

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 3 June 1981

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

PETITIONS: SCHOOL ASSISTANTS

Petitions signed by 66 residents of Yankalilla area and 1 734 residents of South Australia all praying that the House urge the Government to ensure entitlement hours for school assistants are not reduced were presented by the Hons W. E. Chapman and J. D. Corcoran, and Mr Peterson.

Petitions received.

PETITION: EDUCATION

A petition signed by 176 residents of South Australia praying that the House call on the Minister of Education to resign; urge the Government to provide funding based on genuine educational needs; and implement a staffing policy based on recommendations in the Karmel Report was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: I.M.V.S.

A petition signed by 27 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to re-establish the Environmental Mutagen Testing Unit at the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science and recognise it as an integral part of the South Australian health services was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: ABORTION

A petition signed by 34 residents of South Australia praying that the House do not amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act so as to restrict the rights of women in relation to abortion was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITION: SERIOUS CRIME

A petition signed by 6 140 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to increase the severity of penalties for serious crimes to include the death penalty, corporal punishment and life imprisonment without parole was presented by Mr Millhouse.

Petition received.

QUESTION

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answer to Question No. 1067 that I now table be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: TOUCHE ROSS REPORT

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I seek leave

to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: On 2 December 1980, I announced to this House that I had appointed Touche Ross Services to carry out a major corporate review of the Department of Correctional Services. The terms of reference of that review are set out in the report which I now lay on the table. The corporate review sought to complement, rather than duplicate, other investigations under way into the Department of Correctional Services, namely, the Royal Commission now under way.

Together, these investigations will constitute the most searching review of correctional services undertaken in this State for many years. The Government undertook to review the Department of Correctional Services because of the growing disquiet in the community and because we saw a need to inject new ideas and proposals into an area that had been scandalously neglected by the previous Labor Government.

Staff morale was low when this Government came to office and relatively little money had been spent on our institutions and, indeed, correctional services generally. It was a disgrace that two major institutions, Yatala Labour Prison and Adelaide Gaol, had been allowed to run down to the extent where security was weakened and the community threatened.

This Government has been left with no option but to spend a great deal of money in a short space of time to overcome years of neglect by the former Administration.

Mr Millhouse: The former Labor Administration.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: Yes, I am sorry. Time after time, the Opposition has accused this Government of incompetence and mismanagement in regard to prisons: that is the height of hypocrisy. This Government has done far more for correctional services in its 18 months of office than the Labor Party did in 10 years. Let me elaborate.

Since coming to office, this Government has increased the staff ceiling in the Department of Correctional Services by 47 additional positions. This is at a time when staff levels in other departments are being maintained. I remind members that several requests were made to the Labor Party for extra correctional officers while it was in Government, and these were refused.

The Yatala Labour Prison industries complex, which will cost more than \$2 000 000, is nearing completion and should be in operation next year. Completion of that area alone will allow for greater security, far more prisoner stability, less tension between staff and inmates and, perhaps the most important factor, it will provide an area where inmates will learn a skill or trade for the future. This Government is giving inmates every opportunity to learn new skills and, therefore, improve their chances of gaining employment once they are released.

At Cadell Training Centre, we have completed the education complex at a cost of \$83 000. It is a unique complex which will benefit prisoners and the community as well. It will ensure that those prisoners who have the ability and the desire to progress will be allowed to study and undertake educational programmes which in the past have often been denied, not because they did not want them but because the previous Labor Administration ignored their needs!

At both Yatala and Adelaide Gaol we have installed a sophisticated surveillance security system costing more than \$800 000; that is the envy of all prison administrators throughout Australia.

In the 1976-1977 financial year, there were 17 escapes from South Australian prisons. In the 1977-1978 financial year, 14 inmates escaped; in 1978-1979, 14 prisoners escaped, and in 1979-1980 there were 21 escapes. In this

financial year, however, only three inmates have managed to breach the tight security net we have now thrown around the State's institutions. One of those escapes was from Cadell, and all those escapees are now back behind prison walls.

The installation of the surveillance system was long overdue, and has been amply justified. The Touche Ross Report is now being made available for consideration by the Government and all interested parties. It sets out clear needs, and these will be examined in the light of current financial resources, and priorities set.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. W. A. Rodda):

By Command—

- i. Correctional Services, Department of—Review, 1981.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: WATER RESOURCES

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I refer to certain statements made by the Opposition spokesman on health which appear in today's *News*. In those statements the Opposition spokesman on health claimed that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had abandoned a proposal to use activated carbon to filter cancer-causing chemicals from South Australia's water supply. The Opposition spokesman said that the programme had been deferred because of South Australian Government cut-backs. Those claims are absolute rubbish. I am deplored by the gutter-level tactics used by the Opposition in this matter. They are a total fabrication.

Mr. BANNON: I rise on a point of order. The language being used in this statement, which is not even part of a proper debate in this House to which the person at which it is levelled can reply, is unparliamentary and quite inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: Order! To what specific words does the honourable Leader refer?

Mr. BANNON: 'Gutter-level tactics used by the Opposition that are a total fabrication'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! On previous occasions I have indicated to the House that, when the Speaker is on his feet, there will be total silence. I do not uphold the point of order. In referring to this matter previously, I have indicated that the manner in which a Minister answers a question or gives a statement is of that Minister's own making. I believe personally that every attempt should be made (and I have drawn the attention of Ministers to this matter previously), in seeking leave of the House to make a Ministerial statement, to use language which is not offensive, and that, if the Minister uses offensive language, then he or she must suffer the consequences, whatever they may be, in the public mind. That being the ruling which has been given in the past, I uphold it at present. I would ask all honourable members collectively, and Ministers in particular, to make sure that the due dignity and decorum of the House is paramount in their thoughts at all times. The honourable Minister of Water Resources.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Neither the previous Government nor this Government has ever had any proposal to introduce carbon filtering to

the State's water supply to filter out halogenated hydrocarbons. There is provision for the addition of activated carbon in metropolitan water filtration plants, but solely for the purpose of eliminating tastes and odours caused by algal blooms in untreated Murray River and reservoir water. This Government has been most responsible in its treatment of trihalomethanes, and this is illustrated by an announcement by me at the weekend that the Government would extend the scope of the present study into the formation and occurrence of trihalomethanes in South Australian water supplies.

QUESTION TIME

GAS SUPPLIES

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier tell the House what powers he and his Government have to cut off natural gas contracted to the New South Wales-based Australian Gas Light Company; has a Crown Law opinion been sought on the legality of such a move; and what possible contribution would this make to solving the grave national question of Murray River water quality?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that the supply of gas to New South Wales was the subject of a legally binding contract entered into some considerable time ago by the Dunstan Government of the day. I think it is important to remember that, because it has been misrepresented by members of the Opposition that it was a former Government—

Mr Keneally: Steele Hall.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, the member for Stuart persists in promulgating that false information even now, on cue. That contract for the supply of gas is a legally binding document. It applies until the year 2006, and one of the present difficulties is finding enough gas to make sure that South Australia's gas supplies, which are contracted only until later in this decade, will be sufficiently catered for.

The prospect of our cutting off the gas supply to New South Wales is not pleasant, and I made quite clear at the weekend that I would rather we did not reach the stage where it would be necessary to consider that. Indeed, I believe that everyone in South Australia would accept that it would be a bad thing if we had to reach that level, because it would mean that the New South Wales Government in particular had been adamant in its refusal to reconsider its opening up of new irrigation leases on the Murray River system.

I and my Government regard what is happening upstream by the actions of both the New South Wales and Victorian Governments, but predominantly the New South Wales Government at this stage, in stifling and cutting off the quality of Adelaide's water supply, to be very much the same thing as would happen if we were to cut off our gas supply to Sydney. There are no two ways about it: it is as serious and as vital a question as that.

No Crown Law opinion has been obtained. If that course of action were adopted (and it may have to be adopted), it is undoubtedly the case that, unless there were very careful negotiations, we would be subject to the due processes of the law. I also made clear at the weekend that, for the integrity of South Australia's water supply, we may have to face that prospect and, even if we were required to pay damages for taking that action, it could be a cheap price to pay.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is out of order in interjecting, particularly when he is out of his seat.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I hope good sense and responsible government will apply in New South Wales. I can only say that the Minister of Water Resources has worked very diligently in opposing the applications that have been made for licences for irrigation upstream, and he will continue to do so as far as he is able, but the attitude of the New South Wales Government is seen in its legislating to make it impossible for the Minister of Water Resources to take such action in the future. I find it absolutely incredible that the Leader in our State should be on record as supporting the actions of the Wran Government, actions that are very seriously interfering with the quality of water not only in this State generally but also for people in Adelaide. It is a disgraceful attitude for him to adopt.

POPULATION FIGURES

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: It is good to have a turn straight after the Leader. Has the Premier seen the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, which indicate that during 1980 a record net 7 739 persons left South Australia for other States. Can the Premier say why the outflow increased by 41 per cent over 1979 figures and in the light of the information I have just supplied, can he explain the factual basis for his claim last year in London that people have ceased to emigrate from South Australia to other States?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can explain, I hope, to the Deputy Leader's satisfaction. In order to look at the migration from South Australia that has been occurring for several years, it is important to look at the reasons that enable people to stay in South Australia. There was no doubt at all that, during the recent years of the Labor Administration in this State, the number of job vacancies fell to an alarming extent.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: But you've been in Government for two years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am quite sure that the honourable Premier does not require assistance from members on either side of the House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat that the down-turn in job vacancies in that period, particularly the last two years of that Government's term, was very gravely disturbing. I shall quote some figures on the labour force from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. On the question of employed persons in South Australia, I would point out to the Deputy Leader that in August 1977 there were 568 000 employed persons; in August 1979 there were 547 400 employed persons—a fall of 20 600 jobs. Of course, people were leaving South Australia. Indeed, as with any such trend, the outflow has continued.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: There was a 41 per cent—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It has not been possible to reverse that disastrous trend overnight, and if the Deputy Leader believes that it is possible—

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition to contain himself.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would think that that would be a rather enormous task, Mr Speaker. In contrast to the figures to which I have referred (and we can take September 1979 as the turning point in South Australia's fortunes in many regards), from August 1979 to March 1981 there has been an up-turn, a rise of 20 900. In other

words, it has taken us two years to win back the loss of the last two years of the Labor Government.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We will see what happens next year.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: What will happen next year is that that 20 900 rise in employment, which the Deputy Leader said we could not possibly achieve over a three-year period, has not only been achieved—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We are still behind the national average.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There is no satisfying the man, there really is not. I can remember vividly the Deputy Leader coming out strongly and saying that we could not provide 7 000 new jobs in South Australia, and then he tried to turn around and say that we had promised 10 000 new jobs, and that we could not provide them.

The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The whole point is that during the time since we have come into office we have created not 7 000 jobs, not 10 000 jobs, but 20 900.

Mr Crafter: Prove that you have created them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Come on, Greg. I know this is bad and bitter medicine for members opposite who were so vocal in saying that it could not be done. I think that they thought that they could go to the polls next time and accuse us of breaking our promise to create 7 000 new jobs. That situation has happened; there is nothing they can do about it, and they are now grizzling. We have reversed the trend of the last two years of the Labor Administration. Now, since we came into office there are 20 900 more people in employment—jobs have been created. The whole point is that, having made up that disastrous leeway totally and absolutely caused by the policies of the former Government, we can now expect some change to be made in the overall unemployment figures. It is about time because we are all very dissatisfied with the position that the former Government managed to force us into—the dubious distinction of having the highest level of unemployment of any State in Australia. It is a distinction which I do not want any longer than we can possibly help. Now we have got those jobs on the increase again, I believe we are well on the way to making some impact on unemployment levels.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr OLSEN: Can the Minister of Water Resources say what validity there is in the mischievous claim by the New South Wales Government and members of the South Australian Opposition that New South Wales contributes only 8 per cent to 10 per cent of the total salt load of the Murray River entering South Australia?

Recent media reports have quoted the Opposition spokesman on water resources as claiming that New South Wales contributes only less than 10 per cent of the total salt load arriving in South Australia via the Murray River. This cry has also been amplified by the Labor Government spokesman in New South Wales. A little more than a week ago the same statement was made by the member for Stuart in newspaper reports, after he had returned from the New South Wales Government indoctrination seminar held for him.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The statement attributed to the member for Stuart is absolutely false, as are the statements emanating from the New South Wales Government on this subject. I will endeavour to enlighten members opposite on the true situation of what is the total

contribution of the salinity load in the Murray-Darling system, how it is made up and where it originates.

The Maunsell Report, prepared by Maunsell and Partners, was a valuable document, and the New South Wales Government has tended to quote from a certain page of that document. If one reads the report a little further it can be seen that the table quoted by the New South Wales Government does not include tributary inflows from the Murrumbidgee and Darling Rivers. The vast part of the New South Wales irrigation diversion is on the tributaries in New South Wales and not on the Murray River proper. The majority of the salt contribution coming from New South Wales emanates from those tributaries and not through direct input from the Murray River itself.

From August 1980 to January 1981, 295 000 tonnes of salt entered South Australia from the Eastern States and of that quantity 39 per cent came from the Darling River. In fact, 115 000 tonnes of the salt load entering South Australia during that period came from the Darling River, a deposit that the New South Wales Government does not include in its calculation. In the month of January this year, of the 70 500 tonnes of salt entering South Australia from the Eastern States, 45 500 tonnes came from the Darling River, so that more than 60 per cent of the total salt load entering South Australia originated from the Darling River, of which no account is taken whatsoever when the New South Wales Government quotes this figure of 8 per cent. The salt load entering South Australia from the Eastern States is on average 1 100 000 tonnes annually.

I was informed by constituents, who phoned me in an agitated manner because of the stance adopted by him, that the Leader of the Opposition in a television interview on Sunday evening said that annually 400 000 tonnes of salt emanated from Victoria, 100 000 tonnes from New South Wales and 500 000 tonnes from South Australia. That is totally false. It is high time that the Leader of the Opposition sought some advice from the member for Hartley, who obviously has a considerable knowledge of this subject. Actually, the net contributions of the three States to the total salinity load of the Murray River are 45 per cent from New South Wales, including the tributaries, 29 per cent from Victoria, and 26 per cent from South Australia.

Mr Keneally: Talk about controllable—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Stuart can get a call in turn.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: So, it is high time that the member for Stuart made a study of this subject and learnt a little about it. I am quite prepared to make senior officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department available to him to explain the composition of the salt load in the three States. The figures are not provided by South Australia; they are provided by the River Murray Commission. The extremely competent engineers are prepared to explain to him the precise composition of that salt load. The fact is that New South Wales contributes a net 45 per cent to the salinity load of the Murray system, Victoria 29 per cent, and South Australia 26 per cent.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT COURIER SERVICE

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: As Government resources were used in the mailing of a letter, dated 11 May 1981, to the chairmen of school councils from the Premier, will the Minister of Education permit me to use the courier service of the Education Department to send the following letter to those chairmen in response to the Premier's letter:

Dear Sir/Madam,

You will already have received a letter from the Premier

dated 11 May 1981 and containing an enclosure both of which refer to the school assistants dispute. Regrettably, in that correspondence a number of incorrect assertions were made. I take this opportunity to correct the situation concerning the Labor Opposition and the previous Labor Government. I do that in my capacity as the appropriate spokesperson.

In responding to that correspondence I would make the following points:

The rationalisation of ancillary staff resources undertaken by the Labor Government in 1977 was precisely that; it did not represent a reduction in those resources; indeed there was finally an increase in resources committed;

The former Labor Government did not propose a cut of 6.5 per cent in real terms in Education Department spending in its last Budget;

The present Government has not responded to union claims in 'exactly the same way'; appropriate consultation measures by the previous Government averted union disputation;

The A.L.P. is not manipulating the unions and is not conducting 'base politicking at the expense of children'.

Neither of the two unions involved in the dispute is affiliated with the A.L.P. and their activities are not 'politically motivated' but a response to a real educational and industrial issues.

I respond to the Premier's request for a comment by myself on page 29 of his speech by stating that the 'present militant response' of the unions is the result of the Government's poor handling of this issue.

I hope that these points will be of assistance in your consideration of this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Lynn M. F. Arnold,

Shadow Minister of Education.

Mr Millhouse: Why didn't one of you object to that question? You've let him get away with murder.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Mitcham.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The straightforward answer to that question would have to be 'No', in view of the fact that the industrial components, that is, the South Australian Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association, which have quite legitimate reason to communicate with the teachers involved and other people, have been using the State courier system (something which the Government has not been doing) since 1972.

Mr Lynn Arnold: You've used Government resources, though.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: This was responded to quite adequately by the Institute of Teachers and the Public Service Association, and any correspondence from the Government has been retaliatory rather than taking the initiative, and the honourable member will realise that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Quite apart from that, it must be patently obvious to all who have been listening that to permit this sort of thing would be to increase the degree of politicising, and I would point out that, whether the A.L.P., the Institute of Teachers, and the Public Service Association are directly connected or not, during the several years when I was shadow Minister and had ample opportunity to take advantage of industrial disputes, at no time was any member of the Liberal Party a fringe dweller or quite strongly representative at any rally handing out 'How to vote Liberal' or 'Join the Liberal Party' literature, as happened at the rally in King William Street—and we have copies of the publicity that was handed out.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: There is no politics in this, but that is what happened at an industrial rally!

Mr Trainer: You know what sort of response you'd get.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We got a very good response at the last election from being abstemious rather than taking that sort of action. The evidence speaks for itself; sincerity has its own reward. There will be no permission for any additional circulars to be sent from political Parties or spokesmen through the State Education Department courier system.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr OSWALD: Can the Premier indicate the benefits to South Australia if the Adelaide Airport were sold, and whether the profits could finance a new airport for Adelaide? I note that the Opposition spokesman on tourism suggested that a new Adelaide airport would cost about \$200 000 000 and could be financed largely by the sale of the land of the existing airport land. In view of the pressing need to provide in this State as soon as possible an airport of international standard, can the Premier say whether this is a feasible alternative to upgrading the existing facility?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I saw the report referred to, which was attributed to the member for Gilles. On the surface, I suppose it was probably a well meant suggestion, but the proposition of selling the current airport to finance the construction of a new airport is quite ridiculous when the facts are studied. The value of the 760 hectares of airport land would be about \$50 000 000. In the whole planning concept, about a third of that would be required for recreational facilities, schools, shopping centres, and so on. The maximum that could be obtained from the sale of the site, we are informed, would be \$30 000 000-odd.

The complicating factor is the question of the runways which already exist. There is a good deal of runway and apron. In some areas, I understand that the concrete runways are between 1 metre and 2 metres thick, and it would take a great deal of work to develop that area and make it suitable for subdivision and building. The cost of a new airport north of Adelaide, wherever that may eventually be decided, would be quite considerable, probably in the nature of hundreds of millions of dollars rather than tens of millions. The proposal put forward by the honourable member may have been well meant, but certainly it was not practicable.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I direct a question to the member for Stuart, supplementary to a question asked by the member for Rocky River of the Minister of Water Resources. Will the member for Stuart relate to the House the source of the figures that he used in regard to the salinity of the Murray River and say how those figures were arrived at? Those figures used by the Leader of the Opposition were no doubt provided by—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I rise on a point of order. I understand it is the practice of this House (and I speak from rather long experience in this matter)—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Too long, and in Opposition, too.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I admit it was far too long in Opposition; it is much better in Government. The Leader of the Opposition was not permitted to ask questions of members on his side of the House, nor were members on that side permitted to ask questions of other members on that side. The practices of this House dictate that this question, unfortunately, much as I would like to hear the

wonderful material that I am sure would be provided to the honourable member by Mr Wran, is out of order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I refer the attention of honourable members to Standing Order 123, which provides:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

I do not uphold the view that the member for Stuart has Ministerial competence for matters relating to water resources, but I make the point that the honourable member has the opportunity under other Standing Orders to make a personal explanation if he believes that any matter recorded against his name requires correction.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A further point of order, Mr Speaker. I do not want to disagree to your ruling, Sir, but I point out that the question I asked was supplementary to a question asked in the House this afternoon and therefore must be related to the business of the House at this moment.

The SPEAKER: The House has not in the past, in my 11 years experience, recognised supplementary questions. Unless it be a direction of the House that supplementary questions are to become part of the Orders of the Day, I do not uphold the further point of order that the member for Hartley has made.

WINE TAX

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Premier inform the House of the likelihood of a Federally imposed tax on wine and the actions this Government has taken to persuade the Federal Government not to pursue this course?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am very pleased to be able to put on record the co-operation of honourable members opposite in the course of action that I took. Late in April, during the absence of the Leader of the Opposition, I spoke to the Deputy Leader and called a meeting not only of wine industry representatives but also of Federal members of Parliament of both Parties to discuss the mounting speculation about the possible introduction of a wine tax in South Australia. I do not believe I need say other than that the introduction of such a tax would be a disastrous blow to the wine industry as a whole in this State.

We prepared a submission to the Federal Government with the help of members of the wine industry and, together with one of the local Federal Ministers, Mr Ian Wilson, I presented that submission on behalf of everyone in South Australia to the Prime Minister and to the Federal Treasurer. At the time (and I was able to understand this), neither the Prime Minister nor the Federal Treasurer was prepared to make any comment either way, because it would have involved a breach of Budget security. However, I am now greatly reassured. My attention has been drawn to a statement made by the Prime Minister in October last year in reply to an ABC interviewer: when the Prime Minister was asked by the interviewer whether a wine tax was being considered, the Prime Minister replied:

Nobody has expressed that fear to me, and, if they had expressed it to you, the answer to that is, 'No, we won't.' We have made the decision in the past that we are not going to. As I said, general taxing policies are designed to assess and encourage a very great Australian industry.

In the light of that statement, I wrote again to the Prime Minister (and I have circulated copies of my letter and the

transcript to all interested parties: the Leader of the Opposition has probably received a copy) stating that I am gratefully reassured by the commitment that he gave in October 1980.

I have also circulated that transcript and a copy of my letter to all South Australian Federal members of Parliament, and I am quite confident indeed that the Prime Minister, having made that public commitment in October last year, will honour it in the forthcoming Budget.

WINDANA NURSING HOME

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Health say whether it is correct that the Federal Minister of Health, the Hon. M. J. MacKellar, has indicated that no Federal funding whatsoever will be provided to the Southern Cross Homes for the fully equipped and urgently needed 90-bed nursing home for the elderly that is waiting to be opened at Windana, and, if so, are the reasons given by the Hon. M. J. MacKellar accepted by the Minister of Health, and will she be taking any action to have the home opened nevertheless?

Mr Speaker, I see that you are referring to the Notice paper concerning a question that is already there from the member for Mitcham. My question does not conflict with that one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will protect the rights of all members at all times, and the Chair was exhibiting that protection.

Mr TRAINER: I refer to a letter dated 29 May from the Hon. M. J. MacKellar in order to enumerate some of the reasons given for not providing Federal funding for Southern Cross Homes. I shall quote the letter in part:

Southern Cross Homes has submitted a proposal for a 90-bed non-Government nursing home. Under this proposal, Windana was to be operated for a special purpose, namely, a 'centre of excellence' in the care of psychogeriatric nursing home type patients.

It has been put to me that there is some disagreement about whether that was actually submitted in the name of Southern Cross Homes. Their application was for a general nursing home with some beds to be provided for psychogeriatric care, as is often the case, rather than being a specialised psychogeriatric centre. One of the reasons that the Minister gives for rejecting the application for funding is as follows:

Another important factor, and one that is used by the co-ordinating committees as the main guidelines in assessing the need for additional nursing home beds in a particular locality is that, where the ratio of existing beds . . . exceeds 50 per thousand persons aged 65 years and over, approval in principle should not be recommended unless there are special circumstances . . .

The Windana proposal has been assessed in accordance with the requirements outlined above but has not been approved. It is considered that the existing beds in the locality are adequate to meet the needs of the aged population.

The Federal Minister then goes on to deal with whether or not the special circumstances exist in relation to Windana that would allow it to receive funding. The letter continues:

Because of the large number of psychogeriatric patients already accommodated in nursing homes, it was not considered that accommodation of this type of patient at Windana constitutes a special purpose sufficient to warrant approval of the additional beds in excess of the maximum guideline ratio of 50-1000 aged. It would seem more

appropriate to improve where necessary the standard of care provided for this type of patient in existing approved nursing homes.

I might add that apart from the legislative provisions relating to non-Government nursing homes the accommodation of mentally deficient patients would render Windana ineligible for approval as a Government nursing home under the provisions of the National Health Act.

The letter goes on further to refer to the unanimous favourable recommendation from the Co-ordinating Committee on Nursing Home accommodation. I have received substantial approaches from relatives of patients seeking admission into Windana, who claim that they have been kept waiting for as long as 18 months. Windana is located at Glandore within my electorate, and I am very, very concerned about this hold-up, so I await the Minister's reply with some eagerness.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: As I recall the question, which was put some time ago, it was whether I as Minister had received advice from the Minister for Health, Mr MacKellar, in respect to the Federal Government's response to the South Australian Health Commission's submission regarding Windana, and the answer is 'No, I have not'.

Mr TRAINER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question was not whether the Minister had received any correspondence, or anything of that nature; I merely asked whether it was correct that the Federal Minister had refused funding.

The SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. The honourable member gave further explanation of what was his question, and I am not going to attempt to rule on the matter further than that. I call on the Minister of Health.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I, as the responsible Minister, have received no reply of the kind that the honourable member described to the House in respect of Windana. Until I, as the responsible Minister, do receive a reply to the Health Commission's and the Government's submissions, I am not in a position to quote Mr MacKellar's response. The letter from which the honourable member was quoting was presumably addressed to some other person—it was not addressed to me. However, I can say that the honourable member, in his public statements on Windana, has done nothing whatsoever to assist the Government's representations to the Federal Government. Indeed, if he had tried it would have been hard for him to be more effective in sabotaging our efforts, because he has consistently referred to the kind of patients who should be accommodated in this place as 'psychogeriatric patients'. Does he know or does he not know that the responsibility for the care of mental health patients lies entirely with the State Government, and when one designates a patient as being a 'psychogeriatric patient,' that patient is obviously the responsibility of the State Government.

What the State Government wants is for the Commonwealth Government to recognise Windana as a nursing home for patients suffering from brain failure, which is a physical manifestation of age and frailty and cannot be put in the same category as mental illness. In every submission the Health Commission has made to the Commonwealth Government on this matter there has appeared in some public arena or another the prattlings of the local member, who insists on referring to those patients as 'psychogeriatric patients'. One telephone call to the Health Commission from the honourable member would have set him right on that matter, but his public utterances have been, to put it kindly, less than helpful to the Government.

No, I have not received any response from Mr

MacKellar. I would suggest that, if I do receive a response that denies the Government's representations on this matter, then I would say that the special circumstances do exist, that chronic brain failure is a condition which is becoming more and more common among aged people and one which is going to be a very great community health problem in South Australia; indeed, it is already. I suggest that the honourable member may be well advised to contact my office and I would be pleased, like my colleague, to make a senior officer available to explain to him the basic nature of Commonwealth-State financial relationships in the health field, which he appears not to understand, and also to explain the distinction between psychogeriatric patients and those suffering from brain failure.

WHYALLA MEDICAL PRACTICE

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Health state the facts surrounding the allegations made by a member in another place which are reported in today's *Advertiser* that a debt of \$300 000 is owed by Drs Maestrov and Chan to the Whyalla hospital?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am very pleased indeed to set the record straight, because, as has already been remarked earlier in the House today, the member in another place who made these allegations (Dr Cornwall) has shown a similar disregard for the truth in respect of the matter of the Whyalla Hospital and Dr Maestrov that he has demonstrated in his irresponsible approach in creating public alarm unnecessarily on the question of water quality. The matter is complex, and it has roots fairly and squarely in the life of the Labor Government and its absolutely sloppy approach to proper financial procedures in hospitals.

To set the record straight, I want to go back to 1976, when health services administration was the responsibility of the Labor Government and when this matter had its roots. The essence of the matter is the amount of money that Dr Maestrov should be required to pay the Whyalla Hospital for the use of that hospital's facilities during the period 1 October 1976 to 3 December 1980.

I make it quite clear at the outset that this situation was inherited by this Government from the Labor Government. I find it quite extraordinary that Dr Cornwall should publicly raise a matter which casts such discredit on the previous Administration. Nevertheless, as he has raised it, I put the facts on the record.

Dr Maestrov settled in Whyalla in 1969 and provided a radiological service from Whyalla Hospital on a fee-for-service basis. He made payment to the hospital for facilities used on an agreed basis. On 1 July 1975 Medibank Mark I, that monument to the person who seeks to become Australia's Prime Minister, was introduced, and it prohibited medical fees being raised for diagnostic services to inpatients or outpatients of the hospital.

As a result the past agreements between the hospital and Dr Maestrov for the use of the hospital facilities necessarily lapsed. In other words, everything was satisfactory until Medibank came along. From 1 July 1975 to October 1976, country medical practitioners, including radiologists, were paid a modified fee-for-service for radiological services provided to hospital patients. In the case of Whyalla Hospital, this was at the rate of 50 per cent of the appropriate medical benefit rate. Because of these fundamental changes to the charging arrangements for radiological services provided by Dr Maestrov, there were no facilities charges payable to the hospital during this period. In effect, the payment to the doctor by the hospital

for his services was reduced by the value of the facilities charges.

In October 1976 further changes were made to the hospital cost-sharing arrangements which allowed charges for diagnostic services, including X-rays in recognised hospitals, to be raised against private inpatients and outpatients. In other words, the Federal Liberal Government started to put a clamp on the glorious free-for-all that had been embarked upon under the Whitlam Government.

As a result, all recognised hospitals, including Whyalla, were advised, and the hospitals were required to give details of their current arrangements in respect of X-ray services and payments so that a new arrangement for facilities charges could be introduced. The response from Whyalla Hospital was understood to indicate that a facilities charge at the level of 50 per cent of the modified fee was being raised against the radiologists in respect of private inpatients and private outpatients. In other words, the doctor was expected to pay something for the use of the hospital's facilities when he treated his private patients.

This was not the case at Whyalla, and this fact came to attention when queried by the Auditor-General's Office in May 1979. That, of course, was about the time of the Public Accounts Committee inquiry. This is yet another example of the extremely sloppy and slipshod arrangements which the previous Government embarked upon or, in many cases, failed to embark upon in order to ensure that public money was properly looked after.

Subsequently, an account for the use of the hospital facilities was rendered to Dr Maestrov, who disputed the basis for the charges, as well he might, because it was retrospective, and the Government of the day had not seen to it that proper arrangements were entered into. In December 1978, discussions commenced with Dr Maestrov and his financial adviser with the objective of settling an agreed basis for the charges to be made by the hospital to Dr Maestrov for the use of its facilities. These negotiations were conducted with the knowledge that the legal right to recover any amount determined as outstanding for the use of the hospital facilities would be extremely difficult, for the very reasons I have just stated, and that a compromise settlement would be the best course. These negotiations concluded in January 1981, with Dr Maestrov agreeing to pay an amount of \$115 661, which was calculated on the basis of 50 per cent of 85 per cent of fees earned during the period 19 April 1979 to the end of 1980, less allowances for a locum where a locum had been employed, and less the salary of clerical staff employed by Dr Maestrov within the hospital.

The determination of this amount required an inspection of Dr Maestrov's personal income records. It has been further agreed by Dr Maestrov that, as from 1 January 1981, he will make payment for the use of the hospital's facilities on the basis of 50 per cent of 85 per cent of fees earned, and this has applied since January 1981.

Regarding payment of the amount accepted in settlement for the use of the hospital's facilities from 1 October 1976 to 31 December 1981, Dr Maestrov has paid one-half of the amount on 15 February 1981 and has agreed to pay the balance in monthly instalments spread over a period of 29 months, and he has been abiding by that agreement. It is therefore clear that an amount of \$300 000 is not owed to the Whyalla hospital by Dr Maestrov.

I summarise by reminding Opposition members of two factors: one is that their appalling ineptitude is the cause of this problem, and the other is that, when their spokesman on health chooses to embark upon campaigns of this

nature, he would be well advised to equip himself with the facts before he slurs people and misrepresents the facts in Parliament.

STORM DAMAGE

Mr HAMILTON: I would have liked to ask the Minister of Transport a question on progress on lighting at Football Park. However, I wish to ask the question of the Minister of Environment. Will the Minister immediately take up with the Coast Protection Board the necessity to repair the damage caused along the West Lakes coastline by Monday afternoon's storm? An examination of the coastline between Tennyson and Semaphore has revealed extensive damage to the dune fencing and the wooden walkways, and there is massive erosion of the sand dunes in the area. Of the local residents I interviewed this morning, the majority believe that tens of thousands of tonnes of sand has been lost in one of the worst storms, with tides up to four metres, in the last 35 years. Will the Minister, as a matter of urgency, take up this matter with the Coast Protection Board for action?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The answer is 'Yes'. The Coast Protection Board, together with senior officers of my department, has visited most if not all of the metropolitan coastline following the storm.

As a result of much of the work done previously by the Coast Protection Board, the damage caused by the storm is probably much less than could have been expected had the work not been carried out. The answer to the question is 'Yes', the Coast Protection Board is aware of the damage that has been caused in some of those areas, and it will be taking action.

V.A.L. TRANSPORT

Dr BILLARD: Does the Minister of Transport draw any lessons as to appropriate public transport design from the V.A.L. light automated transit system which is being constructed at Lille in France, and in particular does he see any merit in the decision they took to make use of rubber-wheeled vehicles? I understand that the Minister took the opportunity during his recent overseas trip, as I did in mine, to see the V.A.L. system, a novel public transport system being constructed at Lille, in France, by the French Aerospace firm MATRA. I know that those who are concerned about the provision of high quality public transport systems in Adelaide will be particularly interested to know the reason for the design decisions taken by MATRA.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I visited Lille and the V.A.L. installation, and I would like to pay a tribute to the engineers of MATRA for the hospitality they showed to me and my party, and also to the honourable member and others in this House who have had a chance to visit the installation. I think a close parallel to the Lille system would be to equate it with buses running in a guideway. Honourable members will realise that we intend to have something of that nature in the north-east corridor. The V.A.L. system consists of what we would call an l.r.t., but in fact it runs in a guideway and has rubber-tyred wheels, as the member for Newland mentioned. I might add, for the benefit of those who have not seen it, that it has lateral guide wheels on the front. It is almost a direct parallel to what we know as the O'Bahn system, except that it applies to a train rather than to a bus.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It's a mono-rail on the ground, really.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is not really a mono-rail. The advantage of the rubber tyres on the V.A.L. system is

the quietness of it. Those honourable members who have visited Paris will have seen and heard the famous French rubber-tyred trains, but the V.A.L. system is even quieter, because it has no steel rail at all other than the electrical pick-up. The engineers have told me that the sound is some six to eight decibels quieter than that appertaining to a normal light or heavy rail track. When one rides on such a vehicle, it is quite an unusual experience because it is so quiet.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Is it electrified?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, it was electrified. The big difference between the V.A.L. system at Lille and the Government's proposed O'Bahn system for the north-east is that the V.A.L. system is a totally enclosed system, whereas the O'Bahn is an open system which will enable the buses to leave the track at the end of the journey and proceed out into the suburbs to pick up people near their homes. The V.A.L. system is a closed system, and that is the major difference, apart from the fact that the V.A.L. car looks more like a light rail car than like a bus.

PREMIERS' CONFERENCE

Mr MILLHOUSE: If I can get his attention, I would like to ask a question of the Premier. Will the Premier, to get more money out of the Commonwealth for the State, ask most strongly all South Australian Senators to put pressure on the Commonwealth Government—and that means to vote against it in the Senate if that should be necessary, thus putting the interests of South Australia ahead of the interests of their Party? After the Premiers' Conference about four weeks ago, it transpired that the Premiers had been taken to the cleaners by the present Prime Minister and Federal Treasurer, and that they could have had another \$70 000 000 if they had tried hard enough in their bargaining. The Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser*, that reputable journal, on Thursday 7 May as having said this:

I think this revelation has done more to harm State-Federal relations than anything I know. It certainly has destroyed what confidence I had in negotiations between responsible Sovereign Governments, that is, State and Federal.

He went on further in that report and subsequent reports to make some quite unkind comments about his Federal counterpart. It was, of course, incredibly foolish of the Prime Minister to have boasted about his success. When one makes a good bargain with those with whom one will be bargaining again, one shuts up about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that he is now commenting, and not stating facts.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir, but it is pretty sage advice. However, I accept with great respect what you have said. It has seemed since those comments were made by the Premier, and especially last weekend, which was the occasion of the Federal Liberal Council (and I note that it was held at the Lakeside) that—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to come back to an explanation that is relevant to the question.

Mr MILLHOUSE: —for the sake of the Liberal Party the ranks must be closed above every other consideration. In other words, Party interests are to prevail over those of the States. As the Premier well knows, there is only one way in which to put pressure on a Government and that is for its own members to vote against it. It is easy to ask the Labor Senators to vote against the Government: they do that automatically anyway. I can give as good an assurance

as a Democrat can give about a colleague that Senator Haines will always vote in favour of the interests of the State and will put that above everything else. However (this is the final point that I will make in my explanation), I am sure that Mr Steele Hall in the House of Representatives will give the Liberal Senators a strong lead if they show what I am afraid may well be what they will show—signs of spinelessness.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: It is not surprising to members that the member for Mitcham has spent more time in demonstrating his well known antipathy towards the Liberal Party than in asking a serious question. I indicate that all Senators from all States have been well briefed on the position in regard to Federal-State financial relationships. I am quite certain that all South Australian Federal Liberal members of Parliament are well aware of the situation, but whether the Labor Party members have been as well briefed, I do not know.

Mr Millhouse: Will you get them to vote against the Government if necessary?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is something that they will have to decide for themselves. Not having any colleagues in this House and not having the need to conduct Party meetings other than in a telephone box or on his way from the courts, the honourable member has probably forgotten about Party responsibility.

PORT LINCOLN HARBOR FACILITIES

Mr BLACKER: Will the Minister of Marine explain to the House the stage of negotiations for the construction of a breakwater and marina at Port Lincoln, and the extent of the damage that occurred to the marine and harbors facilities during the recent weekend storm? About 12 months ago, the Minister was in Port Lincoln and examined port facilities. He explained at that time that consideration was being given to the construction of a breakwater and marina. Since then, considerable loss of property has occurred as a result of storm damage, not only to private property but also to marine and harbors facilities. Will the Minister assure the House that every effort will be made to expedite the construction of such facilities at Port Lincoln to prevent a recurrence of recent storm damage?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member refers to my visit of 12 months ago, prior to which storm damage had occurred at Port Lincoln. On that occasion, we looked at the facilities for beaching craft. The Department of Marine and Harbors has this matter in hand. For a long time, since before the time of my predecessor, the question of what is desirable at Port Lincoln has been considered. The complex will be expensive. Negotiations have been undertaken with the shipping people. I have seen the boating people at Port Lincoln and some fairly tart remarks have been made about inactivity. This is a *quid pro quo*.

Over the years, discussions have taken place and some moves have been made on a local level. There was some disagreement as to what was required. I have asked for a report and I will see the Acting Director of the Department of Marine and Harbors this evening to discuss certain matters, and Port Lincoln is one of those matters. I do not want to build up the honourable member's hopes that we will start work there next week, but I acknowledge that what happened on Monday highlights the need for a sanctuary for vessels. We look to Port Lincoln as a sanctuary, but at times it is exposed to vicious storms. The matter must be looked at in concert with the demands of

the rest of the State. However, there is some understanding of what is wanted at local level.

OFFENSIVE REMARKS

The SPEAKER: I draw honourable members' attention to an earlier occasion this afternoon on which the Leader of the Opposition rose on a point of order, which I disallowed. I believe it is fairly important that honourable members read the *Hansard* of 1 April 1980, pages 937 and 938, so that we can get into perspective the words that are acceptable within the Parliament. In relation to the matter that the honourable Leader sought to raise, I indicate that it was not so much a point of order as a request that words be deleted. There again, there are difficulties, because the previous rulings have clearly indicated that it is the honourable member who has been impugned or otherwise is concerned about words spoken who must rise on a point of order and ask for the words to be withdrawn. It is also extremely important that honourable members who are preparing statements should recognise the need to act in a manner that will not cause concern on the floor of the House.

Mr BANNON: I rise on a point of order. I ask for clarification of the statement just made. The problem is that the member who was involved is in another place, and this has happened on other occasions. I understood that Standing Orders relating to remarks made about members of Parliament apply to the members in another place as well as members in this place. How is the point of order to be taken if it can be taken only by the member concerned?

The SPEAKER: If the Leader reads the statement to which I referred of 1 April 1980, he will see that that point is canvassed. It is extremely important that the use of a term that might be offensive is directly attributable to or directed against a member in another place, rather than the use of a term generally, without specific reference to another member. A very thin grey line in this matter has been recognised by the Chair over a long period. I would like to believe that we came closest to explaining the situation in that ruling of 1 April 1980. If honourable members have any questions about interpretation after they have referred to that ruling, I shall be pleased to receive notice of their concern so that the matter can be clarified on the floor of the House.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISON OFFICERS DISPUTE

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Correctional officers and senior correctional officers at all institutions except the Port Lincoln Prison are currently involved in strike action. These officers are members of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers Union (A.G.W.A. Branch). This strike commenced on Friday 29 May 1981. The issue over which these officers have seen fit to take such action is the number of their members who will be rostered on duty at night at Adelaide Gaol and Yatala Labour Prison.

