a distinct advantage in the exchange rate to the dollar. For overseas visitors, our air fares are somewhat cheaper than what we would tend to think of them.

Finally, I say that we must wake up to the realisation of the potential of tourism or do something constructive, turn the lip service to constructive strides into the future, and ensure that this State takes the initiative in front of other States and leads the way into the eighties.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I support the motion. First, I congratulate all new members on both sides who have come into this House. Perhaps I should say that I believe that quite a few members on the opposite side will be only once-ers.

Mr. Gunn: You can live in hope.

Mr. SLATER: We can live in hope, that is true, but only time will tell. However, I do believe that many members opposite will be once-ers.

Mr. Gunn: A lot of your blokes who came in last time were once-ers.

Mr. SLATER: Yes, that is true. Circumstances change from election to election. I think it is a different ball game every time.

Mr. Gunn: Like Gilles.

Mr. SLATER: Gilles has been regarded as a marginal seat for the past five elections, but I have always been able successfully to counter the Opposition, and I have been returned on those five occasions. Gilles is still a marginal seat, but with a majority, I think, of about 5.6 per cent.

Mr. Max Brown: And represented by a good candidate.

Mr. SLATER: Thank you very much. First, I refer to the Governor's Speech, mention of which I understand is a little unusual in the Address in Reply; I think that not

many honourable member have referred to the Speech as yet. I know this debate is wide-ranging and many subjects are covered.

Mr. Max Brown: There wasn't very much in it, that's why.

Mr. SLATER: I will come to that.

Mr. Gunn: Better than two paragraphs.

Mr. SLATER: Of course, we know that the Governor is obliged to present the Speech, which is prepared by the Government of the day and is supposed to be a precis of the proposed legislative programme for the coming session. It is appreciated that the present Government had been in office only a short while prior to the House's being called together. The Speech gave little or no indication of proposed legislative initiatives, except in regard to taxation measures that were part of Liberal election policy and which have already passed this House. I was intrigued with the second part of the first paragraph of the Governor's Speech, which stated:

... my Government recognises that the prosperity and happiness of our community cannot rest wholly, or even mainly, upon Government initiatives of a legislative or administrative nature. To achieve this, all sections of our community must arrive at a larger vision of the true welfare and purpose of our society with its delicately balanced social, economic and legal structures. Only when we have achieved a general recognition, a general consensus, that we are all bound together by an essential commonality of interest and that, conversely, the forces that divide our community are based largely upon irrational prejudice, will the peace, harmony and prosperity of this State be firmly established upon a secure foundation.

I would like to analyse that statement; it calls for a commonality of interest, and a general consensus of opinion. This seems a rather strange statement when, in Opposition, the present Government, or most of its members, sought confrontation in our society rather than consensus—they sought to divide the community rather than unite it.

Perhaps what is really meant in the statement made in the Governor's Speech is that the Government seeks the acquiescence of the population to the demands of a privileged section of the community, but somehow the Government desires the compliance and acquiescence of the population generally for its own purpose. This consensus, this commonality of interest, may be only a guise to hide the real intentions of the Government. It may be an old conservative trick. I watched a television programme recently, in respect of happenings in the 1970's, showing an interview with the then newly elected British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher.

The same theme in her remarks brought to mind the statement in the Governor's Speech. It may be that it is a common thought that runs through conservative Parties once they are elected: "Please let us all work together for the harmony of the State and nation so that a few people can have the privileges which still exist." One has only to make a very cursory examination of the political history of this State to find that since the beginning privileges have existed for a certain section of the community, and they still exist today. In earlier days, of course, the power base rested with the landed gentry, and this existed for many years.

However, there has been a shift in power and a new elite and their representatives have arisen to gather the reins of power and, when the opportunity arises, they use that power ruthlessly, but in subdued and perhaps subtle ways, to retain their privileges. They control the real wealth of the community and all the modern means of communication, the media, and the supporters of the press. Before 15

September we witnessed the great degree of manipulation of the population generally. Unfortunately there is a class division, and there will always be a class division while there is such an inequality of distribution of wealth in the community. At one end of the social scale we have people on fixed incomes, pensioners, the unemployed, the bloke in industry, and the battler and his wife and family, who is employed on average or low incomes and faces the inevitability of increased costs and prices for the essentials of life. At the other end of the social scale there are those who can flit off at their whim to events of major significance such as the Melbourne Cup. One only has to look at some of the social pages in the press to see what I mean. Perhaps I should quote from the recent press, as follows:

Off, and running to the Cup. The gates are open, and they're off . . . the Adelaide racing fraternity for the Melbourne Cup festivities.

And a hectic time awaits them, beginning with the Victoria Racing Club Derby on Saturday, the Cup on Tuesday and the Oaks on Thursday. Not to mention all the parties slotted between. "This year seems even busier than usual, with no time left for private parties."

That was said by the wife of a prominent member of the community. I do not want to use names—

Mr. Max Brown: They were all workers!

Mr. SLATER: They were not all workers. I notice that their residences were at Toorak, Burnside, Medindie, and so on. I do not take away the right of people to enjoy themselves, but when we talk about a commonality of interests and consensus of opinion, we should remember there is one end of the social scale where people are battling to sustain their means of existence, and at the other end we have the socialites who can flit off to the Melbourne Cup. I think it is rather unfair that we talk about their having common interests.

The taxation measures in the Governor's Speech go towards the sorts of thing I have been speaking about. They assist in perpetuating the inequalities that exist in our society and benefit those more affluent members of that society. The shift in enterprise from the public to the private sector by the Tonkin Government, and the Federal Government, as I have mentioned before, will lead to what I would describe as public squalor and private wealth. We have all witnessed in the past few years the accentuation in the power play which exists in respect of various companies—the mergers and the takeovers, the company raiders and the power play on the stock exchange, which share purchasers designed to grab control of major industries, all in the name of private enterprise. Many of these activities have been by overseas and interstate interests, moving into South Australian industry. Consequently, decisions are no longer made in South Australia but they are made in the boardrooms of Sydney, Melbourne, London, New York, Tokyo, and so on. All this is in the name of private enterprise and good business.

The small business man within the State, endeavouring to compete against the giants, is easy prey for takeover or for being forced out of business by the larger combines. His real enemies are not the Labor Party and the trade union movement, as suggested by some members; they are overseas corporations whose tentacles reach out to embrace most of the important industries in this State and Australia. Let us take the food industry as an example. Both in manufacturing and retailing the market is largely in the hands of multi-national companies. In the manufacturing section one finds the big companies, Nabisco, Heinz, Edgell-Gerber, Kelloggs, giant American companies—

Mr. Lewis: Never heard of them.

Mr. SLATER: If the member for Mallee has never heard of them I think that it is about time he did a bit of a study and learnt about them, because they are multi-national companies in the manufacturing area.

Mr. Mathwin: He's a bacon and eggs man.

Mr. SLATER: You would probably find that the source of bacon and eggs companies is controlled by multi-nationals as well. The fast food retail industry has had a significant effect and has wrought a quiet revolution on Australia's eating habits. In this industry, the three major companies—Kentucky Fried Chicken, Pizza Hut and McDonald's—have a significant control of the fast food industry in Australia, and it is growing very rapidly. It has been stated that 25 per cent or 30 per cent of weekly food bills is now being spent on those fast foods. It is interesting to note that Kentucky Fried Chicken Proprietary Limited was the most profitable company in Australia after Utah Mining. These figures are from a consulting survey conducted in 1976. At that stage Colonel Sanders's Kentucky Fried Chicken was doing rather well, with a turnover of \$90 000 000. So it is the case that large international companies have gradually forced the smaller organisations into takeovers and mergers or into a situation in which they simply went out of business.

With regard to some of the manipulative aspects that occur in respect of consumer demand, most of us (even the member for Mallee) can recall the famous book, written some years ago, by America's Vance Packard. He wrote a number of books but the one he is most remembered for is *Hidden Persuaders*, which demonstrated the power of advertising. Originally, it was supposed to be a critique of the advertising industry, and Packard showed very clearly how the public were being manipulated. Of course, this science, if you could call it such, has progressed in its endeavours since that time.

It is now used politically by the electronic media and by the press to sell candidates and political Parties. We have had a recent example of how it was used with tremendous effect during the election in this State. It was also used effectively in the 1975 Federal election. The Liberal Party and its various supporting groups were able to utilise the media, and I take nothing away from that campaign, which was clever, sustained and concentrated. I understand that the Liberal Party sought professional advice, that it brought in a couple of top rating advertising people from Sydney and sought advice from them. It was a clever, concentrated and effective campaign; the results indicate that.

The Liberal Party also had other assistance, as I noted in the press recently, from a gentleman named the Hon. C. R. Story, the fourteenth Minister without portfolio. In reply to a question I asked last week I was told that Mr. Story is an executive assistant to the Premier with a salary of \$22 650 plus 25 per cent. I know also that he receives a Parliamentary superannuation, so no doubt not only is he the fourteenth Minister without portfolio but he is the highest paid of all Ministers. I understand he wields a tremendous influence not only now as a member of Cabinet without portfolio—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Where do you understand that from?

Mr. SLATER: It is fairly common knowledge around the place that Story is the power behind the throne, or perhaps the story behind the Leader. This was written by a political reporter only a few weeks ago. Among other things, the article in the *Advertiser* states:

Now, Mr. Story is the executive assistant to the Premier, Mr. Tonkin, and is regarded by most Liberals as the Party power broker—with only his boss having more influence.

I am surprised that the Minister of Transport should query that. The article continues:

Public servants regard him as a very senior and influential adviser to the Government. Mr. Story attends all meetings of the new State Cabinet in his capacity as minutes secretary.

I am not sure whether he takes shorthand; if the meetings last seven hours it must be fairly exhausting for him. \$50 000 a year as minutes secretary is not bad. The article continues:

He has therefore achieved a unique place in South Australian political history. No public servants or Liberal and Labor M.P.'s I spoke to this week could recall any officials—public servants or otherwise—being allowed to attend Cabinet meetings on a regular basis. While expressing surprise at the move, they also acknowledged that it is yet another example of Mr. Story's influence in the new Government hierarchy.

They also point out that his attendance at Cabinet meetings is not in breach of any Act or political convention. Cabinet is not a body recognised in any statute. It is really an informal body which advises Executive Council, and while Mr. Story can attend Cabinet meetings he can not attend any meetings of Executive Council.

This demonstrates that he is still a force, the power behind the scene, and he was particularly active and very effective in assisting the campaign the Liberals waged prior to the 15 September election. I do not deny them the opportunity to use the media, if it is used fairly and honestly, for political purposes. However, I am sure many of the decent members of the Government (and there are plenty of them), although they would no doubt not say it publicly, would feel some degree of remorse in regard to some of the advertisements that did appear. I thought those advertisements were most unfair. Unfortunately, in this State, like many parts of the world, we are getting to the stage where politics is becoming a little too dirty. I do not mind people using the media for reasonable advertisements but some of the advertisements were quite unrealistic and unfair. Nevertheless, the opportunity is there to be used by some unscrupulous people, and I do not think many members of the Liberal Party supported that type of campaign. At least I would like to think that was the case.

It was a concentrated, clever and effective campaign, nothing more and nothing less, and all the advantages lay with the Liberal Party for having the resources, the control of the media and the help of persons with expertise in advertising. Every election is difficult, as are football matches; you win by 20 goals one week and, when things do not go right, you lose by 20 goals the next week. Many of the new members in this House will no doubt be oncers.

I have noted also recently in the press that the Acting General Manager (Mr. T. Farrell) of John Fairfax and Sons has diagnosed a communications cancer spreading throughout public life. He was critical of the type of manipulation that I have mentioned previously which has been in vogue for some time in advertising overseas and to some degree here, and it is fast developing here because we follow overseas patterns in that regard. Mr. Farrell expressed his concern about the manipulation, and ironically, an article appeared in the *News*, in a leader headed, "The right to know". The leader stated:

An Australian newspaper executive yesterday diagnosed a communications cancer spreading through our public life. Mr. Tom Farrell, Acting General Manager for John Fairfax and Sons, criticised the emergence of the mouthpiece, the anonymous spokesman who in words or handouts tries to put the best gloss on things, to mask or conceal the truth.

A politician feels naked these days without his press

secretary about his person. The business executive is shielded from the nose y hoi polloi by his public affairs director. We live in an age of managed news, of puffery and artificial pseudo-events. More serious still are the legal constraints—the laws of defamation, the gagging of public servants—which hamstring free and frank publication of matters of public interest even inquiry into them. Mr. Farrell tartly observed that in Australia today a Watergate would be more likely to see the reporters go to jail than the perpetrators. This State has not escaped the contagion. Indeed, the previous government gave a new dimension to the concept of the press secretary and, now in Opposition has for the first time ever, given its leader specific responsibility for the media.

As Mr. Farrell perceived, all of this has grave implications. What is at stake is not whether journalists find it easy or hard to do their jobs, whether they have to part a veil or smash an iron curtain to get to the facts. What is at stake is your right to know. It is the principle of public accountability which is being steadily eroded in Australia. It is not the newspapers, the radio and television stations that are being manipulated. You are.

Mr. Farrell was making the point that the public is subject to manipulation in many ways, including manipulation for political purposes. His remarks brought a response from people involved in public relations. The president of the Public Relations Institute of South Australia wrote to the press, denying that the public relations services were involved in the type of manipulation suggested by Mr. Farrell. I shall not read his letter, but obviously the public relations people are anxious to preserve their interests in utilising the advertising media to sell a product, a candidate, or a political Party. Of course, it is good business and quite lucrative for them if they can do it. Gallup polls generally can be unpredictable. The only real poll is the one held on election day.

Mr. Hemmings: And that's sometimes false.

Mr. SLATER: That is true, but the only poll that counts is the one held on election day. The results of a Gallup poll reported in this week's *Bulletin* indicate that the Labor Party in this State (I am speaking from memory) has a 49 per cent approval rate, while the Liberal Party has an approval rate of only 40 per cent, which is a far different situation from that which existed only six weeks ago.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Didn't they have a poll before the election?

Mr. SLATER: Various polls were taken prior to the election, but one conducted some months previously indicated a situation similar to the one now existing. The situation can change quite dramatically. The Minister of Transport would be aware that his electorate was the subject of a poll conducted a week or so before the election. It indicated that at that time the Liberal Party would receive an increase of 6 per cent to 7 per cent in its vote. The following week, the situation had changed, and the difference in some cases was 12 per cent or 13 per cent.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The further out it got from the metropolitan area.

Mr. SLATER: True, but it was taken a week or so before the election, and even that did not indicate the true result.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Was the *Bulletin* poll a significant one? I am wondering about the size of the sample.

Mr. SLATER: It was significant.

Dr. Hoppood: It ties in pretty well with the *Age* poll. It was 38 per cent, and not 40 per cent, for the Liberal Party plus the National Country Party.

Mr. SLATER: I thank the member for Baudin for his

assistance. I do not rely entirely on the Gallup poll to say that the Tonkin Government is having difficulty in correcting many of the things it criticised in relation to the previous Government. Although in Opposition it made some rash and irresponsible statements on various aspects of public expenditure, I am sure the Tonkin Government is finding that it is much more difficult to accept the reins of office and to do something than it is to criticise, and perhaps the chickens are coming home to roost. The Premier might bluster—

The Hon M. M. Wilson: He's doing very well.

Mr. SLATER: He blusters very well. He seems to adopt a rather condescending and patronising attitude. He can bluster, and his Minister can find excuses and procrastinate, but the test will be whether they honour their obligations and the promises made prior to the election. I think they are running into difficulty and, as time goes by, the public will become increasingly aware of the Government's inability to deliver the goods.

The Government's emphasis on the private sector will lead to increasing difficulties in the public sector. We are facing that situation at the moment, and we will see a decline, in favour of private wealth, in relation to health, hospitals, education, community welfare, housing, and all aspects of welfare to the average person. South Australia is dependent, for economic viability, on markets in other States, and if the economy is to be restored, it will not be restored by the Tonkin Government. The national economy is vital to South Australia, which has always been extremely vulnerable to economic fluctuations in other States. We are dependent on markets in the Eastern States to sell our manufactured goods—consumer durable goods, white goods, motor vehicles, and so on.

It has been said many times that, if the Australian economy were to catch a cold, South Australia would get pneumonia. That has happened over the past couple of years, and we need a national revival, a re-emphasis of priorities by the Fraser Government, to restore the economic climate in this and other States. Perhaps we need more equitable distribution of the good things of life, the wealth of the country, if we are to achieve, as the Governor's Speech suggests, a commonality of interest and a consensus.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr. McRae): This is the honourable member for Henley Beach's maiden speech. Therefore, I ask the House to extend the usual courtesies.

Mr. RANDALL (Henley Beach): Thank you, Mr. Acting Speaker. I support the motion before the House. I must say, in commencing my speech, that I am disappointed that the members for Albert Park, Florey, Peake and Ascot Park are not in the House. During a grievance debate, I indicated that I was a union member and displayed my union membership card in the House. Within two days of displaying that card I received a letter from my union requesting return of that card and my resignation. I am no longer a member of that union. I want to know from those gentlemen whether they have retained their union memberships. One of the problems in our society today is that unions are being used as a political tool of the Labor Party. They are seen to be representative of only one Party. It becomes a bit of a problem for the union movement when members of unions say that they are members of the Liberal Party. I had problems when it became known to my union that I was a Liberal Party candidate. Whenever I spoke at union meetings there was a hue and cry because a Liberal candidate dared to speak at a union meeting and dared express an opposite viewpoint. That is the problem with unions today; they are not prepared to listen to the alternative viewpoint. They

are prepared to go along on one track, hear only one side of the story and listen to the propaganda of the leaders of unions.

As I have said before, the challenge to the union movement is not to the leaders but to the members. That was a challenge I undertook in my past union, and I believe other members are now undertaking it, to get the members to participate in their affairs. I encourage members of unions to do likewise, to get into their unions, to participate and let alternative viewpoints be heard so that rational decisions can be made. I believe that is what democracy is all about.

It is almost traditional in maiden speeches for a member to present a picture of his electorate. The electorate of Henley Beach is bounded on the western side by the sea, and on the other sides by Trimmer Parade, Findon Road and the delightful boundary of the Torrens River stretching down to the sea. I have worked in that area as a councillor on the Henley and Grange council. My work in the area led to my involvement in various activities.

I want today to bring before the House some of those activities as points on which I hope to elaborate in years to come and which I believe need to be considered. One of the peculiarities of the electorate of Henley Beach is that it has traditionally had an older population. The Henley Beach and Grange suburbs are well established, but today we see a shift in population as the older people die or move into different forms of accommodation and young people buy their old homes and restore them. It is one of the policies of this Government to encourage couples to buy homes in inner metropolitan areas. I believe that, in future, this Government will support young couples in their purchase of established homes. It will give them encouragement, as it has done already in its policy announcements.

On 15 September, history was made in the seat of Henley Beach because, since its inception (when it was known as the West Torrens District) in 1918, until 15 September 1979 it was a Labor seat. Today I stand proudly in this House as the first Liberal representative for the seat of Henley Beach. I believe that this will be an on-going event for Henley Beach, because we will provide much-needed services and input to that area.

As a member of the council in that area I have heard over the years that there have been problems in the inner metropolitan area, particularly in the western region of Adelaide. One has only to reflect on the stories that were told about libraries before they were introduced into the area. It was said that the western region had been missing out. That was because the members representing the area did not meet the challenges in that area that were there for them to take up. I believe that there are still challenges for me to take up on behalf of my electorate.