The background to this dispute commenced in July 1980 when, following the escape of Joseph Tognolini from Yatala Labour Prison, the department took action to temporarily increase the number of officers on night watches at both Yatala and Adelaide Gaol. Prior to this escape, there were five officers on duty at Adelaide Gaol

on both the first and second watch and 10 officers on duty on first watch at Yatala, with eight officers manning the second watch at that institution. The temporary staffing changes introduced following the Tognolini escape resulted in seven officers on duty on both watches at Adelaide Gaol and 13 officers on duty on both watches at Yatala Labour Prison.

What amounted to an additional eight officers on duty at night at Yatala and an additional four officers on duty at night at Adelaide Gaol was introduced purely on a temporary basis pending a total review of security and staffing at these institutions. The initial step taken by this Government in upgrading the security at these institutions was to approve the installation of sophisticated electronic surveillance and detection equipment at a cost of approximately \$1 000 000. In addition this Government commissioned a review of the total operation of the Department of Correctional Services to be conducted by the Touche Ross Services organisation. The Chief Secretary today tabled that report by Touche Ross Services.

Simultaneously, the Public Service Board commenced a review of custodial staffing in all of the department's institutions. The board's review was conducted jointly with the department and in consultation with the Miscellaneous Workers Union and the Public Service Association. The Touche Ross consultants commenced their review in November 1980. The board commenced its review in September 1980.

During the currency of the board's review, recommendations were put to the Government to facilitate the staffing of the surveillance equipment and to introduce permanent supervisory staff on watches at both institutions. At this time, the supervision was provided by a general duty correctional officer on higher duty pay on a rotating basis. The Government approved these recommendations which resulted in the creation of 18 new additional positions of chief correctional officer.

The Government's decision to create these 18 positions was at that time supported by a direct recommendation of the report on the Tognolini escape presented to the Government by Messrs Hornibrook and Lenton. This decision has been further supported by the Touche Ross consultants' report. The creation of permanent supervisory positions on watches, together with the board's staffing recommendations, has resulted in new manning levels for night watches at both institutions. These new staffing levels are 12 officers on both watches at Yatala and eight officers on both watches at Adelaide Gaol.

I point out that this is in fact a total increase of six officers on night watches at Yatala and a total increase of six officers on night watches at Adelaide Gaol. These increases in staffing relate to the number on watches prior to the escape of Tognolini. These changes to night watch staffing have taken place after numerous conferences between the board and the two unions concerned. These conferences continued and progressed to voluntary conferences being held in the Industrial Commission.

As a result of the intransigent attitude adopted by the A.G.W.A. branch of the F.M.W.U. at these conferences, the Industrial Commission referred the matter to arbitration on 22 May 1981. The commission stressed to the F.M.W.U. that any industrial action would bring to a halt the programme established by the commission for arbitration of the matter. Despite this, the correctional officers resolved to take strike action, which commenced on Friday 29 May 1981.

While the F.M.W.U. claims that its strike action is over reductions in staffing numbers of its membership, it has ignored the fact that the department's staff numbers have

been permanently increased by 35 new positions since this Government took office. All of these positions have been for the employment of correctional officers which are covered by the F.M.W.U. As a result of this strike action, I now wish to raise a number of points of concern to the Government.

The F.M.W.U. has established picket lines at the three metropolitan institutions. Specifically, the picket lines have impeded the supply of essential goods and services, such as basic food items, fuel oil used for heating water for showers and cooking, medical supplies for the ongoing treatment of inmates, garbage collection, and essential sewerage maintenance. This action has been taken despite an agreement between the F.M.W.U. and the department that in the event of industrial action by correctional officers the health and welfare of inmates would not be placed at risk. The Government now calls on the F.M.W.U. to honour its agreement with the department in relation to this matter.

In addition, a representative of the F.M.W.U. has been reported as admitting that a member or members unknown breached the wall of Yatala Labour prison on the evening of Monday 1 June 1981. The Government views this action with grave concern and condemns it out of hand as being totally irresponsible. It has also been reported to me that chief correctional officers who are currently staffing the institutions have received anonymous telephone calls during their off-duty hours.

The Government wishes to place on record its appreciation of the efforts of all those officers who have remained on duty within the department's institutions and to commend them for the way in which they have applied themselves to the tasks under these difficult and exacting circumstances. As Minister of Industrial Affairs, I also congratulate those correctional officers at the Port Lincoln gaol who last night voted eight to one to maintain the normal duties and services required of them through the department. I congratulate them for taking that courageous stand.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MURRAY RIVER

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I claim to have been misrepresented by both the Minister of Water Resources and the Premier earlier this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member seeking leave to make a personal explanation?

Mr KENEALLY: Accordingly, I am seeking leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr KENEALLY: Earlier this afternoon in response to a question from the member for Rocky River the Minister of Water Resources said that I, as shadow Minister of Water Resources, and the Leader of the Opposition had both misled South Australians by using incorrect figures in relation to the Murray River. In addition, he said that I had recently attended an indoctrination seminar in Sydney, and the Premier went so far as to say that in refuting those charges I would be quoting from material given to me by Neville Wran.

To answer the last charge first, I shall be quoting from the authoritative report on the Murray River, the Maunsell Report. I did attend in Sydney to speak with all of the senior members of the New South Wales Water Resources Commission, and I did have discussions with the Minister for Water Resources in New South Wales, as I believe I ought to have done in response to the arguments going on between South Australia and New South Wales. I think it was a responsible action for me to

find out from New South Wales exactly what it was doing and also to put to them the concerns of South Australians. That opportunity would be available to any member of Parliament who wished to go across to New South Wales and have the briefing that was provided to me. To put this whole charge into perspective, I think it is important for the House and for people in South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to give a personal explanation. He may not proceed to debate the issue.

Mr KENEALLY: No, Sir, but the Minister said that I had misled the community in South Australia, and to prove that that is not the case it is important for members to understand what the Opposition has done in this very important area. Two months ago I wrote to the Premier requesting that time be made available during this Parliamentary session to debate this very important issue, and I complimented the Minister for a statement that he had made wherein he said that he would give to a Federal authority control of the Murray River and its tributaries. That was a statement that I said was right and just, and one with which the Opposition agreed. The Premier replied with a letter on Wednesday of last week saying that he did not feel there was any need for a debate in the House, that the New South Wales Minister for Water Resources had indicated to the Commonwealth Government that the draft agreement in its present form was acceptable, and that he had discussed this with his Ministerial colleagues. The Premier said, 'It is hoped that a final resolution will be forthcoming soon.' That was in a letter he wrote to me on Wednesday of last week, four days before he declared war on New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already drawn the honourable member's attention to the fact that he may not debate the issue, and likewise he may not make comments which are other than those directly relating to his personal explanation.

Mr KENEALLY: Of course, Sir. The Maunsell Report on Murray Valley Salinity and Drainage was presented, I think, in September 1979. Before I quote the figures, it is important for the House to understand that there are two types of salinity in the Murray River; there is a controlled—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to make a personal explanation. Will the honourable member please resume his seat? The honourable member sought leave to make a personal explanation. I have indicated on two occasions that he may not debate the issue. The honourable member gave me to understand clearly that he wanted to source the information which he had received. He proceeded to do so, and then immediately launched into a debate about the issue. I ask him to source his information or I will find it necessary to withdraw his leave.

Mr KENEALLY: Very well, Sir. The Minister said that the claim of the Leader of the Opposition and me was that 50 per cent of the salinity input into the river in South Australia came from within South Australia. I need to state that that refers to 50 per cent of the controllable salts that go into the Murray River, and to make that point it has to be spelled out to the House. I will read directly from the Maunsell Report.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin interjecting:

Mr KENEALLY: Well, I will not read it if it upsets the Premier. The Maunsell Report states quite clearly that 500 000 tonnes of salt is put into the Murray River in South Australia from irrigation and groundwater inflow.

The Hon. P. B. Arnold: And 300 000 taken out.

Mr KENEALLY: Yes, 300 000 is taken out in diversions, which is very good. From Victoria and New

South Wales combined—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. Is the honourable member personally responsible for removing the salt or putting it into the river?

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member please resume his seat. I do not uphold the point of order. I make the point to the honourable member that the Maunsell Report is not in question before the House. What the honourable member is seeking to bring before the House is the source of the information that he used in making the statements which were the subject of the Minister's comment earlier this afternoon. I have asked the honourable member to source the information. There is no need for it to be read other than that for the source of his information to be identified.

I am not going to accept that the whole of the Maunsell Report be read. I am asking the honourable member to source the information which he used and which he claims was the basis of a respectable statement. I use the term 'respectable' because it is the statement he made which is in question.

Mr KENEALLY: You do place me in a difficult position, Sir, and I have no desire to challenge it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have let the honourable member know that the Chair is not placing him in a difficult situation. The Chair is responsible for interpreting Standing Orders, which clearly indicate that an honourable member may seek leave to make a personal explanation to correct a misrepresentation which he claims was made. The Chair is giving the honourable member for the last time the opportunity to source information which is in dispute.

Mr KENEALLY: The Minister used a set of figures and I used a set of figures. The Minister says that the figures I used are wrong, misleading and false and have misled South Australians. I am attempting to refute that claim by advising the Parliament of the source of the material that I used and the identical material that I used. If I am unable to do that, I do not know how I am able to be—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not been refused the right to source the information. It has already been identified to the House as coming from the Maunsell Report. What the honourable member is now being asked to do is identify the page or pages at which the information to which he referred and which he used in the compilation of his public statement is contained.

Mr KENEALLY: Information that substantiates the claims we have made in relation to—

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw to the attention of the honourable member that it is 'I' not 'We'. It is a personal explanation, and it is therefore a personal issue, not a collective one.

Mr KENEALLY: The information relating to the claim I made is contained on the following pages of the Maunsell Report on Murray Valley Salinity and Drainage; pages 2 and 3, page 26, table 8; page 27, second column, third paragraph, and table 9 (existing salinities for regulating lower river flows). If anyone takes the trouble to read that information, he will readily see that the inflows of controllable salt into South Australia total 500 000 tonnes and the inflows of salt within South Australia is 500 000 tonnes, which makes a total inflow of controllable salt of 1 000 000 tonnes, 50 per cent of which comes from within South Australia. There are 600 000 tonnes of uncontrollable salt.

The other claim that the Minister made was that we were misleading South Australians as to the nature of this salinity input into South Australia during the last six months of last year, and particularly in January this year, and he said we were claiming that that was not the

responsibility of the New South Wales Government. We claim that because the releases from the Menindee Lakes from June last year to January this year were mainly the responsibility of the River Murray Commission and the 30 gegalitres in November, the 107 gegalitres in December and the 96 gegalitres in January were all the responsibility of the River Murray Commission and not that of the New South Wales Government. To finalise my personal explanation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has been given leave.

Mr KENEALLY: —the Premier said that I was supporting the New South Wales Government and Neville Wran in this House. The Labor Party in South Australia is opposed to any development that would affect our water supply and will take action accordingly.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: WINDANA HOME

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation in relation to the comments made today by the Minister of Health in reply to a question I asked.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: I regret that the Minister is not here to hear my explanation. In her non-reply to my question she accused me of prattling on the subject of a badly needed home for elderly people at Glandore, and implied that somehow I single-handedly had destroyed all the negotiations with the Federal Government.

In the passages that I read from the letter from the Federal Minister for Health, it was quite clear that in some of the negotiations that had been carried on between the South Australian Health Commission, Southern Cross Homes and the Commonwealth Government the term 'psychogeriatric care' had been used, and I referred to that in quoting from the letter. That, however, is not the main point that I wish to deal with in my personal explanation, which relates to the Minister's accusations that I had banded about the term 'psychogeriatric care'. I refer to the last press item that I had on this subject, which was printed in the local Messenger press, *The Guardian*, on Wednesday 27 May in which I referred to the delay that had occurred in the opening of the home. The article said:

Mr Trainer said the centre, which would house 30 elderly people and would be a nursing home for 60 elderly people with 'failing mental faculties', was waiting for Federal Government registration and funding.

He said because the centre would house people whose minds were deteriorating the Commonwealth Government would not pay funds needed to employ full-time staff.

I did not use the term 'psychogeriatric care' in those two paragraphs I have just quoted. I first used the term 'failing mental faculties' and, secondly, the term 'people whose minds were deteriorating'. Further down in that article I used the word 'psychogeriatric' in this sense:

It is a disgraceful situation if this long delay is merely because the original plans for the centre had allocated 60 of the 90 beds to psychogeriatric care.

There is an urgent need for facilities for elderly people whose mental faculties are failing.

I referred in that context to the original plans for that building. I can produce reports of press statements from the Minister in which that term 'psychogeriatric care' is used. The next most recent reference in the press to any statement I made regarding Windana was in the *Advertiser* of 15 May:

Originally it had been hoped to provide hostel

accommodation for 30 aged people and residential care facilities for 60 mentally impaired aged people.

There again I did not use the term 'psychogeriatric'; I used the term 'mentally impaired aged people'. Further down I said:

There is an urgent need for facilities to be provided for elderly people whose mental faculties are failing and it is a very fine dividing line that determines whether their mental symptoms are a result of a physiological complaint or a psychiatric one.

It is not permissible for me to debate that point at this stage. I will have other opportunities later.

Mr Lewis: Sit down.

Mr TRAINER: It is for the Speaker to determine that, not you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: I will refer to that later in the week, but that reference makes clear that I understand some of the difference between mental problems of a physiological basis and those of a psychiatric basis.

The earliest reference I have in any press statement to Windana is in the local *Guardian* of 12 March 1980 where I said:

There is a definite and urgent need in the community for facilities for the care of elderly people, particularly for psychogeriatric patients.

There I used the phrase 'psychogeriatric patients', although further down I said 'aged people whose mental capacities have deteriorated'. There was a reason why I used the phrase 'psychogeriatric' at that time.

The bed capacity of Windana was planned for 90. Of this figure, 60 were to be put aside for people in a particular category. I read from the *Advertiser* of 8 February 1980 a reference to upgrading this 90-bed premises as follows:

The upgradings . . . were to make the home suitable for 60 psychogeriatric patients.

That press report was based on a press release from the Minister herself.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The member for Stuart has claimed that I misrepresented him in my reply to the honourable member for Rocky River. First, one must recognise, as must the member for Stuart, that the Murrumbidgee and the Darling Rivers are both within New South Wales. As such, it is calculation on a normal regulated flow situation by the River Murray Commission that 2 100 tonnes a month is contributed to the Murray River by the Murrumbidgee River. On average, the Darling River contributes 18 000 tonnes a month, and the Murray River between lock 9 and lock 6 also contributes 6 300 tonnes. That totals 1 100 000 tonnes of salt crossing into South Australia annually.

Mr KENEALLY: I rise on a point of order. The Minister is reading from a document, and that is the very same procedure that you, Sir, refused to allow me to follow. I ask you whether you would rule on that, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Stuart to withdraw the statement that I refused him permission to read from the same document. That is a reflection upon the Chair.

Mr KENEALLY: I have to make it very clear that I was totally confused about the ruling you gave, Sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows

full well that, if he is confused about a ruling and is not satisfied with it, there and then he can seek to have it overturned by the processes provided for in the Standing Orders. He was given more than a fair go when he persistently sought to debate an issue, having been asked to come to the point of order as it affected him personally. I was listening to the statement being made by the honourable Minister. Before the honourable member stood, I was moving to ask the honourable Minister to link his statement to what might be deemed a personal explanation. I do that now in asking the honourable Minister to identify how the information he has been giving is in any way a personal explanation.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: It is a personal explanation in that the member for Stuart has claimed that I have misrepresented him in my reply to the member for Rocky River. I am quoting the figures I stated during my reply to him. They clearly indicate that the salt load entering South Australia from the Eastern States is identified by the River Murray Commission and the Maunsell Report as 1 100 000 tonnes annually, on average, and that South Australia, as he stated, contributes 500 000 tonnes, of which 300 000 tonnes is moved by diversion. That makes the net contribution by New South Wales 45 per cent of the total salt load in the Murray River system, Victoria contributes 29 per cent, and South Australia 26 per cent.

At 3.38 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that, when I introduced the Supplementary Estimates yesterday, I gave this House a brief outline of the likely Budget outcome for 1980-1981. I also gave members an indication of the difficult Budget situation facing the Government in 1981-1982 as a result of first, substantial wage increases which have occurred in 1980-1981, and, secondly, reduced Commonwealth Government support, particularly in the area of personal income tax sharing.

I do not propose to repeat that Budget outline in detail. Suffice it to say that continued support of the Government's recurrent operations from capital funds would not be in the best interests of the economy of this State, particularly for the building and construction industry and for employment. It could jeopardise also the development of major projects of considerable long-term benefit to South Australia and the nation as a whole. To correct that situation, and to do so in the shortest practicable time, will require the Government to take some difficult and, at times, no doubt unpopular decisions. We will not undermine the economic future of this State or of the people dependent upon the availability of employment opportunities by resiling from those decisions.

I have announced already that the Government, through its Budget Review Committee, is making a thorough examination of all its operations in order to

eliminate all unnecessary expenditures, reorder priorities where necessary, and ensure that maximum return is obtained for the taxpayer's dollar, and to reduce the prospective Budget deficit for 1981-1982 and the need to call on capital funds to finance recurrent operations.

While I am confident of substantial gains from that review, it is not possible to redress the present adverse situation in that way alone. Regrettably, the Government has little choice but to look to the income side of its Budget also. The purpose of this Bill is to seek to increase the licence fee payable by South Australian wholesalers of tobacco products, from the present level of 10 per cent on their sales to 12½ per cent on their sales, with the increase in July applying to a wholesaler's licence effective from 1 August 1981. It is expected that this measure will bring in additional revenue of about \$3 000 000 in a full year.

The Government recognises the need to introduce the legislation at an early date in order to give wholesalers and retailers sufficient time to make the necessary administrative arrangements to implement the fee increase and also to give wholesalers sufficient time to collect at higher prices in order to pay for their August licences.

The Government is aware that this early action could enable some operators to take advantage of the situation and make a windfall gain at the expense of the consumer. However, on past experience we believe that this will not happen in this State.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 increases the percentage fees payable in respect of wholesale and retail tobacco merchants licences from 10 per cent to 12.5 per cent of the value of the tobacco sold by the licensee during the relevant period. The increases will operate in respect of wholesale licences issued in respect of the month of August or subsequent periods.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1980. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explain incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Since 1 July 1974 the salary of the South Australian Governor has been \$20 000 per annum. Under section 73A of the Constitution Act an allowance is also payable to the Governor. This was fixed in 1974 at \$22 600 per annum and now (by virtue of indexation increases) stands at \$44 800 per annum. It is clear that the salary component of the Governor's total emoluments has been substantially eroded by inflation since it was fixed in 1974. (Using the Adelaide C.P.I. as a basis of calculation \$1 as at 1 July 1974, = \$2.03 was at 31 December 1980.) The purpose of the present Bill is to increase the Governor's salary from \$20 000 to \$30 000 for the 1981-1982 financial year and to provide that this salary will, for future financial years, increase in proportion to increases in the consumer price index.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the amendments to come into force as from 1 July 1980. Clause 3 provides that the salary of the Governor for the 1981-1982 financial year shall be \$30 000 and that

thereafter the salary shall be fixed by reference to variations in the Consumer Price Index.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNORS PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Governors Pensions Act, 1976. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Governors are appointed 'during pleasure' and, as the normal term is five years, the Governors Pensions Act prescribes that period of service as the qualification for a pension. By gentlemen's agreement, Governors have had up to six months long furlough and English Governors took this in mid-term in order to go home by sea. This is in addition to short periods of leave taken on an *ad hoc* basis. His Excellency Keith Seaman, O.B.E., K.St.J., has indicated that he intends to take his long furlough at the end of his term and, in consequence, he will not be on active duty for several months next year, prior to his retirement.

It is apparent that Governors who are Australians are more inclined to defer their furlough until the end of their term and regard it as a form of long service leave. This arrangement involves financial complications over the intervening period before the appointment of a successor. An amendment to the Governors Pensions Act to provide for a qualifying period of four years six months (excluding long furlough) would provide a satisfactory solution, and would enable Governors to vacate office on an immediate pension following the period of active service, thus avoiding the need for arrangements involving the sharing of emoluments. Successors could be appointed immediately and could take advantage of the new provision themselves in due course if they wished. The present Bill therefore amends the principal Act along these lines.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 reduces the qualifying period for a pension under the principal Act from five years to four years and six months. However, periods of furlough (i.e. absence for recreational purposes for a continuous period exceeding one month) are not to be taken into account in calculating the period of service.

Mr McRAE secured the adjournment of the debate.

NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This short Bill amends the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981, by adding a number of species of mammals, birds and reptiles to the list of rare species in the eighth schedule. The addition of animal species to the eighth schedule was required by the Prime Minister in his advice to the Premier that a list of birds in Australia in

danger of extinction had been agreed to by the Standing Committee of CONCOM. The Premier then advised the Prime Minister that South Australia would take legislative measures under its National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972-1981 to declare the agreed list of species as either rare or threatened species.

The amendment will achieve two objects. The first object relates to the ratification by Australia of an agreement made with Japan in 1974 for the protection of migratory birds and birds in danger of extinction. Before ratification takes place, it is necessary that State Parliaments enact legislation protecting the birds concerned. The second object is to include in the eighth schedule all the mammals, birds and reptiles included in the list of Australian endangered vertebrate fauna endorsed by the Council of Nature Conservation Ministers last year.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 replaces the eighth schedule of the principal Act with a new schedule which includes the species in the existing schedule together with the new species.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill has two principal objects. First, provision is made for the issuing by the Registrar of Motor Vehicles of number plates bearing the slogan 'S.A.—The Festival State'. From 1 July onwards, all vehicles to which new registration numbers are allotted by the Registrar (other than personalised numbers, Government vehicle numbers, etc.) must carry slogan plates issued by the Registrar. Any other vehicle owner may apply for slogan plates as a substitute for his existing plates if he so wishes; however, there is no compulsion to do so. The new slogan plates will be available only from the Registrar, thus ensuring uniformity of design size and colour. Thus South Australia will partly be brought into line with other States, where all number plates (whether slogan plates or not) are obtainable only from the registering authorities.

The second (and, I might say, the main) object of the Bill is to allow for the gradual phasing-in of the new third party insurance premiums. In March, the Third Party Premiums Committee determined new premiums for third party insurance which were intended by the committee to operate from 1 July 1981. While the new premiums appear to be eminently fair and reasonable, the Government is concerned at the impact they may have in relation to the insurance of certain categories of motor vehicles. In cases where extremely heavy increases have been recommended, the Government believes that there is a case for introducing the increases gradually, over a period of time, thus cushioning their impact.

The Government proposes to implement this policy by instruction to the S.G.I.C., which is the only insurer presently undertaking third party insurance. However, an

amendment to the definition of 'insurance premium' in the Motor Vehicles Act is also necessary. The amendment provides that a reference to insurance premium in the principal Act will mean either the appropriate premium fixed by the committee, or a premium notified by the insurer to the Registrar (whichever is the lesser). This will mean that the premiums fixed by the committee will become, in effect, maximum premiums and will allow for the determination of lower premiums in appropriate cases. I seek leave to have the explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends the definition of 'insurance premium' in the manner outlined above. Clause 3 inserts a new section that empowers the Registrar to issue slogan number plates. It is an offence for any person to drive a motor vehicle carrying slogan plates obtained otherwise than from the Registrar. It is an offence for any person, other than a person approved by the Minister, to sell or supply slogan number plates. Clause 4 provides for the making of regulations relating to number plates and the fees for number plates.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1981

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 June. Page 3697.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): Nine months ago, when speaking in the Budget debate, I pointed out that a Government's Budget acts not only as a financial statement but also as a statement of future policy and a record of the State's progress. The document which the Premier introduced to the House nine months ago was itself a pretty sorry effort. It had little to offer the unemployed, it was not too hopeful about our prospects for economic recovery, and it had nothing for those who had taken Liberal election promises seriously. But, most alarmingly, it spelt out the extent to which this Government had weakened the financial base of South Australia. It exposed the extent of the tax shift towards regressive taxes, which are disguised as charges. And it revealed that this Government was borrowing to pay its recurrent expenditure.

The disquiet caused in the community by that serious state of affairs will not be eased by these Supplementary Estimates and Appropriation Bills that are before us now. Nor will it be eased by the Premier's speech yesterday, nor by his extraordinary attempts outside the House to explain away the ever-growing deficit in State finances. The Premier's speech makes clear that the Government's ability to maintain the level and quality of services it inherited is declining with each month's Financial Statement. It also indicates that the possibility of actually delivering on its election promises in education, in the provision of more police officers, in community welfare, in health services, is moving further and further away. But what I regard as most serious is that we can now see that any Government in the foreseeable future, of whatever political complexion, will inherit enormous financial problems.

Let us not forget that the previous Premier, the member for Hartley, left the State finances in surplus to the tune of \$600 000 and, perhaps more importantly, with the reserves

in very good shape. We now face a growing deficit. It has blown out from the planned \$1 500 000 to the \$10 000 000 figure the Premier admitted to yesterday. If fact, it could be much higher were it not for some judicious juggling between accounts. I will examine some of that juggling in the course of this speech.

The Government's miscalculations and the results of the Premier's appalling arithmetic during the last election are now beginning to bite. The performance of this Government is starkly demonstrated by an examination of the past two years. In April 1980, the combined accounts were \$38 700 000 in surplus; in April 1981, there was a \$9 000 000 deficit—that is a \$47 700 000 turn-around for the worse. The Premier in his speech yesterday sought to shift the blame for this alarming situation away from the Government, away from any action he could take; he wants to put the responsibility somewhere, anywhere else. We saw this tactic nine months ago when, in his Financial Statement, the Premier gave a list of all those organisations and groups on which economic recovery depended and, in effect, he gave them a little pep talk to the effect that they were not really pulling their weight. Significantly, that list did not include the Government of South Australia.

The Premier's speech is littered with the phrase 'due to factors entirely beyond the control of the State Government', and the blame is shared around outside the Government. First, wage increases are described as 'record breaking'. In fact, the Premier described the provision made for wage increases in that year as 'record breaking'. Certainly, work value cases have been concluded this year on top of the expected natural wage case decisions, but was not the Premier aware that they were in the pipeline? Did not his Minister of Industrial Affairs advise him that increases would undoubtedly be granted in the financial year? The facts are that the work value cases to which the Premier referred were begun more than 12 months ago. The P.S.A. case for a 5 per cent work value increase for all the employees it covered was begun in February 1980, well before the Budget was framed. The decision was handed down in July of that year. Most of the other cases the Premier mentioned were concluded 12 months ago, and the very large increases to which he refers went to relatively small professional groups. For example, there are only 400 or so engineers, and the legal officer group is far from large.

The Premier should have known that these increases were coming and should have planned accordingly. Even the most elementary briefing from his Minister would have told him that this series of work value cases resulted from a situation in which public servants had fallen behind their counterparts in private industry. In other words, the wage movement started well before, and in the nature of wage fixation in Australia, with an inexorable flow-on, undoubtedly it would eventually catch up to public servants employed by the State Government. The trend was known months before, yet it was not allowed for in this Budget. Even the Premier, one would think, would surely have enough understanding of the dynamics of our wage system to know that, but apparently not.

Another important fact that the Premier should have known was that every other group of public sector employees in Australia had been receiving similar increases in the 1979-1980 financial year: South Australia was the last State to move, the last State to catch up. The Premier had 12 months in which to understand what was likely to happen and to plan for its effects, and he did nothing. Instead, he is now content to blame public servants, to imply that the increases that they finally received were not justified, and to trumpet that this

situation has never before been faced by a Government.

The Premier talked about a record provision being made. What nonsense! In 1975-1976, Premier Dunstan allowed \$82 000 000 for wage and salary increases, a figure that represented 7.8 per cent of the total Budget. This Government in 1980-1981 allowed \$79 000 000 or 5.2 per cent of the total Budget, so where is the record that the Premier talked about in terms of provision and actual experience? Previous Labor Governments faced wage pressures far in excess of what this Government is looking at and still managed to produce surplus Budgets and keep the State finances in order. The question that is raised by this estimate of wage increases is whether the figure of \$79 000 000 was fixed to keep the Budget result as low as possible, in the confident belief that the juggling that the Premier would do during the year could cover up that fact, and he could then blame the greater wage increases that he knew were in the pipeline for the problems he was having with his figures. So much for that excuse!

Next in line for some blame is the problem of interest payments and the public debt. The Premier used this excuse in February this year when explaining an earlier reassessment upwards of the deficit, but interestingly, on that occasion, the blame was put on the former Labor Government. At least now, as time goes by, the Premier is getting closer to the truth, because the responsibility has been shifted to Canberra. The Premier is not quite there yet. In the interests of publicity, I suppose there must be a limit to Liberal Premiers attacking the Federal Government. Nevertheless, while admitting this was to do with Canberra, the Premier did not refer (and this is the omission) to the broken promise of his Federal colleagues to stop the interest rate spiral. That is putting the real pressure on our interest bill, and the Premier knows it.

He mentioned general revenue grants, which depend on the level of the consumer price index—a third area of blame, something beyond his control or anticipation. The Premier knows that he is lucky to get as much from the general revenue grant as he does. In the March quarter for 1981, Adelaide, at 2.8 per cent, was leading Australia as the capital with the highest quarterly rise. The major difference between South Australia and other States was the high South Australian petrol prices, the result of his Government's hamfisted pricing policy. The Premier should be careful about complaining on that score. It is extraordinary that in his speech the Premier singled out his own initiatives as reasons for the uncontrollable increases in the deficit.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: That was a *non sequitur*.

Mr BANNON: We will hear the Premier's reply on that. The voluntary early retirement scheme has cost \$4 300 000, the Premier tells us. Why was that not costed beforehand? Was not actuarial advice sought about the cost of the scheme in this financial year? This was not something that just happened: it was part of the Premier's deliberate policy of running down the public sector, about which he has hardly been silent since taking office. He should have calculated the cost well before the Budget was framed, but he said yesterday that the Government did not expect to pay this much and this scheme is one of the reasons why the costs have increased.

Clearly, the source of the Government's financial problems is in the Revenue Account: this is where the Government should be concentrating its attention, not seeking excuses in events that were predictable at the time the Budget was framed. Last year in April the Revenue Account was in surplus by \$27 400 000; however, in April 1981 there was a \$34 300 000 deficit, so in 12 months the Revenue Account has worsened by \$61 700 000. Yesterday the Premier outlined how he thought the end of the

year position would differ from that planned on the Revenue Account last August. He suggested that to the initial planned \$16 000 000 deficit on revenue would be added \$50 000 000 in other expenses, making a total of \$66 000 000. From this, he said that \$20 000 000 in extra receipts could be subtracted to give a net deficit of \$46 000 000.

The Premier's speech yesterday was designed to confuse and the figures he quoted need close examination to understand the full implications. An investigation of the \$20 000 000 in extra receipts is revealing. In his speech, the Premier identified various revenue items totalling \$13 900 000, plus a mysterious \$8 000 000 referred to as a recoup from the Primary Producers Assistance Fund. This made a total of \$21 900 000. So, we have the statement from the Premier that \$8 000 000 has been transferred into one of the Budget accounts from the Government's outside account. This is the very type of juggling about which we have been warning and to which we have drawn attention over the past 12 months. There is a movement to juggle funds between accounts to bolster the Budget position. A sum of \$8 000 000 has appeared in the Budget out of the blue, and it is not explained or even discussed. It is dismissed in one line of text.

This reference to a recoup from the Primary Producers Assistance Funds is very interesting indeed. I call on the Premier to give an explanation why this \$8 000 000 transfer to the Budget has been made, and to tell us whether or not it is part of an exercise to hide the true extent of the deficit. According to the Premier, the balance of \$20 000 000 includes other variations both above and below Budget. Basically, what it includes is the net effect of revenues running below the budgeted rate and the increased revenues resulting from the frantic moves to increase State charges, even before the Budget year had expired.

Yesterday I documented the extent of the increased State charges resorted to by the Government, and I identified over 40 increases in respect of a very comprehensive range of State services. Virtually every State service has been increased in cost because the Premier wants to claim that his is a low-tax Government. He ignores the fact that a dollar of increased State charges is identical to a dollar of State taxes. The public has been asked to pay higher State charges to help the Premier get out of his Budget problems.

The other basic element of the residual in Revenue Account receipts is Revenue Account receipts below the Budget estimate. The Premier very carefully avoided referring to these. It is strange that he indicated where revenues were above budget, but neglected to tell us where revenues were below it. I imagine that is because this is a very touchy subject, and by doing so he could have been drawn into identifying how much he has obtained from the round of increases in State charges. It is very hard to actually compute because of the Premier's coyness in detailing those areas where the estimates have fallen below budget.

A key reason for some revenues being below budget is, of course, the economic situation in South Australia. In a number of areas, if the economy is buoyant, with high investment, production and employment, then revenue receipts will be buoyant. The Premier has claimed repeatedly that the State economy has been expanding rapidly. The poor receipts, the below-budgeted receipts in key revenue areas, certainly expose this as propaganda. The economic indicators for South Australia certainly would not comfort the Premier when they are considered as a group. The State accounts for the three quarters ended March do not indicate buoyant receipts.

Let us look at pay-roll tax, which is the State's major local revenue source, accounting for about half of local tax revenue. What happens to pay-roll tax collection is vitally important to the State Budget. The Premier budgeted for a 13.2 per cent rise in pay-roll tax collections during 1980-1981. However, the annual rate of increase to March 1980 was a mere 10.4 per cent. Collections from this tax depend partly on employment level, and therefore something appears to be very wrong with the Government's employment forecasts in the Budget, and certainly gives the lie to the boasts that we have heard, even today, about the Government's record in employment and unemployment.

Mr Olsen: And schemes to help small businessmen.

Mr BANNON: Yes, I will certainly follow that up later; thank you for the interjection. Have the forecasts been over-optimistic? Perhaps the Government has been sucked in by its grossly inaccurate forecasts about the South Australian economy and has compounded these errors by building them into the Budget estimates.

Another key influence on pay-roll tax collections is the rate of increase in wages and salaries. The Premier has made much noise about how fast wage payments have been increasing. Even allowing for the adjustment of pay-roll tax scales, extra wages would have been expected to show up in faster growth in pay-roll tax collections. I think the Premier should tell the House about pay-roll tax collections. Are they to grow at the budgeted rate and, if not, what will the revenue loss be?

Another area dependent on the State economy and reflecting its health is shipping activity. The Department of Marine and Harbors revenues, in turn, depend on that level of shipping activity. These were supposed to increase from \$19 000 000 last year to \$24 200 000 this year—a 27.4 per cent budgeted increase. However, at March 1981 Department of Marine and Harbors receipts were actually below those at March 1980, and this was after a 5 per cent increase in port dues and a 30 per cent rise in pilotage, effective from last July; of course, this partly masked the true extent of the down-turn. Now we are to have a second increase in pilotage and wharfage in this financial year to try to bolster revenue, and somehow get it up to the level budgeted for. This is from the Party which, in Opposition, attacked allegedly high port charges in South Australia.

The extra \$50 000 000 in Revenue Account expenditures includes \$14 000 000 under special Acts, \$11 000 000 extra interest payments, \$1 300 000 extra Murray River pumping, the balance being higher motor registration fees paid to the Highways Fund. Another \$19 000 000 is over-expenditure on departmental and miscellaneous lines. This is a net figure, incorporating decreases below budget, as well as increases.

It would be interesting to learn from the Premier in which areas expenditures were less than budgeted. What can he tell us, for instance, about expenditure on his so-called 'bold initiative', the plan to create 7 000 new jobs (later upped to 10 000) by pay-roll tax incentives? As the member for Rocky River reminded us earlier, the Government has attempted to introduce schemes such as this. Was there under-spending on this scheme in 1980-81 as a result of its limited effectiveness? Members will recall that last financial year the Auditor-General reported (and I think the member for Rocky River would be interested in this figure) that only \$129 000 out of the \$2 000 000 allocated for pay-roll tax rebates had been spent. That is no indication of prosperity in the economy or of those concessions working. The remaining \$17 000 000 of the extra \$50 000 000 was in respect of increased wages.

Overall, the Premier is prepared to concede that the Revenue Account could be in deficit by \$46 000 000. This

is larger than the figure of \$40 000 000 which was the subject of special minutes the Premier wrote to Ministers last year about the 1980-81 finances. In these documents, published in the media, the Premier expressed great concern that a \$40 000 000 deficit could result. He called on Ministers to make 3 per cent cuts in real terms. The Premier said that 'significant savings are necessary if the Government is to achieve financial stability'. In other words, he was saying that a \$40 000 000 deficit on the Revenue Account was not a position of financial stability. Now we have the Premier saying glibly, without much extra comment, that the Revenue Account is expected to have a \$46 000 000 deficit. On his own logic, that is not financial stability. And it would appear that that figure is conservative.

While early in his speech he refers to extra receipts of some \$20 000 000, later he refers to 'an improvement in receipts of perhaps as much as \$20 000 000'. He slightly fudges it with that reference, because it he is not quite sure. Is he going to achieve this figure or is he not? Is it just another of his 'guesstimates', like his original planned \$1 500 000 deficit has been revealed to be. We will wait to hear his response.

We know that \$8 000 000 has been transferred into the Budget from the Primary Producers Assistance Funds. Without this, the deficit on Revenue Account could be \$54 000 000. In addition, there is the matter of receipts from increased charges. Earlier I referred to their inclusion as a residual item. If the extra revenue from unscheduled charges was \$3 000 000, then the Government would have been looking at a \$57 000 000 Revenue Account deficit before it began making its extraordinary moves to rescue the position.

That \$3 000 000 estimate from extra State charges may be a minimum figure; probably, the actual figure will be well above this. So, overall, the Government could be facing a \$60 000 000 deficit on Revenue Account, but for the panic action it took to try to hide the fact. Certainly, a \$60 000 000 deficit is consistent with all the information the Opposition can obtain on analysis of the accounts.

Essentially, the Premier's speech was an attempt to confuse the issue of the State's parlous finances. He constantly tries to lead us away from the real cause of his problems—which largely stem from his own incompetence—towards a variety of scapegoats and excuses. But sometimes even he has to face some hard reality. The Premier said yesterday:

While a one time deficit of that magnitude is not in itself unmanageable [he is referring to the \$10 000 000 figure], there are some aspects of the present and prospective Budget situation which are disturbing and which have underlying long-term consequences.

I would remind the Premier that the Opposition has been warning of just this problem for 18 months. I also remind him that as long ago as October 1979, when he introduced his Government's first Budget, I cautioned him that his financial policies would reach a crunch point in 1980-1981. I said that he would get through 1979-1980 but that the crunch would come in the following financial year. I will refresh his memory. In *Hansard* (p. 141) of 17 October 1979, I am on record as follows:

1980-1981 will be an important financial year for this State . . . The Premier is building up real financial problems for next year. If one adds the financial problems that the Premier will face when putting his promises into effect to the problems surrounding the uncertainty that will come following the ending of the income tax guarantee and the problems posed by the relativities review . . . one sees the great difficulties that are building up for South Australia in 1980-1981.

The problems were as apparent then as they are pressing now, and ample and adequate warning was given of them.

The Premier's flirtation with honesty yesterday was unfortunately brief. When identifying the long-term consequences to which he referred, he ignored his own appalling arithmetic during the election campaign—his own boast that his promises were carefully costed and that the State could afford them.

We knew in 1979 that his costing errors were not just a once only burden to the State, appearing in one financial year and then being forgotten, but represented a sum which had to be found in each succeeding year. We have asked repeatedly where the money is to be found to cover those errors, those errors which must show up again and again as each Budget is formulated.

The Premier has never answered those question, but increasingly the published accounts are answering them for him. When dealing with the Loan Account, the Premier admits that a further \$20 000 000 is to be transferred from it—the fund which is used for capital and long-term public works, Loan borrowings on which interest is being paid—to support the Revenue Account, the day-by-day expenses of the Government. This was the occasion in fact, for one further flash of honesty: the Premier said yesterday:

We cannot afford to continue to finance our recurrent operations from capital funds indefinitely.

Quite right, but when we made that precise point 12 months ago, the result was scoffing and rejection of it by the Government.

This is a remarkable admission as it is only seven to eight months ago that the Premier, and more particularly, the Deputy Premier, rather than admitting as the Premier did yesterday, that this transferring from Loan Fund into recurrent Revenue Account could not go on forever, were even vigorously denying that this was even happening.

Members will remember that during the Budget debate on 17 September 1980, I raised the question of use of Loan funds, or capital funds, to pay the recurrent expenditures. I had already drawn attention to the grave state of our finances, which we now find have worsened. I then referred to the difficulty of recovering deficits on the revenue side of our accounts. I then concluded:

It is the beginning of a serious cash flow problem for this Government which is in fact not just going to affect this Government in its short term of office, but will return to haunt any Government in the future trying to grapple with the parlous financial situation that will be left as a legacy of the Tonkin years—\$16 000 000 of Loan funds on which interest is paid has gone to prop up the Revenue Account.

That means we are borrowing to pay our running expenses.

I also thought I should reduce it to terms which members opposite might understand, and which I know the Deputy Premier finds it easier to handle. Put simply, the Government was using the rent money to buy the groceries. This seemed to raise the blood pressure of a few members opposite, particularly the Deputy Premier, who spent his speech of reply on the Budget debate lecturing, in his best school master manner, on what he saw as the errors of my analysis and how outrageous it was that I should make such a suggestion. But here it is, in black and white, recorded in *Hansard*, his own Premier saying that we can not keep spending capital funds on recurrent expenditure. Indeed, we cannot.

There is no comfort for the Opposition in being proved correct, because the consequences of what the Government is doing pose enormous dangers to our economy. Even the Premier can see it, for he goes on in his speech to acknowledge the detrimental effect this course of action will have, particularly on building and construction. He

did not have to wait until June 1981 to discover that. In October 1979, I asked him whether the cutting of payments from Loan funds was to be the corner stone of his so-called management. How was building and construction to survive if Loan programmes continued to be cut? The Government, some 18 months later, seems to understand that there is some link between public expenditure and private activity, as we have stressed consistently.

In September, last year the Opposition made clear to the Government that its policy of using capital funds to pay running costs was asking for disaster. At that stage we were looking at a net cut of \$29 000 000. At that stage we were looking at a loss of 1 100 jobs in building since September 1979. We are now told that a further \$20 000 000 will, euphemistically be saved on Loan account. So together \$49 000 000 less is being spent this year than was spent last year.

What are those so-called \$20 000 000 savings? How is the \$5 500 000 for waterworks and sewers made up? Similarly, the \$8 000 000 for the S.T.A., the \$2 300 000 for other Government buildings, the \$2 200 000 for harbor works, and the \$1 500 000 for Woods and Forests. How are those savings being achieved? Let us have details clearly spelt out.

A euphemism is used in this context. The phrase 'work not proceeding as quickly as originally anticipated' is bandied about. We should remember the minute the Premier sent to Government departments earlier this year, which the Opposition made available to the House. The Premier wrote on 15 January:

All Ministers have undertaken as a matter of urgency . . . to review operations (both recurrent and capital) with a view to rescheduling expenditures where firm commitments have not yet been made.

That is what the phrase quoted above apparently means. It is clear that important projects have been deferred with serious consequences to both the community and to industry. It is little wonder that a review of the building industry in the journal *Australian Business* in February 1981 concluded:

The prospects are good, too, for Government construction in mainland States, except South Australia.

It would appear from that that the industry sees South Australia as missing out on any recovery that might take place because of the policies of this Government.

This supplementary Budget not only confirms the seriousness of the situation concerning our State finances, but in fact indicates that the situation is far worse than the Government was prepared to admit eight months ago when it introduced its Budget for this financial year. It confirms the Opposition's predictions that the Government was heading for major financial problems, and I invite members to look at Opposition speeches on both Budget debates. It confirms also that in a desperate attempt to prop up its Revenue Account, the Government is drawing more and more on capital funds and essential reserves. The situation is very grave and all the Premier has done is to attempt to confuse the House as to the seriousness of the problem. In fact, were it not for desperate last-minute increases in State charges and the transfer of funds from other accounts, this situation might be far worse than it now appears.

The Premier says he expects a \$46 000 000 deficit on Revenue Account and a \$35 000 000 surplus on Loan Account, for a combined deficit of \$10 000 000. Actually, these figures add up to a combined deficit of between \$11 000 000 and \$12 000 000. I ask the Premier to check this. He says \$10 000 000: I suggest the figures make about \$11 000 000 or \$12 000 000, since the so-called

\$35 000 000 surplus on the Loan Account comprises \$14 500 000 from last year, plus a further \$20 000 000 cut this year.

But that does not give the full picture of the financial situation. Instead of a \$10 000 000 deficit, the real position, before the Government began making its unscheduled financial moves, was worse. It has obtained \$8 000 000 from transferring funds into the Budget, and another \$20 000 000 from deferring or cutting vital public works financed through the Loan Fund, and it may have obtained as much as, if not more than, \$3 000 000 from increased State charges.

Taking these together, adding them up, the real situation on which we should be planning is not a deficit of \$1 500 000 or even \$10 000 000, but in fact \$41 000 000 or more. It has taken this Government only 18 months to bring the State to this position, a Government that inherited a surplus on combined accounts of \$600 000 from the Corcoran Government, and healthy reserves. The Premier has tried to shift the blame for this situation away from himself and his Government, but it is his responsibility and, to a large extent, the situation in which we find ourselves today is a result of his incompetence. As we put to this House yesterday, the State's finances have suffered enough from his mismanagement and the sooner he is replaced, the better.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): We have had put before us a document indicating quite clearly the dire financial straits in which we find ourselves at present under the Tonkin Liberal Administration. The Premier's preoccupation with a programme of damning the former Government (and he is now being forced to criticise the Fraser Government for doing the very same things that he is doing) indicates an appalling situation so far as this State's finances are concerned. In effect, the Premier wants to have his cake and eat it too.

Economic indicators clearly show that the Government has not been able to come to grips with the economic problems faced by this State. Furthermore, the policy of restricting Government activity, particularly in public works and housing, and the increasing use of State charges as a revenue source is working against a recovery from this shocking state of affairs.

In his second reading speech, the Premier referred to a number of factors which prevented the Government's plan of achieving that small deficit of \$1 500 000. Not unexpectedly, the first factor the Premier chose to highlight was wage increases. That point has already been highlighted by the Leader. I quote from the Premier's second reading speech:

Members will recall that a very large round sum allowance of \$79 000 000 was set aside in this year's Budget for increases in wage and salary rates. This budgeting amount represented an increase of 41 per cent over the allocated figure of \$56 000 000 in the previous year. However, present indications suggest that the amount required for wage and salary increases will be closer to \$96 000 000 for the year, an increase of \$40 000 000, or 71 per cent over last year's allocation, and an increase of \$17 000 000 over the allowance provided in the 1980-1981 Budget. That record increase has resulted from:

- Indexation increases of at least 7.9 per cent, and even more if the determination of the State Industrial Commission regarding flow-on of the most recent national wage adjustment impacts on this year's accounts.
- Work value decisions for most State Government employees. So far this year, school teachers have been awarded an interim increase of 4 per cent, other occupational groups, including engineers, correctional service officers, police and legal

officers, have received work-value increases ranging from 7 per cent to 11 per cent, and most other Government employees have received at least a flat 5 per cent.

In all, a large majority of the Government workforce has received a work-value increase this year which, together with indexation adjustments, has resulted in pay increases ranging from almost 13 per cent up to 19 per cent. In other words, wage and salary increases in the current financial year have exceeded inflation significantly, in some cases by as much as 9 per cent. And that is not the end of it.

He then went on to indicate some of the claims currently before the State tribunals, as follows:

Teachers currently are proceeding with a claim for substantial increases in salaries before the Teachers Salaries Board.

Concluding the statement, the Premier said:

As I have said before, and it bears repeating, pay increases of this magnitude limit the Government's ability to outlay funds on new or expanded services, they impact considerably on the availability of funds for other purposes, and they lead to an inevitable reduction in employment opportunities.

The Premier expressed concern at the magnitude of those pay increases. I remind the Premier that the whole South Australian community is very deeply concerned at the magnitude of charges that have been increased by his Government during its term of office. If we look at these increases we find that bus, tram and train fares have increased by an average of 25 per cent since July 1980, with more to come. Water charges are up 12 per cent, and more is to come. Irrigation charges have risen 12.5 per cent since July 1980. Electricity charges are up by 12.5 per cent, with further increases already announced. Motor vehicle registration is up by 12 per cent to 20 per cent.

In addition, there has been the petrol price hike, several interest rate increases for housing loans, gas, and in less visible areas there have been increased fees and charges in more than 27 areas. One could go on and on. The Premier will just have to get used to the wage and salary claims while his Government continues to increase State charges in the manner it has done. He will have to come up with a much better excuse for his financial mismanagement.

One point that worries many Opposition members is the rapid decline in prosperity in South Australia. I raise a matter that has been of great difficulty for a number of years, namely the dispute between the Point McLeay Aboriginal community, the Ralkon Agricultural Company and the Aboriginal Development Commission. It is not only vital to the whole Aboriginal community at Point McLeay but is also very important for South Australia.

The Ralkon company is an Aboriginal farming enterprise incorporated on 2 October 1975 under the South Australian Companies Act by the Point McLeay Community Council to farm at Point McLeay. The Aboriginal Development Commission holds freehold title to the 892-hectare property known as Bartletts Farm, which is approximately one-quarter of the total lands farmed by Ralkon. The remaining 2 752 hectares is held under freehold title by the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The company has had a controversial history, including a dispute over the manager's position, held by a non-Aboriginal, and a decision by the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to withdraw funds. I understand that the manager has offered to resign on a number of occasions but that the company directors, all of whom are Aborigines, want him to continue to manage their farm.

The problems really are quite considerable. The Aborigines want full ownership of the property they have built into what has been and could still be a very successful business. They have also offered to buy it. By its very

nature, it is commercially orientated but, unlike other commercial bodies, it is not free to mobilise its own assets for further development and upgrading until all the problems are resolved to the satisfaction of the Point McLeay community.

It is true that the Ralkon Company suffered early losses, but this, I believe, was due mainly to the very poor condition of cattle that it had purchased in its early days of operation. However, in spite of being denied funding and having most normal avenues of credit closed to it, it cleared a debt of some \$45 000. Since then the company has been able to make modest profits and, as at February 1980, its profit for that year reached a figure of more than \$32 000.

I raise this matter because of its importance to the community of Point McLeay. It can and should continue to be a very viable enterprise, and surely that is very important for South Australia. More pressure must be applied upon the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs to come up with a speedy settlement of this dispute, and I call upon the Premier and the State Minister of Aboriginal Affairs to use their good offices for that purpose. They have been aware of the problems, but they have done nothing about them.

It is essential that the many problems at Point McLeay be sorted out, and sorted out quickly. The matter must be settled before it is too late and before there is any bloodshed. I think it is necessary that a full independent public inquiry be carried out and completed. There have been several inquiries already, but they dragged on for far too long and nothing resulted from them. I understand that only last week a move was made in the Senate, in Canberra, to set up a Select Committee. However, I am not certain at this stage of the outcome of that move.

An inquiry several years ago by the Senate Standing Committee on Social Welfare decided that the matter should be referred to the Federal Ombudsman, but, following more confusion, the report of the Ombudsman had never been released. In the meantime, the dispute has probably deepened and certain factions have developed, resulting in Supreme Court action over the recent Point McLeay Community Council elections. I am sure that the member for Mallee and the member for Henley Beach are well aware of that situation, and of all the problems at Point McLeay.

In a recent press report it was stated that the management of the land leased by the Ralkon Agricultural Company near Lake Alexandrina is extremely poor, and Ralkon's financial records have not been audited since 1977, according to the Aboriginal Development Commission. That allegation brought a quick response from the Chairman of Directors of Ralkon, Mr Spencer Rigney. In the *Advertiser* of 15 May it was reported:

No large sums would be spent on land leased by the Ralkon Agricultural Company near Lake Alexandrina until the question of its ownership was settled, a company spokesman said yesterday. The company had been pre-empted from investing in the land for years, Mr Spencer Rigney said. Mr Rigney, Chairman of Directors of Ralkon, was commenting on criticism of Ralkon's management of the land by the Aboriginal Development Commission. The strongly critical views of the A.D.C.'s General Manager, Mr C. J. Bourke, were reported in the *Advertiser* yesterday.

Mr Rigney said he did not dispute the contents of a report by the A.D.C.'s agricultural consultants, David L. Price and Associates, which concluded that management of the land was 'extremely poor'. Deterioration of the land would be irreversible unless there was a prompt settlement of the title dispute.

He said that for years there had been no clear and proper

definition of tenure for the land which makes up a quarter of the 3 600-hectare Ralkon station. 'Why should we spend big money when we could be kicked off any time?' he said. He said it was true that Ralkon's financial records had not been audited since 1977. 'But as a limited company, we haven't had to do so', he said, 'and last December we appointed an auditor, anyway'.

The A.D.C. inherited the title to the land last year when it was set up in the wake of the disbanded Aboriginal Land Fund Commission.

That will give honourable members some idea of the nature of this complicated dispute.

As the Ralkon Agricultural Company is a registered company, and upon reading that the financial records had not been audited since 1977, I called at the Office of Corporate Affairs to obtain copies of the company's financial statements and balance sheets for the 1977-1978, 1978-1979, and 1979-1980 financial years. To my amazement, Sir, I was told that they were not available, that they did not know where they were and did not know when they would be available.

I also know of other persons who tried to secure copies from the Department of Corporate Affairs some three to four weeks prior to my visit, and they were told exactly the same: that they were not available. The balance sheets and financial statements had been lodged, and I understand that even the company's accountant, the person who lodged them, could not obtain copies.

Last week, however, the Hon. Norm Foster, M.L.C., provided me with copies that he had received after sending a telegram to the Attorney-General, the Hon. Mr Griffin. The Attorney-General pointed out to Mr Foster that the documents are normally available through a search of the Corporate Affairs Commission's records. However, he consented to supply the information to Mr Foster on this occasion.

I would make the point that I and others could not obtain these documents through the normal search procedure, and we were not given a satisfactory answer as to why. So, it seems to me that something very strange happened in relation to those particular documents, and I hope the Minister representing the Attorney-General in this place can explain this irregularity.

On Tuesday 19 May, I and other members of the Opposition's Aboriginal Affairs Committee visited Point McLeay. We held discussions with both the Ralkon Company directors and members of the Point McLeay Community Council. It is quite obvious from those discussions that a quick and satisfactory settlement of the dispute is required.

It also seems a very strange coincidence that, following our visit, the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Senator Baume, saw fit to visit Point McLeay just three days after our visit. I know for a fact that the Minister had been asked to visit Point McLeay on no less than three occasions by Senator Geoff McLaren, who incidentally accompanied us on our visit.

Senator McLaren has been trying to assist Point McLeay for a long time, and at the council talks he said he would again ask the Minister to visit the area, so it would appear that we achieved something by our visit—a visit from the Minister responsible—and it is hoped that he will take action to rectify this serious problem, although, from reading last week's edition of the *Murray Valley Standard*, I doubt that very much will be done. In that publication, the following was stated:

Federal Aboriginal Affairs Minister, Senator Peter Baume, last week threw the Ralkon land tenure claim 'ball' back into the Aboriginal Development Commission's (ADC's) court. Senator Baume said at Point McLeay last

Friday, after a 95-minute meeting with Point McLeay Community Council members and directors of Ralkon Agricultural Company, that he did not have the authority to over-rule an A.D.C. decision. All he could do, he said, was to advise the A.D.C. but refused to say which way he would advise it to move, except to make 'the most sensible, equitable decision'.

Ralkon Chairman of Directors, Mr Spencer Rigney, said he was 'not happy' with the meeting. 'We (the directors) made our point that the council had rejected the A.D.C. offer. We're willing to compromise if the A.D.C. will compromise, and we've made this point to the Minister,' he said.

Ralkon directors want title to the land they're farming so they can use it as collateral in order to borrow money for improvements and further development, the same as any other viable, commercial enterprise. Mr Rigney says that the company has already offered to purchase the freehold title to the land on behalf of the community, but that the A.D.C. has refused to discuss this at all.

I really sympathise with the member for Henley Beach, who has been quite 'considerably involved' in the Point McLeay matter, and I hope the local member for the area, the member for Mallee, does not mind his assistance (he probably needs it anyway), because he wanted to accompany the Federal Minister to Point McLeay, but was told to keep his nose out of it. I think he has been told from several quarters to lay low and to be quiet on this whole affair, and that is a shame, because I believe he is genuinely trying to help find a solution to this problem. I am not so sure about the member for Mallee, because I understand that he likes to confront returning officers.

Because of this long-standing dispute, there have been threats of the Ralkon farm folding up, and the Opposition committee was told during its visit that it had been stated by an officer of the Aboriginal Development Commission that the farm would be put on the market for sale. These threats concern the Opposition greatly, and I know that the Point McLeay community is very disturbed about them, because those statements and threats upset the whole Aboriginal community.

Another very disturbing aspect of this trouble is the effect it is having upon the Meningie Area School, and that is a matter that should concern the Minister of Education, who is also the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs. We were advised by teachers from the Meningie school that, when there is trouble at Point McLeay, it has a drastic effect upon the whole school. The Aboriginal students attending the Meningie Area School take their troubles to school, and this creates major problems for the teachers and other students. If the Ralkon Company was to close or fold up, it would have damaging effects upon the whole Lakes district. The students feel they have no worthwhile future. There would be no jobs, no future and no real life for them to look forward to. But if the problems are rectified quickly, and if the company is able to develop and expand, there will be more jobs and more employment will evolve.

The Minister of Education should make every effort to go there and talk to the people. He should take the Premier with him so that he, too, can speak to the people, discuss the problems with them, and make every effort to assist, as the member for Henley Beach has done on a number of occasions to help solve this longstanding unfortunate dispute at Point McLeay.

The downfall of Ralkon as a successful business venture would be a tragedy. It deserves a fair go and should be assisted in its further development. I again plead with the Minister and the Premier to use their good offices to help solve the current problems for the good of the whole Point

McLeay community and also for the good of South Australia. I support the Bill.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): In discussing the matter before the House, I will make many references to what I believe is the very poor behaviour of the Government in the education dispute we saw this year. I choose this moment to do so because the Government has stated quite clearly that the reason for the cuts in school assistants' hours has been financial and, therefore, we should consider that implication. The school assistants' dispute has been a very sorry affair for this State. It has brought about the first strikes by teachers in South Australian education history, and no Government and no Minister of Education can regard that as being to his credit. Indeed, he should regard it as being to his eternal shame.

From the Government's point of view, this dispute has been fought and lost on three battlefronts: first, on the educational battlefront, and that was lost; the Government then went to the industrial battlefront, and lost that as well; and now it is in the midst of fighting on a political battlefront, where it is quite clearly being mauled. Consistently, the Government has refused to acknowledge the real issues in this dispute: it has refused to look at the impact of these cuts on the quality of education in the classroom, and that is where it matters.

The Government has also refused to look at the genuine industrial complications and problems arising from the 4 per cent cut in school assistants hours. Instead, it has attempted to drown out all opposition with a farrago of nonsense, fabrications, distortions and misrepresentations. The damage that that will do to the good and valuable work of the overwhelming majority of teachers and school assistants in this State could be immeasurable. A Minister of Education who oversees the work of thousands of dedicated teachers and school assistants is the one who quickly and urgently should work to re-establish himself and to convince the teachers and school assistants that he is satisfied that they are working for the betterment of education as a whole—the education of the children of this State.

I would like to summarise the events that have occurred in this dispute, because I believe it is particularly important that we study for a moment what has happened over the months that have gone by. To start with, we should remember what this Government said during the last election campaign: at that time, the Liberal Party and the Labor Party submitted to the Public Service Association and to many bodies in this State their policies on education and other areas. The P.S.A. printed the following comments from the Liberal Party in its newsletter:

Therefore, the Liberal Party's policy on the Public Service and statutory authorities offers no threat to anyone. Tell that to the thousands of school assistants who have been threatened by the actions of this Government! Tell that to the thousands of teachers who have been forced, against their own desire, to go on strike, and tell it to the parents as well. He then went on to say:

Where it is necessary to reorganise and reduce staff then this natural process of attrition will be used. Yet, what we see here is the use of compulsory powers under clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award. One of the statements made by the Liberal Party which must surely rub salt into the wounds that the school assistants feel that they have had inflicted upon them is this:

Our efforts will be aimed at reducing unnecessary and top-heavy administration and at increasing efficiency.

Lay that against the facts that have taken place this year, and what other interpretation can one put on it than that the Liberal Government believes that school assistants are unnecessary and constitute top-heavy administration, and that their reduction can only increase efficiency. That is arrant nonsense. That is what the Liberal Party promised at the last election and beguiled many people to believe them. This year they have found to their cost that the Liberal Party did not mean its promises.

In November 1980, the Minister of Education announced that there would be a 4 per cent cut in the allocation of school assistant hours, and then said that there would have to be a rationalisation of that between schools so that those schools above or below quota could get their fair share. There had in fact been a rationalisation of school assistants before, under the Labor Government. No-one disputes that. The difference is that what happened in 1977 under the Labor Government was a rationalisation to take account of the fact that some schools had faster growing enrolments than others. Indeed, others may have had declining enrolments, and the attempt was to balance out according to where the students were the appropriate allocation of school assistant resources. In every sense of the word, it was a rationalisation.

However, last year's effort was not just that rationalisation moving from one school to another. It was, moreover, actually a reduction, a 4 per cent reduction, and nobody can dispute that. That did not happen in 1977; there was no reduction at that time and, indeed, events clearly show that after some discussions an increased allocation was made for school assistants.

In December 1980, the Minister of Education said in a letter to the Public Service Association:

It has become apparent to the Government that further economies in the financial allocation to the education sector will be necessary, if the Government's financial target is to be met next year.

The letter continues:

Cabinet considers therefore that there is no alternative but to require reduced allocation in the level of ancillary staff in schools of approximately 4 per cent overall. The reduction will be implemented in accordance with clause 13 of the School Assistants (Government Schools) Interim Award.

I ask members to note that in that particular paragraph no reference was made to the impact on the quality of education; no reference was made to the work going on in the schools. The term used is 'the Government's financial target', clearly an economist's response and not an educational response. That letter caused some degree of concern among school assistants at that time. Members will know that there was the threat of industrial action. The real Minister of Education was not in town—he was away somewhere; so we had one of the many acting Ministers of Education. I might say at this stage that the Ministry of Education under this Government in this State is something like the many-headed Hydra—you chop off one head by slaying him in one debate and another one pops up. First, we have had the Minister of Education in his own right; then we have had the Minister of Industrial Affairs wandering in and out of the education portfolio; then we have had the Deputy Premier wandering in and out as well; and of course, when he got back from overseas, the Premier was wandering in and out. We have had each of them making statements and getting embroiled in the affair. Who next do we have? We have had the first four members along the front bench. The next is none other than the Minister who is presently sitting on the front bench, and I look forward to the Chief Secretary's comments when it comes to his turn to embroil

himself in this affair.

When the acting Minister of Education, as he called himself then, the Hon. Dean Brown, got into the fray he undertook a positive initiative; he agreed that the Ministry of Education would enter into negotiations with the unions with a view to trying to resolve the problems at hand. He outlined six points on which negotiations would take place, and I shall quote these from a letter he wrote dated 20 February 1981 to the Public Service Association. He said:

The issues to be the subject of negotiations are:

- (1) compulsory transfers;
- (2) forced reductions using clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award;
- (3) whether the formula should be based on the numbers of teachers or of students or on some other basis;
- (4) the procedure for adjustment of numbers at the beginning of each calendar year;

Then there are two others affecting entitlements of school assistants themselves. He finished the letter by acknowledging that the matter was one of some urgency (I think everybody accepted that) and said that it should be free from threats of industrial action, and then said that the negotiations should go on 'to enable the above issues to be resolved to the satisfaction of all parties'. That is a very positive statement. As a result of that the threat of industrial action was withdrawn.

Unfortunately, the acting Minister of Education went back to his portfolio and the real Minister of Education came back on to the scene. I say 'unfortunately' because then he upset the applecart. The negotiations, which were proceeding and which were covering many of those points—and indeed there was agreement with some of those points—were unilaterally finished in March, when the Minister announced that the implementation of the cuts, the use of compulsory provisions in the School Assistants Award, would take effect from 27 March. So, all this business about 'to the satisfaction of all parties' was for nought, counting for nothing.

Of course, naturally that was very concerning to school assistants and very concerning to the union involved, and also, as we were soon to see, of a great deal of concern to teachers in the education system. So, a strike was called for the end of March. While we were in the process of hearing the debate about this dispute, in the week when the strike was due to be held, which was 27 March, we found that there was a tripartite approach to the Industrial Commission. By that I mean that it consisted of the two unions involved, plus the Government. The Director-General of Education, with the approval of his own Minister, agreed to make an approach to the Industrial Commission to try to obtain some resolution to the conflict. I commend that. That was logical; there was a dispute and the Industrial Commission should have been involved.

However, obviously the Government had one anticipation in mind, and when the Industrial Commission recommended that the implementation of the cuts should be deferred at least until the end of the first term, what happened then? That did not satisfy the Government. It was not satisfied with that at all; it had not anticipated that result. So, the Government sent a message back to the commission, the very commission which it had asked to be involved, along with the unions. Among other things, the Government said:

Under such circumstances [referring to Government policies] it is our submission that it is no longer appropriate for the Industrial Commissioner to further involve himself in this dispute on the basis of when Cabinet policies should be implemented.

What more clear refutation of the power of the Industrial Commission could there be than that? What clearer indication of disrespect towards the commission could there be? First, the Government called in the commission to participate and, when it did not like what the commission said, it told it to go away.

Then there was the strike, in which nearly 40 schools were involved. In fact, the level of teachers voting to go on strike ran to about 4 000 and that became the first strike in the history of education in South Australia. That is a day which I think everybody agrees was a sorry day—a day the teachers themselves believed was a sorry day that such a stage had been reached.

Mr. Langley: They rallied to the cause.

Mr. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, they did, but the response of the Minister was to belittle, to say that only 40 schools went on strike and that most schools stayed open. Therefore, by deduction, he was implying that most schools and most teachers supported what he was doing. By saying that, the Minister opened up a deluge of advertisements and a deluge of letters to the press, to members of Parliament, and whatever, saying that the Minister was not to get the wrong idea and not to mistake what the teachers' decision was. They may not have voted to go on strike but they did not agree with his policy. They said they did not believe that the Minister had the best educational interests of the children in our schools at heart. But the Government was immune.

We then had another attempt to go back to the commission and that was wise decision. At that time, the Commissioner made five recommendations, and I will read the two which were the more significant ones. On 7 April, the Commissioner said:

Second, as there is an application before the commission for variations to be made to clause 13 (3) of the award, in accordance with section 25 (2) of the Industrial Act, there seems to be no good reason why the parties should not be endeavouring to effect conciliation in relation to that claim.

In another recommendation, the Commissioner referred to the implementation of the cuts and said that there should be the ability to consider and recommend whether the working party should be asked to extend its terms of working beyond the four-week period, if the circumstances at the time so warranted. They were two of the five recommendations which the Commissioner put to the disputing parties with a hope of resolving the crisis.

There was a response from the Institute of Teachers and a response from the Government. The response from the Institute of Teachers was that it accepted the recommendations. Admittedly it had four provisos, but all the provisos related to the requirement that the Government should undertake that it adhered to the recommendations as well, and that the Government should give an undertaking that there would be an investigation which would include adequate documentation of how ancillary staff spent their day, what they did. That is quite in line with the Keeves Committee recommendations which was the Government's committee of inquiry into education. The institute accepted the recommendations, and in its letter it said:

In these circumstances, which we see to be non-negotiable, and provided that the employer accepts it as a total package before 12.00 noon tomorrow then Executive has decided to authorise the deferral of industrial action planned for Friday.

Clearly, it would call off the strike. The Government had two responses to that; it had a public response and a private response, one for the man in the street and one for the commission. In part, the public response was:

The State Government today accepted suggestions by the Industrial Commission to help settle the issue of ancillary staffing in schools.

It went on to say that, regarding the recommendations put by the Commissioner, the Government would accept them, and it called on the unions to do the same without qualification. The first response of the public was to say that it was fantastic that the Government had accepted the recommendations; therefore there should be no grounds for a dispute. There was some degree of agitation in certain quarters when the dispute seemed to proceed. It was seen as unreasonable on the part of the school-teachers, assistants and unions. In fact, what the public at large did not know at that time was that there was a private response which was not the same as the public response. The private response addressed to the Commissioner in relation to clause 13 (3) included the following comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the honourable member able to relate this debate to the clauses in the Bill which are currently being considered?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Certainly, this all affects financial expenditure by the Education Department and requirements to keep in rein education expenditure. As I mentioned at the start, I explained that the Government some time ago made a comment that it would be necessary, if the Government's financial target was to be met next year, that these cuts would have to be implemented. That is why I am going through this debate at the moment. The response by the Government in relation to clause 13 (3) was:

In view of the substantial history surrounding clause 13 (3) we are unable to negotiate in respect of that subclause.

With regard to implementing those cuts and the possible deferral of them to the end of the first term, the letter said:

Whilst I am prepared to accept suggestion No. 4, I must indicate that the Government is committed to applying the reduced hours in all schools from the commencement of term 2 in 1981.

That I know caused a great deal of concern to the commission, and at a later time I will be reading out extracts from a letter the Commissioner wrote asking for some clarification to try to clear up the contradiction between the Government's public attitude and the Government's private response.

That then brought us close to 10 April which was the day on which we had the second strike in South Australia's education history. However, just before that the Minister of Education is on record in the *Mount Gambier Border Watch* as saying that only 130 schools were 'whingeing like hell'; only 130 schools were putting up all this fuss. He must have looked even redder when 10 April came, because on that day not only 130 but more than 160 schools closed. If you then add up all the schools that advertised in the metropolitan or regional press a total of 170 schools must be added to that. If you add to that figure those schools which did not advertise or which did not go on strike but which wrote to members of Parliament or to the Minister of Education, you can add on another 30 or so schools of which I know. Thus, the total is more than 360 schools, nearly half the number of schools in this State. More significantly, this involves about two-thirds of the teachers and two-thirds of the student population in this State. Over 55 per cent of teachers voted to go on strike and a significant number of the remaining 45 per cent indicated by advertisement or by letter their opposition to the Government's claims.

Clearly, the majority of teachers were concerned. They could not accept the proposition that financial restraint by the Government should be exercised in the way in which this Government was proposing to exercise it. They could not accept that if restraint had to exist in the education budget that it should take place at the classroom level, the

level at which education is going on. It can be seen from their letters that they argued that remedial programmes, for example, would be undermined and their effectiveness reduced. They argued that the science lessons, laboratory preparation, would be undermined and in certain circumstances could become hazardous.

They argued that the administrative load that would be thrown back on teachers must cut across the board educationally. So, I ask why 55 per cent of teachers of this State voted to go on strike. I say it was because they were concerned at the educational implications of these cuts.

In a strict industrial sense, the teachers of this State stood not to lose one iota industrially from the cuts. If the cuts are implemented, the working hours of teachers in this State will not be affected, nor will their salaries. They will have more administrative work to do, and less time to do remedial programmes and education in the classroom but, if they wanted to be selfish about it, they could say, 'I will spend more lesson time doing "administrivia" that I am required to do and less time teaching these kids in front of me. I will keep them occupied with some rote work.' They could easily do that, if they wanted to. But they assessed that that would be bad education. Indeed, I believe that was a correct assessment. For that reason they opposed it—not for any industrial advantage to themselves, because there was none.

Through all the political smearing that this Government is trying to do against teachers in this State, I suggest it remember that very important point, and that the Premier cease attacking teachers' activities, blaming them on a few political activists within the unions or doing what the Minister of Education has done by implying a communist involvement, which was surely the most inane comment we have had.

Mr McRae: Did he say communist involvement?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, he did. On a television debate he implied communist involvement by attacking certain members of the S.A.I.T. executive whom he did not name. I call on him to do so. What the Government seriously miscalculated was that the degree of concern went right throughout, not only amongst teachers who were very concerned, as I have pointed out, but through all levels of the profession. I have here some motions moved by the Primary Schools Principals Association, an august body, which has in this dispute also attacked the Premier for his political comments, saying that he has missed the point. In its recommendations, of which I have quite a few here, it criticised the Government by saying:

This meeting condemns the Government for its failure to accept the recommendations of the Industrial Commissioner. That was after the Government asked it to consider the matter. Another example is as follows:

This meeting demands that if there is to be any further ancillary staff movement then it be done on a co-operative and voluntary basis as has been achieved in the past.

That is most interesting, and is the comment of primary school principals on the rationalisation that took place in 1977. Perhaps the most stinging one of all for the Government was No. 7:

This meeting calls for the resignation of Minister Allison in view of his apparent incompetence to properly administer education services in this State.

That is a recommendation which I hope he has seriously considered. Let us consider the parents in this State. I have been besieged by many letters from them. I am sure that the Minister of Education has had a similar number of letters, as I know other members have. Let us summarise their feelings in the words of Mr Ian Wilson, President of the South Australian Association of State School Organisations—in a sense the parents' spokesman. First,

in sending a message to teachers, he said:

Firstly, let me congratulate you on the commendable restraint you have shown in your current dealings with the State Government.

Then he said:

I personally have never in seven years of involvement in the South Australian Association of State School Organisations known of more parents as angry as they are now. That is from a man who has not been frightened to criticise Governments of any political persuasion. He has made criticisms of all Governments when he felt, in his opinion, they were justified. But that is his judgment: parents have never been as angry as they are now.

Now, what response do we get to all these approaches from the community, from schools, school associations, and all those people trying to tell those in the Education Centre in Flinders Street and in the State Administration Centre that maybe they are wrong? The response is more political smears. We had the letter of 11 May in which the Premier addressed school council chairmen. That contained 11 points, and a copy of the Premier's speech.

There were two points that were blatant misrepresentations, three distortions, two irrelevant, and three outright terminological inexactitudes (in other words, a complete absence of truth from three of them). It is about time the Government showed more respect for education in this State. I believe that it is about time it recognised that teachers are trying to express an opinion. They believe something is very wrong with the present Government activities in this dispute. Why cannot the Government give them serious attention; why cannot the Government seriously listen to the points they are raising and consider perhaps that it has handled this issue badly, and has led us into a disastrous situation? It should take full responsibility for having brought us—

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

Mr SLATER (Gilles): This Bill is a further indictment of the Government's financial mismanagement of this State's affairs. I refer to the Hospitals Fund, with money paid into the Treasury from the South Australian Lotteries Commission, and to the likely effect that Government introduction of soccer pools will have on the money paid into that fund. I refer to the debate on that legislation earlier this year, when the Minister of Recreation and Sport emphasised that the Lotteries Commission had been asked prior to the legislation whether it wished to become involved as an agent for Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd. In his second reading explanation, the Minister said that the commission had advised that it was not prepared to become involved in Australian Soccer Pools. In the Committee stages of that Bill I asked the Minister a question, which appears at page 2997 of *Hansard* of 18 February:

In relation to subclause (1), will the Minister approve of a person or newsagent, who at the present time may be an agent for the South Australian Lotteries Commission, becoming an authorised soccer pools agent? Further, will he say how agencies for soccer pools will be set up in South Australia?

His reply was as follows:

I assure the member for Gilles that I would certainly want to negotiate with the Lotteries Commission before I took a step such as that. I would not be surprised if the Lotteries Act prohibited Lotteries Commission agents from being agents for other types of competition.

I believe that there were no negotiations with the Lotteries Commission. Instead of that, there was a direction from the Government regarding agents of the Lotteries

Commission acting as agents for soccer pools as well. The Minister did not answer the second part of my question when I asked how agencies for soccer pools would be set up in South Australia. The assurance given by the Minister in the House amounted to absolutely nothing. No negotiations took place with the commission. There was just a directive from the Government regarding Lotteries Commission agents acting as agents for soccer pools.

In addition, the Government revoked regulations: it revoked regulation 19 (1) of the Lottery and Gaming Act to allow lottery agents to act as agents for soccer pools, by Executive Council decision. So much for the negotiations that supposedly were to take place, as I had been assured in this House in February last by the Minister of Recreation and Sport. The Government put pressure on the Lotteries Commission which resulted in the resignation of the Chairman of the commission in protest at the Government's action. A letter from the Acting Premier, Mr Goldsworthy, to the Chairman of the commission on 10 April 1981 states:

I write on behalf of the Premier to follow up his letter of 16 March on the matter of introduction of soccer pools to South Australia and in particular the proposal to permit lottery agents to be agents for soccer pools.

As you know, the Government has agreed to the introduction of soccer pools into South Australia and revenue from this source will be devoted to the provision of Government financial assistance in the areas of sport and recreation. The Government has now selected the organisation to which it will grant the licence.

As if we did not know! Prior to that, the only organisation that could obtain a licence had to be Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd, because it had the entire franchise on the United Kingdom soccer pools competition. The letter continues:

I understand that it is critical to the successful development of the soccer pools scheme for Lotteries Commission agents to be eligible to act as agents for the licensee. However, my legal advice is that there is some doubt as to whether a person acting as an agent for the Lotteries Commission would be breaking his agreement with the commission if he were to undertake soccer pools sales also.

It is the Government's wish that the commission co-operate with the soccer pools licensee by taking no action against any agent of the commission who sells soccer pools tickets. I would be pleased if you would ensure as a matter of urgency that all agents of the Lotteries Commission are made aware of the fact that they are free to become agents for soccer pools in South Australia . . . The introduction of soccer pools is an important initiative of the Government, and your co-operation in this matter will be appreciated.

Following that letter, the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission sought an opportunity to discuss the matter with the Acting Premier and the Acting Minister of Recreation and Sport, Hon. W. E. Chapman, regarding the directive from the Government in relation to agencies. Arising from that discussion, a letter from the Acting Minister of Recreation and Sport states:

Following your meeting today with the Acting Premier and myself, I would like to reaffirm the Government's intention that, at the earliest opportunity, the Lotteries Commission inform all agents in writing that they are free to become agents for soccer pools in South Australia if they so desire as well as being agents for the Lotteries Commission.

They were already agents for the Lotteries Commission. The final paragraph states:

As discussed during our meeting, a draft of the proposed circular to the agencies should be forwarded to me for comment prior to it being distributed.

If that is not an indication of the Government's heavying

the Lotteries Commission, I do not know what is. The result was that the Chairman of the Lotteries Commission, in protest at the actions of the Government, tendered his resignation. The assurance given in this House on 18 February last by the Minister of Recreation and Sport amounted to absolutely nothing; it was not worth a crumplet. So much for the undertaking given to this Parliament by the Minister.

The whole sorry episode has clearly shown just how far the Government will go in assisting its friends, to the detriment of the South Australian Lotteries Commission. The facts are that Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd heaved the Government, which in turn heaved the Lotteries Commission to assist Soccer Pools. The Lotteries Commission has 242 agencies, placed strategically throughout the metropolitan and country areas of South Australia, to ensure that the public is adequately served and that the agencies do not compete with each other in selling lottery tickets. Not so with soccer pools, because I understand that 400 agencies have been established already in South Australia, not only in newsagents shops but also in chemists shops (most unlikely places to sell these things) and in stalls in Rundle Mall, with the consent of the Adelaide City Council, a consent which I believe was refused the Lotteries Commission some time ago. Wherever it has been possible, about 400 agencies have set up. I believe that the Associated Newsagents Co-operative also played a part in heavying the Government and its newsagent members into accepting agencies for soccer pools. One might even say that they were intimidated.

Dr Billard: Would you say that?

Mr SLATER: Yes, I believe that some of them were intimidated into accepting soccer pools agencies. A newspaper report headed 'Soccer Pool boom for agencies' states:

South Australian newsagents today said they were excited about the prospect of selling Soccer Pools from next week. A spokesman for the Associated Newsagents Co-operative said the new money-spinning game would be a boost to newsagents. Co-operative chairman, Marion newsagent Mr Bob Campbell, said it was 'the best thing to happen' to newsagents for some time.

He goes on to state that it is estimated that soccer pools will provide \$2 000 000 to the State Government in its first year of operation. That may or may not be the case—time will tell. I think it indicates clearly that the Associated Newsagents Co-operative played a significant part in approaching the Government and also on behalf of the Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd regarding agencies for soccer pools.

I want to refer to the high-pressure marketing techniques adopted by Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd in its operations in this State. They are out of context with the factual information and the advertising done previously by the Lotteries Commission. Much of the advertising has been misleading. For instance, it is claimed on radio that \$91 000 000 has been paid out in prize money. There is no reference to the fact that that \$91 000 000 has been paid out not in South Australia but in Australia since soccer pools were introduced in 1974 or 1975 in Victoria. If it is true that \$91 000 000 has been paid out in prizes in that time, and working on the figures given to us by Bietzelt and Associates, who are involved as consultants for Australian Soccer Pools, the \$91 000 000 represents 37 per cent in prize money, and with Government revenue being 30 per cent, operational expenses 15 ½ per cent, agency commission 12½ per cent, and promoters fees 5 per cent, it is clear that in that time Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd have made a profit of \$15 000 000 in Australia. This money goes into the

pockets of private enterprise, which is taking money from South Australia.

Mr Gunn: You were in favour of it.

Mr SLATER: I indicate to the honourable member that profit is going to private entrepreneurs, and if that trend continues here (and the figures are available) funds will be taken from the Hospitals Fund. I made this point clearly during the debate on the soccer pools legislation: I said that it was likely to effect the operations of the Lotteries Commission and that the Government should not obviate its responsibilities for funding recreation and sport by means of money from soccer pools. I said that such moneys should be directed to particular projects and finance from soccer pools should not be used to bolster the lack of funding for recreation and sport. It appeared that the Minister could or would not answer questions put to him in the Committee stage of the debate as to how agencies would be set up, and he could not answer questions in regard to the distribution of the fund.

For the benefit of the member for Eyre, I indicate that there was some disquiet and discontent in the minds of people involved in recreation and sport in regard to distribution of that fund. Those people might have been sold a pup in that regard. If the Minister and the Government can breach one undertaking given in this House, there is no doubt that they will try to breach another.

The Lotteries Commission has a proven track record and has benefited the State: it has provided millions of dollars to the Hospitals Fund. Last year, it provided \$16 000 000 to that fund, and in the previous year the sum was \$14 400 000. A public survey conducted by consultants about one month ago on behalf of the Lotteries Commission indicated quite clearly that there was a 90 per cent approval for Lotteries Commission operations in South Australia.

The effect that the Soccer Pools operation is likely to have on the Lotteries Commission is already evident. Since the introduction of the three-State X-Lotto operation, average investments by South Australians in X-Lotto per week have been in the vicinity of \$600 000. In the first week of the Soccer Pools operation, the X-Lotto operation was down by about \$70 000, and in the second week by about \$92 000, and that was on X-Lotto operations alone. The Government has been warned of the likely effect that the soccer pools operation may have on the activities of the commission. If the trend continues over 12 months, it is likely that the commission will be down by about \$4 000 000.