I listened with interest to my colleagues' speeches and to the points that they made. I support their approach. Instead of going over old ground, espousing the Liberal philosophy and encouraging members opposite to participate in that philosophy, I hope to bring forward what are new thoughts. Reinhold Niebuhr in *Nature and Destiny of Man*, states:

Man's ability to transcend the flux of nature gives him the capacity to make history. Human history is rooted in the natural process but it is something more than either the determined sequences of natural causation or the capricious variations and occurrences of the natural world. It is compounded of natural necessity and human freedom. Man's freedom to transcend the natural flux gives him the possibility of grasping a span of time in his consciousness and thereby of knowing history. It also enables him to change,

reorder and transmit the causal sequences of nature and thereby to make history.

As a new member of this House one, at times, is overwhelmed by the history that surrounds one. One has only to look at the walls of the Chamber to see the portraits of wellknown political figures from the history of South Australia; one has only to look at the bookshelves surrounding one in the House recording the numerous debates that have taken place in previous years; one has only to open those books to read what has been contributed by representatives of the people of South Australia in years gone by, as they have made their mark on history. I am proud to be the member for Henley Beach, making my mark on the history of South Australia today.

I turn now to my involvement in local government and some of the issues I perceive in that field. I believe that local government is the best form of government for the people at the grass-roots level because it reflects the people's desires, aspirations and needs within a community and because its representatives are closest to the people (purely because of the numbers). The Liberal Party's philosophy and policy regarding local government states:

The Liberal Government will continue to recognise local government as an independent, autonomous sphere of Government and will ensure that local government is recognised in the State Constitution.

Encourage maximum community participation in local government.

Oppose the use of local government as a tax collection agency for State Government.

Support the principle of providing local government with annual untied grants to be distributed through the Local Government Grants Commission.

Wherever appropriate, utilise the services and facilities of State Government to assist the work of local government.

Recognise the special needs of those outback areas which are not covered by the Local Government Act.

Abolish the compulsory local government hospital levy.

Ensure that community development is the responsibility of local government and that community development boards report to their respective local councils.

My involvement in local government has seen the operation of community development boards that were set up by the previous Government, and this is a step to be commended. However, the problem was that those representative of the community development boards were beginning to take over the role of local councillors and aldermen. They were beginning to express their viewpoints, which covered a much wider sphere and which sometimes traversed local government boundaries. They became representatives of groups covering not only one council area but many other areas. The problem was that local government began to feel threatened. In doing that, those boards issued a challenge to local government which, I believe, in the 1980's it will take up.

That challenge is that members of local government must be more aware of the social implications of their planning, the social needs of their community, and the desires and aspirations within that community. Those desires and aspirations often tend to be in the areas of library services, community development, the arts, recreation, and needs for sporting complexes and community centres. They are the needs the community requires of local government. We, as a Government, will sponsor and support local government to take up the initiatives. Having been provided with the challenge, local government will, I am sure, facilitate the provision of the necessary services.

The policy of local government calling for the abolition

of the hospital levy is one which, I am sure, local government will be extremely pleased to hear. When one sees the sum poured in and collected by local government from its ratepayers and residents, and when the levies imposed by this Government or past Governments in the form of hospital levies are abolished, I am sure that local government will breathe more easily when rating time arrives. The problem with taxes in this State was that not only was the State collecting taxes but also local government was collecting on the State's behalf. The problem came about whereby young couples were purchasing homes, committing themselves to first and second mortgages, living on a tight budget, and then along came the taxes, which increased over a period to the extent that it became a problem for them to exist on their income. Naturally, they called for a higher income; hence, the wage spiral.

The other area of local government with which I have become increasingly aware is the need to look at our limited resources in the metropolitan area, one of which is the land on which we build homes. We have tended to control the building industry by regulation to the extent that, I believe, we have come close to over-regulation, whereby development has been hindered by rules and regulations so that initiative and creativity were hindered in the community, and private enterprise could no longer feel free to invest money to launch out into new creative projects, because of the fear of local government and State Government control on such projects.

During the next few minutes, I will quote from a document entitled "Privacy in compact housing", as follows:

Rising land and building costs have made the availability of single family housing prohibitive to a wide section of our population. In response, new and relatively unfamiliar compact housing concepts have made their appearance as a more economical substitute for the traditional single family housing form. Savings in land, materials and unit labour costs bring these more compact units within the reach of many families who cannot afford single family housing.

The document referred to the problems as follows:

The lack of privacy and the inability to shape one's home environment are dominant concerns. Poor sound insulation, blocked views, overlooking neighbours, lack of outside space, impersonal design and minimal opportunities to reshape either interior or exterior space to suit individual temperament are major contributors to the belief that compact housing cannot offer families the same degree of privacy and satisfaction that is found in the traditional family house.

In an attempt to achieve minimum standards of quality, Government and municipal agencies have placed extensive and, in many cases, rigid controls on new development. These standards, codes and by-laws, while meant to assure a minimum level of amenity, have too often become the rule of the day for most developers and a straight-jacket for the good ideas of others. There are, moreover, few incentives in the present housing market for more satisfactory alternatives to evolve. With demand running far ahead of supply, the most imaginative builder can expect rewards no greater than the least imaginative. Indeed, he may be financially punished for his efforts if his costs rise above average. The prospect is clear: More of the same.

I believe that it has been one of the concerns that has been emphasised throughout the community and to us as local government members, because we see the need to experiment with homes. We have seen the need for architectural design to take place in the area of solar heating and of concepts of heating and cooling in homes, both of which had not been thought of as recently as 10

years ago. Architects are reticent about designing homes incorporating what might be termed way-out ideas, because often the potential buyer is frightened off by something new. The challenge for the 1980's is to encourage architectural experimentation so as to save energy in our homes. In so doing, I believe that we will face the 1980's with some resounding decisions to be made, as a Government and as a regulator. We need to provide to the building industry not regulations, but broad guidelines on what we see as the community needs, so that we do not inhibit creativity.

When we talk about privacy in homes, we talk about the home as the place where the public is excluded and where individuality flourishes, as has been reflected in all societies and cultures. Although the design and planning varies enormously, there is always a public community aspect and a private aspect to a residence. The Arabian house is traditionally surrounded by a high wall defining the property; the doorway through the wall is small and protected, with no visual connection between the home and the street. A home without a wall would be unheard of in the Arab world—they would experience no privacy whatsoever. In Japan, the house may be integrated with a beautiful garden, but again a large wall separates the house and garden from the public world. Such a wall is essential for the privacy of the family.

The Hawaiian house owner exhibits a different attitude towards privacy. A cluster of from six to 10 small houses share common green space. There are no fences between the houses and there is a liberal definition of private territory. Interaction between adjacent families and social custom is not seen as loss of privacy. What is clear from such a study is that, although there are great differences between cultures, with any one culture the pattern is rigidly adhered to. It is also clear that any change in the balance of these three elements within a culture comes slowly. Again, the demonstration that we see in our own community is the change in lifestyle, the change in lay-out of suburban communities, which comes very slowly.

One sees from experience that, should this new concept of cluster housing be talked about within the community, there will be those who oppose it, not on the grounds of non-recognition of the concept but because of fear. That arises because cluster housing will bring into the community a new lifestyle, which will enable people to have a small private area for a home and backyard, but the front area will be joined together as a common community area (a public area) and they will share reserves; a reserve in the centre of the community will become the community reserve.

One of the problems may be that those outside the community may look in and see a better community than they themselves live in; these people may then become concerned. The other problems with community housing relate to its design. The applicants are required to provide all services—post boxes, milk collection agencies and garbage collection points. These must be at a common point in cluster housing developments, because private contractors and postmen will not venture on to private property. That problem of cluster housing needs to be examined and overcome.

If we look towards the solution, we find that two principles could be laid down as guidelines. Every housing development must show a clear delineation of the land as private, semi-public and public areas. As in a single family house, the balance must be weighted in favour of private areas, and a clear definition of personal territory must be possible. I believe that that is one of the principles which, if applied to cluster housing in South Australia, will begin to move that concept in the community.

The other principle that I believe we should look at is that every housing development must offer a means by which the residents can control the design, development, alteration and maintenance of the home environment. That issue needs to be looked at in establishing cluster housing development. We need to provide incentives whereby people can sit down, design and be part of the whole design concept in the initial stages, instead of their being outside the area of subdividing, building and selling the houses. If people are involved in the design of the house in which they will live, they will look forward to living there and will have a greater input at a much earlier stage. They will enjoy the creativity and satisfaction that comes with the design.

We must provide guidelines. The establishment of each guideline must take a positive form, such as, what to do in a situation and how to avoid a problem. This advice must be stated in a way that will suggest a solution to the problem faced on site. A guideline is a suggestion, a push in the right direction. A guideline must, therefore, be generative; it must generate a unique solution. Again, the problem that one sees with local government involvement as a councillor is that over the years so many rules and regulations have been built up that the potential builder, the person with any form of creativity, is scared off. If broadly-based guidelines are provided, the potential of encouraging creativity will be restored.

I now move to another area in which I have been involved in the local community as a representative to a committee that was concerned with the Torrens River development. I have been involved with the Torrens River Development Committee and have seen over the years the frustration of that committee and a long protracted survey after which solutions were put forward, plans were drawn, but nothing was done. I, and the members of that committee, believe that the Torrens River offers a beautiful and large recreation area for the city of Adelaide and for the suburban areas of Adelaide. The area should have increased usage, and small lakes should be created so that local residents can participate in boating activities. The banks of the river should be grassed, and trees should be planted so that people can walk under the trees and enjoy the beauty of the river. Cycleways should be set up, as has been done in certain areas, whereby people may cycle to work along the banks of the Torrens.

I am also concerned with the Coast Protection Board. I was involved in a consultative committee in that regard, and I saw some councils take up the challenge of sand control. It concerned me then, and it still concerns me, that a large sum of money is spent in shifting sand from one end of the beach to another with the result that this sand, in a few months time, is washed up again. I believe that there are more economical means by which to control sand in the metropolitan area. If we encourage local councils in regard to sand drift fencing programmes, and if we provide money and encouragement for that new concept in sand control, the sand drift may be stopped. I call that concept new, although I believe that it is an old concept; in the country, it can be seen that bushes often blow up against farmers' fences, sand is caught, and the fence becomes covered with sand. This principle has been applied to the metropolitan beaches, particularly the areas which I represent and which I have represented as a councillor—the Henley and Grange council area adjacent to the Torrens River outlet.

Over a number of years, I have seen the council begin to build fences; those fences have been covered, and fences have been built on top of fences until the sand dunes in the area have been restored. That is a system whereby sand is collected without the involvement of mechanical forces,

and in time nature stacks up sand against the fences. The sandhills are restored, and they become the insurance of the esplanade that they protect. I have also seen storms eat into the sandhills. That sand needs to be part of the system; it is a fluid system. Sand is not meant to be locked away for people to build nice pretty sandhills. The natural system of moving sand must be maintained. As we know, sand moves from south to north. We need to encourage councils to maintain and build sand drift fencing in their areas, not only to restore the sand dunes but also to keep a fluid sand system going.

Regarding both the Torrens River and the Coast Protection Board, I intend to follow through my beliefs and the beliefs held by many constituents in my area. I believe that there are some constituents in my area who would join a "Save our Sand" group and who are concerned with Government policies regarding Coast Protection Board activities. These constituents will participate with the Government in talks on sand saving programmes.

I move now to an area with which I am reasonably familiar because of my involvement in Telecom as a technician in the electronics field. I come out of that area that I have seen during my period of training. When I trained in the area of electronics, I trained on the electron valve. I then moved to the area of transistor training. Before my election I had been involved in the area of the electronic integrated circuit and micro-processor-type circuitry. Having in my short time of 15 years moved through that sphere, I have had to cope as a person and an individual with many changes. One has learned to see the changes that are taking place in that area. I believe that, if one looks at the new technology question, one sees that the problem in the community is not of how one looks at the question but of our attitude; one can take either a positive or a negative approach attitude. I listened to the maiden speech of one of the members opposite, and he related to us his attitude towards a film which he saw of the problems of new technology and its impact on the community. I consider the attitude that the film put forward to be a negative attitude and a form of propaganda in which I believe that the honourable member has become caught up. I believe we have to take a new look at technology, identify the problem areas, and then move positively. I shall quote from a submission which has been made to a committee of inquiry into technological change in Australia. It is a submission forwarded to that committee from the Federated Clerks Union of Australia. I found it interesting to read, because it puts forward some points with which I identify. Before I move into that area, I would like to read to the House the terms of reference of that committee so that they may be understood. They are as follows:

The committee is to examine and report and make recommendations on the process of technological change in Australian industry in order to maximise economic, social and other benefits and minimise any possible adverse consequences. In particular the committee is to

(a) identify:

(i) technological change which is occurring or is likely to occur in Australia; and

(ii) new technologies which have the potential for substantial impact in Australia;

and to conduct detailed studies of those areas identified as the most important in order to evaluate the likely effects.

(b) examine relevant overseas experience and studies of technological change, and to assess mechanisms used to introduce and evaluate new technologies;

(c) review the effectiveness of Government policies and

programmes in facilitating the introduction of new technology.

I point out to those in the House who may not be aware of this that that committee was recently established by the Fraser Government. It comprises members from various aspects of the community, including one member who I knew as a former member of the union of which I was a member.

In putting forward their submission under the title "Consultation or confrontation", the following point is made in an article by John Maynes published in *The Australian Engineer*:

The question responsible unions must face up to is whether they are going to allow the problems to multiply to the stage where they lend themselves to exploitation culminating in an explosive situation, or whether they take action now to force all interested parties to the conference table while problems are still manageable and there is sufficient time to discuss and solve future issues before they become problems. The responsibility of the unions to the community must force them to the latter course if there is not a dramatic change in the apparently *laissez-faire* attitude of Governments and managements to the question.

It is important for the proper development of Australia that all sections of the community insist upon proper consultation at all levels to ensure that they receive the fruits which would flow to them and, at the same time, to ensure that avoidable and unnecessary hardships for individuals is not countenanced.

It is not too late for joint consultation, but it is indeed getting very late in the day.

That is the concern shared by many members of the community in relation to technology. I believe that this Government has the right attitude to the problems, I believe that it has been demonstrated through the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the Government is prepared to consult with all members of the community. Consultation instead of confrontation provides a better community—a community whereby people feel less threatened, feel that they are listened to, and the individual feels that he is an individual in the community and that he has some worth to contribute to that community. When Governments and big business do not listen to the individual, confrontation takes place. I believe that, in the past decade, confrontation has been the major element in the community. The challenge for the Liberal Party in the 1980's is for consultation whereby all members of the community can sit down at the conference table and express their viewpoint, and we as a Party can learn which way to go from such consultation.

Queen Juliana of The Netherlands with reference to technology, said, "I can't understand it. I can't even understand those who can understand it." That is one of the problems in our community today. We tend to talk in terminology with which the general members of the community are not familiar and cannot understand. They become confused and, where there is misunderstanding and confusion, fear remains predominant.

Robert Noyce, a pioneer of integrated circuitry, made these points:

The evolution of electronics technology over the past decade has been so rapid that it is sometimes called a revolution. Is this large claim justified? I believe the answer is "yes". It is true that what we have seen here has been to some extent a steady, quantitative evolution: smaller and smaller electronic components performing increasingly complex electronic functions at ever higher speeds and at ever lower cost. And yet there has also been a true revolution: a qualitative change in technology, the integrated

microelectronic circuit has given rise to a qualitative change in human capabilities.

That is the challenge that faces us in the future. Our lifestyles are going to change, and they are going to be made easier as far as our labour goes—maybe not for the politician but for the person who works in an everyday office situation. His lifestyle will change, because he will have machines and his capabilities, and they will make his physical and mental activities increasingly easier. He will go home from work refreshed instead of being under a heavy work load, and he will have more time to spend on leisure at community facilities—if we continue to provide those community facilities. Robert Noyce continues:

Today's microcomputer, at a cost of perhaps \$300, has more computing capacity than the first large electronic computer, ENIAC. It is 20 times faster, has a larger memory, is thousands of times more reliable, consumes the power of a light bulb rather than that of a locomotive, occupies 1/30 000 the volume and costs 1/10 000 as much. It is available by mail order, or at your local hobby shop.

That is a new challenge with which we are going to be faced, because computers are coming into the home. They are allowing men and women to express their creativity in a new form. That is the challenge that social scientists must take up and the challenge that we as politicians must look at. What are the implications of leisure centres in our community where only electronic games are played? What is the challenge in homes which are controlled by computers? Will we provide such facilities as link-ups to educational institutions whereby the home becomes the learning place, thus isolating people from the community? Mr. Noyce also said:

It has often been said that, just as the Industrial Revolution enabled man to apply and control greater physical power than his own muscle could provide, so electronics has extended his intellectual power. Microelectronics extends that power still further.

I believe that in the years to come we will see that demonstration becoming clearer and clearer, if we have not seen it at this stage.

Under the heading "Economics and the evaluation of the Australian situation", the submission from the Federated Clerks Union of Australia states:

Australia has suffered economic difficulties along with most other mature economies, although for different reasons. By virtue of local oil supplies, the price of which was fixed by the Gorton Government Australia was largely insulated from the effects of the OPEC price rises in the period under review. Australia also enjoyed an abundance of food and land. In the period under review, basic prices were more stable than in European and North American economies dependent on imported oil. Australia's problems were therefore largely home-grown in origin.

These critical years were 1973-74 when prices and wages jumped dramatically. In Australia's case, this was the primary cause of the "take-off" in inflation and unemployment. To this can be added the rising levels of international costs, the Whitlam Government's 25 per cent across-the-board tariff cuts of June 1973 and the accumulating effects of technological change. The tariff cuts sealed the fate of Australia's manufacturing industry, particularly in textiles, clothing and footwear, which was already declining as an important employer of labour.

Coinciding with the period of falling job opportunities, the increase in female participation in the labour force can have only one effect, even higher rates of unemployment. I wish to demonstrate from figures that the work force has changed; the component of the work force has varied and it might need to be reassessed again. First, the work force has been growing at a rate greater than that of the overall

population. This means that a large proportion of the population is now seeking employment. The increase has largely been accounted for by the increase and the participation in the work force of married women enticed originally into the work force by employers in need of labour, and now determined to stay, for a variety of economic and personal reasons. Between May 1965 and May 1978, the male labour force increased by 762 400 and the female labour force increased by 963 100. Of the additional 135 600 persons in paid employment between May 1975 and May 1977, 116 400 were female and only 19 200 were male. When one looks at the charts in this submission one finds that, of the labour force of 2 321 400 females, 62 per cent are married women. I do not condemn married women for working, but I believe that we as a community are faced with an issue which must be resolved. Are people under 21, our young unemployed people, unemployed sometimes at double the overall unemployment rate, being done out of jobs because of our inclination to employ married women in the labour force? Is the dual-income family succeeding in acquiring material goods and high income at the expense of our young people and their jobs? The report states:

Those who advocate increased Government spending to create demand often forget that the Federal Government has been pouring massive amounts of money into the economy through Budget deficits over the past few years. This has not resulted in the creation of sufficient jobs despite the deficits being in the order of \$3 000 000 000 or more. Increases in the level of deficit spending may also be counter-productive with a new inflationary spiral resulting. The conclusion appears to be that even a level of Government spending which risked creating further inflationary expectations would not remedy the unemployment problem.

So much for those who advocate increased Government spending in the community to create jobs. In relation to technology, I wish to refer briefly to a report published by Telecom Australia entitled *Telecom 2000*. The report states:

In literature about the future, two opposed approaches emerge. One is a deterministic view. This holds that the future is determined by the past and hence could, in principle, be forecast given sufficient past data and the tools to interpret it. In this view, events as complex as the weather could be forecast with increasing accuracy and increasingly into the future—given enough meteorological data, a body of weather-prediction theory and data-processing power.

At the other extreme is the view that the future doesn't exist and cannot be forecast but, paradoxically, it can be created. On this view—the normative view—forecasting is scanning possible futures and selecting the one desired. Planning, on this approach, is "making it happen". It is, perhaps, epitomised by President Kennedy's normative, "self-fulfilling" forecast that a man would be placed on the moon by 1970.