It is significant that the lotteries operation (not the X-Lotto) has also been affected by the Soccer Pools. I understand that a \$2 lottery was last drawn on 30 April. Normally, this type of lottery is filled within two weeks, but the subsequent \$2 lottery is yet to be filled. One can see the effect of Soccer Pools on the activities of the commission. A \$1 lottery (No. 121) was drawn in early May: No. 122 was drawn today, but in normal circumstances that kind of lottery is drawn every 10 or 12 days, so once again one can see the effect that the Soccer Pools operation is having on the Lotteries Commission.

In addition, it has been stated publicly by the proprietors of Australian Soccer Pools that that organisation will spend about \$2 000 000 on advertising and promotion. If that is the case, the Lotteries Commission must expend greater sums on advertising to retain its market. These operational expenses will increase, and this will mean that less money will be available to the Hospitals Fund. By the third week of the Soccer Pools operation, there had been a significant decline in Lotteries Commission operations: the figure, I

am reliably told, was \$85 000. Both the Minister of Recreation and Sport and the Managing Director of Australian Soccer Pools Pty Ltd, Mr Kennerley, have stated that this is a passing phase only and that the situation will not be maintained. An article in the press, under the heading 'Pools "no threat" to lotteries', stated:

Soccer Pools is not threatening lotteries income or taking money from health services, Australian Soccer Pools managing director, Mr John Kennerley, said today.

He said when Soccer Pools was introduced in N.S.W. in 1975, lottery income increased by seven per cent and both continued to increase yearly since then.

I do not agree: I believe that Soccer Pools will have a significant effect on the Lotteries Commission and consequently on moneys available to the Hospitals Fund. It may be a little early to indicate the true nature of the effect.

The Managing Director of Australian Soccer Pools previously stated that there would be no effect in other States; however, up to 1974-75, the States in which Soccer Pools operated (Queensland, Victoria and New South Wales) were enjoying substantial turnovers from the T.A.B. In fact, turnovers were increasing. But, from 1975, these substantial increases declined quite significantly. It is difficult to make a very fine assessment of comparisons between States, because each State operates various lotteries and gambling activities, but, for example, in Victoria the ordinary lotteries have been severely affected by both X-Lotto and Soccer Pools operations.

I point out to those people who believe that Soccer Pools will not have a significant effect that that belief has been proved incorrect in the first three weeks of operations. There may be a levelling off of activities, but I feel assured that, at the end of the financial year, the Lotteries Commission will have lost a significant amount that it would otherwise have been able to provide to the Hospitals Fund.

I think that, at a time when hospital funds are being severely and savagely cut by the Federal Government, that is a tragic situation. The profit from soccer pools goes to private proprietors. I do not need to relate to this House who are the owners of Australian Soccer Pools. I simply say that Vernon Pools of the United Kingdom, Mr Robert Sangster, have the predominating control (that is, 70 per cent of the operation of Australian Soccer Pools), and the News group, Mr Rupert Murdoch, has 30 per cent. If the Government believes that those people should be assisted, as they have been in the operation of Soccer Pools, to the detriment of our own State statutory authority, the South Australian Lotteries Commission, I fail to see their reasoning, although, of course, it is in sympathy with the philosophy of the Government, which stated publicly that it believes in private enterprise. It is a rather peculiar and unreasonable philosophy: I believe that private enterprise died in about 1890, and monopoly capitalism took over at that time.

Mr Ashenden: Come on, Jack, you can do better than that.

Mr SLATER: If one looks at the facts in South Australia over the past 18 months, one finds that all of the mergers and takeovers and so on which have occurred have occurred by way of multi-national overseas companies. We are told by the Premier that 'It's our State, mate', and a campaign is currently being conducted by commercial television stations and the Government. I was fortunate enough to be invited to the launching of a part of the programme last week. One of the unfortunate things that is occurring which the Government condones and which it has proved in relation to the operation of the Australian Soccer Pools is that the Government believes that large

private entrepreneurs are more important than the welfare of the public of South Australia. All of the community services that are important to the people of this State are second to the interests of large private entrepreneurs.

Mr Mathwin: You have got it wrong—we just don't believe in nationalisation.

Mr SLATER: We do not believe in nationalisation of everything, either, but we do believe—

Mr Mathwin: Of course you do—read your platform.

Mr SLATER: The honourable member is talking about nationalisation of everything. He has put his own interpretation on our political platform.

Mr Mathwin: I listened to—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Gilles has the floor.

Mr SLATER: I believe that the member for Glenelg's interpretation is incorrect. I repeat in stringent and strict terms that the philosophy of the Government is for private wealth and public squalor, and I think it is again demonstrated by the financial mismanagement shown by this Bill.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I refer to an article which appeared in the *News* of 10 October last year and which stated 'Vote Liberal for South Australia's sake'. Imposed on a map of the State was the Premier with his head placed around about the Simpson Desert. It has been suggested to me that that is about what it is worth, that the Premier's head was placed in the right area. We now find that, because the Premier and his colleagues have followed their Federal colleagues like sheep, they have now been shorn by their Federal colleagues. This was clearly demonstrated at the last Premiers Conference. We heard them bleating like sheep. I think the analogy to sheep is rather appropriate in view of the fact that the Prime Minister comes from Nareen, part of Australia that I know fairly well, having come from there myself. It is unfortunate for me that having a name like Hamilton, that does not reflect well on me, because the Prime Minister has moved near an area named after some of my ancestors.

We were shorn in South Australia due to the fact that the Premier did not have the guts to stand up to the Prime Minister. After he got done over like a dinner, or shorn, whichever way you like to put it, he came back to South Australia bleating and saying what a terrible man this Prime Minister was, and he warned the Prime Minister about election defeat in South Australia if the State did not get a better deal. We noticed that at least the Prime Minister was taken to task by the Premier of Queensland, and that State got some \$17 000 000 more.

What really concerns me is what is happening in South Australia, particularly in the building industry, and what has happened to people in this State when it comes to a purchase of a home and the repayment of loans. In March this year, I received a telephone call from a woman who lived in Cardiff Street, Woodville West, whose name I will not mention. She said (and this was 14 months ago) that she and her husband signed up for a family home for which the repayments were \$277 a month. There was a subsequent increase of up to \$6, which took her repayments up to \$283 a month. Then there was another increase of \$15 a month, and the repayments rose to \$298 a month. The latest 1 per cent increase has caused repayments to rise by \$28 and has brought the figure up to \$326 a month.

We heard so much from the Prime Minister in 1977 about how he was going to reduce interest rates in this country by 2 per cent. The situation of the woman I have mentioned is such that in 14 months interest rates went up

by \$49 a month. She informed me that she could not keep up the repayments, that she would have to sell her home, and, like many other people in South Australia recoup as much as she could. She said that she could not afford health insurance and that she found it difficult to find money for clothing and to feed her children adequately. This is all occurring under a Government which urged us to 'Vote Liberal for South Australia's sake'.

When one traces the history of the building industry in South Australia one finds a similar situation. I kept a number of newspaper articles to give some indication of what is happening under this Government since it came into office. The first article goes back to Wednesday 26 March 1980. We have heard a great deal about all the industries that are coming into South Australia, but we certainly do not hear much about those industries which have folded. The article to which I have referred states '\$1 000 000 debts. Building firm folds'. I will not detail the whole of the article, but part of it deals with a family whose dream home had just become an empty shell.

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

Mr HAMILTON: Before the dinner adjournment, I was attempting to relate the effects of the Federal Government's policies, which this State Government stated it supports, on the increase in the interest rates on the South Australian community and the down-turn in the building industry, with subsequent effects on jobs in the State. I would now like to turn to housing approvals in the State, and I refer to an article which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 17 April 1980 headed 'Housing approvals tumble', and which states in part:

Building approvals for private houses in South Australia in February were the lowest for 13 years, and the second lowest since the 1961 credit squeeze. Figures issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics yesterday put February approvals at 434.

In the past 20 years, the only months when fewer approvals were granted were January 1967 (392) and May 1961 (363). The February figures represents a fall of 50 on January and a fall of 61 on February 1979. The value of private housing approved in February was \$13.9m. compared with \$15.4m. in January and \$14.2m. a year ago.

Adding to the impact of the decline in private housing approvals was a fall in Government dwelling approvals from 221 in January to 92 in February. However, this was an improvement of 70 on the February 1979 figure and lifted total housing approvals to 526 compared with 517 a year earlier.

A report in the *News* of 29 April states in part:

South Australia's home building industry clearly is in trouble. Last week two Adelaide builders went into liquidation within three days.

Another report in the *News* on 28 April states:

More housing failure inevitable: More company failures in the building industry were inevitable according to a financial expert. And he could see no hope of much improvement in the hard-pressed industry over the next 10 years.

The grim predictions were given by the head of accounting and finance at the University of Western Australia, Professor R. M. C. Lourens, at the ninth annual Congress of Urban Developers at the Festival Centre today. The professor said the level of home building in Australia had reached its lowest level for 12 years with 120 000 houses built last year. This compared with peaks around 150 000 in 1973 and 1974.

Another report in the *News* on the same day is headed 'Top developer quits home construction in South Australia', and that was R.D.C. On 27 July, the *Sunday Mail* contains a report headed 'Another shock for home buyers', which states:

South Australian home buyers received further bad news yesterday when the last of the State's building societies announced another rise in the mortgage interest rates. The Adelaide Permanent will increase its mortgage rates by 0.25 per cent from next Friday, following similar rises by the Hindmarsh and Co-operative Building Societies over the past two months. The rise will mean an extra \$6 a month in repayments for an average loan of \$30 000.

Mr Bernie Lewis, General Manager of the Adelaide Permanent, said he could see no relief in sight for home loan borrowers. He would not be surprised if rates again rose by Christmas.

Mr Lewis said the rises were being forced on banks and building societies by the Federal Government and its semi-government agencies. He said the biggest pressure was from semi-government loan schemes such as the recent Telecom loan.

Further pressure would come next month when the Electricity Trust of South Australia announced its loan scheme which Mr Lewis said he understood to be about \$25 000 000.

The Adelaide Permanent, because of the unavailability of funds, had to change its policy from virtual walk-in loans to a three-month waiting period. The mortgage rates which will apply at the Adelaide Permanent will now range from 11.25 per cent to 12.5 per cent.

A report in the *Advertiser* of 27 January 1981 is headed 'House hopes dive', and I seek leave to incorporate a table of what it costs to buy a \$40 000 house; it is purely statistical.

The SPEAKER: With the assurance of the honourable member that his material is purely statistical, leave is granted.

Leave granted.

WHAT IT COSTS TO BUY A \$40 000 HOUSE

Borrowing \$35 000: From a bank

FIRST EXAMPLE

\$25 000 on 1st mortgage at 11.5 per cent over 25 years.

	\$
Annual income needed	22 955
Monthly repayments	254
Interest payable	51 200

\$10 000 on 2nd mortgage or personal loan at 14.5 per cent over 10 years.

	\$
Monthly repayments	158.30
Interest payable	8 996
Total repayable, including principal	95 196

SECOND EXAMPLE

\$25 000 on 1st mortgage at 11.5 per cent over 25 years.

	\$
Annual income needed	21 800
Monthly repayments	254
Interest payable	51 200

\$10 000 on personal loan at 13.3 per cent over six years.

	\$
Monthly repayments	205.60
Interest payable	4 802
Total repayable, including principal	91 002

A 10-year loan from a finance company at 18.5 per cent involves monthly repayments of \$183, total interest of \$11 960 and a total repayable of \$98 160.

Borrowing \$35 000: From a building society

\$35 000 on 1st mortgage at 11.75 per cent over 25 years.

	\$
Monthly repayment	365
Interest payable	74 500
Total repayable, including principal	109 500

Mr HAMILTON: A report in the *News* of 11 March

1981 is headed 'Home interest rates may go up again', and that was a statement from the Opposition spokesman in the Federal Parliament, which I would like to come back to. A report in the *News* of 24 April is headed 'Housing industry chief alarm' and states in part:

The Housing Industry Association of South Australia is greatly concerned with the dramatic and alarming down-turn in new housing approvals in South Australia.

I will not go into all of that. I would now like to come back to the statement made by the shadow Labor Party Minister in the Federal Parliament, Mr Willis, in which he said in part:

The Housing Industry Association has calculated that for every 0.5 per cent increase in mortgage interest rates some 4 000 potential home buyers per annum are excluded from the market. With the increase of 2 per cent in interest rates that we have seen already in less than the last 12 months some 16 000 potential home buyers have been excluded from the market. With another 1 per cent rise there would be another 8 000 people excluded making 24 000 people excluded in the course of the last 12 months. This has, of course, a very significant impact indeed on the building industry and on the housing situation at large. Of course, the reason those people are excluded is simply that they cannot meet the repayments. To obtain a \$25 000 loan from a savings bank at 12½ per cent interest over 25 years on the basis that these repayments are no more than 25 per cent of gross earnings, which is the normal provision required by banks, a buyer would need a gross weekly income of \$273 a week. Average weekly earnings are only just slightly above that amount at \$278 a week. Over 60 per cent of wage and salary earners earn less than average weekly earnings. Quite obviously the majority of wage and salary earners are excluded from obtaining a home loan of that normal kind at the likely interest rate of 12½ per cent.

I refer again to the situation that I related prior to the dinner adjournment of a woman from my electorate ringing me in March this year. She said that her husband and herself had to sell up their home because they could not afford the interest repayments and I would like to refresh the memory of members as to the amount. The repayment 14 months ago was \$277 a month. The average gross weekly income of a wage earner was \$273, so quite clearly we can see that the Federal Government's policy, which is supported by this State Government, is having a detrimental effect, not only on the average wage earner and average home buyer in South Australia, but also on the building industry.

The State Government believes it can pick up a lot of support in the West Lakes area, but I believe it will be sorely disillusioned, judging by the comments I have heard from people in the area and, more particularly, having regard to the number of homes I have seen placed on the market, and not just once, but two and three and four times I have seen the same homes placed on the market, because these people cannot afford the interest repayments which this Government said, going back to 1977, it would reduce by some 2 per cent.

To further support my proposition, I refer to the following letters to the Editor in the *Advertiser* on 6 May this year:

Mr W. Byrnes's letter (the *Advertiser*, 30.4.81), regarding interest rates, must be applauded. He rightfully states the plight of many. It is unfortunate that, with the present state of the building industry, lending societies are intending to push interest rates still higher.

Mr Byrnes's claim that he has paid only \$437 off his principle in eight years and yet his interest repayments have increased by \$400 a year is a clear indication that the goal of most young couples to own their own home is but a dream. It

must be realised that every 0.5 per cent increase places an extra \$3 600 on to a standard loan. The building industry, which is one of the largest employers, is being crippled by the seemingly never-ending increases to interest rates.

It is a person's right to own a house, not a privilege. Basically, the wealth of a nation is the families in it, a great deal of whom are being disrupted because of financial strains due to the increases in home repayments.

The Federal Government is wilfully wasting skilled tradesmen by having them on the dole. Would it not be better to subsidise their wages and thereby get some return for the outlay? There are about 22 000 persons listed with the South Australian Housing Trust waiting for accommodation. This is where the Government could help by subsidising wages. If a married man is unemployed the Government pays about \$204 a fortnight depending on dependents.

If that person were earning the base rate of a tradesman he would be paying about \$65 a week in tax. Working on a subsidy of wages, it would cost the Government, on average, \$100 extra to gainfully employ tradesmen to build the many houses required.

I would now like to refer to the following information I sought from the Parliamentary Research Library:

According to the Savings Bank of South Australia, an average home loan is at the moment \$27 000, the repayments being spread over 30 years. In October 1979, the interest rate on this loan was 9.5 per cent. Repayments amounted to \$682.50 per quarter or \$52.50 a week. At present, with interest rates at 11.5 per cent repayments would be \$803.50 per quarter or \$61.80 per week. At the present interest rates total repayments amount to \$96 420. At the old rate this figure was \$81 900. Thus total repayments have increased \$14 520 in two years (17 per cent).

I seek leave to incorporate Savings Bank housing loan interest rates statistics in *Hansard*; it is purely statistical information.

The SPEAKER: On the honourable member's assurance that it is purely statistical, leave is granted.

Leave granted.

SAVINGS BANK—HOUSING LOANS—INTEREST RATES

Date or Period	Range of Rates (predominantly charged or standard)
	Per cent
June 1969	5.50- 6.25
June 1970	6.25- 7.00
June 1971	6.25- 7.00
April 1972-September 1973	6.25- 7.00
October 1973-June 1974	7.25- 8.00
July 1974-March 1975	9.25-10.00
April 1975-August 1975	8.75-10.00
September 1975-November 1977	9.00-10.00
January 1977-January 1978	9.25-10.50
February 1978-November 1978	8.75-10.00
December 1978-February 1980	8.75- 9.50
March 1980	8.75-10.50
April 1980-June 1980	9.25-10.50
July 1980-November 1980	10.00-10.50
December 1980	10.50-11.50
January 1981-March 1981	11.50

Mr HAMILTON: I would now like to turn to some of the increases which have been foisted on the people in this State since this Government took office. We have seen a major assault on the pockets of many South Australians,

yet there are more to come. I refer to some of those. I would repeat them, even though my colleague the member for Spence has already related some of them. I want to go through them so that they can be incorporated for those people who read *Hansard* to see some of the increases which have been foisted on the workers and the average income earners in South Australia. Bus, tram, and train fares from July 1980 have increased by an average of 25 per cent; water rates have increased from July 1980 by 12 per cent and there is more to come; irrigation rates have risen from July 1980 by 12½ per cent; electricity tariffs have increased since July 1980 by 12½ per cent, and there is more to come; and motor vehicle registration fees have risen since January 1981 by from 12 to 20 per cent.

In less visible areas, there are higher fees and charges, including the licensing of private hospitals and nursing homes; pilotage and wharfage fees; boat haven fees; Boating Act charges; licence fees; registration of industrial and commercial premises; Registrar-General fees on documents; fees under construction regulations; marine masters certificates; Royal Adelaide Hospital (Northfield Ward) bed charges; Ru Rua in-patient hospital charges; local court fees; land and business agents fees; valuers licences; national park caravan and camping charges; fees for hotel brokers; fees under the Companies Takeover Act (the new fee is \$50 for most applications); fees under the Building Act; Waterworks Act charges; charges for *Hansard*, an increase of 1 225 per cent; charges for all Acts, regulations, awards and agreements; personalised number plates now \$60; liquor licence application renewals, plus 100 per cent; driving learner permits, trader plates, etc. 11 per cent to 150 per cent increases; advertisements in the *Government Gazette*, up to 200 per cent; electrical article testing fees, up to equal to 36 per cent; abalone permits, up 385 per cent; prawn permits, zone B, up 76 per cent, zone D, up 65 per cent; and registration fees for motor cycles, tow trucks, caravans and trailers. Charges under the Meat Hygiene Act for abattoirs, petfood works and slaughter houses were withdrawn after many protests from the industry.

The only way people have of checking exactly by how much and when charges are increased is via the South Australian *Government Gazette*, the price of which was doubled by \$1 in April 1981. We have also seen other areas in which charges will be increased: commission on race bets; marine store collection fees; small lottery application fees; food testing fees; company registration fees; and so on.

Leading up to the 1979 election, the Liberal Party made promise after promise to the people in South Australia that they would be better off under a Liberal Government. An article appeared in the *News* on 11 May 1981 in which the Young Liberals urged 'Make women's age limit 65'. There was an outrage and it is still going in this State as to the intentions of the Federal Government to reduce or increase the retiring age for people in the community, particularly women.

One other matter to which I would like to refer is the support of this Government for the Federal Government's policies. One matter in particular which has deeply concerned me, and which certainly concerns this State, is the 35-hour week. We have seen over many months the exorbitant amount of money that the Federal Government has put into television and radio advertisements telling the people of this country, and particularly the people of South Australia, that the time for a 35-hour week is not ripe. It was rather interesting to see recently, after I had distributed some 10 000 leaflets throughout my electorate on pension and unemployment benefit entitlements, just what sort of response I obtained from my constituents in

one week.

In a period of five days I received more than 60 inquiries, and one came from a constituent who was unaware of his entitlements. In particular, he was unaware of his entitlement to sickness benefits, and he is now in receipt of \$1 670 from the Department of Social Security. I suggest that the Government would be far better off directing its money towards informing the disadvantaged in our community of their entitlements.

I have found that a chap living in Woodville West, someone I knew, who retired in 1976 from the railways, unaware that he was entitled to pension payments. He is a married man, and he was missing out on \$140 a week. I have found students unaware of their entitlements, and this is a Government supported by the State Government.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, what has this got to do with the Bill?

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: There is no need for a further comment from the honourable Deputy Premier. The Budget debate for many years has been very close to that which is the Address in Reply and, provided that the member contributing is referring to matters which have a financial basis and which are relevant to Government action based on finance, it has been the practice for the debate to be permitted to continue. I have listened to the comments of the honourable member throughout the whole of his presentation, and I acknowledge the content directing back to matters financial.

Mr HAMILTON: For the edification of the Deputy Premier, I was trying to relate to the costs that would be imposed by the State Government because of his Federal colleagues, and this would be paid by the taxpayers in this State through community welfare departments. I would have thought that the Deputy Premier, with his so-called academic qualifications, would have understood the implications and the effects on the South Australian community. One wonders about his intelligence when he makes such inane remarks.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to make a few comments in this important debate. We have listened for some time to members of the Opposition. I am delighted to see the member for Elizabeth leaving the Chamber, because later I intended to say one or two things about him.

Mr Langley: That won't stop you.

Mr. GUNN: That will not stop me, but I like to say anything about him when he is in the Chamber. I like to face him. However, there are one or two matters that I would like to canvass.

Mr Langley: Don't get excited.

Mr GUNN: I am just starting to enjoy myself.

The SPEAKER: Whilst being relevant to the Bill before the House.

Mr GUNN: Certainly, Sir. I refer to page 19 of the Supplementary Estimates, and at the bottom of the page, there is a heading, 'Highways Department \$1 750 000', and of that amount \$800 000 is being set aside for work on the Stuart Highway. I raise this matter because the Deputy Leader obviously is unaware of what is taking place on the Stuart Highway. We heard him indicate again today that little was taking place there.

Having listened to the Deputy Leader for weeks, I think it is obvious that he is not only ill-advised about what is taking place in relation to the Stuart Highway, but he has no knowledge of a number of other matters. This Government has spent \$9 100 000 on the Stuart Highway in this financial year—a considerable sum of money. The

latest information on the sealing of the highway between Port Augusta and the Northern Territory border is that, by the end of this financial year, \$13 100 000 will have been spent on the project, and I remind members that \$9 100 000 has been spent in this financial year. The present cost for completion of the project indicates that a further \$88 000 000 will be spent up to the end of the 1986-1987 financial year. The construction time table, which is of great interest, sets out that work is now in progress between Pimba and Glendambo, a section of 115 km. It is expected that the deviation from Pimba to Lake Hart, a section of some 40 km, will be open to traffic by Christmas, with sealing to Glendambo being completed by the middle of next year. Preconstruction work is at various stages of completion on all sections north of Gosses and the next contract is for a section of 113 km north and south of Coober Pedy. At present it is envisaged that tenders for this section will be called next March.

That clearly indicates that this Government has more than honoured its obligation in relation to this project. The Deputy Leader, by continuing to bleat such nonsense, shows that he is ill-informed on this as on other subjects. The previous Government had much to say about the Stuart Highway, while directing its money to other parts of the State. This Government, on this issue and a number of others, has lived up to the policy put to the people at the last election. I am delighted with the progress, and what I have said shows the abysmal ignorance of the Labor Party on this and other matters.

The Leader of the Opposition has returned from his overseas study tour. I am delighted that he has availed himself of the trip, but I am sorry that, since he came back, he has not put forward any constructive suggestions. He arrived back and said there would be no boom. He has been rightly named, 'No boom Bannon' by the Deputy Premier. I have been following with interest the Leader's tactics and the policy of the Leader and his colleagues in relation to the development of the vast natural resources of this State. He and his colleagues want the Premier to pull out of his magician's hat millions of dollars.

Unfortunately, they have not explained where the extra revenue will come from. It is obvious, listening to the Leader, the man who sets himself up as the alternative Premier of this State, and his shadow Ministers, that theirs is a Party of high taxation. Obviously, the Leader and his colleagues would drastically increase taxes and charges in this State, because they cannot continue to put forward programmes such as they have been suggesting without telling the people where the money will come from. I want to ask members of the Labor Party whether they can give an unequivocal guarantee to the people of South Australia that they would not increase one charge. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition stand up and criticise the Premier for increasing charges.

Mr Langley: We have murdered \$47 000 000 already.

Mr. GUNN: I am surprised that the member for Unley would enter this debate, because he is a supporter of a Government that would hold the record in this State for increasing taxes.

Mr Langley: You must be joking. You have increased taxes.

Mr GUNN: The member for Unley has obviously not read the Budget documents that were prepared by Premier Dunstan over 10 years. I am sure we will have to listen to other members of the Labor Party later.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Did you hear the member for Albert Park?

Mr GUNN: Yes, he made a brilliant speech! I would like to know from where the Labor Party would get the money and whether it will give an undertaking that it would not

reintroduce land tax on the principal place of residence. Can the Labor Party give an unqualified guarantee? We want to know whether the alternative Premier can give an undertaking that he would not reintroduce gift tax, death duties, or some other form of capital tax. Can he give an unequivocal undertaking to the people of this State in this regard?

Mr Abbott: What would you like him to say?

Mr GUNN: I would like him to tell us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: It is very interesting. The member for Spence (the former Minister of Community Welfare) has indicated that he can give that assurance. We now know that he would not put on any more taxes: obviously, he would have to raise more revenue by increasing existing taxes and charges. We would like to know. Another interesting aspect of the Labor Party's policy is that—

Mr Abbott: Why do you want to know that at this stage?

Mr GUNN: Is that not an interesting comment? We have listened for 18 months to the honourable member bleat in this House about mismanagement. This Government has had to straighten out 10 years of poor administration and put the finances and administration of this State into an orderly condition. Of course, some difficult decisions have had to be made. The Minister of Health clearly explained to the House today, much to the embarrassment of the member for Ascot Park, just one decision that has shown up the Labor Party in a bad light.

Mr Langley: What about the Home for Incurables?

The SPEAKER: Order! I have a list before me that indicates that the honourable member for Unley, if he is within the House, will be called in about three speakers time.

Mr GUNN: One of the major planks of this Government has been to develop industry, particularly the mineral industry of this State. Under the guidance of the Minister of Mines and Energy, South Australia currently has a record amount of mineral exploration being carried on. Never in the history of South Australia has there been as much mineral exploration or interest in our mineral deposits. One has only to travel around South Australia on a regular basis to be impressed by the teams of exploration companies, drilling rigs and survey teams that are surveying the deposits to see what South Australia has to develop.

Olympic Dam has been established in my district and constitutes one of the most significant areas of mineralisation in the world. That project is progressing at a steady but sure rate, and there is no doubt that in the very near future a firm decision will have to be made whether that project should go ahead and whether Western Mining Company will be given permission to develop the site as a commercial operation. That brings us to the interesting exercise that has been taking place within the Labor Party. We know that the Labor Party had a policy of 'Leave it in the ground'. There should be no development of our uranium resources, that Party said.

Mr Abbott: The Labor Party upset you.

Mr GUNN: Not only did the Labor Party upset a lot of people in this State but also the Leader of the Opposition seems to be upsetting some of his colleagues, namely, Mr Apap and Mr John Scott, two well known democrats. There are tremendous benefits to the people of this State—

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I refer to Standing Order 154, which enjoins members not to impute improper motives to any other member. I indicate that certain members have been named, that is, Labor Party members. The honourable

member stated that we have a policy of leaving everything in the ground, and that is not true. I suggest that this constitutes what might be argued to be imputations of improper motives.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Mitchell whether he can indicate which member of the Opposition was identified in the statement he attributes to the member for Eyre.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I can only assume the remark was directed to the totality of the membership of this side who are members of the Labor Party, because those were the words used by the honourable member in his speech.

The SPEAKER: I am unable to uphold the point of order, for reasons that the member for Mitchell will fully appreciate. Where there is what might be termed scatter shot, it is difficult to permit a member to identify himself positively as having been associated with certain words. However, I ask the member for Eyre and other members taking part in the debate to be very careful about the words they use so that they cannot possibly be construed as impugning the motives of members of the other side.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you for your ruling, Mr Speaker. I accept it, and I believe that I fully understand the ruling. One can only expect scatter shot from a scatter brain.

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order. I ask the member for Mitchell to withdraw the offensive comment he has made in relation to me.

The SPEAKER: In the light of the ruling that has been given to the House on a previous occasion when a member has taken offence in relation to a specific reference to him, I ask the member who has made the imputation whether he will withdraw the remark.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will certainly withdraw, but I seek your indulgence, Mr Speaker, to have the words 'the member appeared to be disoriented' inserted.

Mr GUNN: It is obvious from the manner in which the member for Mitchell is debating that he is at his usual sarcastic best. He is performing true to form. If the honourable member wants to carry on in this fashion, it suits me, because I can trade insult with insult with him. It would not achieve anything, but it clearly indicates to the House and the people of South Australia the negative, narrow outlook that the honourable member has about life.

I now refer to a number of interesting comments made by Stephen Middleton in relation to the policy of the alternative Government in this State, the Australian Labor Party. I refer to an article in the *News* of 25 February which states:

Bannon uranium talks give hope. An apparent change in the Labor Party's attitude to uranium would give added confidence to companies looking for uranium in South Australia, it was claimed today.

Then, in an article by Stephen Middleton of 4 March 1981 in the *News* it was stated:

Uranium now safe, says Labor man. The stage has been reached where it is relatively safe to mine, process and enrich uranium, a top Labor M.P. said today. The Opposition environment spokesman, John Cornwall, said . . .

I refer to a further article in the *News* of 5 March headed 'Big policy dispute' as follows:

Left wing elements of the Labor Party are angry over an apparent moderation in uranium policy by two key Labor Party M.P.'s. But the M.P.'s, the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon and the environment spokesman, Dr Cornwall, said they stood by their remarks.

I will proceed a little further with this interesting saga of events which have taken place. Following those press statements, we had an interesting series of comments by

Mr Scott and Mr Apap, who is well known to the member for Semaphore and to all other members opposite.

Mr Whitten: Get on with the speech instead of rubbishing everyone.

Mr GUNN: I am delighted that the honourable member just woke up, and I am delighted to have his attention. Obviously things got very hot for the Leader of the Opposition. His press secretary led a campaign against uranium mining and the development of Roxby Downs. There was the famous speech that he made on a Friday, so on 5 March the Leader of the Opposition was forced to write to all the secretaries of the Labor Party. A document came into my possession, which I will now read to the House because it is very interesting. It is on the letterhead of the Leader of the Opposition, House of Assembly, and is dated 5 March 1981. It states:

Dear Members,

There has been some comment in the media recently concerning statements I made to the Petroleum Exploration Society. Those statements were reported in the *Advertiser* of 21 February under a headline which implied that I was suggesting a change in Labor policy concerning uranium. Also, John Cornwall's statements on *Nationwide* last Tuesday, 3 March, were misreported by the *Adelaide News*.

I can assure you that neither I nor John Cornwall, nor any member of the Parliamentary Labor Party, are advocating a change or possible change in policy. In fact, the remarks of myself and John Cornwall were completely in line with the platform of the Party, and those persons who are asking that they be retracted are in effect asking us to disagree with the platform endorsed by convention.

Obviously that is the real bite and, of course, a Labor Party convention is to be held this weekend. The letter continues:

I issued a press statement to clarify the position immediately after the *Advertiser* report. I have enclosed that statement for your information. I would like to stress that I stand firmly behind A.L.P. policy on uranium. Claims that I am trying to change that policy only serve to assist the Liberal Government to create confusion in the community and undermine the unity between those who believe that no uranium mining should take place while domestic and international safeguards are lacking and the safe disposal of wastes unproven.

The letter is signed 'Yours fraternally, John Bannon, Leader of the Opposition'. If the Leader of the Opposition had to write this letter, there was a real row taking place in the Labor Party. Things developed to the stage where the honourable gentleman had to go on *Nationwide*, where he was interviewed.

The Liberal Party has said that we believe that there should be an orderly development of our resources so that we can create more jobs and more income, which will assist every South Australian, as well as accepting our obligation to those countries which are short of adequate supplies of energy. As a resource-rich nation, we have that obligation, as, similarly, we have an obligation to provide

other assistance to under-developed countries. I want to quote part of the transcript of the interview which took place on *Nationwide* on 5 March. The interview commenced:

Question—Mr Bannon, Mr Scott, the Labor member for Hindmarsh, has stated that your comments have distressed him. Mr Apap, of the Storemen and Packers, has called on you to withdraw your comments. Are you going to?

Mr Bannon—Well, unfortunately, both Mr Scott, who I've not had a chance to speak to . . .

It is obvious that they are not on speaking terms. There was a further question as follows:

Question—But can I get a clear statement. Would you like to see the establishment of uranium mining if the safeguards demanded by policy were there?

Mr Bannon—Let me state the Labor Party policy. It is not one that says that at all times in all circumstances uranium mining and processing will not be permitted but it does demand that a sever onus of proof should be discharged before we agree with it. Now that onus of proof hasn't been discharged.

Question—No, but what I am trying to establish is a case of attitude, not policy. Would you like to see uranium mining if that policy is fulfilled?

Mr Bannon—Personally, I must conform with the policy.

Question—The policy doesn't state an attitude, and I am asking for an attitude.

Mr Bannon—You want a personal attitude. I believe that uranium mining at the moment hasn't been proved safe; that waste disposal hasn't been established; that international safeguards are . . .

He goes on to say that it is not safe. I will not quote the next two or three questions, but I now turn to the most interesting part of the honourable gentleman's interview. Mr Bannon replied after questioning as follows:

No. Take the case of Roxby Downs. We have never as a Party opposed exploratory work. We have never opposed drilling to find out what mineral resources there are. But at the point when commercial mining operations take place, that is the point we say, judge the facts objectively, and at the moment we would not permit it.

Therefore, this gentleman who has been advocating for a long time a concern for unemployment is prepared to say to those 200 people at Olympic Dam (and by the time the next election comes around there will be a lot more), 'Sorry, boys, you must shut up shop, it's finished'. This will be so because then we will be at the stage when a commercial operation will have to be put into effect, but he is saying that it is finished, that there is not a demand for uranium, and that countries are not building nuclear powerhouses. I have a table which appeared in *Australian Mining* of February 1980 and which clearly indicates that there are currently under construction some 209 nuclear power stations. The table is of a statistical nature, and I seek leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Nuclear power units about 30 MW in operation, under construction or on order as at 30 June 1979

Country	In Operation		Under Construction		On Order		Total	
	No.	MW	No.	MW	No.	MW	No.	MW
Argentina	1	319	1	600	—	—	2	919
Belgium	3	1 650	2	1 855	2	2 000	7	5 505
Brazil	—	—	3	3 116	—	—	3	3 116
Bulgaria	2	820	2	820	—	—	4	1 640

Nuclear power units about 30 MW in operation, under construction or on order as at 30 June 1979

Country	In Operation		Under Construction		On Order		Total	
	No.	MW	No.	MW	No.	MW	No.	MW
Canada	10	5 470	6	3 329	8	6 076	24	14 875
Cuba	—	—	1	410	—	—	1	410
Czechoslovakia	2	520	7	2 870	—	—	9	3 390
Finland	1	420	3	1 740	1	953	5	3 113
France	2	4 703	25	23 950	13	14 400	50	43 053
Germany DR	4	1 305	3	1 230	—	—	7	2 535
Germany FR	10	6 698	13	14 012	4	4 515	27	25 225
Hungary	—	—	2	820	2	820	4	1 640
India	3	582	5	1 082	—	—	8	1 664
Iran	—	—	2	2 480	2	1 850	4	4 330
Italy	3	608	2	880	4	3 868	9	5 356
Japan	20	12 325	5	4 321	5	4 386	30	20 932
Korea RO	1	564	2	1 234	2	1 800	5	3 598
Mexico	—	—	2	1 308	—	—	2	1 308
Netherlands	2	502	—	—	—	—	2	502
Pakistan	1	125	—	—	—	—	1	125
Philippines	—	—	1	600	—	—	1	600
Poland	—	—	1	410	—	—	1	410
Romania	—	—	—	—	2	820	2	820
South Africa	—	—	1	922	1	922	2	1 844
Spain	3	1 073	7	6 342	5	4 740	15	12 155
Sweden	6	3 741	4	3 624	2	2 120	12	9 485
Switzerland	3	1 006	3	2 787	—	—	6	3 793
Taiwan	1	604	3	2 506	2	1 880	6	4 960
United Kingdom	33	8 094	6	3 700	—	—	39	11 794
USA	69	50 291	75	80 411	47	53 968	191	184 670
USSR	22	8 743	21	17 828	—	—	43	26 571
Yugoslavia	—	—	1	632	—	—	1	632
TOTAL	212	110 163	209	185 819	102	104 988	523	400 970

Mr GUNN: During the past few weeks there has been considerable discussion in relation to the water supply in this State and also about the state of the Murray River. As a large section of my electorate depends on the Murray River for its source of water, the quality of that water must be of paramount concern to every other member of the House and every citizen of South Australia. For a considerable time the member for Whyalla and the member for Stuart were making a number of quite rash, irresponsible and inaccurate statements. I could not understand why they suddenly stopped. The member for Stuart stopped his comments as if he had been run over by one of those trains that go through his electorate.

During one of my regular trips through Port Augusta I happened to purchase a copy of the *Transcontinental* of Wednesday 4 March 1981, and it contained an interesting editorial. It goes like this:

Politicians—get on with the job.

Can the Government be held responsible for the death of a Whyalla boy from amoebic meningitis? That, in a nutshell, is the whole crux of the debate which has been raging in the Iron Triangle cities since that unfortunate occurrence.

From statements from the Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, it appears the Government must be exonerated. It's all very well to close the stable door after the horse has bolted, so to speak, and that is exactly what Labor politicians are doing. Mind you it's not to be assumed that Liberal politicians wouldn't have adopted the very same approach, for the unfortunate thing about politics is politics itself.

In short, politicians come out with statements which often are ill conceived and which suit the purpose of the moment.

Their main concern in life seems to be to 'rubbish' the opposing Party. Certainly not to think what is good for the country they are supposed to be trying to run.

In Adelaide last week the member for Stuart, Mr G. F. Keneally called for the resignation of two State Ministers. Mr Keneally's idea—or was it the idea of the Party with Mr Keneally being the mouthpiece because he represents Port Augusta and part of Port Pirie?

Mrs Adamson made some good points in her reply to the criticism. She said there was no substance to the allegations and told of the Government's plans for water filtration in Northern towns.

She revealed Cabinet had approved \$3 000 000 for the design of two water filtration plants for this area adding that was \$3 000 000 more than was provided by the former Labor Government. Despite its pre-election promise to proceed with filtration, it provided a paltry \$50 000 in its proposed the Labor Party can hide its head in shame. For over a decade the A.L.P. was in power and its track record of providing us with filtered water leaves very much to be desired.

Mrs Adamson has made a point. In fact, she has thrown the ball right back in the face of the Opposition by claiming it did practically nothing to give us filtered water. Perhaps Mr Keneally can enlighten us as to just what did his Party do in this regard?

Mrs Adamson appears to have answered her critics—and answered them well, so let's have no more mud slinging as to why wasn't this or that done.

It's a fairly safe bet that had the Labor Party still been in power it, too, would have accepted the advice to reduce

monitoring and chlorine levels in the water supplies to this city. A small child has lost his life and to blame that on the Government is ludicrous. So let's have no more of it, politicians. Get on with what you are supposed to be doing—running the State.

I think that adequately sums up the unfortunate and quite irresponsible attitude that has been displayed not only on that subject but also in the last week by the honourable gentleman in relation to the Murray River. On that subject, he appears to be more interested in looking after the welfare of Mr Wran and his colleagues and selling out the rights of the people of this State.

I have much pleasure in supporting this well prepared, well thought out and enlightened approach that the Premier has put to the House.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I welcome this opportunity to enter the debate on the Appropriation Bill. Some members would recall that a few months back I expressed my concern about what the Liberal Government of this State was doing concerning the Government forests in the Mount Gambier area. I made it clear that the Government had advertised for contractors to do work which was normally done by Government workers who worked in the forests. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industrial Affairs virtually insinuated that I did not know what I was talking about. I would like now to inform members opposite that I have had an opportunity to speak to many of the workers who work in the forests at Mount Gambier, Nangwarry, Comaum, Newlook, Mount Burr and Tantanoola. If some members on the other side do not believe what I said, they, and particularly the Minister of Agriculture, should go down and see what is being done to the Government forests in Mount Gambier. What is happening down there borders on the criminal. The Liberal Government has said on many occasions that there have been no retrenchments. What is happening is that the men are retrenching themselves. Since Christmas, 19 employees from the State mills have given it away. Two of them have transferred, and the other 17 have just given away working in Government departments. I view this with great concern. I have been involved with Government workers for over 22 years now, and one of the things that was always said by Government workers was, 'Look, we may not get quite as much as we would get if we worked with some other contractor, but we are quite happy to work for the Government. We have a job that is guaranteed.' In this section, they realise that there is no future in working for the Government, so they are looking for jobs in other areas. This Government, which is always talking about apprentices, should ask the Minister of Agriculture how many apprentices have been put on in the State mill. There are now three apprentices. There used to be 23, so I suggest that some of the Liberal members make a point of asking their colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, what is happening concerning the giving away of the taxpayers' money by what is happening in the Government mills in the South-East area. If a fitter is sick for one day and cannot be replaced, sometimes that section cannot work and is closed down for the day. The same thing applies with moulding—if one of the moulders is away, that section has to be closed, because people with the expertise to be able to carry out the work are not available. I am very pleased to see that the Minister of Agriculture has come into the House to listen to what I am saying. He was overseas when I mentioned the matter previously, and the Minister of Industrial Affairs, who knows nothing whatsoever about forests, stood up and told me that I did not know about forests. I have been associated with them for the past 13 years.

I am very pleased to see I am getting an audience, as some members are returning to the House. I put to the Minister of Agriculture that the attitude of members opposite is to sell anything the Government has got. Before my half hour is up, I will point to other areas where this is happening. I spoke to these workers as late as last night, and they told me there is no future whatsoever in working for the Government in the forests. They also told me that the private sector in opposition, Sapfor—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I could spell it long before I met the honourable member. He would still have been contracting when I was first doing the forest down about Mount Gambier. Do not worry about my knowing the Mount Gambier forests and everything about them. If you want to know anything about them, come and see me. I planted part of the forests in the Tarpeena area. I have been up and down every row. I worked there 23 years ago. I do know what I am talking about. You want to get down there and have a look at the forests instead of sitting here and having such people as the Minister of Industrial Affairs speaking for you when he knows nothing about anything.

I am talking about the State enterprises at Newlook, Penola, Mount Burr, Tantanoola, Myora, and Penola. All those forests are being allowed by this Liberal Government to run down. What is happening is a crying shame. Fitters have stackers, who are members of the timber workers union, and forklift drivers assisting them of a weekend. They are so far behind because they have not got the workers there. I cannot understand this Government at all: there is so much unemployment right through the South-East (Mount Gambier and Millicent are two good examples), yet the Government is not even prepared to put on a workforce there. The Government is saying the men are not being retrenched. I am saying that the people who are working for the Government there realise that this Government is running the industry down, and it appears as though they may have shares with Sapfor and Softwoods. In fact, it has been reported to me that Sapfor has just advertised in the *Border Watch* and in some of the Victorian papers, too, for workers, for tradesmen.

Some of these tradesmen come from Government forests. A free bus is being run from Casterton over the border in Victoria to come and take jobs in South Australia. If the Minister of Forests wants to take a point of order, if he thinks he has a point, he should stand on his feet now, because this has been reported by people who work in the Government forests.

I would like this Government to explain promptly why they are allowing all the Government jobs to run down to the extent that, in a few more years, plants will be closed down. It is not as though this kind of a job was a non-profitable job; most certainly not. The State mill showed a profit of \$8 000 000 last year. I do not know what they expect from any of their jobs.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: I would like to know from the Minister of Forests answers to some of the questions I have asked his colleague. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, as I said, does not know anything about anything, but he stood up and virtually told me that I did not know what I was talking about. I am telling you now, you get up afterwards and explain to me why you, as the Minister of Agriculture, with the blessings of the Liberal Government in this State, have allowed that State mill to run down to a shocking state. All the workers working there and the foresters, too, can see no future in it because this Liberal Government, for some unknown reason, wants to sell everything which is not nailed down. It will sell it and it has

been selling it. It is virtually giving them away. It is not worrying a great deal about how much money it gets for the equipment.

I will give some examples. I would like the Minister of Transport to come into the House, because he may be able to explain a few things that I would like to know about. First, I refer to the sale that took place just recently of Government plant, namely, from the Highways Department to the value of \$10 000 000.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: A good price?

Mr PLUNKETT: If he got \$10 000 000 for it, it would have been. I would like the Minister of Transport at a later date to tell why he is giving the taxpayers' money away. For that \$10 000 000, \$580 000 was received. That is a fair return for the taxpayers, and do you know why? This has happened because the Government has been pushing private enterprise. Maybe the Government has shares in it. You can take a point of order on me there, because I have an idea that that might be the case. The Minister of Transport may be able to tell me one of the reasons why he sold three nine-yard front-end loaders for less than the price of one. Members opposite should not laugh; they should do their homework and check with their colleagues how much was received for this equipment. If you say other than what I am saying, you are lying, because I have the figures.

The SPEAKER: Order! I wanted to interrupt the honourable member a short time ago, because he was constantly referring to other honourable members as 'you'. I now ask the honourable member to withdraw the word 'lying'.

Mr PLUNKETT: I will withdraw the 'lying' part. I can have my own thoughts, but I had best not say them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must withdraw without qualification.

Mr PLUNKETT: I withdraw, Sir. Members opposite may be able to explain to me why, when a mining company tried to buy one of these nine-yard front-end loaders (which are valued at \$380 000 each) for \$150 000, it was promptly told that it was not possible to sell one, but that there were three up for sale and the company could put in a tender. It tendered and received those three machines for \$155 000. Members can say, 'No worries in the world.' It is down on paper. I know the reason for this, but I would like to know the reason of members opposite.

I would now like to say why they are being sold. I am pleased the member for Eyre said what this Liberal Government has done on the Stuart Highway, because I would like to know why the contract was given to McMahon Bros. The contract price was much higher than the cost of the Highways Department construction gangs doing the work. Do not say it cannot do it, because it has been doing it for many years, and it will still have to do the hardest part. The McMahon company won that contract, and what happens now? The Highways Department construction gangs, while they are still employed (and that will not be for long because the Government will get rid of them, too), have to do all the hard work. They have to line up all the roads. They have to virtually put out all the plans. That is the hard part of road work. McMahon has the contract to come through and lay down the gravel, the bitumen and this type of thing, something any fool can do, and I might add: not to the specifications of the Highways Department. The Highways Department was one of the most efficient organisations in Australia. It was, before 15 September 1979—

An honorable member: Is that when you were with them?

Mr PLUNKETT: I was not working for them, but I had a fair bit to do when I was organising when the freeway

was put in. In actual fact, one contract was given to a private contractor and the road had to be pulled up again because it was not up to specifications for the Highways Department. I say the Highways Department has got the best equipment, or did have it and the best workers to put those roads in but now this Liberal Government sees fit to sell that equipment. I would like to know from the Minister of Transport why.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: This is not Question Time.

Mr PLUNKETT: No, he can get up and speak, and deny this. I want to know what is happening to the money in South Australia. I would like to know most certainly why \$10 000 000 worth of machinery—and this is all big machinery—was sold. One of the excuses given by the Minister of Transport was it was big machinery which had been used up on the freeway and was no longer wanted. What about the Stuart Highway and the big equipment that will be used there by McMahon Brothers or by the mining company that bought for \$155 000 one machine valued at \$380 000? When we on this side ask why the Government cannot use its own highway workers, members opposite will say that it is because they have no heavy equipment. I have it on good authority that the Liberal Party intends to reduce highway jobs by another 150, all construction workers. There are not many highway construction gangs left. They have been done away with in the South-East, although not in the North, but these gangs will be done away with completely and all the work will be given to private contractors.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Who said so?

Mr PLUNKETT: That is what I am saying. The Government claims that it does not retrench people but, if that is so, why has the Public Buildings Department lost 500 jobs? Have those people died, have they retired, or has the Government paid them off? It is not creating more jobs, but it is creating unemployment. The other day we heard the Deputy Premier making claims about new industries. They must be powered by robots, because unemployment has been increasing ever since the Liberal Government came to office. The Government, though, still has the audacity to say it is creating new jobs. Softwoods was a firm mentioned, but that firm has not put one person on. Another gimmick was the meatworks.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What's wrong with that?

Mr PLUNKETT: What this Government announced was done under a Labor Government 12 months earlier. I would like to know where the Government has employed some of the people it claims it has employed. If they are being employed, why is the number of unemployed increasing all the time? I am talking about the entire labor force not just the school leavers.

I am pleased to see that the member for Eyre has taken the Chair. He spoke about the Stuart Highway, and I think there should be some explanation of why the Liberal Government is slowly pulling down the Highways Department gangs and selling their equipment. The contracts are being given to McMahon Brothers.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That's not true.

Mr PLUNKETT: The Minister should look at the tender let to McMahons and then think what the Highways Department could have done the job for; it would have been much less than the price quoted by the contractors.

In relation to the sale of machinery from the Highways Department on 14 May, there was some industrial trouble. Some of the Northfield workers expressed to the unions their fears about what the Liberal Government was doing in selling off the equipment. Some of the items were withdrawn from sale by the Minister of Transport, through Mr Obron—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Mr Abraham.

Mr PLUNKETT: Mr Obron, from the department.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not think the member for Peake needs any assistance from other members. I suggest he be heard in silence.

Mr PLUNKETT: Thank you, Sir. The following items of equipment were withdrawn from sale:

Items 9	136.35	Tractor crawler
17	171.36	Loader crawler
19	171.46	Loader crawler
21	232.24	Gallion 118 grader
23	232.12	Gallion 118 grader

Those machines are used daily on roadworks, but they were withdrawn from the sale. The Government can claim that it must replace machinery every other year, and I agree that it is not good to keep obsolete machinery. The Highways Department, the E. & W.S. Department and the Woods and Forests Department have never done that. They have had sales every two or three years, and their cars and equipment are sold after about 40 000 miles.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: So you accept that?

Mr PLUNKETT: I accept that, but that is not the point. Some of the machinery was almost brand new. I do not have to ask the Minister why the machinery was disposed of, because I can tell him the reason. The Government wants to change to free enterprise and private contracting. The system of private contracting along with Government workers has worked well for many years, but that was not good enough for the Liberal Government when it came to power in 1979, after the promises it had made to gain office. The Government has made sure that it has wrecked all Government departments. What has been done to the departments by this Government is a shame, and they will never be the same.

Government workers, even though they claimed that they were not paid as well as people in some other sectors of the community, had a guarantee of a job. Is the Minister of Agriculture willing to say that the people working for the Government have never done their job as well as the private contractors have? If he will say that, he does not know anything about Government workers. I can show him projects in South Australia where the work of the Government employees has been a credit to them for many years, just as I can show him private contract work, without Government supervision, that has been no good, but where private contractors have worked with Government departments the practice has been accepted for many years. It happened under the Playford Government, and I hope it returns to that.

We will win the next election, but we will be placed at a disadvantage because we will have to buy back the equipment that has been virtually given away. The Government has given away equipment that does not belong to it—it belongs to the taxpayers and the Government should hang its head in shame. I notice that members opposite are not calling out now. They thought it was a joke when I first rose to speak. They should do a bit of research to find out the Government's attitude and why the Government has taken that attitude. It is a scandalous attitude and it is criminal because equipment has been given away that does not belong to the Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The railways were given away a few years ago by the Dunstan Government.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am very pleased that the Minister of Agriculture has had the decency to listen to what I have said. I would have liked to see the Minister of Transport in the House, because he has a lot to answer for. I want to know the answers to the questions I have raised, and I will ask those questions every time I speak. I will ask the Minister what he is doing in his department, and I want answers. The honeymoon is over for the Liberal

Government. The workers now realise what is going on.

I have been amazed at the protests against the Government. The Government stated that everything would go smoothly when it got into office, but now the pensioners are at its door as well as the schoolteachers, motor-bikers are running around, and the pubs are screaming about the stupid price of beer. The people of South Australia, including a lot of previous Liberal voters, are complaining about the price of petrol. South Australians have had to pay millions of dollars extra because of the stupidity of the Liberal Government. I notice that Peter has entered the Chamber: he told me that his constituents are now wondering why they voted for a Liberal Government, because of the increasing price of petrol. I do not like putting Peter in, but he may be on our side next time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I take it the honourable member is referring to the honourable member for Mallee.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker has already indicated that there must be silence when the Speaker or Deputy Speaker is on his feet. The honourable member must refer to other members by their district.

Mr PLUNKETT: My apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker. It was the member for Mallee.

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

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I would like to say what a wonderful speech the member for Peake has made. He has one thing in his favour: he tells the truth, which is one of the things I like about members on this side.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You wouldn't know what the truth was.

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister would be the greatest example of all time of a person who tells untruths. He has one thing in his favour, however. He thought he would be Premier, then he thought he would be Deputy Premier, he is now No. 3, and he will be on this side after the next election. The Liberal Party could run a duck in his seat and still win. I would like to see the day that he doorknocks more than three houses, and I know where they would be. I could say where those houses would be. I know what is going on in my district.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I realise that this debate is normally very wide, but I ask the honourable member for Unley to link his remarks to the debate.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I rise on a point of order. The honourable member referred to me as 'he'. I appreciate that he is somewhat flustered by the fact that in the seat of Davenport the Labor Party obtained only 37 per cent of the vote.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! What is the point of order? The honourable Minister must not comment.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I suggest the honourable member should not refer to members opposite as 'he'.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The Minister must resume his seat.

Mr LANGLEY: I am very pleased. I would like to be the Liberal member for Davenport. The result would be exactly the same. You cannot lose.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Mallee has entered the debate. I was in his district the other day and I did quite well, as did the other members of the committee with whom I visited the area. The Labor Party cannot win that seat. Every time we go to an election in Unley, it is said that we will be defeated. It is a wonderful thing. It will be donkeys years before the Liberal Party wins that seat. I am

very pleased that the Minister of Health is present in the House tonight.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Will this be your last speech?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley does not need the assistance of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr LANGLEY: I can assure you, Sir, I do not need it. He has made so many blues in this House (and we both barrack for the Blues) that it does not matter. I can assure the Minister of Agriculture that I admire his ability, but I do not admire the way in which he speaks in the House. The member for Peake just killed him easily. The Minister tried to interject and the honourable member took no notice of him. The Minister is welcome to come to my district and do a bit of door-knocking. The Minister of Health and any other member in the House can come to my district. We have door-knocked several hundred houses. Members opposite may think they know how the Liberal Party is going, but I am sorry to tell them that they are going very badly in Unley and they must be going very badly elsewhere. There is no doubt about that. The simple reason is that the cuts that the Government has brought to bear are not appreciated.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Do you say Unley is the barometer?

Mr LANGLEY: Every time there has been an election, it has been stated in the newspaper that I will lose. However, I will retire undefeated, and members have heard that before. There is a stalemate in my district: this Government is stale and it has no mate, I can assure honourable members of that. I challenge the young Minister for Coles (or Woolworths). Her colleagues are propping her up. I would like the Minister to come to my district and door-knock. The sooner she does that, the better, because she will find out what people think of the Minister of Health. There is no doubt about that.

The member for Mitcham would understand when I say that there is a big hospital, which looks after people. I would like the Minister to tell me something. I have been to one annual meeting and I do not know whether the Minister attended the annual meeting that was held the other day. This is a vital hospital and I can assure the Minister that every time I have been to an annual meeting, the Minister of Health has attended. This hospital was almost on the edge of my district.

But something has gone wrong out there. How many beds have they got there—plenty! The Minister was not game to come out there, and I am sure the Minister had the opportunity. Much of the money put into it was from the lotteries and from public subscriptions.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: How much did you provide to open those beds?

Mr LANGLEY: I can assure the Minister that I put in more money than she did, because I made a donation. The Hon. Mr Shard and the Hon. Mr Banfield always attended the meetings and they took the good or the bad, but why does the Minister not go out there and prompt the people? There is every opportunity to do that.

Her statement the other day was one of the greatest of all time—that everyone should be able to pay for health. The Minister and I can afford to pay, but many people in my district cannot afford to pay. They cannot afford to pay Medibank—there are many such people. It is all very well for the Minister in her position to say this type of thing, but it is about time the Minister showed some recognition for people in other walks of life. The cuts are getting worse and worse.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I invite the Minister to come to my district and doorknock.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You'll have us all out there.

Mr LANGLEY: That would be the best thing that could happen, because you would all go home and say how well they know that fellow Langley.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister of Education is losing all the time. The Minister should come out to my district and find out what the Greeks and the Italians out there think.

The Hon. H. Allison: The last time the honourable member doorknocked in Mount Gambier I got 10 per cent more votes. Come back again!

Mr LANGLEY: I do not remember doorknocking. However, we are doing one thing in their favour now, the Minister is gone! If the Minister went around to every school in this State to find out his position, especially in Unley, he would find that there are very many parents that are dead against what is happening at the present time. I can assure him of that. There are multicultural people in my district, and they do not want cuts; they want more. However, we appear to be getting nowhere. I challenge the Government to go to the electors at any stage: it would be killed. They tell me that there is a 12 per cent swing in the Minister's electorate, and he informed me that last time there was a 10 per cent swing, so that would make it a 22 per cent swing.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I offer you an invitation to come out to Davenport.

Mr LANGLEY: I would not waste my time. I know that the Labor Party cannot win in that electorate. What about the District of Price—the member for Price is priceless too.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has been most tolerant about the manner in which the debate has progressed so far. I suggest to the member for Unley that he endeavour to link up his remarks to the matter before the House. The Chair has allowed all members to canvass a large number of subjects, but I do think that the honourable member is straying somewhat from the matter before the House.

Mr LANGLEY: I am only too pleased to do that, as I have a lot of material here that I can use.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What about the *Stock Journal*?

Mr LANGLEY: I am sent a copy, but I am not a member of that union.

Mr Mathwin: Are you a member of the Kindergarten Union?

Mr LANGLEY: No. Members of the Government are firing questions at me which I am only too happy to answer. I am a member of the Electrical Trades Union. I can assure members opposite that there is no need for me to worry, as they are in a very low position.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Agriculture has had plenty to say. I suggest that he not interject any further.

Mr LANGLEY: I am not too proud to talk about these cuts. I can say one thing, namely, that I am willing to speak to any member of the House straight to his face about what I think about him. Tonight the member for Eyre made a statement about Mr Apap, who is not a member of this House and who never looks like being a member of this House. However, the member for Eyre went further and mentioned Mr Scott.

Mr Mathwin: The flying Scotsman!

Mr LANGLEY: There is one thing the member for Glenelg must know—he had a little trouble himself concerning his seat. Mr Apap lived in my district. He handed out cards for me, and we won the seat. The point I

am making is that Mr Apap has no opportunity to answer the comments made.

Mr Apap has been spoken about in a derogatory way in this House. I do not have to use coward's castle to do anything about it. I do not want to use coward's castle at any stage in my life.

I suppose the Minister of Health always likes me to get up and speak. I do not have a Government hospital in my district, but I know of one to which patients go. Only the other day I had a complaint about Flinders Medical Centre. Pillowslips are almost at a premium at this hospital. I am told that none are being bought and that sheets are being used as pillowslips. Health is a great thing, and I hope the Minister will take notice of matters raised by some honourable members today. I can assure the Minister that the matters mentioned are just not going down well in my district, and there is no doubt that something better has to be done.

This Government, with all its cuts, and its promises of no retrenchments, decided to give away taxes, and it did. It was left with well over \$40 000 000 in its purse, and the honourable member for Hartley, who was the Premier at the time, will substantiate that. The Liberal Government took off the taxes, and who has to pay? The rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. There is no doubt about it. There have been increases in water rates—increases all round. The people who can least afford to pay are the people who are now paying.

It was part of Liberal policy. The electors made their decision, but they are now paying more. Every member knows that, once you hit a person's purse, you are not going so well, and I can assure the Government that it is not going so well. Many people are in a position to pay, but many people are not. The Government will have to pull up its socks, because at the moment its position is very, very low. If you give away \$26 000 000 and maybe another \$15 000 000, who has to pay for it? That is what the Government has done. That was its policy. The only thing that is now left to do is exactly what the Government is doing: it will sell anything. As the honourable member for Peake said today, this is happening, and it is hurting. Why is the Government doing this? After the next election there will be nothing left when the Labor Government gets in. We will have to start all over again, because the Government will have sold us out.

The Minister of Education knows his position very well. Someone is propping him up. At the stage during the crisis, who was doing all the talking? It was not the Minister of Education. The Premier went away and did not come home. Every time Dunstan went away, there were big headlines in the *News*. What a beauty that paper is! The *News* people are so good that they will ring, ask a question, and say, 'What more can you do?' Stephen Middleton range me recently concerning casinos. I said I would vote for a casino, but I would like to look at the Bill first and see who was going to get the profits. He then asked, 'Can I help you in any way?' I nearly fell off the chair. The *News* cannot even publish an article unless there are two names alongside it. Members of the Premier's staff in most cases come from the *News*. It is a sop. They will do anything for you. It is a great sop, and I can assure you I am speaking the truth.

Mr Ashenden: What did it say about breathalysers?

Mr LANGLEY: I will make my decision when it comes before the House. You are not going to tell me that the *News* does not influence anybody in any way at election time. Not much! What about some of the dirty, stinking statements made during the course of the last election. What about the things you said about Mr Apap? That was really good stuff! I believe that fair play is bonny play. I

have been through the mill over 25 years, and I am sorry to say the newspapers attempt to sway people, and they do it at election time. There is no doubt about it.

I have previously stated how many inches of space was used by the newspapers against the Labor Party. Surely we should get a fair go, and it is about time they gave us a fair go. I am saying it straight to their faces. They will read it. I know my position. They do not want to know me. That does not matter. I said during my last speech here that I would never play sport with them, for only one reason: I believe that fair play is bonny play. That is exactly what I am saying now. If it went against honourable members opposite, I am sure that they would complain. Newspapers do sway people in elections, but they do not sway me. Whatever matter comes before the House, they do not sway me in any way at all.

The Government at this stage would not be game to go to an election, and it will not win the next State election. By that time, we will have nothing left. The Highways Department will have been sold. The Public Buildings Department will be so low that it does not matter and, also, we will be paying extra, doing the jobs that were not done.

Anybody in business knows that when something comes to the tendering stage, one does not have to accept the lowest tender. How often does the lowest tenderer get the job? Very seldom. Members opposite could not care less about unemployment, and these cuts are causing unemployment. A number of people come into my office asking for jobs. According to what some people are saying now, the Liberal Party wants it to be so, and some people will never have a job in their lives. Do not tell me they are dole bludgers. Many people come to my office asking me to try to get them jobs. They are not dole bludgers. They are willing to work, but they cannot get a job. The unemployment rate in this State is too high. The Premier says it is too high, but he says the Government is doing its best to do something about it. A newspaper recently referred to 1 000 jobs a week, but it does not consider how many people lose their jobs. The Premier spoke today about 20 000 new jobs. If we had 20 000 new jobs, we would not have any trouble at all, but how many people lose their jobs? That is exactly what is happening in this community. No-one can deny it. It is a one-sided argument. The Premier made a statement today about the creation of nearly 10 000 jobs, or maybe it was 7 000. It went to 10 000 and then it went to 12 000. However, South Australia's unemployment is one of the highest, if not the highest, in the Commonwealth. People in my own family cannot get jobs and they are willing to work, I can assure the Premier. The Premier cannot con anybody in this State that we are going further. How much do we own of this State? We own less than 50 per cent. There are three people in this country who own the bread and butter. The food stores are owned by three people. They can do what they like. I will have an opportunity later on to talk about what happened to price control. It was one of the worst things that has happened to this country and this State. I can assure honourable members opposite that I voted in favour of price control and wage control. It would have been a good thing, but it did not happen. Now we are paying the penalty. I can assure members opposite that I will be having a few more words to say, if I get another opportunity, concerning price control.

Mr OLSEN (Rocky River): I do not propose to emulate the high-pitched, emotional contributions by the members for Peake and Unley, because I view State finances as being something that deserve a rational, serious approach in determining the direction that will affect the lives of

every South Australian. However, I must respond to one or two comments made by members opposite. The member for Unley challenged us to go into an election at this time, of course he would make that challenge, for it has been proved without much doubt that South Australians, indeed Australians, take a very serious view of frivolous early elections, as the A.L.P. in this State knows only too well.

The member for Unley referred also to the Home for Incurables, an institution within his electorate. I gathered the impression that he was somewhat sidetracked during the course of his contribution and therefore was not able to expand the argument that I would have anticipated he would put. But what is the situation in relation to the Home for Incurables, and what is the history and the contribution of the former Government in that regard? It is interesting to note that the background to this information is that the departmental advice to the then Minister of Health, Mr Shard, was to recommend that the scheme was too expensive and elaborate at an overall estimated cost of \$11 000 000. The Government at that time nevertheless determined in 1970, as indeed it did with many projects that could not be justified, to proceed against that departmental advice. Subsequent to that, in the 1978-79 Budget, the previous Government did not provide funds to commission additional beds in the Home for Incurables. The draft Budget which the present Government inherited upon assuming office included no provision for commissioning more beds for the Home for Incurables.

I believe that this Government has taken the appropriate course and, indeed, has a courageous Minister of Health in this regard, because priority has been put in the right corner. It is important to emphasise that since we took office we have expanded the resources allocated to the rehabilitation, assessment, reassessment and support services which are available to people who would otherwise be admitted to institutions. It is a far better basis for people to live in their normal environment and receive the necessary care rather than to institutionalise them, debasing the very fabric of humans. It is a far better way, giving far better credibility to the people, giving them far more—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Far more cost effective.

Mr OLSEN: Far more cost effective, as the Minister interjects, but far better for continuing involvement with their families. It is interesting also to note that the number of nursing home beds in the Adelaide area currently exceeds by some 40 p.c. the Commonwealth guideline of 50 beds per thousand of those aged over 65. Indeed, in the Unley council area, where the home is actually located, the number of Commonwealth beds exceeds the Commonwealth guidelines by 80 p.c. without counting the beds at that home. If the beds are counted, including those in the west wing, the Commonwealth guidelines are exceeded by some 300 p.c. Quite obviously, therefore, that is why the previous Government did not proceed to allocate funds for the commissioning of those further beds in that home.

There is a need to develop an admission policy for nursing homes in general to ensure that only people who require nursing home care in an institution are admitted to nursing homes. It seems to me to be a very rational reasonable approach to a problem that gives the basis for far more involvement of people with their family over an extended period of time and, of course, it is most effective, which we have to bring back into health care services in this State. Previous Public Accounts Committee reports have certainly highlighted the need in health care to provide cost-effectiveness.

It is interesting to note that two reports support the Government's view in that regard, and also, incidentally, the South Australian Health Commission's view. They are the Bright and Gibson Reports. In February 1980, a committee was appointed under the chairmanship of Sir Charles Bright to inquire into admission criteria for the Home for Incurables and other related matters. The committee commissioned expert advice from the late Dr Gibson, then the foremost authority on rehabilitation and care of the chronically ill in South Australia, who stated that he would not recommend the west wing being used to increase the accommodation within the present role of the home. The South Australian Health Commission endorsed that, as indeed the Government has taken that particular recommendation. As I said earlier, the former Government did not allocate any funds, so it must, in effect, have followed that course itself.

The Leader, speaking in relation to the Supplementary Estimates, referred to pay-roll tax and land tax concessions, indicating the small amount that had been drawn by business in taking advantage of the scheme. The Leader attempted to place a question mark over the suitability and the practical nature of the scheme. I want to point out to the House the benefits of a scheme of that nature in employment in country areas, areas such as the Iron Triangle, in which the member for Stuart has a very keen interest, as well as other areas of the State. It is interesting that, in the mid-north and northern areas of the State \$310 000 was committed to some 35 firms for the benefit of employment opportunities, and 2 489 full-time employees benefited from that State Government scheme, in addition to 130 part-time employees.

There is no single greater imposition on small business and country business than pay-roll tax. There is no greater disincentive in the business community for creating job opportunities than pay-roll tax, an iniquitous tax placed on the shoulders of business men for the right or privilege of paying an employee a wage. If we are really serious about tackling the unemployment figures in this country, we need to look at the inhibiting factors in the opening up of those job opportunities, and certainly pay-roll tax is one of those specific areas.

Decentralised manufacturing and processing industries in my electorate in the mid-north and the north of the State have benefited directly from that scheme, and it has created the number of job opportunities to which I have referred. What a stark contrast we have with the situation in the two years leading up to September 1979, when we had a down-turn in the work force by some 20 600 under the former Administration. We have seen under the Tonkin Administration a complete reversal of that situation in some 18 or 19 months of its holding the Treasury benches.

It is only by taking off the disincentives on the small business community in that regard that we will be able to encourage and further expand job opportunities. I need only remind the House that the small business community is the biggest employer in this country. If the small business community had the opportunity for each business to employ one additional employee across the nation the unemployment problem would be significantly reduced. It needs to have the incentive for the small business man to take account of those opportunities.

I could mention also a whole range of other incentives that the Government has given in relation to business opportunities in this State—the \$2 700 000 given to 247 companies to come to the State, and the co-ordinated regional development programme that has given economic stability and even growth factors in business across the State. We have not centralised; we have taken positive

initiatives to decentralise industry within the State.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Would you mind giving a couple of examples?

Mr OLSEN: One example in my community of Kadina is that in relation to Price's Bakery, a small firm that took the initiative of investing a large sum of money. It took risk capital to do it, and it qualified for some exemption in relation to pay-roll tax. That company now has more than 22 extra people on its pay-roll as compared with 12 months ago. In addition, newspapers in country areas also qualify under this scheme and have been able to increase their job opportunities so that people in country areas can have job printing done at economic prices, those equivalent to their metropolitan counterparts, so that they are not disadvantaged by operating a business in a country area. Taking off the disincentives and giving them a reasonable environment in which to grow and prosper across the State. That is what I referred to, even growth and economic stability across the State, and not sectionalised within the State.

I want to return later to small business and its opportunities, but I refer now to one contribution by the member for Salisbury in relation to education. He made a contribution which one could perhaps call a selective historic survey, which omitted several significant points. At no time has the Government withdrawn from negotiation in or out of the court, and it has not, as a Government, compulsorily transferred anyone at this stage. I was surprised that the member for Salisbury should proceed to discuss a matter in relation to ancillary staff when that matter is currently before the Full Bench. I question whether perhaps it is not an improper matter to be debating.

I want to quote from an article by the member for Salisbury in one of the regional papers. He was giving an indication to the community of what his approach would be should he become Minister of Education—and, fortunately, he will have a lot more time to study the matter before he receives that opportunity. I quote:

A department under his administration would have looked at staff cut-backs—
that is an interesting concession for him to make—
in areas other than school assistants.

It is interesting to note that, in relation to the Education Department, 90 per cent, now moving towards 91 per cent, of the total education vote goes to salaries and wages of the department. If one looks at staff cut-backs, and if it is not going to be in the ancillary staff area, it must be in relation to teaching jobs, looking at teachers. I challenge the member for Salisbury to put on the record, if there are going to be staff cut-backs under some Labor Government, where they will be, who they will be, and to what degree will the cut-backs operate.

If he is honest with the House and the community he should indicate that and enlarge on it. He made some oblique reference to looking at central office or head office and cutting staff there, but he has not done a significant amount of home work because, in the period from 1977, the number on the pay-roll at head office has decreased by 19 per cent, teachers have decreased by 1 per cent, students by 8 per cent, and ancillary staff numbers have increased by 8.3 per cent. If he is going to be a credible Opposition spokesman on education, I think the member for Salisbury needs to get some of the facts and figures right if he is prepared to quote them in this House and to the community, because those mis-statements will come home to haunt him at some time in the future.

I turn now to the Treasurer's speech to the House in introducing the Supplementary Estimates. Looking at the period falling in 1980-81, the allocation for education represents a 12.3 per cent increase over the actual

expenditure of the department in 1979-1980. That makes a nonsense of the campaign of denigrating the Government for its alleged cuts in education. What cuts? There have not been dollar cuts in education, and with the inflation rate running at between 9.25 per cent and 10 per cent—

Dr Billard: It is 8.3 per cent in South Australia.

Mr OLSEN:—and lower in South Australia, as I am reminded, there has been an increase in real terms of funding in the field of education.

Mr Lewis: Where has it all gone?

Mr OLSEN: Salaries. If anyone is to make a judgment that the Budget should be pruned and it will be in the area of staff cutbacks, the Opposition should indicate exactly where those cuts will be. This Government has done significant work in the field of education, for which it has not received credit. There has been a very vitriolic campaign within the community, particularly in the unions representing the teachers, which is illfounded.

I believe there is a misconception in the community at large that there has been a 4 per cent cut in education funding. Rather, there has been an adjustment in relation to the formula applied to ancillary staff. Why did the Government need to consider that adjustment? It is because the union specifically did not honour the verbal agreement with the Minister to the effect that during 1980 it would voluntarily transfer and shift school assistants from the haves to the have-nots. That cost us \$500 000 last year. The formula merely adjusts that \$500 000 so that at the end of 1981 that line in the education budget will balance itself. We have been forced to make the adjustment in the formula because 46 schools agreed to voluntarily transfer assistants and did not do so and six schools point blank refused to obey the Government direction. About 52 schools in this State have held the other 700-odd schools to ransom, schools that are due for ancillary hours but cannot get them while the matter is tied up in the courts.

Those schools did not honour their agreement. They backed vocal, vitriolic minority groups against the well meaning silent majority in the community to the detriment of children in those schools. As we would all understand, there has been a down-turn of about 22 000 students over the past five years, so that some schools will have seriously reduced student numbers. Any Government would make an adjustment to the teaching staff of those schools, as well as support services (that is, ancillary staff). The schools in high growth areas with increasing student numbers deserve an increase in ancillary staff hours. That is the basis of the argument—transferring from the haves to the have-nots, equalising the situation in accordance with a reduction of 8 per cent of student numbers. This rational approach to the situation has been frustrated and thwarted by motives, perhaps not well meaning motives in some instances, of people who profess to take on the Government.

We could look at a whole range of issues in which this Government has been conciliatory in relation to education. For example, 22 senior staff positions were available in country areas in South Australia, but the Government could not entice suitable applicants from the metropolitan area despite the conditions of employment for teachers that were offered by the Minister. We could not obtain 22 applicants for those senior staff positions in country schools. Are we, as a Government, to deny people in country areas the benefit of senior staff? Is not the need at those 22 schools equivalent to the need for quality of education in city schools? Of course it is. Because the Government, and the Minister particularly, took a conciliatory line on the matter and appointed supernumeraries to the positions (that is, 22 extras to take over

those positions), the additional cost to the Government and the State Treasury was \$400 000.

No-one can deny that this Government has tried to bend over backwards to be conciliatory in the field of education and to be rational, reasonable and compassionate in regard to specific issues in the field of education. Yet, that is not the perception in the public arena. That perception must be redressed, because the Government deserves far greater credit in that field than it is gaining at present. The Minister deserves far greater credit for the conciliatory and compassionate way in which he has negotiated.

Mr Millhouse: Why hasn't that come over?

Mr OLSEN: The Minister of Education, in having that very good personal trait of compassion, has worked towards the betterment of quality of education right across the field.

Mr Millhouse: Why hasn't that come through to the public?

Mr OLSEN: The unions and some teachers have been prepared to use and perhaps abuse the privileges of the students in their schools to push a particular line that is mischievous, to say the least. Notes have been sent home to parents that do not refer to a function at the school—the normal basis of notes sent home with students. This action constitutes taking a particular political line in relation to funding. The notes have tear-off strips to be returned to the teacher. This is a whole new approach. I, as a parent, object to that approach. I am thankful that that has not occurred in my district.

It is interesting to note how selective these people have been in this campaign: they have not looked across the board at education needs of kids in this State but have looked at the education needs of kids in marginal districts a little more than the needs of kids in other districts. It is an emotional argument and if someone was to say to me, 'Don't you want the best education for your children?' of course I would respond, 'Yes'. I want the best education for my children, but I put a qualifier on it: more and more dollars going into education does not necessarily mean better education for my children. That is the rational approach that we must introduce to this debate on education. The Government has not only the area of education to look after in providing services to the community but also it must consider water resources, health services, and police services.

Education must take its fair share of the cake along with other Government services. Since in excess of 33 per cent of Government expenditure goes to education, and that figure is increasing despite the fact that student numbers are decreasing, it seems to me that the Government has honoured its commitment to maintain the standard of education in this State. If one refers to the Schools Commission Report, one can see how South Australia is placed in relation to other States. The criteria of the report is not based on the South Australian Government criteria: the criteria applies right across the board. It is interesting to note that South Australia spends more per student per year than does any other State in Australia. We have a higher ancillary staff ratio in this State than has any other State and, with the 4 per cent adjustment on the formula, we maintain a figure that is 11 per cent higher than any other State in Australia (that is, an adjustment from 15 per cent to 11 per cent on the formula of a 4 per cent adjustment). In addition, if one looks at the average class sizes, (and I recognise that this includes all those within the education system divided by the total student numbers), one will see that we have a better student/teacher ratio than has any other State.

There is no doubt that the education standards in this State were established over a reasonable period, but the

point to be borne in mind is that this State Government has continued that thrust and continued education spending in an increasing amount of dollars coming out of the expenditure line in the Budget committed to the continuance of maintaining those standards of education.

It is interesting that the problems of education are not only in South Australia. This can be seen if one looks at the interstate newspapers. There is difficulty in Tasmania, where the number of teachers has been reduced; there has been a staff cut. There are continuing strikes in New South Wales, despite the fact that there is a Labor Government there. So, the field of education is going through turmoil across Australia and not only in South Australia. The \$403 700 000 allocation of funds to the Education Department is, I believe, a reassurance to members and to the electorate of the priority this Government has given to education, and there has been a maintenance of that priority by putting money where its mouth is and committing funds to the provision of education services.

What we really have to get back to in the education debate concerns a question to taxpayers of this State. Do they want ever-increasing amounts allocated to the education budget, while at the moment and in the immediate foreseeable future there is a reduction in student numbers? If they do want such increases, are they prepared to pay and contribute higher taxes to fund it? There is no Government service that can be funded other than by taxpayers' money. The Government is not spending Government money; it is spending the money of taxpayers of South Australia. It is a matter of allocating those resources in the best light, so that all the services provided by the Government in South Australia are given their due. If one compares education as against a whole range of other portfolios, it can be realised that there have been massive increases in education expenditure and quite the reverse in some other portfolio areas. What we need to do is ask that question of the taxpayers: 'If you want more funds for the education budget, are you prepared to pay more taxes?' The Government cannot jeopardise other Government services to provide education services. Flexibility in relation to that area of cutbacks is limited because of the 90 to 91 per cent of the total budget that goes towards the wages of teachers themselves. I would hate to think of the result to the Budget if the current 12 per cent application which the teachers have now before the court should be approved. It is the same theme that can be applied to the 35-hour week.

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

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Twice while the member for Rocky River was talking about education I tried to interject, and I hope you will pardon me for doing it, Mr Speaker. The interjection I attempted to make was: Why, if this Government is doing so well in education, is that not coming across to the public? The member for Rocky River ignored my interjections; he has been here long enough to know that if an interjection is ignored it does not get into *Hansard*. However, that was not the only reason he ignored it; the other reason is that there is no answer to the question. In my experience schoolteachers and those connected with education are pretty reasonable sort of people. They are not red-raggers, despite what is often said by members of the Liberal Party. It is hard to rouse them. However, I have not seen the members of the

teaching profession and those concerned with primary and secondary schools in this State so aroused for more than a decade.

There is no doubt whatever that the focus of their ire is the present Minister of Education and the fact that before the last election the Liberal Party made a series of very attractive promises on education, not one of which has been kept; rather, it has been the reverse. I invite any member opposite to answer the question which I put to the member for Rocky River and which he avoided. Why, if this Government and this Minister is doing so well in the field of education, is it coming across so badly to the public? It will be interesting to see whether any member takes up that challenge.

In the time I have tonight I propose to deal with a miscellany of subjects. One concerns another aspect of education, an aspect for which the States have the Constitutional authority but for which the Commonwealth has the financial responsibility, and that concerns the universities. I asked a question this afternoon about Commonwealth-State relations, and relationships within the Liberal Party came into it by implication. I noticed that the Premier was not too comfortable in answering the question. I always know when he resorts to personal abuse that I have touched on a pretty raw nerve, which I did this afternoon, because all I got in answer was personal abuse.

Mr O'Neill: That's not the only Minister.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, but he is the one I will use as my barometer on the this occasion. Members of the Liberal Party sat rather still and silent during my question and his answer. There is another aspect, the aspect concerning the universities, which will cause great perturbation in the community and which may cause some friction for State and Federal Governments and amongst members of the Liberal Party. The thrust of the question I asked this afternoon was whether members of the Liberal Party, who are members in Canberra, will put the interests of their State ahead of the interests of their Party. They have never put the interests of their State ahead of the interests of their Party and it will be interesting to see whether they do so on this occasion. I now want to test out this Government to see whether it will put the interests of tertiary education ahead of loyalty to its Party and particularly its colleagues in Canberra.

There has been announced an intention by the Federal Government that in future fees will be paid for by students for a second or subsequent degree. That has been greeted with a great deal of resentment by those concerned and by many members of the community. If members do not know now they soon will know—as I propose to read it—that the Council of the University of Adelaide, on which some members in this House serve, has passed a resolution on this matter. It is as follows:

- This university is adamantly opposed to the imposition of fees for students enrolled for university courses and is unwilling to charge such fees.
- This university expresses grave concern at the Government's demonstrable failure to seek advice from appropriate bodies on the direct effects and implications of the Lynch Committee recommendations in relation to tertiary education.
- This university expresses its opposition to the introduction of a loans scheme as recommended by the Lynch Committee, which it sees as an attempt to replace the TEAS scheme, a scheme which the council believes is already inadequate in servicing the university education of students. Further, this university, as a matter of policy, will refuse to administer such a loans scheme.
- This university, realising that disadvantaged students will be deterred from continuing their education, rejects the

further restriction of access to TEAS and the implementation of a loans scheme which will inevitably undermine TEAS.

It will be interesting to know (and we may get the answer by question) whether this Government supports the view of the University of Adelaide, or whether it is going to support the view of the Federal Government in its intention to impose fees.

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the honourable member please indicate how he is linking this argument with this State's Budget?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, because this State is responsible for the university. There is a University of Adelaide Act and a Flinders University Act. If the Commonwealth Government is not prepared to finance the universities in future, then this State will have to finance its own universities, as we used to do not very long ago. That is how I link it. Let me now, having quoted that resolution from the University of Adelaide, quote from the letter which I received only today from the Dean of the Medical School of Flinders University on this same matter. This is what he says:

Dear Mr Millhouse,

I believe that the Australian Government has made a very unfortunate error in planning to introduce fees for second or higher qualifications in universities and that this plan should not be put into effect.