Both approaches are valid only within their defined system boundaries; external intervention by acts of God or man plays havoc with both deterministic and normative models. Again, neither view adequately copes with the elusive but central issue of the continuous interaction between the forecast environment and the life within it.

When we are looking into the future it will be interesting to see what view we will take, whether we are taking the negative approach whereby we believe we have all the answers and we can design everything from an electronic or deterministic point of view, or whether we believe in the normative view. The report continues:

Because of the strongly polarised views which are held about technology in our society, and particularly because of

the fears that are always in evidence when telecommunications technology is discussed, any attempt at secrecy in planning will be perceived by many people as a deliberate attempt at manipulation and will be resisted. The experience of urban developers with community resistance and urban "green-bans" should be a stimulus to open planning, which can now be justified not only on the grounds of social theory but also by pragmatic reality. If people are involved in the long-term consequences of any planning study, there are strong arguments for their further involvement in that study—especially if they are expected to act responsibly towards that system when it is developed.

Our challenge, as members of both Parties, is to become involved in the planning for the 1980's, to become involved in democracy in this House in expressing our point of view, and to come to a solution which we believe will be of benefit to this community.

Earlier, the member for Brighton introduced the new technology problem, and gave us a look into the 1980's and the area of tourism. I believe that therein lie many challenges for us as a community to take up and as a Government to look at. It has often been said to me in the Liberal Party that I do not care for trade unions. I want to reaffirm today that I was proud to be a trade union member, that I believe trade unions have a role to play in the new technology debate, just as management and Government have roles to play. I want to reaffirm to the people of South Australia and to people in my district that trade unions can play a positive role, given the opportunity and responsibility. People of my district and of South Australia and members of trade unions must take up their responsibility. As members of unions they must take up this responsibility, such as attending union meetings and not just letting the few run the meetings, dictating the policies and the guidelines. They must look closely at their union involvement with political Parties. I believe trade unions were never set up to become tools of political Parties.

In the closing minutes available to me, I should like to move to another area of interest, and to express my recognition of what the past Government has done for community broadcasting, in providing finance to enable the establishment of community stations in future. The Liberal Party has supported those projects, and in this year's Budget \$60 000 was provided for community radio, \$20 000 for Ethnic Broadcasters, and a further \$30 000 for Progressive Music Broadcasters Association. All of those groups are using this new form of technology, community-type involvement in broadcasting, and they will be ongoing groups in this community, with the continuing support of the present Government.

The guidelines of the Progressive Music Broadcasters Association reveal that broadcasting in the community of Adelaide is about to take a new shape. I was privileged last week to look through the station and see the hard work that is going on to establish a community broadcasting station. It will be established in the frequency modulation (F.M.) broadcasting area, and will provide the community with a high quality signal, a stereo signal, so that the station will be able to provide high quality programmes to the community. Because it is funded largely from public moneys, it has responsibilities to this Parliament; the people should be involved, because their money has set up the station. The Broadcasting Association has recognised this.

One of the guidelines of the Broadcasting Association is to complement, supplement, and not to seek to compete with existing national and commercial radio stations in Adelaide with respect to contemporary and traditional music, including music of particular interest to women,

young people from various ethnic communities, and folk and jazz enthusiasts. Those jazz enthusiasts will have their programmes, and people who wish to listen to ethnic music will be able to hear it for periods of time. They will now be catered for.

The second guideline is for the station to provide an opportunity for groups, associations, and individuals in Adelaide to produce or present original music or spoken word programmes. That is a challenge in which we have been assisted by the previous Government in providing the community of Adelaide with opportunities for people to make up programmes and to use their own creativity, so that their programmes and their music may be heard by a wider audience. The station is to promote Adelaide musicians and performers by providing facilities for live or recorded broadcasts of their work. It is to exceed at all times the minimum Australian content regulation applying to radio broadcasters. That is an interesting concept; in listening to that station, one will find most of the content to be Australian-based.

Other guidelines are to provide the community with an opportunity to acquire skills in broadcasting techniques; to actively discourage the broadcast of material which is sexist, racist, or which explicitly promotes specific political Parties; to solicit criticism from its listeners on air and maintain a publicly available register of these criticisms and responses to it. I will not cover the other guidelines, but one can see the scope for such a station, and this again is a challenge to the community. If the community does not accept the challenge and support the station, the station will not continue to exist; its existence depends on participation within the community, so that people must be prepared to support it financially and by listening to it.

We are providing \$20 000 to Ethnic Broadcasters, an incorporated group which is about to set up a radio station in Adelaide. In one year, we are to have a flood of radio stations being set up to cater for the needs of the people. Ethnic Broadcasters will take up the challenge to the various community groups. It will be interesting to see how the station copes with providing the various groups with the material required. One of its guidelines is to recognise the cultural plurality of Australia, and so the station shall aim to give the fullest expression to the developing aspirations and diverse cultures of the South Australian people. The previous Government and the present Government have taken up the challenge of recognition of the various ethnic groups.

I have always maintained that the ethnic groups need to be recognised and encouraged to maintain their creativity and their traditions, as well as becoming part of the Australian community. They need to be recognised for who they are. Recently, I had the delightful experience of attending a Greek function, at which I learnt Greek dancing. I found this an exhilarating exercise, quite different from the traditional dancing with which one grows up. It was an enjoyable and exciting occasion. I look forward to visiting the various cultural groups in my area to gain an understanding of both the Greek and Italian communities, which are strongly represented in my district.

I am interested in moving into the high schools, to see the work done there, and to see the support that is needed throughout the Henley Beach community. I am proud to have been elected as the member for the district, and I look forward to the challenges that my election will provide. As elected members, we are not here to look after the interests only of those who have elected us. I state unequivocally that I am here to represent all the people of the Henley Beach electorate, whether they agree with me or whether they disagree with me. I

represent the community as a whole and, given the opportunity, I hope that the people of Henley Beach will give me the chance to meet them so that they can be strongly represented in this House.

Dr. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on election to your high office. In view of the number of times I have spoken in this Chamber since this Parliament has been in session, it may seem a rather belated congratulation. However, with the limited time in an adjournment debate or in a normal debate, one tends to begrudge any time devoted to other than the immediate task at hand. Knowing that I had an hour available in the Address in Reply debate, I thought that seemed the appropriate time to extend my congratulations to you.

I also congratulate my two colleagues who opened this debate for the Opposition. I refer, of course, to the member for Salisbury and the member for Playford, and I congratulate them on the very lucid way in which they followed through their arguments and the way in which they were able to explain the basis of their philosophies. I was especially interested to note that both claim an adherence to the Christian tradition. I claim that same adherence, and from time to time clergymen friends of mine have told me that the more conservative members of their congregations often have the view that Labor people generally are agnostic in their approach to religious matters. We need only point out that already in this debate from this side of the House we have had persons claiming allegiance to the Quaker tradition, the Roman Catholic tradition, and now the Uniting Church.

I was also interested to note the quotation of the member for Henley Beach from Reinhold Niebuhr. Professor Niebuhr is one whose writings have had considerable influence on my thoughts. I wonder whether they have had considerable influence on the thoughts of the member for Henley Beach because, if so, I marvel that he is sitting on the side of the House on which he is sitting. I invite the honourable member if he has not done so, to go to the Parliamentary Library and borrow *Moral Man, an Immoral Society*, which is, perhaps, Professor Niebuhr's best known work, and read it from cover to cover, because I think there would then be a fair chance that the seat of Henley Beach would return to the Labor fold prior to the next election rather than following it.

So far as the other speeches were concerned from members opposite, I thought by far (and possibly I will be severely embarrassing the honourable gentleman by saying this) the best contribution was made by the member for Brighton. I have not yet had the chance to examine in detail and evaluate all he said in relation to tourism in this State. One would imagine, at first blush, that there is a good deal of useful and constructive material there, which should be taken up not only by the Government but by people on this side of the House. I wonder, however, whether the honourable member quite put his remarks in the appropriate context because, although it would seem to me that it is important that we see the development of tourism as one possible avenue of promoting employment in this State, the honourable member did approach that problem from the point of view of looking at the really very grave problem which confronts us so far as technology is concerned and the probable decline of employment opportunities in the manufacturing sector as more and more machines take over what men and women now do. He then seemed to be suggesting that this was "the" answer. If the honourable member is saying that this is an answer I would certainly agree with him; if he was suggesting it is "the" answer, I suggest that the problem is

far broader and deeper than that. In fact, it may well be that it is far broader and deeper than any of us at present imagine.

I have always marvelled at the fact that there are many people who do not welcome the advent of technology and the effect it will have in saving our lives from drudgery. I guess that from the time of the development of animal husbandry and the domestication of plants (in fact, possibly even before that time) a good deal of man's energy has been devoted to eliminating drudgery wherever possible. This has been done, of course, by being able to use more and more energy for these tasks, by using some sort of mechanical or, increasingly now, electronic means.

Suddenly, we seem to be hearing voices saying, "Let us turn the clock back." We seem to be hearing voices (sort of twentieth century Luddites) saying, "Smash the machines, we do not want them." It seems to me that anything that can be developed that will end drudgery, anything that will free men and women to use their lives more creatively, is something which should be welcomed and encouraged. Put in that way, one really wonders why anybody would in any way bewail the advent of technology.

Of course, the answer is that what people fear is not the advent of technology and the fact that that will bring us more leisure time, or that it will release our energies for more creative uses. There may be a few who do not trust the human organism and personality to be able to structure its time once it is free from the structuring which is imposed upon it by drudgery. But they, I suggest, would be a rather fuddy-duddy minority. What people say is that irretrievably bound up at present with the way in which we spend our time is the wealth we accumulate. That is what people really fear, that there will be more and more unemployment as a result of the progressive introduction of new technology, and that these people will be forced, through no fault of their own, to be living at a lower standard of living than the balance of us who are still fortunate enough to be able to get a job.

It may be that other things will happen. It may be that there will be a sufficient expansion in tertiary employment to take up the slack, but what if that is not the case? Should we not as a community be debating this possibility? It seems to me that the only way out of this, the only way to avoid the rather grim scenes that some other speakers have been painting of permanently alienated young people who do not have the job opportunities and, therefore, the access to disposable income that older people have, is for us to begin to consider ways and means whereby this nexus, which currently exists and which has existed for a long time between how one spends one's time and one's standard of living can be broken.

That may seem to be not only an impossibly radical suggestion, but also, to some gentlemen here, particularly those opposite, quite ludicrous, and yet I would invite them to consider this plain fact—that the two most rapidly expanding portions of our population at present are precisely in that category. I refer, of course, to the young unemployed and the old pensioners. For both of these groups, there is no correlation between how they structure their time, on the one hand, and the income which accrues to them, on the other.

I would venture to say that it will not be too many years before some Government somewhere will further grasp the nettle of payment for spouses of either sex (irrespective of whether their spouse or partner is in employment). Once that happens, the movement to that as a universal feature of modern Western economies will be irresistible. At that point, of course, the majority of the population will be people for whom the structuring of time

and the disposable income available will have no inter-relationship whatsoever.

As I said earlier, this may not necessarily come about, because it may well be that the economy, eventually, will be sufficiently resilient to be able to expand into other areas which will enable it to take up the slack caused by the diminution of employment opportunities in manufacturing industries as a result of the advent of technology.

Mr. Lewis: You mean income splitting in families and households?

Dr. HOPGOOD: I am simply talking about the possibility of society's deciding that what we earn will be quite independent of the way in which we structure our time, because the alternative could well be for an increasingly smaller percentage of the community to be in employment and for it to increasingly appropriate the fruits of that community. There are those who are frightened by that sort of suggestion. I simply say that we should be seriously considering it as a possible solution—does this sound too dramatic—regarding a revolutionary situation, because one cannot tolerate the spectre of more and more young people being thrown out of work, there being no employment available for them, and their facing the prospect of a lifetime of being at a lower standard of living than that diminishing proportion of the community who are fortunate enough to have a job. At any rate, I found it interesting to turn to *Habitat* of October of this year an article by Dr. Coombs, President of the Australian Conservation Foundation, entitled "Is Democracy alive and well?" He touches on some of the points I have tried, in my imperfect and halting way, to sketch to Parliament this afternoon. For example, he says:

During the 1930's it became apparent that the economic system could not automatically be relied upon to provide employment even for all adult males seeking wage-earning opportunities, and Governments over the following decades became increasingly concerned to sustain levels of total expenditure which would ensure for business entrepreneurs a context in which they could confidently expand production and offer employment. These policies together with rising productivity of labour flowing from improved organisation and technology appeared to justify the presumption that wage employment could provide for improving standards.

In recent years Governments have encountered a dilemma in the pursuit of these policies. The contexts in which the business entrepreneur had to make his decisions were altering. Natural resources (such as oil), basic to many industries, were becoming increasingly scarce, and the owners of these resources were in a position to demand a greater share of the proceeds of production. The search for new sources and for substitutes for scarce resources combined with a changing pattern of technology (including the computerisation of many services) to increase greatly the demand for and the cost of capital. This again encroached upon the earnings of the entrepreneur and restricted his willingness to venture.

In recent years, Governments have therefore put their weight behind the attempts of the business entrepreneur to restore to an acceptable level the share of the proceeds of production flowing to his profits. Since the demands of the resource owner and the provider of capital cannot be evaded, his share of profits can be restored only at the expense of that of wage earners. In conditions of full employment, however, the bargaining power of unions would make significant reduction in that share unlikely.

Accordingly, the objective of full employment has apparently, at least for the present, been abandoned, and the Government has continued to urge a widespread reduction in real wages and to ensure conditions in which wage earners lack the bargaining power to resist. There are now more

unemployed than at any time since the Great Depression; young people find entry into the work force increasingly difficult; and the real income of those in employment declines.

These conditions may not be temporary. The basic causes of the change—the growing scarcity of natural resources and the rising demands for capital—seem likely to persist. Technological change, unless it effectively counters these causes, is less likely than in the past to provide the means to reward labour more generously, and the need to constrain the bargaining power of unions may continue to be a predominant influence in economic policies.

We are likely, therefore, to find that the economic system will work to reduce greater rather than less equality—to make the rich richer and the poor poorer. Since we continue to rely heavily on overseas capital, the benefits of that inequality will flow to the owners of that capital abroad, while its burdens will fall on those in Australia who must depend on the market for the services they, in their own person, can provide.

These comments on changes which appear to me to be taking place in our economic system may seem to be a digression, but they bear upon an assessment of the performance of our democracy in two important ways. First, they call in question the reassuring belief that employment for wage or salary can be relied upon, except in marginal instances, to provide a reasonably fair and improving source of real incomes for practically all who need it. A community in which unemployment is widespread and in which the level of real wages does not rise will not merely bear heavily on the weak, the disadvantaged and the unlucky, but will be one in which demands on Governments dedicated to government for the people will be more insistent and more difficult to satisfy.

It can be seen that I have some support from no less than Dr. Coombs, suggesting that the problem is far graver than would be suggested by the few comments by the member for Henley Beach when he raised the question of women in the work force. I rather thought that I detected a certain degree, if not of embarrassment, of apprehension on the features of the former President of his Party as a result of his remarks. No doubt the member for Rocky River was thinking what possible impact those remarks might have on a section of the female voting population.

I turn now to something that is not altogether unrelated to the comments I have just been making. It seems to me that the speeches we have had so far from Government members, varying as they have been in their quality, have tended to stick to somewhat of a formula. What we have is, first, the ritual obeisance to the free enterprise philosophy, and then follows somewhat of a catalogue of the problems and needs of individual members' electorates, all of which seem to imply that the Government of the day is going to have to do something about these things. On the one hand, what is being projected is a general philosophy of non-intervention on the part of the Government, but, secondly, a shopping list of needs that require or presuppose the continuing involvement of Government and the continuing check on the operations of the market place.

Let us, for example, look at some of the things that have been raised in this context. First, we had a most heartening few words from the member for Henley Beach in relation to trade unions and the continuing value and benefit of them in our community. I can do nothing other than support him in those remarks, but I remind members opposite that a trade union is nothing more or less than an association in restraint of trade. Adam Smith would surely be turning in his grave if he could hear those sorts of remarks from the advocates of free enterprise in this place.

Furthermore, let us look more closely at this matter. If members opposite had an opportunity, as they no doubt have from time to time, to consider the proper role of the trade union, do they see it as an element in the arbitration system, that new venue for law and order that Justice Higgins talked about in the early years of this century, or as a vehicle for collective bargaining? I do not think there is any doubt that they would plump for arbitration as the proper sphere where these matters should be resolved.

Where does one find perhaps a greater intervention in the business cycle than in industrial arbitration, for heaven's sake? The arbitrator tells the employer how much money he shall pay to his employees, under what conditions those employees shall be paid, and how much holidays they will get each year, and, indeed, it can, in certain circumstances, reinstate an employee who has been sacked by his employer. That by now ancient practice is a massive intervention in the free enterprise system. The member for Newland spoke in terms that were reminiscent to me of some of the things which I said when I was new here—no doubt because he represents an electorate that is not dissimilar to the one I represent. All of these planning matters again presuppose a considerable Government intervention in one aspect of the market, that is to say, the buying and selling of land or, if I can turn again to the member for Henley Beach, he told us all about how we had to be involved in this place in planning for the 1980's.

Why, for heaven's sake, from the free enterprise point of view should we be involved in any planning at all? Why should he not be giving a catalogue of the ways in which we, as the financial sustainers of the Government of this day (because the Parliament grants the money), should be requiring the Government of the day to be drawing back in all sorts of areas? But no, we have to plan for the 1980's, presupposing the continuing act of involvement of Government in the market place. The member for Brighton, whom I have already complimented on his remarks about tourism, obviously envisages that the Government will continue to have a most active role to play in this particular area.

We could go on. People have talked about coast protection, and we could discuss the energy crisis. There has been considerable intervention in the home of free enterprise, namely, the United States of America, as regards the energy crisis. What will tonight's headlines in the *News* mean for that country, with a further drying up of its oil sources, this time from Iran, other than that further intervention will have to take place?

It seems to me that what we have confronting us on the Government side of this Chamber is not a group of latterday Adam Smiths at all but a group of fig leaf socialists. I do not deplore that. This is those honourable members' response to the realities of the late 1970's and what they see as the realities of the 1980's. But it is a little tiresome to have to put up with the sermon again and again only to hear the sermon denied in reality when the shopping list is trotted out. What I would urge upon the Liberal Party in this place and elsewhere is that it cut the cackle and get down to cases. It should come clean and admit that it accepts a continuing role for Government in the market place, in planning, and indeed in some aspects of production. That has to continue because it is a matter of reality and of practical politics. If members opposite want to get down to cases, that is well and good; that is what we ought to be doing in this place rather than spouting about generalities.

I want to turn now to a few comments about the recent election, because I have been known in this place during the years as one of the resident psephologists, and I think I might offend one or two people if I did not get a little

involved in the numbers game. The first thing I want to do is compliment the Hon. Mr. DeGaris in another place, who has done us all a great deal of service by having placed in *Hansard* (page 122) his analysis of the 15 September election results. I have not checked his figures in any way; I am going to accept them. It seems to me that honourable members opposite will accept them and, provided they cannot find any particular *non sequiturs* in the logical processes that I will try to bring forward, having accepted the basic material and having found no fault in the logic, they will therefore accept the conclusions that are brought forward.

The Hon. Mr. DeGaris was not simply seeking to educate us in putting these figures in *Hansard*; he had a polemical purpose and a polemical intent. He was seeking to demonstrate that the electoral system, in fact, is weighted at present in favour of the Labor Party, and he was obviously urging upon the Government from which he has been excluded that it do something about it.

First, it will surprise some of the newer members of the Liberal Party in this place to know that their Deputy Leader and Deputy Premier has, in the past, used an extremely naive analysis of the election results in order to show that his Party "was robbed" when it lost elections. Were I in the shoes of the Deputy Premier now, I might be tempted to say that my Party, on Mr. DeGaris's results, finished up with 45 per cent of the total vote after preferences (the preferred two-Party vote, as it is called), and we got only 19 of the 47 seats, which is 40 per cent of the seats, so our share of the seats does not match the share of the two-Party vote, and therefore we were robbed.

Of course, we cannot play that game any longer, because I think certainly Mr. DeGaris knows, and the Deputy Premier now understands after my lecturings of him, that such a thing as the cube law operates. That means that, in those electoral systems where there is a single member elected for each district, the spoils tend to go to the victors, and the winning Party tends, unless there is a gross distortion, a real malapportionment, to get a greater percentage of the seats than it got of the votes. This is something that has been recognised for a long time. The highly naive analysis is simply not valid. It has been demonstrated as being invalid, and it is therefore certainly not one that is available to me this afternoon.

What is available is the best system that I have been able to come across, and it was one that was pioneered by Soper and Rydon in the *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, probably in about 1955. I apologise to the House that I do not have the exact reference, but I am sure the Librarian will find it for honourable members if they want to follow it up. This relies first on being able to calculate the two-Party preferred vote, which is obviously a realistic thing to do because our electoral system, which demands that people indicate their preferences, indeed demands that they do, also demands that analysis. In effect, it says to the people who voted for minor Parties, "Well, having wasted your vote, we will give you a second chance; you can now decide what you want between the big battalions". It is what people want between the big battalions that finally determines the result. Seeing that it is what people want between the big battalions that finally determines the results in individual electorates as well as overall, it is necessary to calculate the two-Party preferred vote. That is what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris has done.

It is not clear to me from page 122 of *Hansard* or from anywhere else in *Hansard* what his presuppositions are for those four seats where, in effect, it was not a two-Party contest at all. I refer to the seats of Flinders, Mallee, Mitcham, and Semaphore. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris has

come up with some results, and I notice that he takes them to the first decimal point, so I assume he has done his calculations fairly carefully. In any event, in order to keep faith with honourable members opposite, I will accept that they accurately represent the two-Party preferred vote in those seats.

Let us talk in terms of the Liberal Party, because it is that Party that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris claims is disadvantaged in this matter. The Liberal Party gained a two-Party preferred vote of 55 per cent. Soper and Rydon go on to say that what really counts is not the two-Party preferred vote overall but the two-Party preferred vote in the median electorate (electorate No. 25, if you stack them all up in order of the Party's performance), because that is what you need to sustain your majority on the floor of the Chamber. If the system is working correctly for you, and if it is fair, then your twenty-fifth electorate should mirror the result that you got overall. The median electorate was Brighton, and the Liberal Party vote in Brighton was 54.7 per cent. So, the Liberal Party appears to be under-represented in the Brighton District to the gigantic extent of .3 per cent on this analysis, something that may well be taken up by the possible errors inherent in the assumptions that have to be made.

Soper and Rydon take the analysis a little further, because, in fact, there are two sources of under-representation that can occur in an electoral system. First, there is the source of under-representation which years ago we all came to know and in some cases love and in some cases detest: the famous "Playmander", so called because it was not a gerrymander in the classic sense at all, as I will explain. That is one in which, because of the gross imbalance in enrolments between districts, a Party which has most of its support bottled up in the districts with high enrolments has to get many more votes in order to get the same number of members elected. Political scientists tend, these days, to refer to that as the rotten borough effect, because it happened in the last century in Britain in the House of Commons, where there were some extremely small districts. The rotten borough effect can also be calculated on this analysis. You take your two-Party preferred vote, 55 per cent for the Liberal Party; you then find the average that they got in all the districts, not median but the mean, by adding them up and dividing by 47. Again, if there is no significant under-representation for that particular Party because of the rotten borough effect, those two figures should be the same. In fact, the mean vote for the Liberal Party was 54.8 per cent. So, the under-representation due to the rotten borough effect was the princely percentage of .2. As every schoolboy now knows, in addition to the rotten borough effect, there can be the classic gerrymander, under which, even where you have equal or nearly equal enrolments in each electorate, it is possible to draw the boundaries in such a way that a particular Party may be significantly advantaged over another. That is the so-called gerrymander effect.

Obviously, the way in which you calculate the gerrymander effect is to subtract the rotten borough effect from the total under-representation of the Liberal Party. I have already indicated that the total under-representation is the miniscule percentage of .3; .2 is due to the rotten borough effect, and therefore only .1 per cent is due to the way in which the boundaries are currently drawn on the map. As I understand it, this is basically the claim that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris makes, that it is not a rotten borough effect (he may suspect that that favours his side a bit); rather, it is the way that the boundaries have been drawn.

I invite members opposite to take up this analysis based on figures which have been brought forward by their own side and to ascertain whether there is any way that I have

misrepresented the position. Certainly, if the technical equipment that I have used, the Soper and Rydon method, is correct, and if the figures that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris gives are correct, the conclusions that I have arrived at are also correct.

I turn now from the raw results of the election to some things which I believe are beneficial that have come out of the election. It may be a little surprising for members on both sides of the House to hear me mention anything about the benefits from the results of 15 September. First, I have always been uneasy about the concept of Parliaments not running their full term. I was outraged at the suggestion that an Opposition should in any way be able to force a Government to the polls, because that is, of course, a quite irresponsible act in that they have nothing to lose. If a Party in Opposition forces the Government to the polls, and if it loses, it is still in Opposition—so what? There is always the chance that it may win. Yet the Liberal Party has done that at least twice to my knowledge; in Victoria in 1947, and federally in 1975.

With the advent of polling techniques and that sort of thing, I have always been uneasy about Governments doing that same thing. Admittedly, that is a responsible act in that the Government is putting something on the line (namely, its very existence) in a way that the Opposition is not. Nonetheless, it seems to me that situation could well get out of hand. It may well be that the lesson of 15 September is not "woe betide Governments that go to an election early"; or maybe it is "woe betide Labor Governments that go to an election early".

Mr. Lewis: That's right!

Dr. HOPGOOD: That may well be, and I have some confirmation from a member opposite. It seems to be that there are different rules that apply in the media in this country—the Labor and the non-Labor. I am having some sort of confirmation from the member for Mallee. Let me hasten to say that a case can be made out for ensuring that Parliaments should go for their full term, except in unusual circumstances. How on earth the present Government, which said that it would do something about it, will be able to enact some such provision in the Constitution, I am blown if I know, without causing considerable damage to conventional ideas of responsible government. That may well be, and we will wait for it with a great deal of interest in the Chamber if they ever get around to doing it. In any event, it is also possible that the events of 15 September will act as somewhat of a warning to Mr. Bjelke Petersen in Queensland, to Mr. Fraser, and to other non-Labor leaders, against calling early elections that are likely to favour them. Only time will tell.

The other benefit that may come from the election is that at long last the Liberal Party in this State will now accept a full measure of democracy. I am not too sure that everybody in the Liberal Party has quite repented of those many years that they denied a substantial proportion of the citizens of this State the right to vote for the Legislative Council. It seems to me that, with all the sort of justifications and excuses that came forward from time to time from their spokespeople, what it really got down to at bedrock was that they were frightened of the ramifications of giving everybody on the House of Assembly roll a vote for the Legislative Council. They did not really believe that they would be able to get or sustain a continuing majority in the Legislative Council in the circumstances of everybody having a vote. This did not apply, of course, in this Chamber, where people are a little more circumspect, but I have heard it said by Liberal supporters that you cannot really expect that their philosophy, which they said was so vital to the continuing well-being of the State and the economy, would be supported, and that all we would

have would be a Legislative Council which would mirror the House of Assembly and, by and large, there would have to be a Labor majority because of universal suffrage.

Eventually, of course, the Liberal Party was forced into it and in the debate in which the statistics I have read were incorporated in *Hansard* the Hon. Mr. DeGaris admitted that they were forced into accepting the Bill as it came out of the Committee at that stage. There was always the possible element of unpredictability about the situation that as long as there was a Liberal Party fearful of the full measure of democracy, once the Party got back into power and had the numbers, it would do something with the franchise. To give them their due, I think that is gone for all time. The Liberal Party has found to its great surprise that it is able, on odd occasions like the last election, to win a majority of votes on a universal franchise. Therefore, it seems to me that it is most unlikely that any future Liberal Administration would now want to turn back the clock and reintroduce some measure of restrictive franchise.

In terms of the sorts of philosophies that were coming forward even when I came into this Chamber only a short nine years ago, it would be perfectly consistent for it to do so, whether they were the sort of sophisticated arguments we had about the Upper House being a mirror image of the Lower House or whether they were the dreadful sorts of statements which we heard, such as the relative worth of the vote of the Mallee farmer and that of the new Australian drink waiter in a hotel in one of the local towns. These things were actually said. What seemed to be coming forward, particularly with the dichotomy coming forward between the country and city areas, was almost a South Australian home-grown version of apartheid. It seems that that is all long gone. The Liberal Party no longer has to invent its sophistications. It no longer has to hand out long tortuous arguments to justify its position. I think we can say that universal suffrage is safe in this State. How it will deal with the Liberal Party in the future is something to which I will return in a moment.

I now want to look at the significance of the result of the election of 15 September and to determine how we ought to weigh it in the mid-term political history of this State. It seems to me that, with the various schools of thought that exist at present, we might discern two extreme schools of thought. One would be the watershed theory, which would have it that the Labor hegemony in this State has at last been broken, that the natural majority which existed for the Labor Party from probably about 1943 through until 15 September has now been broken, and the Labor Party can now no longer be regarded as the natural majority Party in this State.

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

The other extreme of the theory is the "fit of absence of mind" theory, the suggestion that what happened on 15 September was a complete aberration from normal voting patterns to which people will, if they have not already done so, return. It is interesting to look at polls taken of voting intentions before and after the State election that may give some sort of indication whether either of those two schools of thought is valid.

We cannot tell at this stage exactly what the situation might be; time alone will tell. However, it is instructive to look at possible indications as to trends. I am setting up two extremes of theory: on the one hand, the watershed theory, which suggests that on 15 September the long-standing Labor hegemony in this State was broken and will be replaced by a period of Liberal hegemony, or, on the other hand, the fit of absence of mind theory, which says

that, although the Government changed at that time, little has changed in terms of long-term voting intentions and trends.

If we look at the polls taken, particularly by Gallup, we find that from the 1977 election right up to just before the calling of the State election there was a consistently high level of support in this State for the Labor Party and an extremely low level of support for the Liberal Party and the National Country Party. At the June 1977 election, Labor got 51 per cent of the vote, the Liberal and Country Parties 43 per cent, with the rest distributed between the Democrats and others. In October 1977, in a poll published in the *Bulletin*, the A.L.P. rose to 55 per cent, and the Liberal figure had dropped to an abysmal 33 per cent, with the remainder equally distributed between the Democrats and the others. For the remainder of the analysis I will leave out the latter two, because the position there does not change substantially.

In January-February 1979, a poll taken and published in the *Bulletin* suggested Labor support of 51 per cent, and Liberal-National Country Party support of 37 per cent. In March-April 1979, the figures were Labor 50 per cent, and Liberal and National Country Parties 38 per cent. In May-July 1979, the figures showed Labor 54 per cent and Liberal and National Country Parties 36 per cent. A poll in August 1979, and ironically this poll was published in an edition of the *Bulletin* dated 18 September, showed Labor 54 per cent and the Liberal Party 36 per cent.

We do not have to end the story there, because we can also turn our attention to the Age poll taken on 15 September on a national basis, to look at people's voting intentions at a Federal election. It is extraordinary to find that, on that day, the responses of the South Australian people who were so polled were 50.3 per cent in favour of the Labor Party, on the very day on which they voted the South Australian Labor Government out of office.

Another poll taken, on 1 September and 8 September, and published in the *Bulletin* only recently suggests that at that time Labor had 52 per cent support and Liberals 38 per cent, while a poll taken since the election and just published gives the figures as 49 per cent for Labor in this State, 36 per cent for Liberal, 2 per cent for National Country Party, 9 per cent for Democrats, and 4 per cent for others.

The change of Government, surprisingly, does not appear to have changed substantially people's voting intentions, as revealed by polling techniques which are being published at present. This is some sort of pointer to possible trends. It does not altogether support the fit of absence of mind theory, but it suggests that probably the people of South Australia treated the 15 September election as a by-election. There are certain obvious features common to a by-election—the brevity of the campaign, and the feeling that the Government of the day could not be put out of office, so perhaps one could take the chance of giving it a bit of a fright. In fact, the indication that the Labor Party has had since that time from a number of people has been, "We didn't vote for you because we didn't think you could possibly lose."

On present indications, it would suggest that there was somewhat of a by-election mentality around on 15 September, and there is no indication at this stage that the Labor hegemony in terms of voting intention has been broken. That does not necessarily mean that the Government is doomed to lose any forthcoming election, because it would enter such an election with the advantages of incumbency, and there is no doubt that normally an incumbent Government does have an advantage in an election in Australia. Also, it has three years in which it will be able to distribute patronage in

such a way as to maximise the return to itself in terms of voting intention, and that exercise will be a fascinating one to follow.

What is very interesting is that if we put together, on the one hand, a suggestion that what occurred on 15 September was purely an aberration, the suggestion which seems to be borne out by the evidence of the polls, and if we allow for the effects of incumbency, which would be flowing in the Liberals' direction, and if we say that the result is that Labor probably would get back only half of what it lost at the last election, it follows that only one of the new Liberal Party members now here who have just won seats from Labor would remain, and the rest would be swept out. That would suggest one of the problems that the Premier will have in the next few years.

It might be instructive, whatever the state of the electorate, whether what we have seen is only a mere aberration, or whether there has been some more drastic turn-around, to look at some of the things the new Government has going for it and some of the things that are going against it. First, it seems to me that one of the things it has going for it is that many of the initiatives of the former Government have been bequeathed to it, and the present Government is going around joyfully opening those various public facilities which were initiated by the Labor Government. It is interesting to look at the performance of the various Ministers and to see how generous they are in admitting that this is not one of their initiatives.

Mr. Evans interjecting:

Dr. HOPGOOD: I inherited the Education Department from one of my Party colleagues, and I was only too happy to appropriate the fruits that he had sown, but nevertheless we were still on the same side of the House. On the one hand, we had the Minister of Transport, who generously acknowledged the presence of Mr. Virgo at a recent ceremony in my electorate, and admitted that this initiative was started by the Labor Government. On the other hand, we have the Premier, who seemed to give the impression that he had managed to build the Colonnades shopping centre in about three weeks. It is true that many of the initiatives of the former Government have been bequeathed to the present Government.

The second advantage it has is that the business recovery was obviously already under way in the final months of the Labor Government, and it is likely to continue. No doubt the Government will be in a position to appropriate some of the fruits of that. It is interesting to speculate on why, for many years, from about 1970, the State was consistently above the Australian average for performance in employment and then, around late 1977, it started to drop marginally below the Australian average. I have always thought that it had something to do with inflation, and the fact that we held up so well in employment in the early 1970's was because of inflation and the fact that people continued to purchase our goods to keep ahead of the drop in the value of money.

Once inflation started to ease, the advantage that our milk bar economy tends to have disappeared and we were back to the old situation of earlier days of the Australian economy sneezing and the South Australian economy catching somewhat of a cold. Anyway, it is quite clear that some improvement in the performance of the economy in this State has been under way for a time, and that is likely to continue.

Thirdly, we have in South Australia a Public Service which is efficient, capable, and will no doubt do all it possibly can to keep the new Government out of trouble. I would make one caveat there, and that is that the new Government seems to be doing all it possibly can at this

stage to wreck the confidence of the Public Service in its ability to be able to operate in the traditional Westminster way. If that continues, all I can say is that the people who will immediately suffer will be the members of the Government of the day.

Fourthly, I think we can say that there are not great chasms in our society that exist in other societies; that, by and large, this society is relatively homogenous; that, by and large, it is possible to move in terms of consensus in many of the great issues of the day. But, again, I would warn the Government that Liberal Governments are not always particularly good at promoting consensus because they seem to have this gut feeling that in fact polarisation probably works to their advantage. I believe that that is probably true, that it is when society is most sharply polarised that probably, for one reason or another (which I do not have time to go into now), the returns accrue to the Liberal side. When there is more of a consensus spirit abroad so the returns tend to accrue, in a political sense, to the Labor side of the political spectrum.

In any event, we can see the sort of things that the Liberal Government in Canberra has tried to do, particularly in relation to the trade union movement, as being some sort of indication of the perverted genius of the Liberal Party for being able to induce chasm and polarisation in society. They are four of the things that I genuinely believe the present Government has going for it.

What has it got going against it? One thing is the continuing decline in the performance of its Federal colleagues. It is going to be impossible for the Liberal Party in this State to be able to continue the momentum of the business recovery in this State if, in fact, the performance of the Liberals federally continues to decline. This Government must know that fact, it must know that it alone, as a Government which controls a Budget which is smaller than some of the municipalities in the United Kingdom, is not able to sustain the sort of recovery that it needs, and that only a Federal Government, really, can bring the economy of this country around.

Secondly, it would seem to me that, in terms of the analysis which I have presented to the House, the events of August-September were somewhat unique. In fact, the polls are already showing that South Australia is returning to its traditional preference, perhaps marginally, for the Labor Party, and that the Government will enter the next election, on present indications, with a majority in this House but a minority outside the House (which, of course, was the situation that faced the Hall Government when I first entered this place in 1970).

Thirdly, in terms of the analysis, if it is right, the next great problem that the Premier will have is the flock of once-ers that he will have on his back benches. I wish those honourable gentlemen well, but they cannot view with anything but a certain amount of alarm a return to a natural Labor majority in this State. What the Premier will have to watch out for very carefully is the sort of demands he will have placed on him by nervous members who are looking at their very slender majorities and who are aware of the large swing that brought them in and the small swing that is required to sweep them out again. That sort of thing does not make for stable Government; it makes not for long-term planning; it makes for responding to the last scare, responding to the urging, the earnest entreaties of the particularly nervous back-bencher sitting on an 0.5 per cent or 3 per cent, or 4 per cent majority. That, I suggest, is probably, in terms of the stability of his Government, the biggest problem that the Premier faces and the greatest challenge that he has in front of him. In any event, I wish him well, I wish the new Government well, all the luck in the world, because I believe it is going to need it.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the honourable member for Todd to speak, I indicate to the House that as it is the honourable member's maiden speech I expect due courtesy to be given to his contribution.

Mr. ASHENDEN (Todd): I support the motion. Before I proceed to the body of my speech I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election and on the way in which you have been handling so fairly the business of this House. I would also like to take this opportunity to pay my respects to the previous member for Todd. As I said to her on the Saturday night when she rang me to concede defeat, I am genuinely sorry that it had to be Mrs. Byrne that I defeated in the seat of Todd. I believe that she worked as she saw her ideals. She was certainly a conscientious member for the seat of Todd.

What I want to do this evening is, briefly go through some of my philosophies and then spend some time speaking about areas of particular interest. Before I do so, I would like to stress to this House and my electors that I see my duty as being to represent everybody, as other members have said, to represent all persons in my electorate not simply those who supported me on 15 September. I believe a good Parliamentarian will do this.

It is with a sense of pride and humility that I stand here tonight as the new member for Todd. My background having been one of involvement both in secondary education and the business world, these will obviously be areas that I will mainly concentrate on in this Parliament. When I speak of business I speak of it in its broadest sense. I want to go into that in some detail later. Before I do so, I would like to speak briefly about why I am a Liberal and about what I believe is a good Liberal philosophy. Basically, I believe in the freedom of the individual to choose. This, of course, is a basic tenet of Liberal philosophy. Freedom is strongly associated with enterprise, and I think nothing shows that more clearly than the exodus in recent years of Indo-Chinese from those countries ruled by Communist regimes.