I am the Dean of a new School of Medicine from which two classes have now graduated. We admit a number of carefully selected mature entrants, some with degrees, to our school. Many of these will make excellent doctors and much needed leaders in patient care, teaching and research. Even more important is that the presence of these more experienced highly educated people confers great benefits on the rest of their class. They cause their companions to mature more speedily and to acquire appropriate attitudes more easily and certainly.

With the imposition of fees, graduates could not possibly enrol in our six-year course, unless a generous scheme of scholarships, allowances or loans supported them. Many already have families. I believe that I can rule out the possibility of such generous schemes during present restraints on Government spending. It seems quite unlikely that the loan scheme which has been announced will come anywhere near meeting the needs of a graduate enrolling in a six-year course. Additional earnings are precluded by the intensity of the course and the very short holidays in the later years. The very highly selected graduates whom we wish to enrol for higher degrees will have similar problems. Higher degree students are the future teachers and research workers in the medical sciences. They are also essential contributors to our research teams during their studies. The wise and economical leadership of our profession and the future of medical research in Australia largely depend on these two types of graduates.

I believe that the two groups of young doctors who have graduated from this school are exceptional in their understanding of the social role of medicine in Australian society. They also understand the necessity for wise allocation of limited resources. If we are to be prevented by financial restriction from enrolling the best applicants, the quality of our graduates must deteriorate, greatly to the detriment of the Australian people.

Therefore, I urge you most strongly to do all in your power to reverse the decision to impose fees on second and higher degree students. The savings will be negligible compared with the damage done to the standard of Australian medicine.

Yours very sincerely,
G. J. FRAENKEL
Chairman and Dean

School of Medicine

What he has written about the medical school has been said by many others with regard to scientific research and so on. I ask any other member on the Government side who is going to speak tonight to say, if he or she has authority from the Government to do it, where this State Government stands on that issue.

That is all I want to say about education, but let me now come (and it leads on from one to the other, I suppose) to some things within the responsibility of the Minister of Health, and, by coincidence, they follow on, again, from some of the things that the member for Rocky River had to say. He spoke about the Home for Incurables. I happen to have in my hand some correspondence I have had with the Minister about that very matter. At one time the Home for Incurables was in my district. Now it is not in fact in the member for Unley's district: it is in the district of the member for Bragg, the Premier. It does not matter. Because it is in our area, we all take a particular interest in it. In my view, it is an absolute disgrace, whoever was responsible for the building, to leave a capital asset like the west wing of the Home for Incurables empty, and it has stood empty now for quite a long time. It is the same with Windana, of course. There is a capital asset to be used where there is a great need in the community and, because of squabbling between two blasted Governments or public servants, it is empty. I know the member for Ascot Park is going to say a good deal about that later on tonight, and I will not say anything more about Windana. I, too, have pushed the Government on this, and it is impossible to get any sense out of the Minister of Health about it.

With all the prating we get from members of the Liberal Party about the use of scarce resources, and economy and so on, it is a scandal that we have Windana standing empty and that we have that west wing in the Home for Incurables standing empty, and this is not just a political ploy. There are many people who share the view that I have just expressed. I wrote to the Minister about the west wing of the Home for Incurables in March, because I had had a letter on behalf of the members of the Uniting Church, Urrbrae parish. They sent a letter to me. They sent the same letter to the Premier, over whose district the parish extends, expressing the greatest concern about this. This is what they say, in part, in their resolution:

Many members of the parish take a keen personal interest in the home, which is situated in the parish, and many are expressing surprise and concern at the situation in regard to the empty west wing of the home. It is our understanding that there is a lengthy list of needy patients awaiting admission to the home, and it is incomprehensible to us that the west wing remains empty when these patients should be admitted to give them much needed professional care and attention, and to provide families with relief from often intolerable burdens of continuing care.

Then they go on to refer to the irony of the situation, this being the International Year of the Disabled Person.

The Minister of Health, when the member for Rocky River was speaking, interjected that it was better to leave people in their own homes and look after them there. Many of the people who ought to be in the Home for Incurables can be best looked after in that environment, and it is, as I say, disgraceful that is the word I use to the Minister that that west wing is empty. I wrote to her on 11 March; I gave her the usual month. I had to write again on 13 April, because I had had no reply. All I got was a silly-willy answer from her. It took nearly a page and said absolutely nothing, except 'We are not going to do anything about it. The west wing is going to stand empty as far as we are concerned.' I do not believe that is right.

I may say that I have had a number of experiences recently with the Minister of Health either avoiding an answer or giving me a most unsatisfactory answer. There is a question on the Notice Paper at the moment asking the Minister when she is going to give me an answer to a letter I wrote to her about Dr Clarence Oliver Fuller, who is an officer of the Health Commission. When I got out to the electorate office at dinner time tonight I found that there was an answer to my letter, but it is an entirely unsatisfactory answer. Unfortunately, I did not bring the correspondence with me, so I am speaking from memory, but the position is this: Dr. Fuller, who is a man of about my age (he is in his early fifties; he has just reached that desirable degree of maturity which you, Sir, passed not long ago), is, and has been for many years, an officer in either one of the Departments of Health and now in the Health Commission. For I think 18 months or so, he has had no job. He has been paid a good salary, paid at a senior rate of salary, but he has been given no work to do in the Health Commission. Not only is that a scandal but it is destroying him. There he is. He goes in day after day, and he tells me that all he has to do is to sit on about half a dozen committees, and he goes to one meeting of each of them every month. That is all he has been given to do, and they will not give him a job.

When I heard about this, I wrote to the Minister saying that that, too, was a scandal and asking what she was going to do about it, saying—and I am sure this is right—that she must have known about it during the time she has been Minister. I had back today from her a letter which says, 'Really, maybe later on we will be restructuring the Health Commission and he will be offered a job'.

It is wrong on two counts: first of all, it is an absolute waste of resources and a waste of money to pay the man; and secondly, as I say, it is having a very adverse effect on the man himself to be humiliated in this way without being given any reason, without being able to get any redress. As with so many people, he came to me when he was at the end of his tether, with the hope that I would be able to do something to help him. I hope I can. I believe the Minister should have intervened already in this matter, even before it was raised with her by way of letter.

That leads me to another matter, not concerning that Minister but concerning the Minister of Industrial Affairs. It is a completely different matter, but it also shows a very unsatisfactory situation. Last year, we passed an amending Bill with regard to shop trading hours. One of the objects of that legislation was to provide for hardware stores opening at weekends. There has been for months now a very great anxiety on the part of hardware stores because of the lists of exempt goods and the fact that this is to happen at the end of June. Time is running out for them, and they cannot get any sense out of the Minister or the department about this.

It was ironic when the member for Rocky River a few minutes ago was talking about the small businessman and what this Government is doing to help the small businessman. Well, it is a damn shame they do not do something to help the hardware merchants, most of whom can be classed as small businessmen, but they are not getting anything, and they are not even getting any sympathy from the Government.

They came to me some time in March. On 20 March, I have a letter from them, which said in part:

The committee of the National Hardware Institute of Australia, South Australian Branch, has been requested by members from both the retail and manufacturing sectors to make approaches to the Government in an attempt to reclassify goods exempt by the legislation currently before the House relating to shop trading hours. There have been

discussions between representatives of the retail trade and the Minister to no avail.

They asked my advice, and so on. They came and saw me. I wrote to the Minister on 23 March and said they were perturbed with the regulations. I also said:

They tell me that the lists which you have had set out in regulations are full of anomalies. Many items which are regarded as 'hardware' have been omitted and incidentally some items have been included twice (i.e. 'metal cleaners' and 'metal polish' appear both in new regulation Five (3) (c) and in regulation Five (4) (b)—an obvious mistake and, for all I know, not the only one.

A very serious aspect of the matter is that you have given the trade until the end of June to quit all non-committed products means a sell-out between now and then at cost or below. They are most anxious that you should review the lists, in consultation with their representatives, but unless this is done quickly they will be in a more and more difficult position when trying to quit their stocks. They complain moreover that although you have claimed that the amendments to the Act were drawn up after extensive consultation with interested parties not one of the retail hardware merchants have ever been consulted at all by you or your officers.

That was on 23 March, and again giving the Minister plenty of time, I wrote again on 16 April and pointed out that I said the matter was urgent, and I also said 'Unfortunately, I have not had even an acknowledgement from you, let alone a full reply'. I got an answer after that dated 21 April in which the Minister said, in part:

I am surprised that those who called upon you claim that there has been a lack of consultation with them in the drafting of the regulations.

Then he says he met representatives, and so on. All I can say is that I saw those same blokes today in the centre hall coming to see a Liberal member of Parliament, and they told me they had got nowhere between now and then.

Even more revealing, I have had a couple of letters from a hardware merchant in my own district, Barrow and Bench on Unley Road, premises which I opened a couple of years ago. In their first letter to me, they said:

As you are aware, we have built our business up very much with the view of serving the public's requirements with traditional hardware items. We are often advised by customers that they have searched everywhere to find items stocked by us, which are referred to in the exempt list. Accordingly, we have ensured adequate stocks of these items are maintained.

Glenn and I were originally against Sunday trading in order to preserve our own private family life patterns, but due to the loss of trading we had no alternative but to open on Sunday, and now that trading plays a significant part of our total trading pattern.

As this legislation now stands, we have to sell the exempt stock items prior to 30.6.81, which is an impossibility even if we sell articles at below cost, or we cease trading on Sundays, which would have serious financial implications. We consider it grossly unfair to be forced into this situation.

This small businessman has, I remind the member for Rocky River, been placed in this position by this Government. I have had an even more telling letter from him in the last couple of days. This is what he says about the items themselves—and perhaps the honourable member will care to do something about this:

We can stock kerosene, but we are not allowed to stock replacement parts or wicks for a kerosene heater; we can stock plastic containers for indoor plants, but we can't stock containers made of cane. We can stock chain to hold up plastic hanging baskets, but we can't stock macrame hangers.

We can stock 2ft high aluminium steps, but can't stock a 3ft

kitchen stool. We can stock laundry trolleys but not laundry baskets, but we can stock peg holders. We can stock polishing cloths, but we can't stock furniture polish, but we can stock Scandinavian teak oil. We can stock garbage cans, but we can't stock garbage can liners, but we can stock vacuum cleaner bags. We can stock scissors and shears as long as the customers only uses them in the workshop or garage.

We can sell a cork as long as the customer doesn't use it in a bottle. We can sell household oil, but not an oil can to put it in. We can sell a funnel as long as the customer doesn't use it in the home. We are unable to sell instructive magazines to educate our customers to use the products which we are allowed to stock. We can stock timber, etc., to make up furniture, but cannot stock timber furniture legs; however, we can stock furniture casters.

I have just returned from an ANZAM Regional Conference, where a total of 65 Mitre 10 and Big H stores, and many major manufacturers were represented. The conference was opened by the Deputy Premier, who stated that his Government was reducing legislation in order to assist small businesses and to make them more profitable. He didn't stay for question time. How can this type of Government performance receive any credibility from us as an industry, or the public at large?

I could go on with that letter. It says more rather hard things about the Government, which says that it is here to help small business.

I have never made any secret of the fact that I do not believe in shop trading hours legislation at all. I think it is not the concern of Parliament to decide whether merchants will open and sell particular items. In my view, that should be a commercial matter, and it should be up to them when they trade, how long they trade and what they sell. It is demeaning of Parliament to consider this sort of thing—whether they can sell or not sell particular items. I can remember when I was the Minister for Industrial Affairs, or whatever it was called in those days.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will be linking this with the Bill?

Mr MILLHOUSE: Of course, I am linking it closely, because it is a line for the Minister. I was lobbied to put in panty hose so that they could be sold after hours.

Mr Keneally: To put them on, surely.

Mr MILLHOUSE: No, I am not like the member for Stuart. That is the sort of absurdity that we get. Here we have an actual urgent situation that the Minister, because he is too stiff necked, will not do anything about. Many hardware merchants will be financially very hard hit because of these senseless regulations.

Mr Mathwin: You can move for disallowance on the floor of the House.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I hope that the Subordinate Legislation Committee will do something about it, but it has not done so yet. If there had been a notice for disallowance, I probably would not have been able to talk about it tonight. The member for Glenelg knows as well as I do that at this time in the session, when private members' business has passed, neither I nor he nor any member, without the say so of the Government, would have a ghost of a chance of moving or debating the disallowance of those regulations. Let him answer that if he can. It is only the Government now that can do anything about this situation, and I hope to heavens it will.

Those are only a few random things, but I chose them from probably a dozen other matters that I could have mentioned tonight because they seem to me to be important, urgent and topical, and indeed several of them did follow what the apologist for the Government, the member for Rocky River, had to say when he spoke

before me. I hope that members, particularly on the Government side, will pay some attention and, more than that, take some action on the matters I have mentioned, because all of them are worthy of action and remedy.

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I want to address a few comments to some of the remarks of the member for Mitcham. He has urged us to take note of some of the comments made earlier in this debate in relation to the allocation for education. The member for Mitcham asked why this campaign has taken on so well. If he would really address himself to the problem, he would know quite well, as the member for Rocky River said, that the problem we are facing is not purely a matter specific to South Australia, but is one facing every State in this country as well as countries overseas. The member for Rocky River referred to Tasmania, where cuts were made in teaching staff under a Labor Government, to the reduction in education in New South Wales, and to the fact that teachers are going on strike there to try to get class sizes reduced to 30.

I had the privilege, two weeks ago, of speaking to a teacher who was in Australia from Seattle, U.S.A. She informed me that this year in that city 18 schools were closed because of the declining population. The situation is so serious that teachers are now placed on a one-year contract, and no-one knows from one year to the next whether they will be employed. The college course has been increased to five years to try to spread the load over more years to compensate for the problem.

More specifically, I want to refresh the memory of the member for Mitcham, because obviously it is lagging when he says that this Government made promises prior to the last election and has not upheld its promises on education. Under the previous Administration, the education budget was cut by 6.5 per cent in the last Budget drawn up. He would know, if he were to cast his mind back to yesterday when the Premier introduced this Bill, that in real terms we have increased education funding this year by 12.3 per cent. If he were to go back to last year's Budget debate, he would know that we have increased the allocation over the previous year by 14.5 per cent. There is no denying that this Government has increased expenditure in education, not decreased it, as the campaign has tried to portray. The campaign has had the impetus it has had because it has been engineered by a teachers association which is the head of an education system that is the best in Australia.

Let me give a few examples. I have quoted that we have increased expenditure for this year. For the first time since 1976, the Government has increased allowances for both primary and secondary school text books, and it has also increased grants made for materials, school maintenance, maintenance of school grounds, and school equipment. These were increased for the first time since 1976, both on a per capita basis and the basic allowance.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

Mr SCHMIDT: If the honourable member would continue to listen, I shall go through and point out other matters, too. He will not listen at all. He comes in here and alleges that we have made promises and did nothing about it, and how he does not want to listen.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has had the call.

Mr Millhouse: I did give him—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SCHMIDT: Perhaps the member for Mitcham would like to recall that since we have been in office we have increased the allowance for students whose families need special assistance. Surely they are a needy sector of

the community. This Government has employed an additional 22 teachers for the migrant education programme, and that was above Budget plans. On top of that, we had the transfer of 18 teachers to multi-cultural areas. Surely the member for Mitcham would not deny those needy areas. This Government has doubled the grant from \$14 to \$28 for after-hours ethnic school. Surely the member for Mitcham would not want to deprive our ethnic community.

Mr Millhouse: No, but I—

Mr SCHMIDT: If he would like to listen, we have had the introduction of a \$500 grant to enable children in isolated areas to continue their secondary education. Surely the member for Mitcham would not want to deny those people in isolated areas access to better education.

This Government has provided \$3 700 000 over two years to enable teachers to take long service leave and to be replaced by unemployed teachers. Surely we would not want to deny our teachers the flexibility of taking long service leave, at the same time providing some employment for our unemployed teachers. This Government is allowing parental leave for both sexes, and again I am sure the member from Mitcham would not want to deny both sexes that opportunity.

We have encouraged teachers to retire earlier in order to create more jobs. Surely the member for Mitcham would not want to see us do an about face and not encourage people to retire at an earlier age. We made available \$2 200 000 last year and a further \$2 300 000 this year to help school leavers prepare for work. We have often heard the member for Mitcham say that we need to help our young graduates from school to find better employment. Obviously, this is all too much for the member for Mitcham, as he has decided to leave the Chamber. His conscience must be pricking him.

This Government paid teachers a 4 per cent wage increase in November, over and above the normal consumer price index, and currently before the salaries tribunal the teachers have a case for a further 12 per cent pay increase. The Government has put a moratorium on Teacher Housing Authority rent increases. That is a \$400 000 reduction on what teachers should have paid. They now pay only 54 per cent of the market value of a trust home. We have also improved the teacher-student ratio, which is now the best in Australia. We have increased expenditure in education which makes us now the highest per capita in all of Australia in education expenditure.

The Government is also maintaining its promise to give support to independent schools on a needs basis, and 80 per cent of that support goes to the Catholic sector. We would not deprive that sector, because we know the valuable work that the Catholic church does in providing education for that sector. It has become quite obvious that this Government has spent considerable sums on education. In no way has it cut back on education spending, as the campaign has tried to indicate. I remind the member for Mitcham, who has left the Chamber, that, if he reflects on the promises made prior to the last election and if he refers to the 14 or 15 points I have made, he would see plainly that this Government has honoured its election promises.

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): I refer initially to the line of the Chief Secretary. I notice that there has been a considerable additional provision for the Police Department, but I regret to say that there has been no additional provision for the Department of Correctional Services. I was concerned to hear statements that were made today in regard to the problem that currently exists at the Adelaide

Gaol and the Yatala Labour Prison. A report on the news last night referred to the fact that a gate at Yatala had been opened, then closed, prison officers had gone over the wall with a ladder and had taken the ladder with them. I went to the gaol because it is in my district. Some time ago, I told the Minister that a number of my constituents were concerned about the breakdown in security from time to time at the prison.

I spoke to the prison officers who are on the picket line at Yatala and, in fairness to those officers, if there has been any imputation by Ministers or reporters that this picket line is in any way aggressive, I wish to put the record straight. I was standing on the road when a vehicle arrived; one of the prison officers in the line said, 'Excuse me, Sir, a car wants to go through. You are obstructing the traffic.' I said, 'I thought that was the general idea', and he said, 'No, we are just acquainting people with the dispute and if they want to proceed that is their business.' The officers in the picket line seemed to be acting in a very restrained and responsible manner.

As the member for the district, I was concerned at what they reported to me: they indicated that a gate, which was not visible to me from the position in which I was standing, at what they called the back of the prison, had been left open for the passage of people going into and coming out of the gaol, when the gaol was manned by senior officers, staff or whatever the term is. The officers on the picket line were concerned that an insecure situation existed. Yesterday, as reported on the news, they locked the gate on their own initiative. I gained the impression that a time lock device was used, so they needed the ladder to get out of the prison, having locked the gate.

It was indicated in a Ministerial statement earlier today that extra officers were employed as a temporary measure following what was referred to as the Tognolini escape in July last year. I gained the impression that that is not the understanding of the prison officers involved in the dispute. They are concerned that at last television surveillance cameras have been installed in the prison and, apparently, it is the opinion of the responsible people that these surveillance cameras can be used to replace officers. I wrote to the Minister on 2 July last year about the provision of electronic surveillance systems. The letter stated:

The provision of electronic surveillance systems and more sophisticated technical devices will be of no use unless sufficient trained officers are maintained to maintain an effective human presence at all times.

I maintain that view and I believe it is the view of the officers. A surveillance camera may be a very fine tool in the business of maintaining security in a prison, but a television camera, in the event of anything untoward occurring, cannot get recalcitrant prisoners under control or back into their cells. This is the point the officers are making. I do not pretend to understand the full details of the dispute on manning scales, but I know that the officers are concerned that the department intends to remove three men from the first watch (I presume that is in the evening) and three men from the second watch. On the day shift, 14 utility officer positions will be created instead of having fixed posts. I am informed that the end result on the day shift will be a reduction from 67 to 53 officers on duty in the prison.

Those officers are probably very conscientious: they have accepted responsibility under the Crown to carry out responsibilities. They did not strike me as being people who would engage in frivolous activities, and I can only assume they have a very serious dispute on their hands. I know from lengthy experience in the trade union movement, both as a worker and an official, that there is

often a tendency on the part of employers, whether private enterprise or Government departments (and I refer to public servants in that capacity, even though the Minister has the final responsibility), to automatically draw the conclusion that the fault lies with the workers.

The Whitlam Government initiated the collection of statistical material on industrial disputation, and one of the things that came out was the fact that consistently a figure of between 30 and 40 per cent of the causes of industrial disputation were directly attributable to managerial policy. Between one-third and one-half of disputations were caused by the direct attitude of management. I do not have the answer to the dispute in the prisons, but I am concerned about the welfare of my constituents in Florey. The problem has been going on for a long time. One of the prison officers said to me this morning, 'Surely to goodness the Government cannot look at this situation in terms of productivity. We are not producing an item for sale. We are trying to contain and rehabilitate people who have broken the law. The Government should give due consideration to that fact and provide us with sufficient and appropriate means to carry out that job.'

I will not belabour that point any further. People realise that there are always two sides to an issue, but I think that the prison officers have a legitimate complaint and I hope that the Minister recognises that and that he will take steps to bring the matter to a satisfactory conclusion, which I hope will include the provision of sufficient staff and the dropping altogether of this idea that the television surveillance camera can replace prison officers. Certainly let them have the cameras, as they could make for a more efficient system, but they should not be used as an excuse to unload a few more Government workers.

Another thing that concerns me is a local matter and maybe I understand a little better than the members opposite who come from more affluent areas of Adelaide some of the real problems that exist in society. Maybe I can understand a little better than they some of the reasons why there is a very serious backlash against the Liberal Party in South Australia. If members opposite do not realise that, they are kidding themselves. I refer to a matter which concerns a lady, whose name I will not mention, but I think it is appropriate that I raise this matter during the Year of the Disabled Person. The lady is seeking some assistance concerning payment for surgical shoes. She has a deformed leg which she was born with, and for years she has had to wear an iron and has been required to have a special boot so she can walk. She is what one might call a middle aged lady at this stage.

During latter years, there has been a marked deformation of the bone structure in her foot that necessitates a change of shoes more frequently, so much so that almost every four months this lady has to acquire two new pairs of shoes made by a surgical bootmaker at a cost of \$400. She made inquiries of the medical benefits organisation of which she belongs and she was told she was not covered there; even if she paid for the optional extras, she could get no coverage. She was in receipt of a deserted wife's pension for a period of 16 years during which time she was able to get full assistance for replacement of shoes. She got a divorce, remarried and as soon as she did that she found out that any assistance she had been receiving was immediately cut off. She is not in a position where she can work; her husband is not earning a great deal and he has to support them both. Of course they are finding it very difficult to buy shoes for her.

I wrote to the Minister of Community Welfare (and I am not casting any aspersions on him), as I could not find any Government instrumentality which could assist. I asked

the Minister whether he knew of any means of assistance. He informed me that the Department for Community Welfare had no programme to assist the lady, nor had the South Australian Health Commission. It was suggested that she try the Department for Social Security for assistance from the subsidy section or that she may be able to get some assistance from an orthopaedic surgeon who may be able to advise her of concessions. I do not know whether she has as yet received any assistance—I very much doubt it. I raise this matter because I feel that, surely in the Year of the Disabled Person, the Government should be paying some attention to matters of this nature and providing some assistance for people, and there must be many of them in the dire straits in which this lady finds herself.

I notice that the Premier in his explanation picked first on wage increases as the problem confronting the State. I found very interesting the revelation of the member for Mitcham concerning the medical officer or doctor who gets paid a considerable salary for sitting around and doing nothing all day. That is hardly looking after the taxpayer's dollar. It goes a lot further than that. People in my electorate who work in Government departments have told me that they are becoming increasingly concerned about the situation. They have not been told to finish up but they have been told that there is nothing for them to do. They just hang about and play cards, for example. That is a very insidious way of getting rid of people. However, it is going on; maybe members opposite do not know it is going on. People are responding to this treatment in a way that I can only imagine is desired. Members heard the member for Peake refer to the situation in the South-East concerning the Woods and Forests Department. I am referring to the E. & W.S. Department; It does not matter which depot it is. People are sitting around with nothing to do, but are getting paid. My advice to them was to brazen it out because precisely what was wanted of them was for them to get up and put in their notice, and thus become one less statistic that the Government must worry about in its wages schedule.

The whole problem that confronts us in Australia in respect to the job situation is one that the Government does not understand. The Liberal Party in South Australia supported the Fraser Government in 1975 with great enthusiasm when Mr Fraser introduced his new federalism. I think many people were unaware of what Fraser meant at the time and maybe, in fairness to members of the Government, they put the best possible light on it, thinking that this was a new deal for the States, that the States would be able to have a new found freedom from what was the great catchcry of the day 'The Canberra octopus'. They perhaps thought that they would be able to do as they liked, that there would be a lessening of centralism.

The Labor Party certainly knew what Mr Fraser was talking about when he spoke of new federalism. What he was talking about was that the Federal Government would have all the money and the States would have all the responsibility. I think that the Premier has just borne that argument out to some considerable extent by the way in which he went on when he went to Canberra for the abortive Premiers Conference at which the Prime Minister told them what they were getting. He conned the lot of them, and then blew the whole thing up by having a great laugh and letting everybody know that in his opinion his own State Premiers, along with the Labor Premiers, had been gulled. Certainly events that have occurred since then have probably wiped the smile off the face of the Prime Minister. Nevertheless, we have now on the record the fact that the Premier is somewhat more aware of what

new federalism is than he was in 1975.

That does not help the people of South Australia and we are going to get into a lot more trouble under this Government than we are in at the moment. I was saying that this attack on wages is one that always comes from conservative Governments and has done so for years. Part of this continuing attack I want to point up because a lot of people see in the paper the average weekly earnings. That is the term that is bandied around, and a lot of people think that they are well below the average. They do not understand the basis for it, and they think that the average person in Australia, for example in the September quarter of 1980, was getting \$252 a week. A lot of people in my electorate do not get anywhere near that; they would not get \$182 a week gross. The average minimum weekly rate in South Australia in that period was \$169 for a male worker and that is a gross figure.

It always intrigues me when I talk to people on good salaries and in professions when they find out that there are people who have to exist in this State on a little more than what they could get if they went on to a social service benefit. There are a lot of people in that category. These people, strange as it may seem, do not give up and go on the hole. They keep plugging away and keep working for those low rates of pay. Goodness knows how they manage.

These people on low wages are blamed for the fact that there was a record breaking increase of some \$17 000 000 over and above the allowance that the Government made. One of the reasons was, particularly, work value wage increases. I do not know whether the Premier is suggesting that once a work value case has been concluded and it has been proved in a court that the work is worth that money that the Government should not have to pay it. I think that the Government made a mistake in its estimation. I will not belabour that point because the Leader has done a considerable amount of work on it.

These people that I referred to—the real people out there as far as I am concerned—are interested in the second point that the Premier makes. The Premier is concerned about the interest on the public debt. That would concern the people of South Australia too because, as we are often being told by members opposite, the Government handles only the taxpayers money, so therefore the people must be concerned about the interest on the public debt. They are also concerned about the interest on their home loans. This is a frightening aspect in the electorate of Florey, where a lot of people went into long-term financing of the smaller-type trust homes. In fact, further out in the bigger homes they went into first and second mortgages at rates of interest which they thought were high at that time. They now know that the rates they were paying then were fairly low. The frightening thing is that we have no control over interest rates in South Australia. I will agree with the Premier on that.

I am concerned about the way in which the Commonwealth Government, which can control interest rates, is allowing them to blow and blow and blow out. I do not know where it will finish. Earlier this year, I went to the Parliamentary Library. I had something in the back of my mind about extortionate rates of interest. I thought that in British law there was something that said that, if a certain rate of interest is charged that can be shown to be an excessive rate, it is not enforceable in law. I found it all right and it horrified me because in the British legal dictionary the definition of excessive rates of interest stated that if you are required by contract to pay more than 48 per cent it is not legally enforceable. We have a long way to go, but what worries me is that if we follow the economics of the Prime Minister we will get to that stage.

More horrifying still was what I found when talking to some young fellows in my electorate. One had been tied up in a contract with a hire purchase company in respect of a loan on a motor vehicle. If I understood him correctly, the rate of interest was 27 per cent flat. The rule of thumb I have been taught in respect of flat rates of interest is that to find out the real rate of interest one has to double it and add one. That gives a total of 55 per cent. If that is correct, according to my information from the library (although I am no lawyer) it appears that that is an unenforceable rate of interest, and it is shocking that somebody should be charged that rate. I am raising this matter because I feel some sympathy for the Premier if he is really concerned about the interest being charged on the public debt. I hope that he is also concerned about the interest being charged on home loans, and I hope that he will do something about it, because it is no good getting up in this Chamber and bleating about it. He should go to Canberra and take it up with the Prime Minister because the Commonwealth Government can control the rates of interest.

Another point interested me when the Premier was expressing his concern about the amount of money that has been spent in excess. He said that because of the Government's plan to denude the Government work force of skilled people in a number of areas it has cost it \$4 300 000 in the current year. I do not think that we should feel any sympathy for the Premier in that dilemma. That was a conscious decision that he and his Cabinet made to unload people from the Government work force. It is unfortunate that I am going to run out of time, because I wanted to develop that theme. In my opinion what is going on in Australia (and again I can see that members on the Government side perhaps do not know it) is the the Prime Minister of Australia is setting out to establish what he firmly believes in—a class system in Australia. It was once referred to as a bunyip aristocracy. What he wants is a minority of Australians that will become increasingly richer and an ever-increasing majority who will become increasingly poor. Do not let us kid ourselves—they are well on the way to that.

From where do these people get their money? A lot of them got it a long way back in the development of the colony but there was a massive expansion of wealth in this country in the 1950's and the 1960's.

Some of them, because of their positions of influence, have cornered the market. We see an intrusion into a debate in this Parliament by the *News*. It is not the first time that that paper has intruded into Government affairs in this State, in other States and, indeed, in other countries. There is a move to deprive the ordinary people of this country more and more of the mere necessities of life. A greater and greater portion of people will lose their homes and their chattels and be reduced to penury by the policies of the Federal Government in Canberra. This Government must make the position quite clear, and put some teeth into the outburst of the Premier and attack the Fraser Government, or else it is just talking through its ear or some other orifice. This is of grave concern to me. I do not want to make a joke of it.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to address myself to the matter under debate, but before doing so I must express my disappointment that, at this hour, we should have only one solitary member of the Government present. The Minister of Education sits in solitary splendour on the front bench like a shag on a rock. Further down, the member for Flinders is with the Government but not of it, and there are no other Government members, apart from

the Minister of Education, who have the courtesy, the integrity or the decency to be present in this House as part of this debate. Actually, he is here only because he has to be here.

The Hon. H. Allison: Will you be interesting enough to bring them back—to life in some cases, by the look of some on your side?

Mr TRAINER: I pause in the hope that *Hansard* will record that interjection for what it is worth, and I will now proceed. I would like to make passing reference to some of the inanities regarding education spouted by the member for Mawson. He seemed to be reading from some blue documents that I understand were circulated by the Minister of Education to his back-benchers to be used in arguments.

The Hon. H. Allison: They were circulated by the Institute of Teachers. Mine are white.

Mr TRAINER: Well, copies were forwarded from the Institute of Teachers with comments that were much more intelligible than were those on the original. The member for Mawson commented about the need not to preclude anyone from education. He and I are on the council of Flinders University. Unfortunately, I was not present to vote on an issue there which concerned him. He sought readmission to a politics course to complete a degree. I was disappointed not to have been present to vote, because, being a compassionate person, I think it important for us to improve the employment prospects of the member for Mawson, as he will not be a member after the next election, and he will have to re-enter the teaching profession. Also, his political knowledge obviously requires much improvement.

We have heard much about how the A.L.P. is to blame for the furor within the field of education, that the teachers, parents, and school councils are imagining everything, and that it is all a result of the Labor Party's efforts. The Government sees reds under the blackboard. If Government members believe that, they will believe anything. The Minister of Education and the Minister of Industrial Affairs have provoked the teaching profession, forcing them, daring them, to escalate the industrial situation until we had the first dispute of that nature—the first time in the history of this State that the teachers had come out on strike. That is unbelievable.

The conduct of the Minister is such that it brings to mind a journal article brought to me by my secretary, I think from the *Australian Women's Weekly*, containing a photograph of the Minister at a function. My secretary and I found this most amusing, because it portrayed the Minister's reading to a group of pre-school children from a book entitled *The Useless Donkey*. I think that illustrates the arrogance of the Government. Not only are the children forced to suffer its educational policy, but also they have to listen to the Minister reading from his autobiography.

The subject on which I intended originally to speak relates to State and Federal expenditure on health, and the issue of Windana, which I raised by way of a question this afternoon. I received a disappointing response from the Minister which led to my making the first personal explanation I have found it necessary to make in this House. The Minister's response was a typical non-reply; many of them are in this category. The *Hansard* transcript next day shows clearly how she plays with words in her replies. In this case, because she was under perhaps more pressure and became a little flustered, her non-reply did not have to wait on the *Hansard* transcript to be identified: it was obvious the moment she resorted to abuse and denigration of me for having raised this matter.

This is typical of how the Minister throws up a smoke

screen, as she did when she was caught out a few months ago pressuring a company that dealt with photocopiers. Members may recall the way in which the Minister made an ass of herself regarding an advertisement, but she threw a smokescreen. We recall headlines about the pressure that she applied to that company and the misuse of her Ministerial office, but those headlines disappeared, and we were regaled with tales of the Minister having had her bum pinched. She was somewhat careless with the truth. The story in the *Advertiser* referred to the incident having taken place in the dining room. The Minister then said that the journalist had made that up, but the journalist assured me that the Minister had tried to mislead everyone and pretend that the alleged incident took place in the dining room.

Mr Keneally: So she had her bum in the bar.

Mr TRAINER: Her bum in the bar and her nickers in a twist.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will be coming back to the clauses of the Bill, I hope.

Mr TRAINER: I will try to get back to the bottom of the problem.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to make a positive effort.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed. This afternoon the Minister may have misled the House with her answer. An hour or so ago, on *Nationwide*, Mr Patrick O'Neill pointed out some unusual facts in relation to the letter from which I was quoting in the question this afternoon. He said that the Minister had replied that she had not seen the letter, but he pointed out that he had shown her the letter yesterday and indeed that she had taken away a copy of it. I have it from another authority that a member of the Health Commission was also provided with a copy of that letter yesterday, and I have it from another source, a member of this House, that that member saw the Minister and a senior member of the Health Commission reading a photocopy of that very same letter yesterday, and looking somewhat perplexed at its contents. It is somewhat strange in view of the way in which the Minister replied to my question this afternoon. May I refer to that? Is that within Standing Orders?

The SPEAKER: A member may not refer to a debate of this session, other than by general reference. A member may not quote verbatim discussion which has taken place previously in this session identifying the fact that that is what he is doing.

Mr TRAINER: I asked a question earlier in general terms regarding that letter, the general terms being whether or not the Minister had been advised of the situation in regard to Windana. When the Minister commenced her response, the Speaker quite properly refused to accept my point of order, because the Minister was entitled to answer the question in any way she saw fit. She continued her reply saying that she had received no reply of the kind that I described to the House and that she would be in no position to quote the views or the response of the Federal Minister until such time as she, as the responsible Minister, received a reply through the Health Commission.

Mr Keneally: Yet she was seen reading it and people knew she had it in her possession.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Patrick O'Neill gave her a copy of that letter.

Mr TRAINER: That is correct: Patrick O'Neill gave her a copy of that letter. Another source has informed me that another member of the Health Commission was also provided with a photocopy of that letter and, as the member for Stuart has reminded me, both the Minister of Health and the member of the Health Commission were

seen reading that letter within the precincts of this building.

Mr Keneally: Obviously, she has misled the House.

Mr TRAINER: As the honourable member points out, the Minister has obviously given a very misleading reply to the House, and that is not unusual for the Minister.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Shameful.

Mr TRAINER: It is shameful. The Minister's attitude to the truth is usually more meretricious than meritorious. The Minister pointed out that letter was not addressed to her. It was addressed to a Liberal back-bench Senator, Senator Don Jessop, and was dated 29 May. In addition to the shameful way in which the Minister has given a very misleading reply to my question (and I would go so far as to say it would appear that she has misled the House), there is something strange in the way that a Federal Minister should give information regarding the status of Windana and his almost final rejection of the application for funding to a Federal Government back-bencher, yet he has not yet written directly to the Minister. I am advised that he has not yet written directly to the South Australian Health Commission. I am also advised that the South Australian section of the Commonwealth Department of Health has not been advised.

It would appear that the Federal Minister has a very low opinion of our Minister in providing information in such a cavalier fashion. It is quite incredible. Words fail me. What can one say about a Minister who plays games with words in such a serious matter? It is an absolute scandal that 90 beds at Windana are empty and the wards are gathering dust. I have seen that the mattresses on the beds are still covered with their original plastic after 18 months. In order that the facts can be put on the record, I will recount for the benefit of the House some of the history of Windana and the way in which this sorry state of affairs has come to pass.

Windana was originally a remand home. An announcement appeared on 8 May 1975 during the time of the previous Government to the effect that the State Government would close the Windana remand home at Glandore. At that stage, the future use of Windana had not been decided. Later that year, on 24 September, there was an announcement to the effect that the former Windana remand and assessment centre at Glandore might become a home for the aged. A little later, on 19 February 1976 it was announced that the Windana Remand Centre would be remodelled as a home for 60 psychogeriatric patients. The Minister at that time said that there would be hostel-type accommodation for about 30 aged people from the southern metropolitan area. The phrase about which the Minister was so scathing in her response to me ('psychogeriatric') appeared, and I will return to that phrase later. Another newspaper article on about the same date stated:

The former Windana remand centre at Glandore is to be redeveloped as a home for psychogeriatric patients. It will also provide some hostel accommodation for elderly people.

There was a need for residential care facilities for psychogeriatric patients in the southern metropolitan region.

The article further said that Windana was 'one of a range of co-ordinated facilities for aged people in the southern metropolitan region'. Something has certainly happened to that co-ordination since then. At that time the Leader of the Opposition (the now Premier), commenting on the press release, did not seem to be too impressed with the fact that Windana was to be closed as a remand home and used as a home for what were described as psychogeriatric patients. His response was that, 'while there was a great need for added facilities for elderly people, there was also a marked upswing in violence and vandalism, particularly

amongst juveniles'. Obviously, he was not too enthusiastic about the proposed use of the premises.

Because of the way in which the Fraser Government seized power and cut the purse strings, the former Government had difficulty in funding the centre, and offered it under an amicable arrangement to various institutions that tendered for it. The Australian Affiliation of Voluntary Care Associations at one time was interested in operating the centre, and the Church of England Elderly Citizens Homes Incorporated and the Helping Hand group at one time considered running the centre, but in the end Southern Cross Homes continued with its tender to operate and manage Windana. Shortly after the election of this Government, an announcement appeared in the *Advertiser* of 8 February, to which I alluded earlier this afternoon, as follows:

A multi-million dollar State Government institution at Glandore which has been unused for the past five years, will reopen as a nursing home. The Windana Remand and Assessment Centre was remodelled two years ago for \$1 000 000 to nurse elderly people needing special care. The Minister of Health, Mrs Adamson, said yesterday she had approved a formal approach by Southern Cross Homes Inc. to operate the institution as a nursing home, subject to final negotiations.

That was nearly a year and a half ago, and still the final negotiations have not been worked out suitably. The Minister stated further that the home would be opened once conditions between the South Australian Health Commission and Southern Cross Homes had been clarified and the Commonwealth accepted the premises as a nursing home. We are still waiting. It is scandalous that beds should be empty when there is such a desperate need for them and that the Minister persists in covering up for her Federal colleagues.

I was very pleased earlier last year to be informed that the remand centre would shortly open. I was very pleased for the people in my district and for all those people in the community who are so easily forgotten because they are so powerless—the frail and the senile, the people for whom the centre was intended. Some comments of mine were published in the local Messenger press on 12 March 1980, as follows:

Although there is a widespread problem in the community regarding the care of aged people whose mental capacities have deteriorated, very few people are aware of it until the problem is personally encountered by them in the form of a neighbor or relative who is afflicted.

Young people do not think much about the problems of elderly people, and neither do middle-age people. I stated further:

Young people give little consideration to their own retirement which they see as being a long way off, so they tend to give less consideration to the problems of old age especially the possibility of physical or mental deterioration.

It is not until people are involved with a relative in that condition that they realise what it means. I further stated:

The shock of finding themselves in the position of having to care for a senile grandparent could be quite traumatic. I have been approached in the past 12 months by a substantial number of people who have found themselves involved in having to care for a senile relative. Some of these people approached me as the member for the district even though they are strong supporters of the Party opposite.

In one particular case, a woman in her early thirties rang me concerning her aunt, someone who had raised her as a child but who was now senile. This old lady was living in a block of flats but she wanders and annoys other people in those flats. The younger woman has no means of taking

her into her house to look after her. She has no space and has little children living with her who could not cope with the strain of living with a senile person. This aged person has been threatened by the manager of that block of flats several times that her lease will be terminated if she did not cease bothering the other tenants. However, she cannot help herself, and yet that person cannot get admission to Windana because Windana cannot open. The younger woman has been applying for her aunt for 18 months, and during that time the matron and the staff at Windana have been giving her the same answer, namely, 'It won't be long now', yet it has been going on for 18 months.