The Liberal philosophy enables people to achieve the benefits of their own enterprise. I believe that we must have a Government that works for and not against the creation of productive jobs. I believe that the people of South Australia have come to realise that it is enterprise that keeps a State or a country prosperous. I think that they are seeing that their wealth emerges not from Government but from enterprise and industry. The view that Government operations are virtuous and private enterprise is evil is total folly. Any State that allows itself to be tacitly guided by those illusions must obviously suffer, as South Australia has suffered over the past 10 years.

The Government takes money. I believe that industry makes money for the State. I do not believe as does the member for Stuart, that Governments have a responsibility to produce an egalitarian type of society. Society will only progress when there is the opportunity for personal achievement, so that those with a higher degree of drive will reap the rewards of their drive and success and not be held back by socialist ideals of mediocrity.

Members opposite have criticised Liberal Governments as having no social conscience. That is ridiculous, and a perfect example of the concern that a Liberal Government does have in this area is shown in South Australia's own Housing Trust. There are many other examples of the concern that Liberals have for society as a whole. A tenet of the Liberal is to encourage the individual to achieve. But, certainly, there are people who do need assistance to

be able to achieve and this is the area of social conscience that our Government shows.

I will now briefly speak about the election. I want to concentrate not on the negative aspects of why the Labor Party lost. Let us fact it, the Liberal Party won Government. I believe that it was necessary for the good of South Australia that the Liberals win the recent election. I believe that we can compare the Whitlam years and the effect that they had on Australia as a whole with the Dunstan years and the effect they have had on South Australia. I believe that historians, when looking back on the 1970's, will be extremely critical of the socialist regimes in these two areas.

The Government to which I belong has an approach that wants to build up industry by offering incentives for employment and investment. This will get jobs. Our Government will offer incentives, not the disincentives that were seen to be operating prior to 15 September. I believe that the Liberal Party won the election for a number of reasons. We had positive policies and, from the time that the then Leader of the Opposition made his policy speech until 15 September, the Liberal Party made the running. I do not intend to go over the ground covered by the member for Rocky River, who put the matter so adequately, but I stress that the electorate saw us as being the positive alternative.

Since the election, the speed with which we have implemented so many of the Government's policies has been well accepted by the electorate. Those Government policies, such as the rebate of stamp duty on the first purchase of a home, the remission of pay-roll tax, the removal of succession duties, and so on, were all speedily handled by this Government.

I must at this point disagree with the member for Salisbury and his attitude towards succession duties. I believe that they are totally inequitable. I have seen the effects that these can have on families, particularly those in the country. I acknowledge that I do not represent a country district, but I have a strong connection with the country through my wife's family's background. I know of a number of examples, including her own family, who suffered because of the iniquitous aspect of death duties. It is all very fine to say that because a farmer owns a lot of land, he has a lot of assets, but there is a huge difference between an asset and cash.

Okay, the cost of land is high in the country, particularly at present, but I know of another example whereby the duties levied on a family in the South-East were greater than the total value of their assets. This occurred some few years ago when the rural economy was suffering a downturn. The number of families who had to leave the land because of death duties is too great to mention. I believe that the move we have made will benefit a number of enterprising people, and I see no reason why, if a family is able to build up an asset, that asset should not, if the person wants it, remain in that family.

I believe that is a right, and I believe in the family, and I think that this is one of the strengths of our community. The figures quoted to us by the Opposition about the so-called wealthiest few per cent controlling so much of Australia's wealth came from *A Journal of Political Economy*, a rather obscure Marxist publication, so I do not think that we can take much notice of that. *Australia Ripped Off* was another book quoted by the Opposition. It used totally unreliable figures espoused by the Labor Party in Canberra.

I now turn briefly to some matters of personal interest. First, in my campaigning, there is no doubt that the electorate saw the control of crime as one of the key issues in the election. I assure all South Australians, particularly

in the seat of Todd, that I regard with the greatest importance the support the Government can offer the police and the courts. I also believe that it is time that we had a Government that considered the victim of a crime as well as the criminal. I do not for a moment suggest that we ignore helping the person who perpetrates the crime but, at the same time, surely we must take a much greater interest in the innocent victim of crime, and ensure that South Australians can move freely about our cities and towns.

I will now speak briefly on unemployment. This, again, is an issue on which I spoke frequently in the lead-up to the election. It is a matter of great concern, because the Todd District comprises dormitory suburbs with a large percentage of young families. It is a seat that suffers greatly from unemployment. I assure my electors that such operations as CITY will have my wholehearted support, because I believe that it will really help the young unemployed, as it encourages the individual to help himself or herself.

The hour we spent upstairs earlier this week with representatives from this group was one of the most rewarding sessions I have attended, and I look forward to meeting them again and providing any assistance I can to that group. I will speak on unemployment in more detail later.

Road safety is another area about which I will speak tonight, because it concerns me greatly. Those of us with young growing families have our children now or shortly coming on to the road. All members have seen some of the things that occur on the roads in this State. I firmly believe in and will be pushing for major changes in some of the areas of road safety. I believe that the age for licensing in South Australia is too low. I believe the use of P plates for the first 12 months by a driver obtaining a licence is essential. The P plate is a real restriction on a new driver, since he is limited in the speed at which he can drive, and he knows full well that he has to break the law only once and he will lose his licence.

Unfortunately, in our society today, too many people (and I am not referring only to the young) regard drivers' licences as a right rather than a privilege. We need to provide better education for young drivers and new or learner drivers. The United Kingdom system is extremely good, and I would like to see all learners having to go through a professional driving school to achieve a basic driving standard. Some real encouragement ought to be given to the young (in fact, anyone in the community) to attend advanced driving schools. There should be more severe penalties for certain aspects of the abuse of road rules. If we were to move in this area, we would find results again such as in the United Kingdom, where drivers are more courteous and much better in the way in which they handle their privilege to drive.

While on this aspect, I will now take a broader look at transport. In areas such as the Todd District we must examine this matter closely. Certainly, most of the people living in Todd have normally a great distance to drive, and they usually have to use either the North-East Road or the Lower North-East Road, both of which have extremely bad bottlenecks at any peak hour time. We should be looking to use better the facilities we have. I have lived in New South Wales and seen a system that works there extremely well, whereby lanes are not automatically always either to a point or from a point. I see no reason why that sort of system, such as operates in Sydney or Melbourne, could not be introduced for such roads as we have to use in the seat of Todd. There is no reason why on the Lower North-East Road we could not have three lanes

of traffic coming in in the morning and three lanes going out in the evening.

Some of the wide medians are an awful waste of useful space, and if we were to utilise that area better, we could increase the number of lanes for traffic. No matter how good the public transport system we offer, people will still prefer to use a car and I believe we should cater for these people.

I am glad to see that the issue of the north-south freeway has again come forward, because I believe that this is an area that we should look at very closely. Certainly, there has been a lot of hoo-hah from the other side of this House in relation to freeways, but I assure honourable members that, having been in the United States on a couple of occasions and having seen the effectiveness with which they are used, I only wish we had had the foresight to plan as some of the United States cities have done. I know people will probably ask, "What about Los Angeles?" Just think what Los Angeles would be like if there were no freeways! The situation would be far worse than it is now.

Regarding public transport, one area in which the electors of Todd are vitally interested is the question of what the Government will do to provide good public transport. When we came to Government, we said that we would review very carefully the schemes put forward by the previous Government and also many other schemes, because we believe, and I certainly share the belief, that the l.r.t. scheme was far too expensive. I think that even members opposite would admit that that idea was really a pipe dream. It is ridiculous to think of spending that sort of money to service such a small area; that was never on. We are now looking at schemes like the OBahn scheme. As my colleague from Newland has stated, the Labor Party seems, at the moment, fairly well removed from reality and the people. I believe that that is exemplified in the attitude it has taken to the OBahn proposal and to the investigations being undertaken.

One huge advantage that such a system as the OBahn has is that there is no need to use feeder services. The public in Australia and overseas has shown quite clearly that it will not use a public transport system that requires the use of feeder services. The l.r.t. system would have required feeder services. For example, people in Highbury would have had to catch a bus to Tea Tree Plaza, and they would then have had to leave the bus and catch the l.r.t. into the city. The OBahn system and other systems like it offer the advantage that, if one gets on a bus at Highbury, one stays on that bus and goes right through to the city.

I think the most expensive example of the way people will not use feeder services in the experience of the B.A.R.T. system in San Francisco. In that city, without a doubt, is one of the most modern, fast and magnificent systems of public transport that one could imagine, but it depends upon feeder services. What has happened? It is not used at night or at weekends. In other words, a magnificent public transport system is going to waste. I believe that that is exactly what would have happened to the l.r.t.

Another area of interest to me, obviously because of my years as a high school teacher, is education. I believe that the education system should cater for all children, including those who are excellent at certain aspects of their studies, the average student, and the student who needs remedial help. The education system in South Australia at present does not cater for excellence, and I think that reflects the Labor Party's attitude of mediocrity. Our children who are better at their studies than others should be given every opportunity to develop to the absolute utmost. In this way, we will be bringing up young people who will have initiative, new ideas, and keep the

community going. Again, I refer to my years in New South Wales; in that State, such special schools have been established, and the brightest children from a number of schools in an area are taken to a special school and are given training in an environment where they can be challenged to the utmost.

Certainly, from my previous employment experience, I believe that that is an area in which I can see a difference between graduates we were seeking to employ in my previous company from New South Wales in comparison with those in South Australia. We found, in my previous employment, that those graduates were far more advanced in a number of areas than were those in South Australia. I certainly agree that one cannot put this down to the education system alone, but I think that that is where it starts. Certainly, there is a lot more pressure on industry and all sorts of areas in that State than there is in South Australia, and those factors certainly play a part. I believe that the recognition of excellence and the provision for bright students to develop to the full is something we should look at very closely.

I believe that this Government has already started to look at, and will continue to look at, the waste and poor planning of the previous Government. I refer specifically to two schools in my district, although I could refer to others. These two schools are outstanding examples of extremely poor and costly planning. The primary school at St. Agnes is in a huge growth area; it is a new school, yet already it is absolutely choc-a-block with buildings. It is situated in an area developed by the South Australian Land Commission. The previous Government must have known this fact, yet that school was built on small grounds. There are virtually no facilities for playgrounds. The school is overcrowded, yet it is only a couple of years old. This is an absolute indictment of the previous Government. At the same time, the previous Government spent a large sum on a brand new school at Tea Tree Gully, which is situated in beautiful surroundings. I congratulate the previous Government for that. This school is probably one of the prettiest schools I have ever seen in the metropolitan area. It has magnificent playgrounds, but it is a school that holds 300 students but was built to take 600 students. Also, it is situated in an area where there is static population growth and, in fact, where school numbers are declining.

Both of the schools to which I refer are new. I cannot understand the planning that went into those schools, if one can call it planning. The architects of the Tea Tree Gully school went wild; it is a beautiful building, but most impractical. The school has hardly any windows, and it is not air-conditioned. Can you imagine the situation in that school in hot weather, with no air-conditioning and no windows to open? A number of rooms have four solid brick walls, and have no glass whatsoever. Even though it is called an open-space school, in the areas of open space there is virtually no method of ventilation. I have already taken up this matter with the present Minister of Education.

I refer also to early childhood education. I believe that the previous Government gave most unfair advantages to the non-independent child care centres. I spoke with the Minister about this matter also, and I am sure that we will be able to come up with a more satisfactory arrangement. I believe that there is a place for the independent child care centre, and that must be faced. They provide a lot of employment at no cost to the Government, and also provide day care facilities and play groups. However, under the previous Government, positive incentives were given to people to conduct family day care centres and play groups and to have children go to those centres rather

than to independent child care centres. For example, under the old system, 150 families were needed in an area for a family day care co-ordinator to be appointed. What will happen in relation to a family day care co-ordinator? If someone approaches that person, it is only human that the suggestion will be made that children go to the family day care centre. Similarly, the previous Government provided assistance for the disadvantaged if they attended a family day care centre, but it would not provide that assistance for a needy child to attend an independent child care centre. We must look at these areas closely.

I now come to uranium. Since my election, I have heard only emotional arguments expressed and seen scare tactics used by the Opposition regarding uranium mining. For example, in the *Advertiser* of Friday 26 October, a half-page advertisement appeared, and it contained statements such as to the following:

It is likely that South Australia will become a dumping ground for other countries' nuclear waste.

Roxby Downs won't stop the job rot.

For each job created in mining, 20 could be created in manufacturing for the same investment.

The State Government will be required to invest hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money into building roads, rail links, port facilities and other structures.

More is spent in this way than is recouped in taxes and royalties.

The uranium enrichment plant will emit radio-active elements into the gulf and surrounding areas.

At all stages of nuclear development the general population is threatened by the release of cancer-producing agents.

They were emotional arguments which were based not on fact but on fear. It was stated that hundreds of millions of taxpayers' money would be spent in building railways, roads and port facilities. How would they know that? The Government and private enterprise companies have not even started negotiations on how the infra-structure is going to be developed. It concerns me that Opposition members in this session have had all the facts on uranium thrown at them, and then they have had to resort to arguments of sheer emotion. They now realise that their so-called facts are just not there. I was also extremely concerned to note the signatories to that advertisement, which included the Communist Party of Australia and (I hope only imprudently) the signature of a member opposite.

I turn now to my discussion on industry in general, and I will preface my remarks here, because I am going to be critical of the management of companies and the management of unions. I stress in my remarks that I do not at any time refer to the ordinary union member; I am referring here to the very few radical union leaders. The unions are arguing about uranium mining. Bob Hawke, probably one of the most astute and intelligent members of the Labor Party, is very keen to see uranium mining proceed. Unions such as the Federated Ironworkers Association wants its members to include uranium workers. In fact, the F.I.A. Federal secretary, Mr. Laurie Short, has stated:

We do not object to our members working in the uranium industry.

It is obvious that the thinking moderate unionist can see the inestimable value of this industry to our country with both jobs and investments. We see the value of a huge mining complex at Roxby Downs. It is now agreed that it will be bigger than Broken Hill and bigger than Mount Isa—possibly one of the biggest concentrations of minerals in the world. The Labor Party states that there will be little employment and that long lead times are needed. For

goodness sake: the longer we delay any start at Roxby Downs, surely the longer it will be before we can achieve any benefits because of the lead times. I have never heard such a false argument. It is not only the employees directly involved in mining who will be affected. What about the tens of thousands who will be involved in the support functions, such as the builders labourers, the people who will put in the roads, the railways, and the industries that will support that mining town, or city as it probably will become. I think these are the areas that must be taken into consideration.

Before I go into detailed remarks on my criticisms of some aspects of industry, I would like to dwell briefly on a very important aspect (I believe it is the main aspect) that causes the difficulties that industry is facing. I believe that the most important thing that industry and unions can do is to sit down together and open lines of communication, because I consider that the importance of communication cannot be underestimated. Communication affects us in all areas of our life; at work, socially and at home. A couple of good examples of communications are when, not our wives but other wives say to their husband, "I have a headache": there is no mistaking the communication there. Similarly, I believe that when Mark Anthony went to Cleopatra's tent at midnight on the banks of the Nile and said, "I am not here to make a speech", and Cleopatra replied, "I am not prone to argue", I am quite sure the lines of communication were clearly established.

Communication is vital. Let us have a look at one major disaster that has occurred when communications have broken down. Although it did not affect our country, a major example is that of Pearl Harbour. Well in advance of the attack on Pearl Harbour, the Americans were warned of the attack. The messages were heard but not believed, and the warnings were ignored. Even when the Japanese planes came over, people showed no concern, because they thought it was their own Air Force putting on a show. That is an example of communication at its worst. What happens when communications break down? That is what is happening in industry. Immediately it happens, management blames the unions, the unions blame management, and we get nowhere. Again, I stress that in the remarks I am making I shall be fairly critical of both unions and management in this respect. After all, the prime purpose of communication is surely to transfer information. I would like to quote here from the Jackson Committee green paper on Australian manufacturing industry:

Communication between management and the workforce is generally very poor and attitudes are polarised. Processes for wage determination and dispute resolution inhibit the reduction of this polarisation.

I believe that that really does hit the nail on the head. Our own Prime Minister, in his speech to the national private enterprise convention, also stated that "Australians cannot treat or should not treat workmen like a piece of equipment. Employees should not have to read in a newspaper the fate of the firm for which they work." I believe that that is totally true, but there has been an inbuilt suspicion for years in that management will not talk to unions and *vice versa*. I believe that employees should be constantly and reliably informed by their employers of matters of major importance.

I also believe that, in a free economy such as ours, the employees as consumers already wield the ultimate decision-making power in every business, in that, through their decisions to buy or not to buy, to favour a particular brand, the Australian consumer is in fact the regent of the marketplace. He can make life and death decisions in relation to every one of our Australian companies, and

employers obviously must heed this. Employees frequently, perhaps because of poor communications, do not support the industrial concern for which they work. I believe that this is also bad on the employees' part.

It always concerned me at my previous place of employment (which was a car manufacturing company) to see the number of new cars parked in the car park which were not made by the company for which the employees worked. I believe that management must take some of the blame. Let us face it, employees can buy cars from their manufacturing companies at very competitive prices; in fact, they can get a car at virtually trade cost. Despite that, employees at my company still did not take advantage of that. Why was that so? Because there is not the feeling of closeness between the employee and the company. I believe that that company is working on this now, and that lines of communication are being opened. I think that will help the employee to develop a sense of commitment to his company and to his employer, and that this will therefore develop loyalty, which is vital if an industry is to survive.

Why is it that the workers of Singapore, Japan and Switzerland, just to mention three vibrant economies, are so much more motivated than those in Australia? I believe that communication is probably one of the most vital reasons. The Australian does not feel that he is an integral part of the company for which he works in far too many cases. Again, I will be quite honest and suggest that it is management that must have the major part of the blame for this sheeted home.

I would like to give some examples of the difference that good or poor communication can make, and those examples relate to my previous employment. In 1977, due to a very severe downturn in the automotive industry, the company for which I worked was forced to make a large number of retrenchments in its workforce. I think through fear, suspicion, and all sorts of reasons, the management determined that it would not advise the unions, the people or the employees about what was going to happen. As a result, when the axe fell there was tremendous industrial unrest.

On the other hand, just recently the same company closed an entire plant, but for at least six months before the closure of the plant management communicated with the employees, telling them what the company was doing and why it was doing it, and offering all possible assistance to help those people get other jobs. Management provided retrenchment benefits and other opportunities of employment in other parts of the company, as well as assistance for employees in looking for jobs outside. There were no industrial troubles. I think that shows what can happen when the two communicate.

I turn now to the matter of profits, because it is obvious that the way in which members on this side look at profits is different from the way in which members on the other side look at profits. When a company makes profits, its employees profit. Business should be a co-operative organisation, where the employer and employee have a mutuality and a commonality of enterprise. If one member of the group slows down or stops, all the others inevitably will slow down or stop. In this context, I do not see profit as a dirty word.

How many of us appreciate the tremendous share of income earned by private enterprise that goes to the employees? The latest figures I have been able to obtain show that 89.1 per cent of total corporate income goes to employees, and only 10.9 per cent to the corporations. From this 10.9 per cent, all expenses have to be taken, such as the cost of materials, taxes, interest on money borrowed, and so on. The average profit after tax for

corporations is just under 3 per cent.

I should like now to quote from John Maynard Keynes, as follows:

Unemployment exists because employers have been deprived of profits. The loss of profits may be due to all sorts of causes but short of going over to communism there is no possible means of curing unemployment except by restoring to employers a proper margin of profit.

I quote now the former British Labor Prime Minister, James Callaghan, as follows:

We must ask ourselves unflinchingly what is the cause of high unemployment. Quite simply and unequivocally, it is caused by paying ourselves more than the value of what we produce. This is an absolute fact of life which no government, be it left or right, can alter.