It is untenable that people should have to cope with situations such as these. It is scandalous that the Minister has not been able to bring negotiations with her Federal colleagues to fruition. Something is wrong. That particular case is not the only one by any means. Many others have rung me. One of those, for example, is a woman who herself is not a young woman. She is about 60 years of age and she has a 95-year-old father. Three weeks ago that father, who is a tenant of a Housing Trust establishment for the aged at St Marys, had an accident because of his incapacity to look after himself. His daughter cannot look after him any more because she herself is not well and there are no other relatives with whom that person can be lodged, so he is still hanging on in this Housing Trust flat. He is blind in one eye and has about one-third vision in the other. The neighbours rang the daughter about the noise coming out of his unit. She went around to discover that he had been lying on the floor in a shocking state for 24 hours. Being incontinent, he had fouled himself and was smothered in faeces from head to toe, and the kitchen was covered with faeces. He was badly lacerated on his back where he had fallen and was incapable of getting up himself. He was taken to the Flinders Medical Centre. Physically he was all right; his wound was cleaned up, and he was held there for three days in a geriatric unit, but he was returned to his unit, the social worker saying that that was where he wanted to go.

The daughter tried to get him admitted to the Linden Park Salvation Army Home, but the Major-General said they could not be responsible for him. She tried many nursing homes, but they were all full. She tried Melrose House for the Blind at Gilles Plains; after being put into the car so many times, travelling to these places to be assessed, he was not too enthusiastic about visiting, but eventually she persuaded him to go to Gilles Plains. However, it was full.

The woman rang Windana and was told, 'We have 90 beds here. We have 120 on the waiting list. We can add you to the list, but we cannot tell you when the centre will be open. The Health Commission will not tell us, and apparently the Minister does not know either.' I have related one typical tragic story.

Instead of taking the matter seriously, the Minister chose to vent her spleen on me for bringing up this subject, yet I do not regret doing so, because I think it is an important matter. Very little space is given in the media to the needs of the elderly. As was pointed out on *Nationwide*, they are not organised as a pressure group; there is no pressure group organised on their behalf, basically because they are uncomplaining about their situation. They do not go out in public and say, 'I'm in a bad way; I need to be looked after.' Relatives do not parade the elderly out in public to draw attention to their cause. Normally, if one has a senile relative who wanders, one keeps it quiet—one suffers in silence. One does not parade the fact that one has an incontinent uncle or grandfather, or whoever, who cannot look after himself. It

is not the sort of glamorous cause that attracts people to wage campaigns on their behalf. As a result, we tend to forget the senile elderly people we have in our community.

Many of them have to struggle on alone, like the gentleman I have just described. In my area I have come across quite a few examples of people living in Housing Trust flats, of poor old ladies who cannot cope with looking after themselves and who have no relative in the world to cope with looking after them, and nowhere to be admitted. Where there are relatives to look after them, this places a tremendous strain on the people concerned. What I am about to say may seem to make some young people appear a bit selfish, but the married children or the grandchildren of elderly people are often quite unable to care for the elderly adequately. A typical case could be that of a married couple in their early thirties who may be raising their own young children. Because they may be the only living relatives, they may suddenly find themselves responsible for looking after someone with problems associated with senility, problems that could involve an elderly person who is continually bedwetting or soiling their clothes or losing their memory or repeatedly wandering the streets in a daze, unless supervised 24 hours a day. The continued strain on a young married couple could be extremely painful. Their loyalties could be perhaps split between looking after their very senile grandfather or grandmother and looking after their own children, who also require a great deal of care and attention. Yet, if this not so hypothetical couple were to inquire they would find that there were very few facilities available for the intensive long-term care that is needed for the elderly person suffering from the condition of senility.

I am personally aware of this because of a condition affecting a relative (not a near relative), so I know how serious this problem is. As a result, I take the issue of Windana very seriously. It is sitting there unused, with 90 beds. There are 120 people on the waiting list, and the situation has been going on for 18 months. It is absolutely scandalous that a situation like that should be allowed to occur. I want to deal with this matter at some length at a later stage, so I shall return to this subject when the opportunity arises later in the course of the Supplementary Estimates debate and the grievance debate.

The Minister was quite unfair in her allegation that I do not see any distinction between psychogeriatric problems and those of chronic brain failure associated with ageing. I want to point out that it is just splitting hairs—using words as a loophole to avoid responsibilities on the part of the State Government and the Federal Government—to make a black and white distinction between those two terms. The symptoms of a psychogeriatric complaint originate from environmental factors and are basically the same as those that originate from physiological factors. Loss of memory can be the same whether it is the result of a psychiatric condition or whether it is the result of, say, a brain tumour or just general degradation of the brain cells. It is just playing with words to try to draw a clear distinction between the two. We are talking about people who are in need—weak, old people. For the Federal Government to try to use the excuse that ‘these patients are psychogeriatric cases, you have used the word “psychogeriatric” at some stage in the negotiations, you people from South Australia, and because of that we will not fund Windana’—That is a despicable excuse.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I am pleased to join in this debate. It is one of the rare opportunities that members on both sides of the House have to participate in a more wide-ranging debate on some of the fundamental issues relating

to the economy of this State and some of the policies of both the State and Federal Governments which affect the well being of those people that we represent in this place. There is no doubt in my mind and no doubt in the view of the great majority of residents of this State that the living standards of the great majority of Australians have fallen in the latter part of the 1970's and continue to fall in the 1980's. There is clear evidence of this fact available.

I will refer to some of the indicators that I believe are revealing in this context. Certainly there are the numbers of persons who are unemployed in our community. A growing percentage exists in this State of young people who make up that army of unemployed persons actively looking for work and suffering as a result of not being able to participate in meaningful work in the community. The other telling factor is that which relates to the availability of housing in our community — building approvals for homes are at a disastrously low level in this State. The numbers of families waiting for Housing Trust accommodation is a good indication of the down-turn in the building industry and of the general degree of poverty in the community. The rate at which new applications are being received by the Housing Trust is at an all-time high. It exceeds those rates in most other Australian States, and in fact the total number of persons seeking Housing Trust accommodation is in excess of 20 000 in this State, a far greater percentage of persons than in other States.

The number of men and women and even families seeking emergency housing has risen as well. I understand that there are some 10 000 men, women and children each year now seeking accommodation in men's homes, women's shelters and hostels. Unfortunately, only two hostels in this State accept family units in a crisis accommodation situation. One of those hostels is in my electorate, and it is always crammed with families in desperate need of accommodation. It is conducted by the Lutheran Church and its work is well known and highly regarded throughout the welfare agencies of this State. It unfortunately has not been able to attract any Government funding and may well have to close soon because it has been unable to attract the funding that it should deservedly have.

The increasing number of homeless youths in our community is continuing to be of grave concern to all responsible citizens. The Government report that was brought down some time ago indicated that there are possibly in excess of 6 000 young people in this State who are homeless. There has still been little inroad made into providing adequate housing for those young people and the associated services that those people obviously require. The increase in cost of home ownership is of great concern to those people who are trying to meet mortgage repayments and those who are saving to purchase a home and to meet the deposit gap required by the banking institutions to service the loans that they are seeking. Interest rates have risen steadily in the period to which I am referring in the late 1970's and the early part of the 1980's in particular. That is sending more people, particularly young people, into the rental housing market. Of course it is contributing to the down-turn in the building of new houses.

In the more general areas the cuts in funding for education and the relocation of funding, particularly at the Commonwealth level, from the public sector to the private sector has had effects on the community. Those effects are being felt as is evidenced by recent activity that has been the subject of comment in this debate already. Cuts in funding in health programmes have also brought new pressures on these people whom we would regard as disadvantaged in our community, so much so that the

Commonwealth Government has developed a new category of disadvantaged persons—the working poor in our community. Health is a major concern at the moment to people in our community.

There is once again the fear of illness in so many families—the cost of meeting illness when it arises in a family, the fear of not being able to pay debts and the fear that people will have to go to gaol, as they did in the 1960's, for non-payment, particularly of doctors' accounts. An inquiry was conducted into poverty and debts, and this has been the subject of legislation in this House. The statistics attached to the report of the Law Reform Commission clearly indicate that many people were in gaols in this State for the non-payment of bills associated with illness. Independent surveys that have been done by organisations such as the Brotherhood of St Lawrence, the Australian Council of Social Services and other independent objective welfare agencies clearly indicate that there is a growing number of people living in poverty in Australia.

I mention some of the indicators because they clearly show that there is a relationship between Government policies and the delivery of essential services in the community. If those essential services are diminished, weakened or withdrawn, the community is the worse for it. I have referred to some of the results of those policies.

The only conclusion that can be drawn in those circumstances is that the policies of the present conservative Governments in Canberra and in this State have precipitated these situations. There is undoubtedly a unity of policy between the Liberal Party in this State and the Liberal Party in Canberra. Even if we see some public manifestation of personality conflict and arguing, there is no criticism of the fundamental philosophy that is adhered to by the respective branches of the Liberal Party. There is associated with these policies (and this is the area of most concern for people who care about the overall welfare of our community) a real transfer of wealth going on in our community as a result of those policies both in Canberra and in this State. There is an aggregation of wealth into the hands of those few people who are the most powerful and wealthiest people in our community—whether they be real persons or corporate persons.

We saw an example of this late last year when the Premier, in introducing legislation to amend the Stamp Duties Act, refused to face up to the realities of tax evasion in this State. He was not prepared to bring down amendments suggested by the Opposition relating to instances of which he well knew that were rife in the commercial community in this State. No attempt was made to close up many of the loopholes that exist so that there can be a continuation of this aggregation of wealth in the community and the avoidance of taxes which are required to be paid according to the law of this State. We see it federally, where once again the Government has made many bold statements saying that it is its intention to close up loopholes in the Taxation Act to avoid the incredible tax evasion going on at the moment. Within days or almost hours of this legislation being introduced, loopholes have been found and the tax evasion continues.

There is no sincere effort to penalise, to follow up, to close those loopholes which will stop those many people in our community who fall into the categories I have mentioned of already having wealth and power and having the means to hire people who can help them avoid their duties. As a result, there is less money available to the Government to carry out the essential services, bringing about a decline in the living standards of the people who should be cared for by the Government as its first duty.

The priorities of this Government in its taxation policies

are to abolish succession and gift duties and land tax, and the taxes that relate to wealth, to the small group of people in this State who already have property or other forms of wealth; and in relation to succession and gift duties they have not used their own efforts to obtain that wealth. It has been unearned. It is the unearned increment, as former Premier Tom Playford referred to it in this House on many occasions.

That brought into the coffers of this State, when Sir Thomas Playford was Treasurer, a great deal of money on which to build the economic base of this State on which we rely so heavily today. While undoubtedly succession duties and taxes associated with death have become unpopular, the Victorian Liberal Government and the New South Wales Labor Government have adhered to those taxes. They have said that they will abolish them, but not when. They are an integral part of the taxation system of the two most populous States in this country. It is all very well for Western Australia and Queensland, the resource-rich States, to abolish those taxes, but South Australia is not a resource-rich State and depends very much on its tax base, particularly in its relations with Canberra for Commonwealth-State Financial Agreements, and also to maintain the quality of life.

No taxpayer likes paying tax, but at the moment many taxpayers in our community are most unhappy about the distribution of the taxation responsibility under our system. We have heard from the Leader of the Opposition that long litany of tax increases, or increases in State charges, as the Government refers to them, that have been associated with the corresponding withdrawal of taxation and the aggregation of wealth. The increase in those essentials required for day-to-day living is significant, because the provision of power and gas costs more, as does the use of and the ability to drive a motor car, and so on. For those who smoke and for other ordinary aspects of daily life there are heavy taxes.

The people acquiring the unearned increment are relieved of their taxation responsibility, and we find a maldistribution of taxation and a greater division between the haves and the have-nots in our community. Much of the legislation coming through this Parliament, on the rare occasions when it sits, is aimed at reducing the burden of financial responsibility of the Government. Even in the area of penal reform there is legislation to reduce the number of prisoners in prison, and one of the predominant reasons is to reduce the overall costs falling on the Government.

The recent release of information from the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment through its house magazine indicates what we can expect in the months ahead from the State branch of the razor gang, in relation to what we would have considered basic provisions, such as the Home Handyman Scheme operated through local government, the Noise Control Unit, the activities provided for youth employment, all matters being put to the razor gang for staff cuts or elimination. This is the price we are paying for the philosophy of small government, the philosophy so clearly identified with the Commonwealth and State Governments of the day.

I am concerned that these policies and the way in which they are being delivered to the community are harmful to the democracy of this State. They are not being done through the Parliament. I believe we are operating as members of Parliament in a parlous situation. This year we have sat thus far for some 14 days, and we are now into June. In the first six months of this year we have suffered as a community some enormous blows, and there was a need for the Parliament to sit to consider the issues as they arose, to have the ability for free debate on matters of

great public importance, such as education, transport, the control of the Murray River, the future of the motor vehicle industry, and so on. Many of these matters are being decided in a most undemocratic way without Government mandate. They are being decided by Parliaments outside this State, and they are matters which often require a bipartisan approach, and yet we are denied debates in this House on programmes such as the O'Bahn system, denied the opportunity to put questions to Ministers because of deliberate filibustering in reply, and many other techniques are used to thwart the Parliamentary system.

This Government has nearly completed its second year in office. I looked at the sitting days of the first two years of the Walsh-Dunstan Government in 1965-66; it sat for 155 days. In the first and second years of the Dunstan Government in 1971, Parliament sat for 149 days. If we sit next week and do not resume until late July or early August, in the first 22 months of the Tonkin Government we will have sat for 91 days, which is not an indication of a Government with great faith in the Parliamentary system, the role of Parliament in the community, or the accountability of Parliament and the checks and balances that can be achieved to safeguard the community from unbridled and irresponsible power by Cabinet Government.

I want to raise the specific area of the administration of work being done along the Torrens River. Since this Government has been in office, three major schemes have been announced. First, there was the announcement of the O'Bahn transport scheme and, as part of that scheme, \$4 000 000 is to be spent on the environmental effects of the proposal along the river valley, such beautification works as will be necessary to shield local communities from the environmental hazards of that transport proposal. A second proposal being implemented is \$4 000 000 being spent on a flood mitigation programme for cleaning up the Torrens River, a programme which has been recommended for a number of years. This has come about as a result of studies.

Then there is the rather grandiose scheme of a linear park from the foothills, and it has been estimated that it will cost \$23 000 000. Little effort seems to have been made in explaining to the community how these schemes are to be co-ordinated, what effect they will have in the short term and the long term and the ultimate costing of the schemes. I understand that there will not be a sum in excess of \$30 000 000 spent but that many of the schemes are costed in the context of each other. Unfortunately, the community has not been told this, and I instance here the work that has been done in clearing the Torrens banks for the flood mitigation programme.

Numerous statements have been made by the Minister of Water Resources, who is responsible for that programme, about the need for a flood mitigation programme and the dangers that occur almost every 100 years from massive flooding of the Torrens. Then there is the need to clear up the debris, the non-native tree growth and fauna that has aggregated along the Torrens. This work has brought a great deal of criticism from the communities living along the Torrens. We have been assured time after time by the Minister that this work is being done under the strictest environmental supervision. That may well be so, but I have grave doubts whether the Torrens River committee report is being implemented in the way in which it was envisaged that it should be implemented.

The report continually refers to the need to clear the offending trees and shrubs over a long period to minimise the environmental effects. However, we find that there

has been a massive clearing programme with the use of bulldozers and other heavy equipment, and few trees are now left. There are large mounds of sand and very little else on long stretches of the river. It seemed rather strange to me that the particularly heavy clearing work was done in those parts of the Torrens where bridges would be erected in association with the O'Bahn busway.

I was rather interested to read in the *Sunday Mail* recently that the Minister of Transport announced that environmental guidelines had been prepared for the privacy of residents and in regard to dust nuisance, hours of work and playground safeguards during construction of the \$40 000 000 north-east busway. He went on to say that work on the first stage of the busway would begin 'next week' with the planting of more than 5 000 trees and shrubs in the Torrens Valley. The Minister has stated that the clearing work is the first stage of the building of the O'Bahn busway and the provision of environmental effects.

I ask why the community was not told from the beginning that this work constituted the start of the building of the O'Bahn busway. Just two weeks prior to the announcement by the Minister that the O'Bahn busway work was beginning, the *Sunday Mail* announced that the Minister was advertising for a project construction manager for the busway; it was stated that construction of the north-east suburban busway would begin next January. So we find that confusion is rampant in the community about what is really happening in regard to these proposals. I have written to the Minister of Water Resources on numerous occasions about some of the problems associated with this clearing work, which I now understand involves the compulsory acquisition of part of some 60 properties in my district. Many of the people involved have given the E. & W.S. Department authority to clear shrubs, trees and debris from their property without having seen the plans for that clearing work and without knowing what will happen on the property that they still own.

Further, legal problems have been associated with the delineation of the properties and some clearing work has taken place on private property when the Government did not realise that it was clearing private property. I wrote to the Minister of Water Resources about these matters and asked that meetings of residents and departmental officials be held, to clarify these issues, on 4 March, 1 April and 6 May. On 21 May, I received my only reply from the Minister. In the meantime, I am advised that someone had fully briefed the Hon. Mr Davis in another place, who spoke to the people on whose behalf I was making representations. He advised them of specific details about acquisitions and the nature of clearing work that was to be done. The Minister naturally advises me in his letter that there is now no need to hold such meetings and that the residents have been fully informed of the situation.

I regard this as a most serious matter: information that I would regard as essential, when requested by the local member, has not been provided. Yet, it seems that somehow another member of Parliament has been provided with that information, which has been conveyed to the constituents on behalf of whom the local member was raising this matter. Some 60 acquisitions are involved. Three quite major and very costly programmes are under way for development of the Torrens River involving in excess of \$30 000 000. As recently as two weeks ago, the Minister sent out a circular letter to some residents in my district outlining the plan to plant 5 000 trees in an area of the Torrens River and the effect that that would have on the local community. It is interesting that the plan in association with that letter is dated April 1981; yet, it was

not sent to residents until a couple of weeks ago. Of course, there is no opportunity for local residents to participate in discussions about the planting of trees, the type of trees and where they will go, information that residents would like.

Work is already under way and the decisions have already been taken. A similar situation applies in regard to clearing work on private property. There has been an appalling breakdown of information, which I would not have thought would be controversial information. The Government should advise the local community, which is the most affected by these proposals, about what is going on. Information has not been forthcoming. Representations that I have made have been ignored and there has been some Machiavellian use of representations.

A lot of explaining must be done to the community about these programmes and proposals before the people will be confident that the Government is acting in their best interests and that the recommendations of the Torrens River report are being treated seriously. The matter of the relationship of the North-East busway staff and the Torrens River committee is serious, and I will refer to that in another debate. I hope that my comments will realise some responsible reply from the Ministers involved in this important work along the Torrens River.

[Midnight]

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I bring to the attention of the Parliament my concern about the effects that industrial disputation will have on the financial and budgetary situation in this State. The Minister of Industrial Affairs could help quite a deal and he could make representations to the Minister in the Federal sphere. I want to talk about some of the disputes, such as that at Clyde Engineering at Rosewater, which is in my electorate, and the Telecom dispute, which will affect Australia. We can see in tonight's *News* the headline 'Mail ban will hit South Australia in Telecom row. Phone and telex services will be crippled.' This is unnecessary. Also, we had the dispute last Friday concerning trains, which need not have happened if there had been consultation instead of confrontation. We had a dispute concerning court reporters. We had problems at the Strathmont centre, where there has been a claim for compensation for infections that may occur at the centre. Also, there is the prison officers dispute and a probable national transport strike.

The Clyde Engineering dispute has been going on for four weeks. One hundred and fifty workers who cannot afford to be losing money have been on the grass. A worker on top wages there would be getting \$200 a week; he has now lost approximately \$800 already, and the dispute is in its fifth week, so the loss is getting close to \$1 000. The workers at Clyde Engineering are in the Metal Trades Union. There are 150 members altogether from the A.M.W.S.U. and there are some from the Federated Ironworkers Association. A number of claims have been served on the employers. The principal issues have concerned demands for increased over-award payments, and a nine-day 70-hour fortnight in conformity with A.C.T.U. policy.

The workers resolved in January 1981 to increase the pressures and apply a more forceful organised campaign. Concerning the history of the dispute, on 6 May this year seven members of the Ironworkers Association were required to shift a locomotive in excess of 20 tonnes, a job which had been previously done by cranes and forks. These men at Clyde Engineering were asked to shift it manually. They endeavoured to shift it with bars, but the

bars bent and they were unable to do so. When they complained, the management told them that, if they did not do as they were told and shift it manually, they would be sacked, and that until such time as they intended to do it there would be no work for them. No crane was available because a limitation had been placed on the use of a crane in relation to the claims the men had made. At present, there is a threat that the firm will stand down apprentices. I believe that, with this industrial disputation, our State will be in a much worse position financially as far as the forthcoming Budget is concerned. While men are out of work they are unable to live as they should, as they are not able to buy things or pay their bills. Therefore the State is going to suffer a great deal.

When the seven members refused to shift the diesel locomotive, they were instantly dismissed. Naturally, the members of the two unions decided that they would certainly support them. The reason for the dispute was that the workers served a claim on Clyde Engineering that they require a \$22.40 increase in wages. That amount is not in excess of what is paid by the same company in Queensland or Western Australia. In fact, in Queensland \$28.40 is paid for men doing the same work as that done at Rosewater. In Western Australia the men are paid \$40 a week more. Clyde Engineering at Rosewater has been rebuilding locomotives for New Zealand, and this has brought a lot of work into the State.

On 6 May, when the seven members refused to shift the locomotive manually they were told that they were sacked, and the whole lot when home. On Thursday 7 May they requested that the management meet them and they resolved to withdraw their labour and reconvene a meeting on 11 May. They were told that if they went back to work under the terms of the Metal Industries Award there would be no more problems, their jobs would be open, and the other members would be reinstated. Of course, that is industrial blackmail, and there is no way that such conditions can be accepted.

The situation now is that the members at Clyde Engineering have served a claim on the company for the immediate reinstatement of seven members, and the company agreed to enter into meaningful negotiations on the question of over-award payments. The company agrees in principle to a shorter working week, and supports the establishment of a shorter working week steering committee in accordance with A.C.T.U. policy. At this time, the company is still refusing to talk and the men are still in dispute.

To give some indication of the work that has been done at Clyde Industries, I indicate that 13 locomotives have been built for Western Rail, five for Hamersley Iron, and there is still a further contract for New Zealand for another 12. To give an idea of the skill of the workers at Clyde Engineering, let me say that they built a prototype of what is called a super locomotive, to be used on the New South Wales railway. The result is that Clyde Engineering has a contract to build 80 locomotives for a total cost of \$130 000 000. I think that illustrates the skill and ability of the people who are in dispute at Clyde Engineering.

I say that the high claim is that Clyde Engineering has the ability to provide increased wages, and it also has the ability and a precedent to negotiate on a shorter working week. Clyde Engineering owns or has interests in 40 factories and branches throughout Australia and a further four in New Zealand, the United Kingdom, South Africa and Singapore. It is a company that issued shares in 1944 to the extent of \$600 000. Since that time there has been a one-for-three par issue in 1950, a one-for-two issue in 1952, a one-for-five bonus issue in 1954, and a one-for-

eight bonus issue at a 40c premium in 1961. Including shares issued in connection with the take-overs, issued shares grew to \$8 366 452.

In recent years, this company has had a one-for-three bonus issue of ordinary shares made in 1976, a one-for-four bonus issue was made in December 1977, a one-for-five bonus issue in 1978, and another one-for-five bonus issue in December 1979. In 1979 (these are the latest figures from the Jobson's Year Book of 1981) the ordinary capital had grown to \$14 663 389. Clyde Engineering made a profit of \$9 650 000, equal to 65 per cent. All in all from the start, with a mere \$600 000, in 1975 to 1979, this company amassed the following: \$37 514 200 net profit, from which the shareholders received \$30 490 000. The remaining \$7 300 000 has been retained in the business. All but \$600 000 is the value of the bonus shares which Clyde Industries shareholders gave themselves. This would prove that the employees have a justified claim—that the company does have the ability to pay an over-award payment, or at least to enter negotiations for an over-award payment.

When one looks at the profit, especially the 65 per cent which was made last year, the company can pay extra wages and could also enter into meaningful discussions on a shorter working week. To top all that off, in Saturday's *Advertiser* appeared a small article in the financial pages stating that the company had made a \$18 500 000 deal with Placer. The Placer company owns Fox Engineering. Fox Engineering recently agreed to over-award payments and to a shorter working week. The agreement reached with Fox Engineering provided for an immediate 37½ hour week, plus a 4 per cent pay rise. As from 1 September the hours will reduce to 36 a week, worked on a nine-day fortnight, and as from 5 January next year the men will work a 35-hour week based on a nine-day fortnight.

We can see that the Fox Company, owned by Placer, which Clyde has now bought for \$18 500 000, can certainly afford to do something in South Australia. Clyde would most certainly have been aware of the reductions at Fox when it negotiated to buy that company in New South Wales and, being aware, there should not be any hindering of negotiations in South Australia. The diversified Sydney based engineering group, Clyde Engineering, is to pay \$18 500 000 for the mining equipment operation for Placer Exploration Limited. In a joint statement by the two groups yesterday, the directors announced that Clyde would acquire the Fox manufacturing division of Placer over a three year period. What they are really building at Fox, which has agreed to the 35-hour week and an increase in wages, is a range of products including continuous mining, shuttle cars, diesel mine locomotives, underground conveyers and other auxiliary equipment. When we look at what is happening in other industries we are well aware that in the metal industry there have been many break-throughs in relation to a shorter working week. Some are working a 37-hour week, some 36 hours and some 35 hours.

In the power industry, the chemical industry, oil, brewery, mining, and glass, the employees work less than 40 hours. Here in South Australia we have a wealthy company with plenty of forward orders refusing to negotiate in any possible way, and therefore South Australia is going to be much worse off financially and in many other ways. Whilst we are on the matter of the shorter working week, it is interesting to note that there are over 30 companies now in New South Wales working less than a 40-hour week, and it has all been through direct negotiation—something that I believe our Minister here could assist with by representations to the Federal Minister of Industrial Relations, Mr. Viner. If he would do

that, I think this dispute could be settled and the men could go back to work, earn money, and probably the company would earn a lot more profits.

We see political action taking place. When a company wishes to do something for its workers and recognise their skill and the fact that the company is making a lot of profit out of the workers, everything possible is put in the way. Only as recently as last Friday a large overseas owned company, Alcoa of Western Australia, agreed to a 35-hour week. What do we see there? Immediately the Premier of W.A. said, 'If you are going to do a thing like that, we will reduce your royalties'. I would think that that may be the same as our Premier cutting off the supply of gas. I cannot imagine a company like Alcoa entering into an agreement on royalties unless it was watertight. The same would apply in South Australia and New South Wales as far as the gas supply is concerned.

Recently, there has been emphasis on the trend for the shorter working week; I believe that it is inevitable and that it will come about very quickly. In the recent elections in France, Francois Mitterand was elected on a policy of instituting a 35-hour week without a reduction in salary. I have a copy of a *Le Monde* newspaper of 8 March, which has been translated for me. One of the planks in his platform was the fight against unemployment, and he pledged the creation of 210 000 jobs. It was edged that negotiations would take place for a progressive reduction of the time of work to 35 hours without reduction in salary and the correlated creation of new jobs. That is happening throughout the world, and it will happen in Australia.

When I picked up the *News* of 27 May, I saw reference to a shorter hours win for the A.C.T.U. The Full Bench of the Arbitration Commission had ruled that a 35-hour week case for Northern Territory power workers could go ahead. Mr Viner was one of those who tried to lean on the Arbitration Court so that it would not allow these cases to go ahead, because they are outside the indexation guidelines. He is saying that about the present Telecom dispute. The Arbitration Commission had ruled that the cases could proceed, despite the fact that they began after the wage guidelines had virtually outlawed shorter hours and agreements when they were introduced. Whenever we pick up a paper, we read of problems. Page 4 of the *Advertiser* on Saturday 30 May contained the following headlines: 300 prison staff out indefinitely; court cases affected by a stoppage over tapes; trains out in seniority dispute; 'stop banks bid', say unions; the row may hit car plants.

I refer to a statement made in the courts on Friday. I was quite disgusted to read, in relation to the reporters dispute, that a judge had said that he was disgusted because the reporters were behaving like workmen. What are court reporters but workmen?

Mr Trainer: There are women—

Mr WHITTEN: Perhaps he should have referred to work persons, but what are they? They are workers, and the judge was saying that they were degrading themselves by being workmen. On the same day there was a headline to the effect that a national transport strike was possible, and that an estimated 50 000 members of the Transport Workers Union would stop on Wednesday (today) over a wage claim. They will vote to see whether they will involve themselves in industrial disputation. South Australia will be affected, because I believe that they will vote to involve themselves. They know that they are not getting enough in their wages and they want shorter working hours. The transport workers are claiming an increase of 10.45 per cent, equal to \$20 to \$28 a week, because of what they have lost under indexation in the last two or three years.

Something similar will happen with Telecom, but I do not have time now—

Mr Randall: You've got five minutes.

Mr WHITTEN: I know that the honourable member was a member of the A.T.E.U. Last Thursday there was a secret ballot of Telecom workers in Queensland and New South Wales. Of the 14 200 members who took part, 13 700, or 96 per cent, voted for industrial action. No-one can tell me that the Telecom workers do not have a reasonable claim. They are highly skilled workers, as the member for Henley Beach is well aware, but they have not kept up with the relativities of comparable workers.

Mr Lewis: How much do they get?

Mr WHITTEN: They are paid less than State Transport Authority workers are paid in South Australia. On 29 May 1980, Telecom and the Secretary of the Federal organisation, Mr Mansfield, got together and did a survey which showed that wages paid to Telecom technicians were far too low. Highly skilled tradesmen who had served five-year apprenticeships were receiving \$40 a week less than were clerical workers in relatively junior positions. Telecom wants to negotiate. For 12 months they have been negotiating.

Mr Randall: For 10 years it has been like that.

Mr WHITTEN: I think that many of the unions have realised that they will not suffer this any longer. They will withhold their labour, and they will be successful.

That is the situation. While this dispute goes on, next week the telephone and mail services will not be as they should be, because the postal workers union has come into the act and wants the same conditions, to which its members are entitled. I am pleased that the member for Henley Beach interjected in the way he did—and to advise me—

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

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was happy for the honourable member to have a couple of seconds of my time, but I am grateful for the protection you gave me. I listened with interest to the member for Price, particularly his latter comments in relation to Telecom employees because, whilst those comments were relevant to Federal Government employees, they are specifically relevant, as they apply to State Government employees, to the Estimates that we are debating. The first thing to which the Premier refers in the financial document, when he lists four matters that he says have been basically responsible for the need for these Estimates, is wage increases. We all know why wage increases have occurred at the rate they have. The Leader of the Opposition dealt well with the fact that the Premier tried to claim that the increases were record breaking. They are not record-breaking but they indicate the sort of result that this Premier will reap for the kind of economic policies that he is applying. If charges are increased, if the people of South Australia are squeezed economically, if you are to run an economy that means increased interest charges on home loans and other increases in the cost of living, such as petrol prices, inevitably people will feel the squeeze and they will take the only step available to them—through industrial organisations, they will take steps to try to arrest the deterioration in their standard of living. That is exactly what the Premier now complains about. He is reaping the results of his economic policies and those of the Federal Liberal Government, the Fraser Government, from which of recent times he has been trying to distance himself, with pretty limited success.

The next point the Premier raises is the interest on the public debt. Again, he should not lament that and seek to

explain his problems in the light of it. Increases in the interest on the public debt have arisen precisely because of the policies of the Fraser Government in Canberra, and the Premier encouraged the people of South Australia to vote for that Government not many months ago.

The third matter with which the Premier has dealt and which he says is outside State Government control is the general revenue grant from the Commonwealth. The Premier whinges a great deal about the poor treatment that he is receiving from the Commonwealth Government, but he was the one who encouraged the people of South Australia to vote for Fraserism and now he is getting his just deserts. Unfortunately, the people of South Australia are suffering along with him.

The fourth matter which the Premier raised and which I find particularly fascinating is the fact that the Government of South Australia introduced an early voluntary retirement scheme in September 1980 but, apparently, that was not taken into account in the Budget papers, even though the Budgets debated in Parliament in August-September each year. Surely, a matter such as that should have been dealt with in the annual Budget if the Premier had been undertaking effective and proper housekeeping. Apparently, as Treasurer, he is unable to do that. The people of South Australia are now in a situation in which the State that was in our view a great State is now the State with the highest petrol prices in Australia, a State in which there are huge increases in charges, some of which I will refer to later, the State with the worst unemployment of any mainland State, a State where building works are slowing down, and bankruptcies and the crime rate are increasing, and a State from which people are leaving in thousands (6 000 last year).

This is the situation with which we are confronted at present. What is the response of the Premier of South Australia? His response is 'more of the same'. I do not believe that the people of South Australia will cop more of the same for very long; they will not be prepared to cop the sort of the policy that is set out in the documents that have been tabled with the Estimates. The facts are plain. The State Budget is getting further and further into the red. A joint squeeze is facing the people, a squeeze from the Tonkin Government and a squeeze from the Fraser Government. The people of South Australia are really starting to feel the pinch. Any member of this Parliament who talks to ordinary citizens and wage earners, people in the lower and middle-class brackets, will soon learn that those people are starting to become thoroughly sick and tired of the economic policies that have been foisted on them for almost two years by this Government. I do not believe that the people of this State will cop it for very much longer.

The Premier can hardly complain that it is the fault of Prime Minister Fraser. Indeed, most of the blame can be sheeted home to the Federal Government, but this Premier has the blood of the Fraser Government on his hands. He is the one who specifically invited the people of this State to vote for the Fraser Government, and now he must cop the consequences of that action. There is not very much detail in these papers in regard to the present exact Budget deficit position and what it will be at the end of the current period. One thing on which we can be clear is that it seems on revenue, the Budget position at present has deteriorated by about \$40 600 000 compared to the same period last year. That is an ominous figure for this State. While the Premier can claim that the position is not too bad because of massive transfers from Loan Account to Revenue Account, that condition, as he says, cannot go on forever.

The inevitable message for the people of this State is

that we are soon to confront massive increases in State taxes and charges on top of the increases that have already occurred in the past few months. A very serious situation is developing in this State. The Premier, as Treasurer, and the Government are seeking to shift the burden of the cost of running the State from the more well-to-do sections of the community to the poorer sections, and that is absolutely scurrilous. The rhetoric of the Government is nineteenth century liberalism, but its actions are more like those of Edmund Bourke, the them and us theory—they is the ones that pays, us is the ones that get the benefit. That is the sort of policy that the Government is foisting upon the people of this State.

The charges that have been increased already have included a number of charges that are in the areas of transport and marine, which are my Opposition responsibilities now. Particularly, in July last year bus, tram and train fares were increased by an average of 25 per cent. Further, there have been increases in motor vehicle registration fees, which rose from 12 per cent to 20 per cent in January this year.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: How would you fund the road programme?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I will have something to say about the road programme in a few minutes. Before that, I want to say something about the increases in bus, tram and train fares because it is quite obvious that the Government intends to increase bus, tram and train fares significantly more soon. It seems that the Government is attempting in some woolly-headed way to apply the user-pays principle to public transport. It will never work and the Government will find that it will be counter-productive. I particularly want to refer to some figures from 1978 to show just how woolly headed these thought processes are behind dramatically increasing bus, tram and train fares.

In late October 1978, the then Minister of Transport, Mr Virgo, wrote to the Secretary of the South Australian Labor Party in relation to a motion which had been passed at the annual convention of the Labor Party. It referred to the question of extending free public transport services operated by the S.T.A. At that stage the only free public transport basically was the Beeline bus service, and the motion had sought to increase free public transport in the metropolitan area. The letter was as follows:

In the financial year of 1978-79 it is anticipated that revenue received from fares in the metropolitan bus, tram and rail services will be in the vicinity of \$15 000 000.

No doubt those are 1978 fares. The letter continues:

There are approximately 360 persons in the bus and rail operations engaged in the collection and accounting of revenue. It is estimated that the savings would amount to approximately \$15 000 per person. However, this saving could not be achieved immediately, as in the rail operation it would be necessary to renegotiate agreements with the Australian National Railways Commission, as under the rail transfer agreement the S.T.A. is required to meet 25 per cent of the cost of the staff transfer to the A.N.R., which is the proportion determined for the operation of the metropolitan rail system. Thus in the first year the manpower saving would be \$3 700 per person accruing to the authority, although a 100 per cent saving could be expected within 12 months. Therefore, the cost of introducing free public transport in the metropolitan area of Adelaide can be summarised as follows: revenue loss, \$15 000 000; manpower savings, \$5 400 000; total cost, \$9 600 000 per annum.

The point I take from that is the fact that the fares received by the bus, tram and train services provided in the metropolitan area are a relatively modest amount in terms of not only the State Budget as a whole, but also in terms

of the cost of operating the S.T.A. service. I believe that increasing fares dramatically, for example by 25 per cent, provides a positive disincentive, stopping people from using public transport. I have a high regard for the Minister's integrity and I believe he will acknowledge this point, but I am sure that some of his advisers no doubt would argue back at me that there are figures to show that when the 25 per cent increase occurred the patronage did not drop off all that much, or if it did, it has since recovered.

However, there are no figures to indicate to what extent people who were not using public transport at that stage, who might have been in the position of considering using public transport, were deterred from doing so because of these increases. I think that is an important consideration. There is a marginal economic situation, particularly in the outer suburbs of this metropolis, where people consider that it is no longer an economic proposition to take a motor vehicle to travel to work, and they decide they will take a tram, bus or train.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Did you know that the average fare at the time you are talking about in 1978 was 20c or 25c because of the huge concessions that this State gives? I am not saying that the State should not give concessions, but we give huge fare concessions.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are sometimes tolerated even though it is improper, but a complete speech cannot be tolerated.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Presumably the 1978 figures that I have quoted can roughly be equated with the figures now.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The average fare—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Certainly the amount would be far more than \$9 600 000 now (I do not deny that for a moment), but that was the figures in 1978. The Minister mentioned the concessions that are already given and I concede, if my memory serves me correctly, since 1978 additional concessions have been granted. For that very reason the proportionate amount that it might cost to abolish fares altogether is probably less than it was at this time.

I want to deal briefly with the question of concession fares. I have had a lot of correspondence from the War Widows Guild of Australia since I have been shadow Minister. I am sure that the Minister has had similar correspondence because he was mentioned in a letter that Mrs Mayo gave to me. The letter stated that she had written to the Premier following the election, bringing to his attention the anomaly that she sees in the fact that war widows are not able to receive concessions. She said that she wrote to him on 4 December 1979. The letter was briefly acknowledged and she stated that 'one could imagine my astonishment when the Premier advised that he had asked his Minister of Transport to advise him on the proposal'. I would not see any astonishment in that move, but no doubt the ways of the Government are particularly mysterious to ordinary members of the public. The letter states:

Late in February last year Mr Tonkin wrote to me refusing our request. He also kindly told me that war widows received their pensions as payment for their husband's lives. He explained that to give all war widows a State concession card would incur a significant reduction in State revenues.

I will not take up further time of the House going through the whole of that letter. It basically sums up the case of war widows for concessions. I frankly think that in justice and equity they have what amounts to quite a good case. They are in a different category from other pensioners, but this lady points out that one of her members was particularly galled to stand at a bus stop with seven ladies

and on entering the bus, to find that she was the only one paying full fare. I think that is a matter to which the Government should pay particular attention. In fact, I do not believe it would cost a great deal. It will be difficult to calculate how much this would cost. I understand there are not too many ladies in this category. I think that this is a step in all equity which the Government could take and one which should not have to wait for the election of a more humane Government when the Labor Party takes the Government benches in 1983.

Having dealt with those matters, there are one or two things to which I would like to refer. I have noticed in the press, particularly during my absence overseas, some comments in relation to the question of O'Bahn and the north-east transportation question. I want to take a couple of moments tonight to make quite clear that the Opposition's position has not fundamentally changed at this time.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I thought you said—

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If the Minister will hear me out, I will be only too happy to explain the situation to him. The Opposition's position in relation to north-east transport has not fundamentally changed at this point in time. We support the construction of a fast modern tramline between Tea Tree Gully and the city using the Torrens Valley. What I have said is that by the time the next election comes around in maybe another two years, as this Parliament could go to June 1983, the situation by then might be quite different. In those circumstances, we will have to review the situation in the light of the then existing circumstances. Why those circumstances will be different or how they will be different will depend on the progress that this Government has made in pursuing its policy of implementing an O'Bahn. It would be quite obvious to all citizens of this State that, as a responsible political Party and a responsible Opposition, if this Government has already gone a long way down the road in constructing the O'Bahn, we will be presented with a *fait accompli*.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: We said the same about the l.r.t.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes. On the other hand, if at the next election we are in a situation where we have a free hand, then again we will have to review the whole project in the light of the existing circumstances in relation to technology and developments that have been made.

The announcement to build the O'Bahn was made prior to the last election. The decision to build an l.r.t. was made about 18 months before that, or certainly some time before. I heard in the House this afternoon the Minister refer to modern transport technology in France with rubber wheels on urban passenger transport.

Dr Billard: The V.A.L. system.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Yes. That is an example of developments in technology that may occur between now and when we take the Treasury benches in 1983. As I pointed out at a meeting at St Peters—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: I'm sorry I wasn't there.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The people of St Peters were unhappy about the fact the Minister was not there.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Why did they hold it three days after I left for overseas?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I was wondering why they held it three days after I was appointed shadow Minister, but no doubt they had their own good reasons for holding it when they did.