That from a British Labour Prime Minister. The advantages to be gained from a proper systematic communications programme are numerous and in many cases have an impact on costs and productivity. A systematic communications programme (and I think these should be set up in all companies) assists in the reduction of rumour and uncertainty. It helps to create an environment in which credibility, trust and co-operation can occur. It reduces the irrational content in labour negotiations, and it provides involvement, which is one of the major keys to productivity.

I come back to the fact that the real employer in this country is the consumer. The Government is not a producer, but the reverse, and therefore we have to encourage something which will provide the income that will enable a State such as this to continue.

To this stage, I have been quite critical of the management of companies. I am now going to be critical of the few radical union leaders—and I stress that I do not intend these remarks for the average union member. There is a quote from the communist manifesto of Carl Marx and Friedrich Engels, as follows:

We have seen that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class to win the battle of democracy. The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the *bourgeoisie* to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State.

You can see there that they speak of taking all capital from the *bourgeoisie*. Members opposite very much want to see death duties remain. That is one way of doing it. Obviously, from the way they brought in the South Australian Land Commission and other such public enterprises, the whole idea was to centralise the instrument of production in the hands of the State.

I should like to refer briefly to the member for Henley Beach who, in this House, has been called a scab. He has been forced to rescind his union membership. How petty can the group of people who made that decision get? Can they not stand the thought that perhaps some of their members are Liberal rather than Labor supporters? By what piece of imagination can that be seen as democracy when such a group can force a man who wanted to be a unionist to give up his membership purely because he is a member of the Liberal Party? And they talk about democracy! I should like to quote something from Charles Kingsley, which was given to us earlier in this session. He said:

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

What utter rubbish! Surely, if this State is to go ahead, we must give everyone the opportunity to improve himself. I stand here proudly, having come from what the Opposition would call a working-class family. I do not believe, as the Labor Party does, in encouraging

mediocrity. I quote from Saul Alinsky, a noted American radical organiser, who laid down a set of tactical principles under the title "Rules for radicals". One of his rules was:

Pick the target, freeze it, personalise it and polarise it. And polarisation is exactly what these few radical union members are trying to get. Why do they do this? It is not for the good of the workers or for the good of industry, but for their own selfish gain.

The member for Ascot Park asked earlier what was meant by productivity or increasing productivity. Again, using as an example my previous employment, perhaps I can explain. By increasing productivity, we mean by making the entire workings of the company more efficient. I can say that, with virtually no disruption in the work force, and nothing but co-operation from the majority of workers in that plant, the number of hours required to make a car has been reduced from more than 60 to 28. That is what is meant by increasing productivity, and it can be done by unions and management working together.

The member for Florey said that there was protection of the unions by the previous Government. I believe there were wage pressures that were helped by the unions and by the previous Government, but I do not believe that the previous Government should have given the preference that it did to certain areas of the union movement.

I now turn to another area of concern in this country, the type of unions which we have, trade unions. I believe, as does Bob Hawke, that this country needs bigger unions. I shall go further and say that I feel that this country would be helped if we had industry unions instead of trade unions. I have seen this system work extremely well in the United States. A contract is entered into between the employer and the employee groups. Both sides know their rights and their future, and the companies can plan, and ensure that contracts entered into will be met. I believe, for example, that the Japanese fear of dealing with Australia at the moment in the Pilbara would be overcome if we were to go in this way. Because of the troubles that are occurring up there, I am sure the Japanese would, if they could, go to another country for their ores.

I have seen in the United States the way in which management and workers enter into contracts. This enables planning, and the contracts are watertight. If the employer breaks the contract he can be sued by the unions. If the unions break the contract, they can be sued by the employer. Every three years there is a fair old stoush as the two get together and work out their agreement. The United Airlines strike was one of the worst examples in the States, but agreement has been reached, and for three years the company can plan, knowing that it will not suffer a strike.

I believe that unions should not become involved in politics. I fail to see what right a union, such as the one on the wharves, has to bring this country to a grinding halt, as it does so often. If it has a legitimate wage claim or because of working conditions, fine. If it cannot, under the present system, get what it wants, of course it has a right to strike. But, just because it disagrees with a Federal or State policy, by what God-given right can it turn out and stop the production of innocent people and innocent companies in this country?

If South Australian industry is to get back on its feet it has to be more competitive and efficient; it has to be able to plan. It cannot stand the demarcation disputes that presently occur. Again, who suffers in a demarcation dispute? Everybody! The companies lose and the workers lose. I know from my involvement in employment that far and away the majority of employees regard the demarcation disputes as something they wish they could get rid of. I believe that, under a contract system, under

industry unions, that would occur.

I do not agree with the member for Baudin, who said that we could not possibly agree with trade unions if we support private enterprise. I think he is confusing *laissez faire* with private enterprise. I believe that unions are absolutely necessary for the wages and conditions of their members. But, as I said earlier, I just cannot go along with political strikes. I believe, from some of the quotes I gave earlier, that far too many of the radical union leaders want to see the destruction of the society we presently enjoy.

I cannot agree with the way in which unions break the law and, if any action is taken against them, everybody goes on strike and they get away with it. What would they say if industrialists said that they disagreed with a court order and would shut their factory gates? Can members imagine the uproar at a lock-out like that? But what about a political strike, and that sort of thing? At this stage the unions have forced, through in some areas, conditions which are very detrimental to industry in this State.

I believe that an injured worker should get adequate workers' compensation, but he should not be in a situation in which it pays him not to go back to work, and that does happen today. It will probably surprise the member for Salisbury, but I am going to agree with one of the points he made about the involvement of unions in companies. I agree with him that private ownership by employees should occur, but I think that this should come, provided ownership of the company is bought. Worker ownership gives worker involvement; it gives the worker voting rights; it gives him the democracy that the unions tell us they want. Ownership will give him pride, and therefore it will be better for us all. Of course, we have seen examples where companies have done that and have reaped the benefits.

Another area of which I am critical of some of the structures within the union movement is the aspect of compulsory unionism and the fact that some unions take money automatically from their fees and give it to the Labor Party. How would the Labor members opposite feel if they were forced to contribute to the Liberal Party? I am sure that they would not like it at all. How do members think members of unions feel, if they are Liberal supporters, if they know that some of their money is supporting an ideology with which they, in fact, disagree? I believe that that is most iniquitous.

Turning to union voting, I believe that the member for Salisbury should take things a little further. He said that we should have compulsory elections at State and Federal levels, and I believe he said we should also at local government level. But for some reason he says that it is not necessary in unions. I cannot agree with that at all, because until we get compulsory voting, until we get the secret ballot, I believe the radical few will continue to control too many key unions. I imagine that members opposite are probably saying, "What rubbish!"

I was door-knocking a lot before the election, and I would like a dollar for each of the small businessmen and residents in the electorate of Todd who said to me that they were frightened because of the control of unions in this State. It is a fact that that is the way unions are perceived at the moment. People saw the State as over-regulated; they saw that the Government had an antipathy to private enterprise, they felt that the Government took only a one-sided view. I do not think that this can be under-estimated when looking at the effect of the last election.

I turn now to technological change. I agree with what the member for Baudin said about this matter, and this matter only, when he talked about technological change and the fact that so many unionists and others tend to look

at this as an ogre, as something that should go. It tends to remind one of members of the Ku Klux Klan who bought the tape of *Roots* and played it backwards so that it would have a happy ending. The thing is that there is just no way in which we are going to stop technological change. Some of the major reasons for this are the cost of employment, and, in this State, the unreliability due to strikes, the taking of sickies, and so on.

Cheap labour in other countries is a fact of life that we in Australia have to live with and, if Australian industry is going to be effective in competing in those markets, we have got to become more efficient. At this stage, obviously, technology is going ahead and there is no doubt that this Government and the Federal Government in future will have to look very closely at just what they are going to do in relation to technological change. It will bring about a society which, undoubtedly, has never existed before. It will bring about a society which, unless a lot of thought is given to the polarisation which is presently occurring, will become far worse and we will see some results which we would never have thought could occur in this country of ours. It is something which all of us will have to give a lot of thought to—not emotional thought. Again it comes back to communication. The owners and managers of industry have to sit down with the workers, the unions, and something must be worked out together, because if the Government forces something on the employers or the employees, or if the employers force something on their workers, or the workers force something on their employers, we will just have further and further polarisation.

I would now like briefly to summarise some of the points I have made relating them to my own seat of Todd. I have already spoken of the importance of transport to the district, the importance of education and good planning in the schools, and the fact that I wish to become a representative of all my constituents and provide them with the assistance that they need. The points I have made in the major part of my speech I see as tying up with the way in which I would like to assist the people in Todd. I would like to see a better system of public transport. I would like to see a better use of the roads in my area. I would like to see the effects of unemployment reduced. I would like to see us come up with some meaningful schemes in the area of growing technology.

Another point I would like to make is that I believe that, if we can have communication between people of different opinions, we will be so much richer for that.

I have already said that I agree with a number of points made by the member for Salisbury. Another point he made with which I agree strongly is that members of this House are sincere in the way in which they have gone about being elected to this place. They have beliefs and they feel that what they believe is best for the State. Everybody has that right. For example, the member for Salisbury has a strong belief in that support for Kampuchea should go through Ho Chi Min City. I respect his right to that belief. However, I disagree with it, but just because we disagree I see no reason why we should come to blows about the matter.

Although I totally disagree with the views of the member for Elizabeth on uranium mining and with the way he is going about having it stopped, no-one can question the sincerity of the views he holds. He has the right to hold those views, and to put them.

This, again, comes back to management and unions—of course there will be differences, but let us air them and come to an area of mutual agreement.

I must admit that since I have been in this place there has been one area of major concern to me so far as one

member is concerned. I refer now to the occasional member for Mitcham. I believe that the way in which he appears to handle this Parliament is not right.

I felt, when elected, an extreme sense of pride, and I believe that it is the duty of every Parliamentarian to be in the Parliament to be seen to do the job for which he has been elected. The honourable member's almost complete lack of attendance here concerns me greatly, and the public of South Australia should become more aware of the situation. I am being critical not of his beliefs or views, but of what I believe is not the right way in which a Parliamentarian should use this Parliament. He has been extremely critical of some of the so-called perks we enjoy but, at the same time, he accepted them. I have seen him on occasions having the cheap meals of which he was so critical, yet not attending the House. This is not right.

He has levelled criticism at both sides about our so-called benefits and salaries, which are certainly not high. If I had a lucrative law practice at which I spent so much time, I guess I would regard my salary as so much petty cash too. Regarding meals, we are required to work here, if we do our job earnestly and honestly, and as we are not able to go home and have meals and spend time with our families, this is not a perk at all.

The same honourable member wants an extra staff member. Perhaps if he spent more time as a politician, and less time in the courts, that might not be so necessary. I am also concerned about the criticism he has levelled at our Government over the use of Ministerial cars, especially when I consider the way he used (and I could use a stronger word than that) the privilege when he was a Minister some years ago. What I see as his misuse of Parliament has made me critical of that honourable member. It is not criticism of his views or of his right to hold indifferent views, but my sense of responsibility of being in the House appears to be different from his.

Finally, I wish to say that I look forward to contributing to the growth of this State, and I assure the member for Gilles and the member for Baudin that I also intend to do this for some time to come.

Mr. HAMILTON (Albert Park): In speaking to the motion, I will not let go unchallenged the number of remarks made in the House against the trade union movement in Australia. I refer particularly to the remarks made by the member for Morphett, who referred to the way in which union power is abused and industrial muscle is manipulated in the area of industrial relations. As an honorary union official for about 10 years, I think that I have some small knowledge of the problems associated with industrial dispute. I am also aware that any union member has the democratic right under the constitution of his organisation and under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act to challenge a decision of that organisation. If he is unable to seek proper redress through his organisation, he can apply to the Industrial Registrar, lodge a complaint, and ask him to investigate the decision of that organisation. If necessary, the Industrial Registrar can prosecute that organisation. I cannot recall during my 10 years as a union official and 25 years in the railway industry and as a union member of my organisation being prosecuted for breaching the constitution not only of the organisation but also as regards the Conciliation and Arbitration Act.

We also hear a great deal about secret ballots. In the constitution of the union of which I was a proud member, we had the opportunity (and occasionally our members availed themselves of the opportunity) of holding secret ballots. I did not oppose secret ballots. They were a democratic right. If the members were not afforded that

opportunity, they could have challenged the decision of the organisation to which I belonged. I belonged to a State-wide organisation; it had members as far south as Mount Gambier, as far north as Cockburn, and on the West Coast. To conduct a secret ballot, in many instances would have taken at least three weeks. I am not opposed to secret ballots and, if that was what the membership had wanted, we would gladly have conducted them. If the majority had agreed to taking industrial action as a result of a secret ballot, it occurred, and on the following day we found that the dispute could be resolved. Surely members of that organisation could have argued that they had the right to have a secret ballot to return to work.

Obviously, the Government can see the logic in what I am saying. Why hold out for three weeks unnecessarily if the workers are sincere in wanting to return to work and are opposed to losing money? Every situation should be weighed up. It is no good holding a secret ballot if a situation can be resolved perhaps in a day or so, or even in a matter of hours.

I refer now to the remarks of the member for Henley Beach about not being able to retain membership in his organisation. I was somewhat surprised that he said that, because I think that, if he had done some homework, he would have realised that many trade unions or organisations require their officials, once they leave the industry, to resign from the organisation. I was one who left the railways industry, and I also had to resign my position as brach president of that organisation. I was required under the constitution of the organisation to which I belonged to resign. I did not oppose that practice, even though I would have liked to retain membership in an organisation in which I strongly believed and to pay my union contributions, which I would gladly do today.

As a trade union member for many years and as a honorary official, I personally experienced the reactionary forces the trade union movement had to contend with whilst trying to obtain better wages and improved conditions for the workers I served for many years. I acknowledge the support and able assistance given me by the trade union movement in this State, particularly the branch officials and the rank-and-file members of the Australian Railways Union. It was through my trade union activities that I gained a greater appreciation and understanding of the aspirations and struggles of the average working man and woman in this country. It is worth while to reflect on some of the notable achievements of the trade union movement that have been won since the formation of trade unions in Australia.

Some of those achievements are as follows; shorter working hours, long service leave, annual leave, superannuation, public holidays, overtime rates, industrial safety, workers' compensation, equal pay for women, maternity leave, and the minimum wage. Until 1856, workers' hours ranged from 56 to 90 hours a week. In 1856, builders' workers were able to achieve an eight-hour day based on six working days a week; that is, eight hours work, eight hours recreation, and eight hours sleep. Subsequently, after a prolonged struggle, workers achieved a 48-hour week in 1900.

In 1920, timber workers achieved a 44-hour working week, but in 1929 the Arbitration commission granted an application by employers to extend working hours from 44 to 48 hours. It took another nine years before the 44-hour week was once again obtained. Another 10 years elapsed, and in January 1948 the trade union movement achieved a 40-hour working week. Since then, and 31 years later, the trade union movement has campaigned for a 35-hour week, even though since that time we have seen massive industrial, technological and automotive changes.

Annual leave of one week was achieved in 1941 after a prolonged campaign. Five years later, workers achieved two weeks annual leave, and another 13 years elapsed before most Australian workers were granted an additional weeks annual leave. It was not until 1970 that four weeks annual leave plus 17½ per cent annual leave loading was achieved. After nearly 30 years of consistent campaigning by the trade union movement, the Arbitration Commission handed down the equal pay for women decision. It is worth noting that in each and every application for equal pay made to the Arbitration Commission, there was a strong opposition by employers. Women were then, and still are in many instances, treated as second-class citizens in this country.

After many years of struggle by the trade unions to achieve penalty rates, we see employers and Governments advocating the abolition of not only penalty rates but also the annual leave loading. Employers have also recently advocated reduction of annual leave entitlements for a large number of employees. As many members on this side of the House are well aware, in many areas only lip service is paid by employers to industrial safety, and I could relate many instances of this in the industry in which I worked for 25 years.

As a union official and a railway employee for many years, I had many personal experiences of seeing fellow workmates suffer damage to, or loss of, limbs, etc. because of poor industrial safety provisions. In many instances, industrial disputations occurred because of the refusal of employers to observe basic safety precautions, and yet on so many occasions we heard the cry, "The strikes are caused by unions". In many instances, industrial disputation is a last resort by workers because of the delaying of union claims as long as possible by employers, and the refusal to enter into negotiations and/or take a calculated risk that lower profits caused by the strike will be less expensive than meeting union demands. The attention of the public is invariably directed to the union's decision to go on strike, while the provocative actions of employers are usually ignored by the press.

Some myths have been expounded about the trade union movement. It has been said that unions are too greedy, and they make too many unreasonable wage demands. What is a reasonable wage demand—one that meets the workers needs, one based on the employers ability to pay or one tied to productivity? The fact is that no-one has yet devised a workable formula to determine wage increases that would be considered reasonable by the employers, the workers, the Government and the public. In simple terms, workers' pay increases come mainly from two areas—rises fought for by the union and rises awarded upon promotion, which in many cases are also the result of union struggles. Yet both of these sources for wage rises do not compensate at the national gross wage earner level for the inflation of prices.

One should compare the figures. From 1975 to 1978, wages rose by 32 per cent, prices rose by 34.8 per cent, and profits rose by 44.1 per cent. According to the facts, who is too greedy—wage earners or the companies?

We also hear that unions are always going on strike. Strikes grab the headlines. As a result, most people have a totally distorted idea about the frequency and impact of strikes in Australia. It is even suggested that our economic problems are caused by excessive strikes. Yet, the Federal Minister for Productivity, Mr. McPhee, released details of Government surveys of September 1977 which show that there is approximately 10 times more lost production attributed to sickness and accidents than to strikes. In 1976, only four-fifths of one day on average per employee

was lost through industrial disputes. Absentee rates are apparently higher where factors such as job boredom, poor inter-personal communications and poor management-employee relations are present. That information is from the *Financial Review* of 29 September 1979.

We do not pretend that strikes are not a serious matter. Certainly, no worker wants to go without pay but if a lot more fuss was made about the reason for absenteeism which causes more loss to production than strikes, we would be less cynical of the cries by Governments, employers, and the press. Have you seen headlines decrying job boredom in the papers lately? Have you read editorials urging companies to practice better safety conditions to avoid loss of productivity and human suffering. Power in Australia is concentrated in the hands of a very small group of wealthy people. The heads of companies like B.H.P., Chrysler, Utah or the Bank of Adelaide make decisions in their boardrooms which directly affect the lives of all Australians, not just the thousands of employees.

International company heads in New York or Tokyo can make decisions which result in further unemployment in Australia. I would like to refer to the matter of unemployment later. The power of the great companies is enhanced by their ability to pressurize Governments. For example, they threaten that, if company tax is not reduced, they will close their Australian plants and move to the Philippines, where, as we all know, workers are paid a pittance. They spend sums lobbying, and they swallow up small local competitors. Governments also have great powers which are sometimes recklessly used. There has been a series of tough legislative action against trade unions in Australia recently which increased the power of Governments to penalise trade unionists. It is the Governments that exercise the power to establish the legal framework of controls upon unions.

The media, too, have the power to influence attitudes by withholding information and providing slanted news and editorial comment. Have you ever read a newspaper editorial supporting a union or a strike? The bias of the Australian news media, which are owned in the main by only four companies, is against the kinds of union activity which has contributed so significantly to today's living standards.

I would like to refer to comments made by the member for Todd that unions should not become involved in the political arena. This is a cry of those who have control of a particular situation and who wish to maintain the *status quo*. In fact, it is the responsibility of trade unions to be involved in the struggle for improving living standards for their members. It is obvious that, if the Government decides to raise taxes, unions should have a right to protect their members' pay packets as they see fit.

Similarly, there are many issues in our complex society where it is not just appropriate, but in fact essential, that unions act in defence of living standards. Such issues include health costs, superannuation, discrimination, pollution, transport, education, and unemployment. The level of union activity on those questions may be determined by the members, but remember that those who have the real power in our society, the corporation heads and Government Ministers, will determine the course of events according to their own interests unless organised groups in the community such as the unions can bring their influence to bear.

I refer again to the comment of the member for Todd about compulsory unionism. We never hear of non-union members refusing to accept salary increases won by unions. For example, if a teacher union struggles hard and achieves a salary rise, that is awarded to all teachers, even

if they are not in the union. A union member pays the fees, supports the union, even goes on strike and forfeits pay if necessary, but the non-unionist, too, gets the pay-rise at no cost. One could ask whether this is fair. Incidentally, the A.C.T.U. has never argued that non-union members should not get the benefits won by the unions, and unions generally do not oppose *bona fide* conscientious objectors to unionism, no matter how illogical the conscientious belief may be. Those objectors accept pay-rises won by the unions, too, but clearly it is not non-union membership which is unfair, as the members make the sacrifices but everyone shares the benefits.

I turn now to the old bogeys "Reds under the bed" and "The unions are led by communists". This is a typical comment by members opposite. Each union elects its leader in accordance with procedures determined by legislation. I see that the member for Henley Beach nods in agreement. The results reflect the wide variety of attitudes amongst union members to the style of leadership they seek. As you would expect, this wide variety includes many different shades of political opinion, even some allies of the Liberal Party. Opponents of the trade union movement are constantly claiming that communist leaders within the trade union movement are conspiring to create industrial chaos. That is a dangerous misrepresentation, and it reflects a refusal of such people to acknowledge that union members do not go on strike, losing pay in the process, unless they have a genuine and deeply-felt grievance. Mr. Justice Ludeke, a Deputy President of the Arbitration Commission, said in July 1979:

Many take refuge in the conspiracy theory, that fantasy in which every strike and ban is linked and traced back to a secret cell of industrial bomb-throwers. If we permit the ascendancy of the conspiracy theory, we will fail entirely to understand the nature of industrial relations.

In my first speech in this House I referred, amongst other matters, to the most serious social problem in Australia today, being, of course, the unemployment problem. I quote from the booklet "Beyond unemployment", which was prepared for the Catholic bishops of Australia and which states:

Unemployment is the most urgent social problem in Australia today. It is a problem which has a serious impact on all Australians and a destructive impact on those who are unemployed and their dependants.

With regard to the problem of dependants, I will refer to the July-August edition of the Australian Railways Union Magazine in which mention was made of the problems of children of unemployed people, as follows:

The South Australian survey made the depressing point for the future of the children of these families, based on US experience, that children who grow up without a working parent for a significant time during their teenage years have themselves difficulty in adapting a life style conducive to work—so a cycle of poverty is created. Some Utopians believe that the times are a-changing, and that the work ethic is finished, so the unemployed will be happy doing nothing. This may come to pass in some distant future, but speculating that it is nigh is decidedly premature and tends to play into the hands of the dole bludger bashers. For most people most Australians, most British or any other country were sociological investigations have been carried out, the evidence is overwhelming that work is a psychological necessity. People identify themselves in their occupation; the work place is a source of conversation and social contact, the wages obtained are far above the dole and provide for their dependants. The massive evidence from the survey work carried out by sociologists and psychologists, and the

experience of social workers in direct contact with the unemployed, is that they are not happy doing nothing. One English authority, J. M. Hill, commented:

Leisure takes on a different quality than it had during times of employment. It involves staying longer in bed, watching more television or just lazing about, without a sense of restoration in preparation for meaningful occupation. It is one thing to come home after a day's work and flop down in front of a television screen, but it is another to watch television during the daytime because you simply have nothing else to do.

Indeed, the unemployed often become uneasily aware that as time goes on they develop a kind of inertia that is psychologically debilitating. They feel insufficiently stimulated and personally undervalued. The terms that are used consistently to describe this condition include—"depression", "boredom" and "laziness". They feel increasingly that they are not only becoming occupationally de-skilled so far as their previous work is concerned, but psychologically de-skilled, also being less able to make the effort to discover in themselves the drive either to search for work or to get back to it if a job were to become available. In simple words, long-term unemployment in our society destroys people as human beings.

There is a widely expressed concern in the community about the economic problems facing Australians. Unemployment is seen as one of these economic problems, but the social dimensions of unemployment are even more important than are the economic dimensions, for they are the needs and problems of people who are real, and not just statistics. The social dimension is not concerned with the economics of Budget deficits, money supply in the gross domestic product, but with the actual suffering and hardship experienced by individuals and families in our community, those who have to bear the burden of unemployment. This social dimension is our first concern.

Who are the unemployed? The basic facts about unemployment in Australia are well known. We all know that the unemployment rate has been rising steadily since 1974, that the number unemployed each month is higher than was the number in the corresponding month in the previous year, and that the current level of unemployment is the highest since the Great Depression in the 1930's. We know that the rate in January 1979 was 7 per cent, and that in May 1979, one of the best months each year, it had fallen only to 6.1 per cent, according to the A.B.S. figure.

Although we know these facts, it is difficult to comprehend the extent of the suffering that these statistics represent. It is difficult to visualise 400 000 unemployed Australians. If all these people were gathered together, they would form the sixth largest city in Australia. Sydney has a population of 2 765 040; Melbourne, 2 604 232; Brisbane, 957 745; Adelaide, 900 745; Perth, 805 747; and the total number of unemployed is 446 200. If we include their dependants, perhaps we would have the third largest city.

The official figures for unemployment do not tell the full story. In addition to those registered as unemployed, there are perhaps hundreds of thousands of others who want paid employment but cannot find it. They are the women who are deterred from entering the work force because of poor prospects, the young people who return to school unwillingly, the handicapped persons who were employed previously but who are now classified as unemployable, older persons forced into early retirement, and persons of all ages and backgrounds who deny that they are unemployed so as to avoid social disgrace. Young people are more affected. In a situation of massive unemployment, employers are more selective, demanding higher standards from job applicants. Young people with no job

experience and no record of stability miss out. When they obtain a job, young people are usually the last hired, and so often are the first fired when retrenchments occur.

The causes of youth unemployment are not simply short term. There are also long-term factors which will exist even if recovery occurs. The high birth rate in the 1960's, for example, means that job opportunities must increase during the next five years even to keep employment at current levels. It is estimated that 250 000 new jobs will have to be found each year for the next 10 years for young people entering the work force. Even without migration, there will be an average of about 250 000 youths entering the Australian labour market each year until the end of the 1980's. The problem of creating jobs for this immense generation is clearly with us for more than a decade to come.

The *News* of 15 October 1979 reports a statement by Bill Hayden, as follows:

By this time of year, another generation of young Australians are thinking of what the future holds for them beyond the education system. In the next few months, about 250,000 young Australians will be leaving schools and tertiary institutions and, on the evidence of the past few years, at least one in five of them can expect to go straight into the unemployment statistics and stay there for months. That is an appalling prospect in a country like this, but one which still receives surprisingly low priority from our Federal Government.

The situation of the young unemployed, is, first of all, a great tragedy in human terms. We cannot accept that, at the point of entering the mainstream of the community, the best-equipped and most highly motivated of our citizens should suffer such rejection—which is certainly how most of them see it. Rejection leads easily to alienation, and the step from there to hostility, with so many bad social consequences, is dangerously short.

At this juncture, I should like to elaborate on some of the problems associated with unemployment, and I refer to crime and drugs. Unemployment causes crime. Oddly enough, there is a school of conservative criminologists who can juggle general criminal statistics to show otherwise, but I know from the police I have talked to and the store managers and the worried parents that petty crime by young unemployed is a growing problem. The Youth Unemployed Working Party established in South Australia in 1976 reported a 58 per cent increase in juvenile offences over four years. The largest increase was among unemployed juveniles, where the conviction rate rose by 238 per cent. The latest figures for New South Wales disclose in court statistics for 1977 that, for serious crimes tried in the higher criminal courts, 27.9 per cent of those convicted between the ages of 15 and 19 years were unemployed, and for the 20 to 24 years age group, some 20.3 per cent. Shoplifting cases in New South Wales for that period reached a massive 4 910 cases. Police records show an increase of 10 per cent over the year.

On the question of drugs, for an unhappily large number of youth unemployed the attractions of another desperate subculture, the drug world, draw them in. This was brought home to many members in this House last Thursday when we spoke to some of those unemployed people from CITY. Heroin use cases are universally up in areas of high unemployment in Australia, and they are still rising. In the 1977 figures, Blacktown, in the New South Wales outer western suburbs, recorded 187 drug convictions, while Bankstown recorded 240 and Liverpool 220. Of the overall number convicted for drug offences for the year in New South Wales, 25.4 per cent were unemployed, compared to 21.9 per cent in the previous year.

The human cost in wasted lives is incalculable, but the material costs in medical, counselling and other services are very substantial, although never included by the politicians, who worry about the deficit. The health implications of unemployment go far beyond drugs; the report of the Joint Economic Committee of the United States Congress in 1975 said that statistical evidence showed the direct influence of unemployment increases on physical health.

A 1 per cent general rise in the rate of unemployment led to a 4.1 per cent increase in the suicide rate, a 3.4 per cent increase in mental hospital admissions, a 4 per cent increase in prison admissions, and a 5.7 per cent increase in deaths from illnesses of the heart, liver and kidneys. One of the other most traumatic experiences that one reads about, of course, is the suicide rate.

In Australia, as Keith Windschuttle has demonstrated in his book *Unemployment* the peaks and troughs in the male suicide rate from 1906 to 1973 correlated very closely to the level of unemployment. The Victorian Mental Health Authority carried out a survey of suicide attempts in Dandenong and Ballarat over the two years 1975-76. In Ballarat the attempted suicide rate of the unemployed was more than twelve times; the average rate in Dandenong more than seven times. In Sydney another survey in 1976 showed that of the 235 attempted suicide cases in the Blacktown area, some 40 per cent of the men were either on the dole or invalid pensions. Associated with suicide rates is the increase in mental illness. The depression of the unemployed easily deepens into a clinical state after the crisis time. Malnutrition and poor diet among the dependants of those half living on the dole are storing up problems for the future.

The catalogue of social cost is almost endless; vandalism by the bored and alienated; youthful alcoholism. The great difference between Australia and the other countries in the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development is that the other nations are concerned about these costs. In Australia a question to the Prime Minister on unemployment can bring an answer like this one given by Malcolm Fraser on 23 May 1979, when he was asked his opinion on a crass piece of callousness from J. Haslem, MP for Canberra. Haslem had proposed that dole payments to those under 25 should be abolished. Malcolm Fraser answered:

... I say only that, while those particular matters have been stated, the policy of the Government is the policy of the Government that happens to be the policy that is applied at the moment. Let me also say that we will in no way embrace the policy of the Opposition, which suggests some unemployed people should be encouraged to have unemployment benefits and go and surf at the beach at the taxpayer's expense.

That, history will record, was the response of the Prime Minister of Australia to the existence in the month of May of young people on the dole. The victims have become the scapegoats. This is appalling in a country like Australia, but it still receives a surprisingly low priority from the Federal Government. The situation of the unemployed is, first, a great tragedy in human terms. We cannot accept that, at that point of entering the mainstream of the community, the best equipped and highly motivated of our citizens should suffer such rejection, which is how most of them see it. Rejection leads to alienation, and the step from there to hostility, and to so many bad social consequences, is dangerously short.

At the same time, the Special Youth Employment Training Programme has been cut back this year by 60 per cent to \$50 000 000, and the Community Youth Support scheme, a much smaller programme, has been cut by 2.3

A special survey commissioned by *The Weekend Australian* shows that most people agree unemployment is a more serious problem than inflation.

Spectrum Research interviewed by telephone a random selection of 1 005 people aged 18 and over in Sydney and Melbourne on October 13 and 14. The tables at left give a detailed breakdown of the survey, which is copyright to Nationwide News.

Question: Which do you feel is the more serious problem—unemployment or inflation?

	CITY	
	Sydney	Melbourne
Base	504	501
Unemployment	291	309
Per cent	57.8	61.6
Inflation	177	173
Per cent	35.1	34.6
Don't know	36	22
Per cent	7.1	4.4
N.A.	—	—

Mr. HAMILTON: I have a table that shows the present unemployment situation in Australia and South Australia, and I seek leave to incorporate these statistics in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: They are purely statistical?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes.

Leave granted.

1. UNEMPLOYMENT

The Present Position

Comparative figures for unemployment rates in Australia and South Australia since 1971 are given in tables below:

	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79
Australia	1.7	2.5	1.8	2.4	4.6	4.7	5.7	6.2	6.2
South Australia	2.5	3.2	2.5	2.8	4.9	4.2	6.3	7.4	7.6

A.B.S. figures—August of each year.

At the end of September 1979 there were:

324 100 persons looking for full time work (C.E.S. figures 390 000)

73 900 persons looking for part time work

398 000

Mr. HAMILTON: The statistics illustrate that 6.2 per cent of the work force is unemployed. Of those looking for full-time work, 49 100 were aged between 15 and 19 years and looking for a first job. The total number of young people looking for full-time employment is however 113 800. Thus, one unemployed in three is aged between 15 and 19 years. A comparison with the position last year showed that the situation is worsening. In September 1978, 39 200 aged between 15 and 19 years were looking for a first job, and 102 000 young people were looking for full-time work. In September 1979, in South Australia 38 000 were looking for full-time work and 7 100 were looking for part-time work; this represents 7.6 per cent of the work force. The total number of young people looking for full-time employment was 16 700; this compares with a figure of 17 500 at the same time last year, showing that youth unemployment has declined over the past year, which is against the trend for Australia as a whole.

Youth unemployment in South Australia continues to be above the national average which, in South Australia, is 27.1 per cent, compared to the figure for Australia as a whole of 18.8 per cent. Youth unemployment is not a new development. In 1964-65, 37 per cent of all unemployed were teenagers, and the percentage in 1976-77 was 35.6. What has changed is the rate of unemployment as a percentage of the teenage labour force. This figure remained at 3 per cent to 5 per cent throughout the 1960's, but increased to 10.2 per cent in 1974-75 and 14.5 per cent in 1976-77. The number of youth unemployed has increased markedly. In 1965, 37 per cent of youth unemployment represented 14 000 people, whereas today

a similar percentage represents over 100 000. Therefore, it can be seen that since the early 1960's the Australian economy has consistently failed to provide employment for a significant percentage of its youth. I have other tables which I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure the Chair they are of a statistical nature?

Mr. HAMILTON: Yes.

Leave granted.

TABLE 3

Shares and Rates of Teenage Unemployment

	(A) Shares (Per cent of Overall Unemployment Borne by Teenagers)			(B) Rate (Teenagers Unemployed as per cent of teenage labour force)		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1964-65 ...	33.2	40.6	37.3	2.5	4.0	3.3
1965-66 ...	31.9	43.9	37.9	3.1	4.6	3.8
1966-67 ...	29.4	41.1	35.1	3.3	4.7	4.0
1967-68 ...	30.9	36.4	33.7	3.6	4.7	4.1
1968-69 ...	30.3	37.4	34.0	3.3	4.8	4.0
1969-70 ...	32.5	34.7	33.6	3.6	4.5	4.0
1970-71 ...	33.2	33.2	33.2	3.9	4.1	4.0
1971-72 ...	30.6	34.3	32.2	5.4	5.4	5.4
1972-73 ...	32.8	35.3	34.0	6.2	6.8	6.5
1973-74 ...	34.3	38.1	36.3	4.8	6.2	5.4
1974-75 ...	29.4	39.7	34.2	9.2	11.4	10.2
1975-76 ...	32.4	41.2	36.5	12.1	14.8	13.4
1976-77 ...	31.8	40.2	35.6	13.2	16.0	14.5

Source: ABS, The Labour Force, Ref. 6.20

TABLE 9—UNEMPLOYED PERSONS BY AGE GROUP, SOUTH AUSTRALIA (continued)

Period	Unemployed (Age Group)					Unemployment Rate (Age Group) (a)				
	15-19	20-24	25-34	35 & Over	Total	15-19	20-24	25-34	35 & Over	Total
	'000					Per cent				
	PERSONS									
August 1971	3.7	2.8	*	4.5	13.1	5.7	3.6	*	1.7	2.5
August 1972	4.4	*	3.6	7.0	17.1	6.8	*	3.2	2.5	3.2
August 1973	5.8	*	*	3.5	13.7	8.5	*	*	1.3	2.5
August 1974	5.8	2.7	3.1	4.2	15.8	8.2	3.2	2.4	1.5	2.8
August 1975	10.9	4.9	5.6	7.0	28.5	14.9	5.7	4.1	2.5	4.9
August 1976	10.2	3.7	4.5	6.3	24.7	13.2	4.2	3.2	2.2	4.2
November	10.1	6.1	4.5	5.5	26.4	13.4	6.8	3.2	1.9	4.4
February 1977	14.4	7.5	6.6	8.1	36.6	17.1	8.1	4.6	2.9	6.0
May	13.2	9.4	5.4	7.3	35.3	15.7	10.1	3.7	2.6	5.8
August	16.9	7.8	5.3	8.4	38.5	20.0	8.7	3.6	2.9	6.3
November	14.5	7.5	6.8	8.0	36.8	18.6	8.1	4.6	2.8	6.1
February 1978 (b)	17.8	10.0	8.4	9.1	45.4	21.0	11.1	5.7	3.3	7.6
March	14.7	9.3	7.0	8.6	39.6	17.9	10.2	4.8	3.1	6.6
April	13.7	8.0	7.6	8.0	37.3	16.9	8.9	5.2	2.9	6.2
May	14.9	6.8	10.0	8.5	40.2	18.6	7.6	6.8	3.0	6.7
June	15.5	7.3	8.9	9.2	40.9	19.1	8.2	5.9	3.3	6.8
July	14.8	7.5	7.7	9.6	39.7	19.1	8.4	5.1	3.4	6.6
August	17.1	9.0	8.6	9.5	44.2	21.5	10.1	5.7	3.4	7.4
September	18.9	9.3	7.7	11.0	46.9	23.6	10.4	5.1	3.9	7.8
October	17.7	8.4	8.2	11.3	45.7	22.6	9.4	5.3	4.1	7.6
November	14.9	8.7	9.2	11.4	44.2	19.2	9.6	6.0	4.1	7.4
December	19.2	10.2	7.1	10.4	46.9	22.9	10.7	4.6	3.7	7.6
January 1979	18.3	8.6	8.6	10.5	45.9	22.0	9.4	5.8	3.8	7.7
February	18.2	10.4	10.1	11.0	49.6	22.0	11.3	6.7	3.9	8.2

(a) The unemployment rate for any group is the number unemployed expressed as a percentage of the labour force (i.e. employed plus unemployed) in the same group.

(b) Figures before February 1978 have been revised.

A.B.S. The Labour Force February 1979.

Mr. HAMILTON: It can be seen that the rate of teenage unemployment has increased from 5 per cent to 7 per cent up to 22 per cent and 27 per cent in September 1979, and the number of this age group unemployed has risen from 3 700 in 1971, to 18 200, and it was 16 700 in September 1979. The rate of increase has been much higher for this age group than for any other age group listed.

In the brief time left, I will speak on the attitude towards unemployment. Once again, I refer to the Catholic book *Beyond Unemployment*. The unemployed are victims of structures over which they have little control. Their well-being is subject to the competing interests of Governments, employers and unions, the development of technology, the pursuit of profits—all the forces which shape the economy. They are not victims in the same sense as we are victims of those forces. We all, for example, are involved in the fight against inflation, but the unemployed bear more than a just share of the burden of that fight.

The benefit of reducing inflation is achieved at a minimum cost to the 93 per cent who are employed and at intolerable cost to the 7 per cent who are not employed. Even though their employment is not of their making, the unemployed are frequently subjected to abuse. The dole bludger allegations of 1975-76 have been softened, but there is still a prevalent attitude at all levels of society that the unemployed are bludging, loafing, or drop-outs, but this is not true of the majority of unemployed. It cannot be stated strongly or often enough that the unemployed are victims, not criminals. Many surveys, studies and reports, including some by Government departments, have found that the proportion of unemployed who can be considered dole bludgers or work shy is minimal, yet the unemployed are still portrayed in these terms, even by those who should know the real situation. Indeed, the very word "dole" should not be used to describe benefits which, in

Australia, are a right. The same attitude underlines statements such as "work is available if someone really wants work". This, too, is clearly untrue.

In January 1979, there were about 20 unemployed persons for each vacancy. There are about 24 young unemployed for each vacancy for their age group, yet some community leaders still say that there is enough work if people want to work. Such situations directed to the unemployed are damaging and unjust. They can only reinforce feelings of failure and worthlessness when those so encouraged to find work are unsuccessful. Another popular belief is that the unemployed lead a life of luxury on unemployment benefits. This is simply not possible. The weekly rates of benefit in June 1979 were for a 15-year-old, nil; for 16 to 17 years, up to \$36; adult single, up to \$51.45; adult single with at least one dependant, up to \$53.20; adult married, up to \$88.70; and for each child, up to \$7.50. These benefits are supposed to cover all the necessities of life, such as food, clothing, shelter, and recreation.

I refer not to a report that appeared in the *News* of 8 May 1979 that gave an example of how a man and a wife with two children are expected to live. The report states:

When the \$38 000 a year Industry and Commerce Minister, Mr. Lynch, recently said that he thought the dole was far too high, it was seen as a hint that cuts could be on the way in the next Federal Budget. It is a prospect that has alarmed thousands of families making do on the dole, for whom life is not merely easy, but merely impossible.

Making do on the dole: Last Thursday, John Ford borrowed a utility, packed his wife and two kids into the front seat, and took them to the drive-in movies. It was a splurge, a real extravagance. As a result, the only food they have to eat until the dole cheque arrives tomorrow is a tin of spaghetti and six eggs. The Fords husband John, wife Margaret, kids

Martin, 20 months, and nine-week-old Kendrick are a family on the dole.

Each fortnight they get a cheque for \$192.40 and, with that, John Ford somehow manages to feed and clothe his family, pay the bills and have enough left over to be able to look for a job. He sums it up with a soft-voiced understatement, "It's not easy."

Life wasn't meant to be easy. Out of the dole cheque comes the following fixed fortnightly expenses: rent of \$66, gas and electricity \$3.50, repayments of \$8.65 on their fridge and washing machine, \$20.20 hospital insurance, necessary because their daughter has a heart condition and brain damage which requires constant care, and \$6 life insurance premiums.

That leaves just \$85 a fortnight for food and clothing, and that rare night at the drive-in. "It's tough, no doubt about it," he said. "Food is our biggest problem. I have to keep an eye open for all the bargains. We've just run out of coffee and margarine but we won't be able to buy any more until the next cheque arrives. I can't run a car. I can afford only one packet of cigarettes a week and sometimes I have to rely on charity to get clothes for my family and myself."

The point that has to be stressed is that the Fords are not an isolated case. Like thousands of other families throughout Australia, they are living on the poverty line, thanks to the dole. But John does not get bitter about it. "Sure the dole is not enough to provide for a decent sort of life. But I often think to myself 'What would I do without it.' At least we can survive, not much more, but we survive and I'm grateful for the dole."

If the Fords call their lifestyle surviving, then working Australia lives in the lap of luxury. Take yesterday. There were those few eggs in the cupboard, and a tin of spaghetti. The washing machine had broken down. They could not afford to have it fixed. Margaret had a mere 38 cents in her piggy bank. John was waiting for a telegram to tell him if he had a job or not. And they were still smiling. John last worked six weeks ago. He spent nine weeks working in an automotive factory, and he's looking for any kind of factory work now though he says he is prepared to turn his hand to anything that comes along.

I will not read the rest of the article, because I do not have time. I refer to unemployment benefits and the Catholic book entitled *Beyond Unemployment*, which states:

The Government should also reassess the level of unemployment benefits and the conditions attached to these benefits. Until society—

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

Mr. SCHMIDT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): I refer to housing and particularly the activities of the South Australian Housing Trust. The annual report of the Housing Trust for the year ending 30 June 1979 was tabled in this House last week. It revealed that the previous year was one in which the trust had to reconsider and redefine its objectives, some policies, and organisation that will be needed to meet the needs of the 1980's. The report revealed that the trust had a deficit of nearly \$3 500 000 last financial year. This compares with a deficit of \$900 000 for the previous year, and it was largely due to the fall in trust house sales from \$3 300 000 in 1977-78 to \$150 000 in 1978-79.

Mr. Mathwin: They're building out in the sticks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. SLATER: The report also indicates that rent reductions during 1978-79 amounted to about \$5 000 000. That figure was based on \$10 755 forgone by the trust in the last week of June. The annual report indicates clearly that the cuts in Commonwealth funds had a serious effect on the trust's over-all programme and that the trust suffered an over-all reduction in funds of \$17 300 000 as a result. The needs of the community for housing assistance remain substantial and urgent. Therefore, the trust faces the future with diminished confidence if the Commonwealth is to continue to provide insufficient capital for public housing. There is a continued pressure from those in need for housing assistance. This prospect has led the trust to examine several alternatives to ensure the most effective management resources available and to overcome the problem of allocating resources to competing priority needs.

Social changes that have occurred have affected the nature of these demands. Of the 9 403 applications for rental accommodation last year, the characteristics of the applications reflect current and economic social trends: 26.1 per cent of applications came from single parent families; 12.7 per cent came from people who were unemployed; 7.9 per cent came from aged pensioners; and 63.9 per cent came from persons earning less than \$200 a week. The principle for setting rents is indeed a difficult one, and the trust provides a rental reduction for persons in necessitous circumstances. At this stage, approximately one in three tenants receive rent reductions; that is, 12 012 persons, or 31 per cent of the tenants of the trust are now receiving a reduction in rent or a concessional rent. Five years ago, 3 157 or 8.9 per cent of all tenants were in receipt of rental reductions.

I am concerned that it will be necessary, owing to the substantial reduction in Commonwealth funds and in line with the trust's activities of last year, for the trust to make substantial adjustments to rents. Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, it is required that the State is to make an annual rent review. No doubt, recommendations from the trust are currently under consideration by the Minister and the Government. Indications are that market rents will be considered rather than market related rents. The Federal Minister for Housing, Mr. Groom, at the last Housing Ministers' conference, endeavoured to promote the need for State housing authorities to adopt market rents. It was only the intervention of the then State Minister of Housing, Mr. Hudson, that persuaded the conference to adopt the policy of market related rents.

Mr. Mathwin: He's gone.

Mr. SLATER: Well, maybe he has gone.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member that he should not answer interjections, which are out of order.

Mr. SLATER: That is true, but if the member for Glenelg—

Mr. Mathwin: You naughty man.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg will cease interjecting.

Mr. SLATER: Thank you, Sir. The Liberal Party policy statements as to the re-emphasis of trust activities indicate that the trust may be pressured to move to market rents. If so, there will be sharp increases to all Housing Trust rents.

Mr. Evans: The previous Minister agreed to do that.

Mr. SLATER: We agreed to market related rents. Market rents are a comparatively different situation. If we move to market rents because of the trust's situation and the lack of Commonwealth funds, we will find that tenants

with the least capacity to pay will bear the financial burden of significantly increased Housing Trust rent. I have always believed that the Housing Trust has been an efficient and effective organisation, and is to be commended for its efforts on behalf of the people of South Australia.

However, I am concerned that because of the substantial reduction of Commonwealth funds the trust will find it necessary to make adjustments to Housing Trust rents. As I said, most unfortunately, many tenants who can least afford it will be faced with steep increases in rent.

Another factor mentioned in the report of the trust was that the reduction in Commonwealth funds has seen the discontinuance of the rental-purchase scheme. Since the scheme was introduced in 1962, 8 144 low-income families have been able to purchase homes under the scheme. It was a scheme where by people could purchase a home over a 40-year period at low interest finance under the earlier Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, but this scheme has been discontinued. It has been particularly successful and unfortunately it has been torpedoed because of the lack of Commonwealth funds. So we face a situation in which trust activities are likely to be severely curtailed. What concerns me most is that most of the tenants will be faced with large increases in rents. This is in line with some of the policy statements made by the now Government, prior to the election, in relation to a re-emphasis on the activities of the Housing Trust. I hope that the Minister will seriously consider market related rents rather than moving to market rents as far as the South Australian Housing Trust is concerned.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I cannot let this opportunity go without at least making some comments in relation to what has been said by the member for Gilles. He can be assured as can the people in the Housing Trust homes that those who have the least capacity to pay will not have the burden of heavy increases in rent placed on them. There is very little difference between market related rents or market rent as it is a matter of interpretation at the final stage as to what rent you apply. The previous Minister, in the Labour Government accepted in connection with the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement, that we should move forward towards market or market related rents. That was an agreement by all of the States with the Commonwealth because they believed it was desirable. The reason we as a nation decided that was the right approach was that people in the community were exploiting the situation. Some people with grown-up families were still paying very low rent for Housing Trust accommodation; they had caravans, boats, holiday shacks, and so on.

In fact, I know of one family that had money invested in flats and home units, and achieved this while operating a business and living in a Housing Trust home. We know of prominent people in the community who lived in Housing Trust accommodation for very little rent. It is only right that those people who can afford to pay market rent (that which would apply in the private sector) should pay it. In fact, if we had taken that step in the 1950's when the scheme of large-scale construction of Housing Trust rental accommodation began, we would have found that many more people set out to buy their own home. They would then have had an investment, and being financially better off in the long run, with the security of a home. This would have meant more money for the State and Commonwealth to spend on persons in the lower-income groups.

However, this was not done and it was as much the fault of Liberal Governments, off other Governments; as in fact if may have been more the fault of Liberal Governments

because in the main Liberal Governments were in power right throughout the country at the time. We have realised that those people paying tax cannot go on paying the burden. I have never heard one member opposite say that he is sure that he can go out into the community and promote that people should pay higher taxes, because one could not hope to win an election and support after having said that. The average person in the community paying taxes of any type believes he is paying too much tax for income received, whether it be wage or salary or some form of profit from some business organisation.

The State and Commonwealth Liberal Government brought in the rental-purchase scheme in 1962 because it was a good scheme. Time has proved that it is not the best scheme any more. That is why the State and the Commonwealth agreed to it. With regard to the honourable member's reference to low-income groups, it is the Liberal Party's philosophy that quite clearly the main role of the Housing Trust is to look after those persons and provide for them the lower rental accommodation. Others who have lower priced rental accommodation and who can afford to pay rental at somewhere near the private sector rental should be asked to do so.

Members opposite should consider the young people in the community who as tradesmen, are attempting to buy a home, paying anything from \$8 000 upwards for a block of land and from \$26 000 upwards for the home they build on the block. Large first and second mortgages are involved and the cost of putting in furniture is considerable. Those persons are in a much more difficult position in trying to meet those commitments than are people in the Housing Trust rental accommodation who earn at least an average wage.

Let us not forget that the group in the community that is most forgotten by both sides of politics has in the past been the average young couple moving into a home. The most difficult period of their life is when they are trying to buy a home and raise a family. Very often Government planning authorities push those families out to the extremities, making it costly to travel to the city where most of them work. They are thus greatly disadvantaged.

We should be starting to think about those people, ensuring as far as planning is concerned, that we start to redevelop some of the inner metropolitan area. You can be sure that with this Government that sort of approach will be more prominent in the future than it has been in the past with a Government that has just fallen by the wayside because of its inability to do the right thing by the State and its people.

I originally intended to speak about another matter. I believe one of the biggest curses we have in our society is greed. Whether it be the greed of the individual or of companies, big or small (but mainly big) or whether by organisations, trade union movements, or whatever it may be, the thing that has destroyed much of what was good about our country has been greed. One member was heard to say recently that we should be concerned about young people and their lack of opportunities for work, and that is one of the major problems we face. That member spoke of how difficult it was for young people to obtain work, and yet that member actively supports, as does the union movement that supports him, the concept of first-on-last-off.

In other words, the person who got a job in a factory 20 years ago will be the last one to be put off. The question of ability does not arise: the young person going along for a job as the last on is the first off. How will young people develop any confidence in a system that does not have regard for how good your brain is or how great your

capacity for work is? The society tells young people that they will be sacrificed first under the first-on-last-off system. The Party opposite supports that position, and this makes one wonder how genuine are other statements they make.

We should recognise that brilliant young people must be given an opportunity for permanent employment, without such a threat hanging over them.

I turn now to what greed has done, and I refer to the big stores, especially those in the food business, which have set out to do things which, although lawful, are unethical. They have set out, by arrangement with manufacturers, to buy goods if in turn they are given money for promotion purposes. The big stores in the food industry are not paying for the advertisements. It is the manufacturer who pays, and adds it to his costs, so that he can justify food prices.

I believe that the big stores very often are exploiting the consumer in that way, and they are setting out at times to sell some articles below cost for the sole purpose of destroying the small operator. Once they have done that, they will not have to worry about cutting the price of one or two articles to have a catch line. They can say that that does not matter. They will have got rid of the small independent operator, and that appears to be their goal.

I belong to a Party which believes in private enterprise and free enterprise, but I believe also in ethics. If these business houses continue with this practice, they will force Governments of the philosophy of my Government to look at legislation or some form of control. The alternative is that people will not accept Governments of the philosophy of this Government.

Part of the problem is that Governments like the Labor Government recently defeated have a philosophy of introducing as much legislation as possible to attempt to protect the consumer. This developed in the minds of business men an attitude that it does not matter what is done as long as it is lawful. That is unfortunate. I would hope that people would think about ethics, and stay not just inside the law but clearly within it. We are thinking about what is lawful, and not what is ethical. I hope that business houses will change the approach of trying to destroy small business to get bigger themselves. In doing as they are now doing, they will destroy their own system.

Mr. HEMMINGS (Napier): It does not give me any pleasure to raise the matter on which I wish to speak, and it is with some reservations that I do so. Grievance debates, however, are opportunities for members to bring to the notice of the Parliament situations which, in their opinion, are of paramount importance and on which action is needed. I refer to yesterday's fatal accident in my district at the intersection of Coventry and Dalkeith Roads in the area of the Munno Para District Council. Yesterday's fatality need never have happened if the bureaucracy had listened to the officers and the elected members of the Munno Para District Council.

I notice that the Minister of Transport is in the Chamber, and I suggest that the Government should look at the proposition of regulatory powers being given to district councils in relation to traffic control where it can be seen that the district council is obtaining qualified and expert opinion and advice.

Within the area of Munno Para there has existed for some time a situation where, as country roads are upgraded, along with increased residential development, extremely hazardous situations are occurring at a number of intersections. The district council, being aware of this, had attempted to avoid possible accidents and had acted promptly and correctly in its dealings with the Road

Traffic Board. I wish I could say that the Road Traffic Board had acted in the same way.

The first instance in which the district council met with problems with the board occurred in November 1976 and related to the intersection at Andrews Road and Petherton Road. It took four deaths and seven injuries before "give-way" signs were erected. I should like to place on record my thanks for the efforts of Geoff Virgo, the former Minister, in giving approval overruling the decision of the Road Traffic Board following a deputation to the then Minister, led by myself.

I should like to relate the series of events dealing with these two intersections, in the hope that the Minister will take action similar to that taken by his predecessor and give approval for "give-way" signs to be erected without further delay at the intersection of Dalkeith and Coventry Roads in order to avoid another fatality.

In November 1976, the District Council of Munno Para wrote to the Secretary of the Road Traffic Board, informing him that, as a result of resealing of Petherton Road and Heaslip Road, permission was sought to erect "stop" signs and "give-way" signs. In April 1977 (after a delay from November 1976), the Munno Para District Council received a reply from the Road Traffic Board, the relevant portion of which states:

I refer to your letter of 22 November 1976 regarding regulatory sign control at the Petherton Road-Heaslip Road and Petherton Road-Andrews Road intersections and advise that investigations have now been completed at these locations.

It was found that neither location has a serious accident problem, as only two accidents were recorded at the Heaslip Road intersection and one at the Andrews Road intersection, both without injury. Consequently, it is considered that, as sight distances are good and the accident history low, the installation of regulatory sign control is not warranted at these locations.

The council replied in September of that year. The relevant paragraph is important. It deals with the situation from the time the Road Traffic Board had written to the council, which was in September. The letter states:

From accident records, since Petherton Road was sealed in June this year, four people have been killed and seven injured in two separate accidents on the intersection of Petherton Road and Andrews Road. It is understood that these accidents resulted from a failure to give way to the right.

The sudden increase of fatal accidents at the intersection proves that the board's reasons for refusing the erection of control regulatory signs at these intersections were incorrect, and the erection of such traffic control devices is warranted. The Minister intervened, and "stop" signs were erected at these intersections. Since then, no accidents have occurred. With that experience in mind, one would have thought that the upgrading of another almost identical intersection would have caused the Road Traffic Board to be sympathetic to the problem, but the sorry story was re-enacted once again. In April 1979, the district council wrote again to the Secretary of the Road Traffic Board, as follows:

Thank you for your letter of 29 March 1979, advising that the board has given approval for the installation of safety bars and associated pavement marking work at the above intersection.

At the discussions with Mr. . . ., Design Section of the Highways Department, it was agreed that further regulatory control signs are required at this intersection, and Dalkeith Road should be regarded as a major road and the other intersecting roads to be minor. The board's approval is therefore sought for the installation of "give way" signs at the

approaches of Coventry Road at this intersection as shown on council drawing No. 151.

I stress that the person from the design section had said that "give way" signs were necessary. The council took that officer's word, and proceeded to erect the signs, but, in August 1979, after a delay from the previous April, they received a rather curt reply from the Road Traffic Board, as follows:

Further to the Council's letter dated 18 April 1979, I advise that investigation of the Dalkeith and Coventry Road intersection at Dalkeith indicates that the installation of Regulatory signs is not warranted on either a sight distance or accident basis. The discussions with the officer of the Highways Department concerned the general treatment of the whole area.

So we had a repeat performance of the Road Traffic Board denying the District Council of Munno Para the power to erect "give way" signs. The district council decided that it would write to the previous Minister. In that letter the following sentence appeared, which proved to be true:

You must recall 18 months ago that five people were killed at the intersection of Petherton Road and Andrews Road . . . because your board refused the erection of "give way" signs at this intersection. The intersection of Coventry Road and Dalkeith Road is in a similar position to this intersection and, unless regulatory signs are erected immediately, a similar tragedy may occur.

The previous Minister possibly received that letter early in

September just prior to the election, and he sent a reply setting out the advice of officer's of the Road Traffic Board. Since the election the council has again written to the present Minister. I understand that the Minister is aware of the problem as I spoke to him this afternoon. I quote from that letter to the Minister, as follows:

The intersection of Coventry Road and Dalkeith Road is similar to this intersection [of Petherton Road and Andrews Road], except that it is in a worse location as it has very poor visibility. At present if any vehicle is travelling a speed greater than 18 k/hr on Coventry Road approaching the intersection when there is a vehicle travelling on Dalkeith Road, there will be a hazard involving a collision which could be fatal.

There has been a collision, and it has been fatal. I appeal to the present Minister, who gave me an undertaking that he would be in the House tonight to listen to my grievance, to take the necessary steps to overrule the decision made by the Road Traffic Board in connection with the intersection of Dalkeith and Coventry Roads and provide "give-way" signs.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 8 November at 2 p.m.