I will now deal with the question described in the *News* tonight as the State's worst road. I am pleased to see that the member for Mawson is here (he will be here for such a limited amount of time that I have not quite got the face

related to the electorate). The article refers to the issue of Morphett Road near Trott Park. I have seen that road. I saw it on Sunday when I drove down it in my four-wheel drive. Fortunately, I was able to pass over that road without difficulty. Unfortunately, not all people in the community are able to have four-wheel drive vehicles. I do not know whether the Minister intends to encourage the use of four-wheel drive vehicles by the poor standard of roads such as Morphett Road at that point, but certainly that is what he is doing. I should be very interested to hear whether the Minister intends to direct the Highways Department to reorder its priorities so that that road can be urgently upgraded.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: It's a local road.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It might be, but the Minister knows the history of that road. In fact, the reason why it has been left to deteriorate to that degree is that there was some question whether or not the southern freeway was going to be constructed.

Mr Schmidt: Who put a moratorium on it?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The Labor Government. Indeed it did, and everybody understands why it did that. The point has been reached where it is becoming quite clear that the southern freeway is a long way from being constructed. Nobody is debating that.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Maybe never.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Maybe never. In those circumstances, given the fact that the road was held in this state because of the likelihood of the development of a southern freeway it now well behoves this Government to give some assistance to the local authority so that the road can be put into some sort of reasonable order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am amazed to hear the suggestion that they have not asked for it. Possibly the fact that the member who made that interjection never goes to that part of the metropolitan area explains his ignorance. I am informed that the local authority has in fact sought a grant.

Mr Schmidt: You haven't spoken to the town engineer, have you?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I have not, but I am informed that a grant has been sought.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The member for Newland means that they didn't make it a top priority on their local road application.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I am pleased that the Minister has been able to try to fish the member for Newland out of the difficult waters that he was getting into. It is even more interesting that the member for Mawson had to be corrected by the Minister.

I want to raise the fact that this road would only require about \$300 000 of highways funds to correct the shocking situation that exists. I believe that the fact that something has not been done about this shows the lack of flexibility in this Government.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: How do you know that nothing has been done?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: When I drove down it on Sunday there was no indication of anything being done about it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: You do not think that the planning process applies, that it is being discussed, or anything like that?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The information I have is that no indication has been given by the Government that it is prepared to contribute towards this at the present time. Tomorrow night the Minister may intend to equip the member for Mawson with documentation indicating that he is going to save the member's bacon. The

information that is available to us tonight indicates that the Government is being intransigent on this matter. I express on behalf of the Opposition my hope that the pressure being applied to the member for Mawson will be effective in ensuring—

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: He has worked very hard.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have seen the comments in the local press from the member for Mawson. He has not been working hard on the Government, but on local government. I want to express the Opposition's belief that the road should be funded as a matter of high priority by the Government so that people in this area do not have to suffer the indignity of travelling on it and the sheer embarrassment of not being able to travel on it in wet weather.

Mr KENEALLY (Stuart): I want to concentrate my remarks within the line relating to the Minister of Water Resources and Irrigation. Yesterday afternoon I was accused by the member for Rocky River of telling lies.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Stuart to withdraw the words 'lies'. It is unparliamentary, and it will not be tolerated in this House.

Mr KENEALLY: What would be the position, Sir, if I were to point out to you in *Hansard* that that is exactly the word that he used in asking a question?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked a question of me. It is a question which I have previously addressed during this day's sitting. The word used by the honourable member for Rocky River was 'cry'. It is a fact that, in the first draft of *Hansard*, an alternative word 'lie' was inserted. I have checked the record, and the honourable member for Rocky River did not use the word that the honourable member has attributed to him. I ask the honourable member for Stuart, without further qualification, to withdraw the word.

Mr KENEALLY: Certainly I will withdraw the word. Earlier yesterday afternoon the member for Rocky River asked a question of the Minister of Water Resources, and informed all and sundry that I had been circulating false information, and also that my Leader had been circulating false information about the Murray River and the problem of salinity. I find appalling the level of debate that has taken place in South Australia on this important issue, the lifeline of this State. There is no debate. We have on the one hand a person making some quite irrational statements, the other side of the argument not being put at all. We find our Premier being held up to ridicule in the interstate press for what he has been saying in South Australia. That does South Australia no good, and it does the discussion and debate not one bit of good.

On 27 March 1981, because I was concerned about the Murray River and the deteriorating water quality that we were receiving, I wrote to the Acting Premier in the following terms:

Dear Mr Minister,

I was pleased to read in the press that your Government is prepared to hand over control of the River Murray to a national authority that would manage this most important resource for the good of all Australians unhindered by State parochialism and petty political point scoring. The Opposition is in complete agreement with your Government on this important issue and commends the Minister of Water Supply on his statement.

The Opposition believes the future of the River Murray is of the most critical importance to South Australia and is one of, if not the, major challenges facing this State. A secure water supply of good quality is not only vital to the State's future development but necessary for a continuance of our present living standards. The difficulties facing the continued

viability of the River Murray are well documented and widely understood. However, constructive debate on the remedies necessary has been less prominent.

Understanding that your Government is at one with the Opposition on the importance of the River Murray, I call upon you as Acting Premier and Leader of the House to make time available during the June sittings of the current session of the House to enable the South Australian Parliament to fully debate this matter. Hopefully such a debate will result in a unanimous and bipartisan approach to the River Murray enabling the Parliament to recommend to the other parties to the River Murray Waters Agreement workable solutions to the problems faced.

Two months later I received a reply, signed 'David Tonkin, Premier.' It states:

Dear Mr Keneally,

I refer to your letter of 27 March 1981 to Mr Goldsworthy, the then Acting Premier, about the quality of water to South Australia. Whilst it is appreciated and pleasing that we are as one on this most important issue, I feel that little would be gained in discussing the finer points of this matter in the House.

Ministers of the four Governments party to the agreement met in Canberra earlier this year to discuss a draft new agreement which included the proposed water quality provisions. The New South Wales Minister for Water Resources has indicated to the Commonwealth Government that the draft agreement in its present form is acceptable as far as his portfolio is concerned. He has, however, referred the draft agreement to other relevant New South Wales Ministers for their comment. It is hoped that a final resolution will be forthcoming soon.

I received that letter four days before the Premier declared that he was going to cut off the gas supply to N.S.W.—an idle threat, as he later said. That would be similar to my going out and threatening to shoot Lindsay Thompson, the Premier of Victoria—an idle threat, of course—hoping to get a headline to bring Victoria to understand the degree of pollution being placed in the Murray River. The Premier's statement was ridiculous, and my response, if it were serious, would be equally ridiculous.

There has been built up, as a result of this press activity, this headline grabbing by the South Australian Premier, a bitterness between New South Wales and South Australia. I have received a report from a person who came back from Bourke, in New South Wales, and who had asked people there what were the problems. They expressed in the most bitter terms their disgust with what the South Australian Government is doing. I am not prepared to accept that, but I point out that this bitterness is building up because of the irresponsible statements being made.

Let there be not the slightest doubt in anyone's mind as to the Opposition's policy on the Murray River. We are totally opposed to any future development on the Murray River or its tributaries that will adversely affect the quality of the river water, whether that development be in New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia. We strongly support the establishment of a national water authority that would manage the nation's scarce water resources in the interests of all Australians. Until a national water authority is established, we strongly support the vesting in the River Murray Commission of power to control water salinity.

The Opposition calls upon the Federal Government to, as a matter of extreme urgency, provide funds sufficient to construct the necessary salt mitigation works and water filtration plants that will ensure good quality water for the Adelaide, Spencer Gulf, and other town water supplies in South Australia, and good quality water for the State's irrigators.

It is interesting to read a response from the Prime Minister to a letter he received from the member for Grey, Mr Laurie Wallis, and I quote from that letter as follows:

I have had the matters you raised examined and am advised that the filtration of water in the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline is essentially a State responsibility. You will be aware that, following sharp increases in recent years, general purpose funds to South Australia under the Commonwealth Government's tax sharing arrangements are estimated to increase in 1980-1981 by a further 11 per cent over their 1979-1980 level of \$697 000 000. This assistance has increased the resources available to the South Australian Government and may be spent on projects, such as the proposed water filtration works, according to the State's own priorities.

The Commonwealth already provides substantial assistance to the States for water-related projects under the National Water Resources Programme. In 1980-1981, it is estimated the Commonwealth will provide \$26 000 100 to the States under this programme, an increase of 25 per cent over the funds provided in 1979-1980. Of this amount, \$5 725 000 will be provided to South Australia for water resources assessment, Murray valley salinity mitigation and the Adelaide water treatment scheme.

That was a piffling amount that would hardly make an impression on the critical situation that we are facing. The Commonwealth Government has the resources to provide the money to construct the capital works required, and it is not prepared to do so. There should be an agreement between the Government, the Opposition, and all South Australians to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government to provide the resources so badly needed.

To understand the problem we face in South Australia with a water supply of deteriorating quality, we must know where the major salinity inputs occur. On 28 September 1979, Maunsell and Partners completed a report on Murray salinity and drainage. This report is accepted by the Murray River Commission, the Federal Government,

and the Governments in New South Wales, Victoria and, hopefully, South Australia, as authoritative work on Murray River salinity. On page 2, the report, under the heading 'Murray River salinity', states (and I ask honourable members to try to note these comments):

River Murray salt loads (although they vary considerably with flow and are highest in years of flood flows) can be used to identify the sources of salt in the system. In a normal year, the total salt flow to South Australia (as measured at Lock 6) is estimated to be about 1 100 000 tonnes made up of:

Tributary and main stream inflows, about 600 000 tonnes;

Drainage inflows, 250 000 tonnes;

Groundwater inflows, 250 000 tonnes.

A further 500 000 tonnes of salt is added to the river in South Australia (generally from groundwater sources) of which nearly 300 000 tonnes is diverted at irrigation and town supply offtakes.

This is the critical point that the Minister of Water Resources tries to swim over:

As the salt inflows from the major tributaries result from catchment conditions and are contained in large quantities of water at low concentrations, it is only the drainage and groundwater inflows that can readily be intercepted to produce water quality improvements.

The only sensible comparisons that can be made on salinity in the Murray River can be made on controllable salinity. There is no-one except the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources in South Australia who includes uncontrollable salinity, the natural salts in natural freshwater flows, in the figures of salinity inputs. The Maunsell report lists the salt inflows by State into the regulated lower Murray River. I seek leave to have that table inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is purely statistical.

Leave granted.

EXISTING SALT INFLOWS BY STATES INTO A REGULATED LOWER RIVER MURRAY
Units: Thousands of Tonnes of Salt per Month

Source of Salinity	New South Wales		Victoria		South Australia			
	Inflows	Diversions	Inflows	Diversions	Inflows	Diversions		
● Tributary Flows that seriously worsen Murray quality	Edward R.	0.4	Goulburn R.	0.7	National Channel	0.7		
			Campaspe R.	0.2				
			Loddon R.	0.7				
● Tributary flows that improve Murray quality (equivalent salt removal)	M'bidgee R.	-1.9						
	Wakool	0.1	Barr Ck	7.3	Tutchewop	2.1	Lock 5-	
			Swan Hill	0.9	Woorinen	0.8	Berri	8.8
			Psyche				Upgrading Basins	1.1
			Bend Lake	1.1			Berri/Loxton	0.7
			Hawthorn	1.0	Hawthorn	1.0	Loxton/Cobdogla	1.7
			Sunraysia	0.8				
			Red Cliffs	0.3				
			Robinvale	0.5				
							Renmark Res.	2.1

EXISTING SALT INFLOWS BY STATES INTO A REGULATED LOWER RIVER MURRAY

Units: Thousands of Tonnes of Salt per Month

Source of Salinity	New South Wales		Victoria		South Australia					
	Inflows	Diversions	Inflows	Diversions	Inflows	Diversions				
● Groundwater Flows	Wakool R.	1.7	Buronga	2.8	Cobram/	Sunraysia	Lock 9/6	6.3	Rufus R.	2.3
			Sunraysia		Torrumbarry	Diversions	Lock 6/5	3.0	Riverland	
	Mildura/		Diversions	2.2	Torrumbarry/		Lock 5/		Diversions	21.6
	Merbein	3.0	Coomealla	0.5	Barham	1.1	Berri/	3.4		
	Merbein/				Barham/		Lock 4	0.3		
	Lock 9	2.3			Tooleybuc	1.3	Lock 4/			
					Euston/		Lock 4/			
					Nangiloc	1.0	Loxton	0.5		
					Nangiloc/		Loxton/			
					Red Cliffs	3.4	Cobdogla	0.6		
					Red Cliffs/	} 2.7	Cobdogla/			
					Mildura		Waikerie	16.3		
					Mildura/		Waikerie/			
				Merbein		Morgan	2.7			
				Merbein/		Morgan/				
				Lock 9	1.1	Wellington	0.8			
Totals	6.1	5.5	25.2	11.7	45.1	27.1				

Mr KENEALLY: Using this table to ascertain the percentage of the total controllable salt inflow for which each State is responsible, we find that the breakup is as follows: New South Wales, 8 per cent; Victoria, 33 per cent; and South Australia, 59 per cent. However, as the Minister pointed out, each State has instituted diversion programmes, South Australia diverting 325.2 tonnes per year. Allowing for these diversions, the percentage breakup for each State then is: New South Wales, 2 per cent; Victoria, 44 per cent; and South Australia, 54 per cent. It is of more than passing interest, despite the Minister's comments earlier, that the report on page 27 states:

The Murrumbidgee flow has been recognised as generally improving Murray salinities at Euston.

The Murrumbidgee River improves the quality of water, and that is one of the rivers that the Minister condemns in the New South Wales river system. The report also stated:

Contributions by the Darling River have been taken as releases under the River Murray Commission control.

That is not New South Wales control. Thus, it is not listed in the New South Wales table. It is also interesting to note that one river in Victoria, the Barr Creek, places more controllable salt into the Murray River than does the whole of New South Wales. Table 9 of the Maunsell report shows existing salinities for the regulated lower Murray River, and I seek leave to insert it in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

EXISTING SALINITIES FOR REGULATED LOWER RIVER MURRAY

River Murray Station	Echuca	Swan Hill	Euston	Mildura	Merbein	Wentworth	Lock 9	Lock 6	Berri	Waikerie	Morgan
Regulated Discharge	8 400	4 000	4 000	2 400	2 200	4 100	2 900	6 400	5 000	4 100	3 900
Post Dartmouth (megalitres/day)											
Expected Salinities (EC units)	80	173	225	367	500	532	550	515	678	988	1 042

Mr KENEALLY: Reference to this table shows that the expected salinity at Lock 6, just this side of the State border, is 515 units. A few river miles downstream at Morgan, that level has more than doubled to 1 042 units. The salinity content of the water from which most of South Australia's water supply is obtained doubles in the district of the Minister of Water Resources.

That is the existing position in the Murray River and its tributaries. Whatever the Government says about the Murray River, the facts remain that the salinity content of the river doubles from Lock 6 to Morgan. I do not wish to blame anyone, and I will cover that point later. Special

attention should be given in this debate to the Darling River. Many people do not realise that the Darling River does not normally flow into the Murray River: it flows into the Menindee Lakes, where the water is stored and released as required. However, in times when the lakes are full or in times of high flow, the Darling River naturally flows into the Murray River. It has not done that from some time, because there has been a drought, and the Darling River is not flowing at all. It will be flowing now, because there have been big rains in the catchment areas. The major catchment area for the waters that normally fill the lakes is the south-western rivers of

they will have a dramatic effect on our water supply in about six weeks.

The eastern tributaries, such as the Bogan, Macquarie, Namoi, etc., are regulated streams, and in a normal year only a minimum flow reaches the Darling River. As a consequence, these rivers are not normal contributors to the Menindee Lakes. The lakes consist of a huge, shallow storage area where high evaporation exists, and currently, because of the severe drought in Queensland and New South Wales, which has recently broken, the Menindee Lakes are at about 30 per cent capacity. The salinity of this water is over 1 000 EC units. In November and December 1980 and January and February 1981, the Murray River Commission authorised the following releases from the Menindee Lakes to the Murray River: November, 28 gegalitres; December, 107 gegalitres; January 1981, 96 gegalitres; and February, 32 gegalitres. Quite obviously, a source of water that in a normal year has a beneficial effect on our water had, over that period, an adverse effect.

I do not question the Minister's statistics when he said that over a six-month period 34 per cent of the salt came from that part of the Darling River, and in January 69 per cent came from that part of the Darling River. It occurred because of releases that the Murray River Commission, with full knowledge of the situation, approved, not from any activity in the irrigation areas of New South Wales. It came from the storage area, the salinity of which increased dramatically because of high evaporation and low river flows.

The quality of the Murray River water supply to the majority of South Australians is poor and unacceptable. Despite the Premier's diversionary tactics, that fact will not disappear. The quality of our water is not the fault of the new licences that are being considered for issue in New South Wales next year. The quality of water today is the result of what happens in the Murray River today. Solutions to the current salinity inputs are achievable, so let us all get together and encourage the Federal Government to meet its responsibilities in this area. I seek a non-political approach to this problem, but unfortunately it has been politicised. The Opposition believes that it is the responsibility of any South Australian Government to concern itself with developments on the river by upstream States. The Dunstan and Corcoran Governments did so, and it is appropriate for the Tonkin Government to do likewise. One of the two developments causing South Australia most concern are the Shepparton programme of reducing water tables to free agricultural land for development, which is estimated by the Maunsell report to place 142 000 tonnes of salt per annum into the Murray River. That is what will happen as a result of the Shepparton water table development programme; it will place 142 000 tonnes of additional salt into the Murray River. The Government's attitude to that development would be interesting, because the total salt input into New South Wales to date is not as great as 142 000 tonnes.

The other programme of concern to South Australia is the consideration that is currently being given by the New South Wales Government to the issue of new irrigation licences. However, before we consider what New South Wales is doing in this regard, we should appreciate the South Australian Government's policy on the issue of new licences. This is what the Liberal Party put to the people of South Australia prior to September 1979, and I ask members to listen very closely. The Liberal policy speech stated:

We reaffirm our policy for improved use of River Murray water by divertees during periods of free flow. This will provide greater opportunities to increase productivity and at

the same time protect the interests of South Australians dependent on this source for their water supply.

This action will also allow additional water above the allocation provided in the divertee's licence for the production of fodder and similar crops in times of free flow.

In large part, that is the same policy as the New South Wales Government is currently considering. It is considering issuing licences at periods of high flow. That is exactly the same policy that the South Australian Government has and exactly the same policy that the South Australian Government put to the irrigators on the Murray.

I recently met with the Minister in New South Wales, Mr Gordon, and the Chief Commissioner of the Water Resources Commission, Mr Cuneen. These gentlemen provided me with an extensive six-hour briefing of New South Wales activities on the Murray and Darling River systems through the agency of Neville Rees, Commissioner, Bill Youll, Chief Engineer, Peter Millington, Engineer in charge of Flood Management, Warren Martin, of the River Murray Commission, and Simon Fels, Salinity Engineer. I was given six hours with the top officers of the New South Wales Water Resources Commission, because they are concerned about what is happening between South Australia and New South Wales and they are concerned that someone might be wishing to talk to them to find out what the position is.

The New South Wales Minister and his officers fully appreciate the critical situation South Australia faces with the Murray River and the dependency this State has on it. I was given information that contradicts the claims of the Premier and the Minister that New South Wales was approving an additional 250 000 hectares for irrigation. Accordingly, I provide to Parliament a breakdown of the licence applications so that if the Minister has the proof that these applications, if approved will affect the quality of our water, he can provide a detailed report to this House of this proof so that the Parliament and the people of South Australia can be aware of the technical details, and we are entitled to have them.

These are applications for 250 000 hectares. Seventy thousand hectares is in the Murray, Murrumbidgee and Lachlan areas, and they are largely replacement applications. That leaves 180 000 hectares for the Darling. Forty-five thousand hectares is included in replacement licences. Fifteen thousand hectares was applied for after the embargoes were in force some four years ago, and of course, will not be considered. There are 25 000 hectares for high flow licences on regulated tributaries of the Darling, so they can be applied only when there is sufficient water coming down the Darling that would not affect downstream users. This leaves 95 000 hectares to be considered for licences. About 50 000 hectares is on regulated streams applied for prior to the embargoes which applied four years ago. The remaining 45 000 hectares on the Darling—Barwon will be licensed only with high flow conditions attached if they are licensed at all. That is the same policy that the South Australian Government has.

If the Minister can provide the Parliament with proof that these licences threaten South Australia's water supply, I am prepared to give an undertaking that I will use my good offices with the New South Wales Minister and the Government to resolve this difficulty that seems to apply between the New South Wales Minister and the South Australian Minister as to what actually is the position. The New South Wales Government has studies proceeding on its own initiative to ensure that any licence granted will not adversely affect downstream users. All the results they have show that that is the case. I repeat that if

the Minister or the Premier can prove otherwise, the Parliament is entitled to a detailed report that can be considered here. Unfortunately, the Premier refuses to allow us to have a debate in this House on this critical issue. We all agree on that, yet the one forum in South Australia that is the most appropriate to debate this matter of great concern is being denied that opportunity.

The Minister of Water Resources has compiled what he terms a salinity action file. He says this, in part, in a covering letter to which I have had access. That file has been sent to people and organisations who are concerned about the problem and who are willing and able to do something about it. That file has been sent to all and sundry, but it has not been provided to the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia and it has not been provided to me as shadow Minister of Water Resources. We are told by the Minister that this is a non-political thing, yet we have not been provided with this document. It has been provided to New South Wales. I have seen some of my Federal colleagues, and they have been provided with it. I am sure that members opposite could mention numerous organisations that have been provided with a salinity action file. I would have thought that the Leader and I ought to be provided with a copy, and that copy should have been kept up to date. I think that somehow we have reason to complain about this. It is a reflection upon the Government; it does not wish to develop a bipartisan attitude to the Murray River which the Opposition is seeking. We are looking for a co-operative approach between the Government and each State to overcome our dilemma.

We are not seeking to blame anyone, whether the Government or irrigators, for the current problems, which have only been fully understood in recent years. We will not blame New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia

for the current input of salinity. What we want is to have a full acknowledgement by all authorities involved as to each authority's input into the Murray River, and, by an acknowledgement of one's own position, one is then able to negotiate with the other parties. I found it very difficult when I was in New South Wales to impress upon the gentlemen there that we were concerned about what they were doing when they could easily point to proof that South Australia was placing more controllable salts in the River Murray than New South Wales was doing. Let us have no more about including uncontrollable salts in free freshwater flows. The Maunsell Report ignores that, because it says that that salinity cannot be controlled, and in fact there is so much water that it has no effect at all. It is the concentrated salinity that comes from irrigation and groundwater inflows that has the most dramatic effect on River Murray salinity, and that can be overcome if funds are made available.

We want to see a full constructive debate on possible solutions. I was told, for instance, that in New South Wales it is believed that using fresh water as a flushing agent is not a wise use of such a valuable resource in such a dry continent. It is interesting to record that in 1977-78 South Australia's total diversion of Murray water for town supply and irrigation was 18 per cent of the water that flowed into the State. In 1978-79 it was 5 per cent, and in 1979-80 it was 13 per cent. The balance was either lost in evaporation and seepage or ran into Lake Alexandrina. I have statistics from the River Murray annual reports which I would like to have inserted in *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that they are purely statistical?

Mr KENEALLY: I can.
Leave granted.

RIVER MURRAY STATISTICS

	1977-78		1978-79		1979-80	
	Megalitres	%	Megalitres	%	Megalitres	%
Total Flow entering S.A.	3 773 000	100	9 140 000	100	3 880 000	100
Total diversions within S.A.	674 613	18	480 469	5	492 465	13
Evaporation and seepage losses within S.A.	235 600	6	177 900	2	180 600	5
Undiverted water	2 862 787	76	8 481 631	93	3 206 935	82

From R.M.C. annual reports

Mr KENEALLY: The New South Wales view is that, if salinity inflow could be reduced, less water would be required as a flushing agent. It could be kept in the upriver storages to be used to greater benefit for water users. I am asking the Government to do Parliament the benefit of commenting on that and on the other suggestions. It appeared to me to be a sensible suggestion that at least required consideration, because currently we are seeking to have a greater flow of fresh water down the Murray River to flush out the salinity into the sea. That does not seem to be the most useful thing to do with such a vital and scarce resource. The Opposition is seeking co-operation from all the authorities concerned in this vital issue of Murray River salinity. We are anxious to co-operate with the Government, and we will do so in all those areas in which we have a common front. We do so on most of the issues. We do not agree as an Opposition that the whole issue of the Murray River should be obscured by some

headline-hunting and inaccurate statistics put about. We ought to admit that we have a contribution to the Murray River salinity and we ought to continue the good work that we are doing in diversion. We do a good job in that area and we would do better, as would the other States, if funds were available to implement the schemes recommended in the Maunsell Report that would keep salinity out of the river and give all river users quality water down the Murray. That depends on the Federal Government.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): You, Mr Acting Speaker, above all would know that I have once again been given the opportunity and responsibility to sum up this important debate in the early hours of the morning.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson interjecting:

Mr MAX BROWN: The Minister of Transport immediately recognised that fact. My colleagues know that I am about to sum up this debate at this early hour of the morning and will keep members opposite interested and chock full of interest as I go on.

The first matter that I want to deal with is the barrage of nonsense that the member for Rocky River delivered earlier in this debate. He went on at great length to suggest that in some way that the Tonkin State Government, through its doing away with pay-roll tax, has created literally overnight a big increase in work opportunities in small businesses. I suggest to the member for Rocky River that small business is being squeezed out. I suggest to him as an example the fact that the small grocery shop or delicatessen on the corner is presently non-existent. I suggest also to the member for Rocky River that the 10 000 jobs that the Government promised are also non-existent. I suggest to the honourable member that in reality the unemployment position in this State has significantly increased under this Government.

I point out to the member for Rocky River that, in my own district, only in the past few months the city of Whyalla has either lost or is about to lose N.E.I. of which Geddes employs between 60 and 100 people, the abattoirs which employs another 10 or 12, and the timber yard which employs the same number. I am wondering whether the member for Rocky River can explain to the employees in those industries in my area the philosophy of the Premier and of his Government in assisting in any way at all those small businesses.

This Bill comes into the House at a time of complete monetary bungling by the current Governments both Federal and State. It would be appropriate for me to say that the different philosophies of the two major Parties in this country have become apparent in relation to the type of people about whom they are most concerned. I had said on numerous occasions that the Labor Party is concerned for people, and I believe that our past record in this State shows just that. However, the Liberal Party, through the current Government, is still hell bent on a disastrous course of endeavouring to bolster the private sector to overcome its economic ills. It has been pointed out before that cutting back spending in the public sector does not automatically create an increase in spending by the private sector. In fact, quite the reverse usually eventuates.

We have seen from the Government the slashing of funds week after week to organisations and people who are in most need of additional financial assistance. One does not need to have a great memory to recall members of the Government, when in Opposition, getting up in this House and telling the then Dunstan Government that, although it was not directly raising taxes, that it was certainly indirectly doing so. Time after time, speaker after speaker of the Opposition brought to the attention of the House the increase in electricity and gas charges and house rent. I can only say that in my opinion the then Premier, Mr Dunstan, whichever way we look at the question, was an ordinary amateur when compared to the current Premier, who has increased direct taxes or direct personal changes on just about everything that directly or in some way affects the ordinary citizen of this State. Those changes were pointed out by the Leader in the no-confidence motion that he moved in this House at the beginning of the week.

Perhaps at this point I should refer to just one matter as far as cut-backs are concerned which created a very grave problem in my own area. I can assure members that I could refer to many that have caused a great deal of concern. Savage cuts have been made by both the Tonkin and Fraser Governments. These cuts will deny my

constituents and the city of Whyalla a very worthwhile and needed facility. I will refer to one of those facilities and will quote from an article in my local paper of early May this year. The facility in question was a women's shelter which was provided at Whyalla after a great time and at much expense. It was reported on by a visitor to Whyalla—Judith Roberts—who is, as I understand it, a leading authority on women's shelters. The article which is headed, 'Our women's shelter is one of the best', states:

Elouera, the Whyalla women's shelter, has been dubbed 'one of the best in Australia.' South Australian member of the National Women's Advisory Council, Judith Roberts, was speaking at the local Y.W.C.A.'s annual meeting in the Education Centre recently. Addressing about 30 people, she described the shelter as unique and 'one of which you can be proud.'

The article continues:

There was a great need for the shelters in Australia which, as regards to domestic violence, flowed on from America and England. It was an alarming fact that one in 10 women were likely to fall victim to serious domestic assault at least once in their lives.

It further states:

The National Women's Advisory Council was appointed on 14 July 1978 to advise the Federal Government on women's issues. The number of members has now increased from 12 to 15, and this comprises women from all walks of life and with varying political views. There are grandmothers, professional women including a doctor and two lawyers and migrant and Aboriginal women. One of its members is Jan Marsh, A.C.T.U. advocate and research officer from Victoria.

That woman was very praiseworthy of the facility that was afforded to Whyalla.

I can recall very vividly the long and sometimes tedious discussions and counter discussions that went on to ultimately get the then State Government to agree to the provision of this women's shelter. I recall being involved in discussions with the Y.C.W.A. and the Housing Trust which at that time provided a double-unit trust home for this facility. The home was to some extent redesigned by the Housing Trust. I recall vividly the appointment by the Y.W.C.A. of a pleasant elderly couple as caretakers of the women's shelter. The shelter was used to provide a worthwhile facility for the women in our community who suffered some matrimonial distress. Unfortunately, I find in this world a philosophy of straying away from the family concept of marriage. Unfortunately, we are going through an era in which broken marriages, unwed mothers, and *de facto* relationships are quite common. Although I do not agree with them, I have to face up to the facts.

In an industrial environment such as that of Whyalla, these problems seem to be more concentrated than they are in other environments. I was delighted to read the article, but I cannot describe my annoyance when I read the front page report in the *Whyalla News* of 28 May, headed, 'Elouera fate critical—Razor Gang hits women's shelter.' The report states:

The future of Elouera Women's Refuge Shelter in Whyalla may be in jeopardy. The fear was expressed by the Whyalla branch of the Y.C.W.A. and the Elouera committee following indications from the Federal Government that responsibility for the shelters is to be handed over to the State Governments.

Until now, this responsibility has been the Federal Government's which has footed most of the bills. The financial support has come from grants allocated on a basis of 75 per cent from the Federal Government and 25 per cent from the State Governments.

It is now feared that these shelters will be swallowed up by

State health departments and forced to compete with health centres and mammoth hospitals under a block grant scheme proposed by the Committee of Review of Commonwealth Functions, otherwise known as the 'Razor Gang'.

I want to deal with this matter, because it is an important issue in Whyalla and I am concerned about the prospect of its being done away with. The report continues:

Elouera was established just over five years ago by the Whyalla branch of the Y.W.C.A., in response to a request from social and welfare workers, and other people who realised a need for it within the community. It is run by a committee supervised by the Whyalla branch of the Y.C.W.A.'s board of directors. It is one of the earliest established women's shelters in this State—there were only two in 1975. Presently there are 11 altogether in South Australia and about 200 throughout Australia.

Elouera is the only shelter in Australia run by the Y.W.C.A. Executive director of the Whyalla branch of the Y.W.C.A. Miss J. Blake, said 'There is undoubtedly a need for Elouera to continue here on the present basis of funding, and it is feared, throughout South Australia generally, that the latest proposal could have a detrimental effect if it eventuates.'

Again the report continues:

In Queensland and Western Australia, where the State governments were not noted for their commitment to these shelters, it was also feared that they could vanish altogether. Some Adelaide shelters were overcrowded to the extent that it was claimed that some women and children had been turned away.

Since it was established as emergency accommodation, Elouera had provided 'a port in a storm' for many women and children in crisis situations, such as domestic violence.

The report states that the women who use the place come not only from Whyalla but from country areas such as Cleve, Cowell, Ceduna and Coober Pedy. Finally, the report refers to a media release from the Minister of Community Welfare dated 5 May as follows:

In a media release dated 5 May, Minister of Community Welfare, Mr Burdett, praised women's shelters 'for the role they have played in providing shelter and support for women under stress.' He had visited overseas shelters where he had found that they were not of the same 'high standard.'

There was also a large degree of autonomy in South Australia regarding women's shelters, he said. During a recent Whyalla visit, South Australian member of the National Women's Advisory Council, Mrs J. Roberts, praised Elouera as one of the best in Australia.

I hope that the Minister of Community Welfare is prepared to stand up and be counted on this issue if the Federal Government pursues the Razor Gang proposals. The Premier has often spoken of his concern for the family concept in our community.

I refer now to the much publicised and important subject in my electorate, the quality of water, referred to also by the member for Stuart, particularly the water emanating from the Murray River and being used in the Iron Triangle. I do not wish to reiterate the issues that arose last summer in my area. However, I wish to express my grave concern about the important problem that the quality of water within the Murray River system is worsening. Urgent steps are required to rectify the situation.

The Labor Party has made quite clear that it supports a non-partisan approach on this worrying problem and is prepared to act responsibly in any effort towards rectifying the existing salinity problem in the river. I cannot stress that too strongly. If we take time out this morning to

consider the remarks of the member for Stuart, the shadow Minister, it would have to be agreed that he has endeavoured to bring some sanity into the question. It is a matter of grave concern to me that this State Government through its Minister is obviously hell bent on diversionary issues in an endeavour to substantiate in some way the claim that the salinity content of the river is the responsibility of the New South Wales Government or anyone else they might be able to find, and in some way, rightly or wrongly, blame. The fact that the Minister attacked the member for Stuart over features of salinity of the river shows glaringly the lengths to which the Government will go in an attempt not to face up to the real commitments on this matter.

While the Minister is attacking New South Wales and the Premier is playing snakes and ladders, the Federal Government has some real responsibility in this matter and is unchallenged as to its very necessary support. Like the member for Stuart, I refer to the letter written to the Federal member for Grey, Mr Wallis, by the Prime Minister. I will not quote from it, because the member for Stuart used it in a demonstration of the commitment the Federal Government is not facing up to. It is important to reiterate that part of the letter that suggests, by the Prime Minister's remarks, that in some way the Federal Government is honouring its responsibilities in this saga by making available the sum of \$5 725 000.

It is ludicrous to say that when the Government and the Opposition know that, to do this work in the proper manner, \$85 000 000 will be needed, \$80 000 000 more than Mr Fraser suggests will solve the problem. I refer now to what the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Anthony, was reported as saying in the *Advertiser* of 10 April in a glorious display of understanding of the problems of the Murray River. Under the heading, 'Adelaide water excellent to drink', it was stated:

Adelaide's drinking water is of excellent quality, according to the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Anthony. This was judged by two bench-marks relating to salinity in drinking water recommended by the Australian Water Resources Council and the National Health and Medical Research Council.

Figures published by the River Murray Commission indicated that average weekly salinity levels in the Murray River at Mannum, where water was diverted for Adelaide supplies, had varied between 552 p.p.m. and 630 p.p.m. from the beginning of 1981 to the end of March. It is suggested further in the article that that makes this water drinkable. I find that article amazing. The figures will show that between Lock 6 and Morgan the salt content of the river increases significantly. Mr Anthony was very quick to endeavour to justify in some way criticism of that statement.

An article appeared in the local press in Whyalla after Mr Anthony's statements were reported in the *Advertiser*: this article attacked the Deputy Prime Minister for his statements. I also made a statement, and I said that Mr Anthony was either a disaster in his portfolio or he was not in the habit of drinking water, or both. I also said that it had been generally agreed that the salinity in the Murray River and its control was a major problem.

It would be difficult to convince Adelaide people of the truth of Mr Anthony's statement, and an absolute impossibility to convince Whyalla people of that. It is rather interesting that, in the same article, Mr Proud, who was associated with the Australian Water Resources Council, urged Whyalla to continue pressing the Federal Government for remedial works in the Riverland and an adequately funded overall national water resources plan. Mr Anthony was not interested in the situation, apparently. I understand that he took us to task in Federal

Parliament because he said he was misquoted in the *Advertiser*. My remarks show quite glaringly that the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister are not concerned for the quality of water. Neither the Premier nor the Minister has shown any opposition to those statements, and I say that quite seriously. In fact, ironically it was left to the member for Mallee to comment. I was fortunate to find what he said in a country newspaper that circulates in my home town of Orroroo. I do not know why his comments were printed in that paper, but he certainly got a headline. Under the heading 'Anthony wrong', it is stated:

South Australian water is a health risk.

I could not agree more. It was further stated:

Mr Anthony, the Country Party Leader, said in a recent media statement (the *Advertiser*, April 10) that South Australia's River Murray water is 'excellent to drink'. He wants to justify the pressure his Country Party colleagues are applying to the weak-kneed unprincipled Wran Government to grant the increases in irrigation diversions in New South Wales along the Darling and elsewhere, stated the member for Mallee, Mr Peter Lewis.

'He is doing this to shore up the Country Party's sagging political fortunes in the battle to hold their seats in the forthcoming State election to be held in New South Wales sometime this year,' said Mr Lewis.

That was probably a better remark than those in the first part of the statement. He went on to say:

I call upon all members of the Country Party to publicly denounce this irresponsible statement attributed to Mr Anthony, their National Leader.

The member for Mallee calls upon the Country Party to denounce Mr Anthony, but we cannot get the Premier of this State to denounce him. The article reports Mr Lewis as saying that the views Mr Anthony has expressed on behalf of his Country Party colleagues show how much they are prepared to put short-sighted political opportunism, parochial interests and personal profit ahead of other people's health. I think he is a socialist. It was further stated:

'I have written to Mrs Jennifer Adamson, the Minister of Health, requesting that she refer Mr Anthony's comments to the Government standing committee on health aspects of water quality for comment, which is currently examining the birth defect problems in Mount Gambier.'

Mr Lewis concluded by saying 'that concerned people should write to Mr Anthony at Parliament House, Canberra, and tell him how appalling they find his indifference to their long term health and water quality needs.'

I could not agree more. I suggest to the member for Mallee that the Minister and the Premier have not done what he suggests.

I believe that the two examples that I have given to this House in respect to water quality show quite glaringly the lack of response there has been to this problem. I find it extremely difficult to agree with a local councillor in Whyalla. Despite the fact that the Mayor of Whyalla, who is a member of the Commission on Water Quality, has supported all aspects of endeavouring to get some sanity into this question and some progress—and I applaud her for it—Mr J. A. Feetham, although he agrees with the Mayor that we should have better quality water says that the council should offer moral and physical support. He explained that the Premier had taken a very strong stand on this issue, and I find that statement absolutely amazing, because the Premier has not taken a strong stand on this question.

The Government charged me with being an alarmist when I attacked it in relation to the amoebic meningitis case that unfortunately occurred in Whyalla last summer.

The Minister of Health was retaliating against Dr Cornwall in the *News* yesterday. It is time we realised that this problem is probably one of the biggest that has faced us for some years. It is not a question of attack, attack and attack: it is a question of realities.

Call me an alarmist if you like, but the fact is that, if you have discussions with doctors in the iron triangle area, they will tell you that there has been an increase in bowel cancer, for example. It is time we faced up to this fact and did something on a bi-partisan basis about the quality of water in this State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I take pleasure in closing the debate, which I think must be an all-time record in this House for a debate on the Supplementary Estimates. May I say what a procession of dull, turgid, reaffirmations of negative thinking and ideological turpitude we have been subjected to tonight. We have heard the same ideological commitment to a discredited collectivism associated with a bitter criticism of any Government daring to return to individuals the right to think for themselves and the right to manage their own affairs. Indeed, anything that helps people to do their own thing and have equal opportunities to work as hard as they like—in fact, a return to the classic Liberal economic model—attracts the abuse of the Opposition.

With regard to the criticism made by the Leader of the Opposition, it was the same sad old story, a tedious repetitious litany of doom and disaster. Mind you, it was made all the more tedious because we have heard it all before, except that this time he got his figures right and projected the deficit at \$10 000 000 instead of the \$15 000 000 he claimed. He is not terribly good at this sort of thing. A difference of \$5 000 000 in a total overall budget of \$1.4 billion is not much. However, because he was too impatient to wait for the figures in the Supplementary Estimates, the Leader's figure was 50 per cent out. I would have thought he would be well advised to wait for this debate today instead of wasting the time of the House in vain with his repetition yesterday. It is unfortunate that he did not wait, but by the same token it is unfortunate that he still does not seem to have learnt anything. I do not think that he even read yesterday's speeches; I suspect somebody else did, because he certainly did not write (at least I hope he did not write) the detailed calculations. He made a number of wild allegations interspersed with accusations of financial mismanagement, using wild figures and making wrong conclusions, all laced with ample evidence of a lamentable lack of understanding.

For instance, I noticed that the Leader said (and I think he thought he made a very telling point) that we had gone from a \$38 000 000 surplus to a \$10 000 000 deficit in the short space of less than 12 months, a disastrous total difference of \$48 000 000. I gather from that comment that he thinks the accounts carry on each year and that we actually started this year with \$38 000 000 up our sleeve. I think that was the point he made.

An honourable member: He should have made it clearer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. The Leader obviously does not understand what he is saying. The other thing I am not clear about is how he got the figure of a \$41 000 000 deficit. He could have taken any one of a number of figures and done his sum any way he liked, and if he added everything together he could have come up with \$80 000 000 or \$90 000 000 if it suited him to, but it suited him to come down with a figure as close to \$40 000 000 as he could. That is what the Leader has been talking about, and he wants to make sure that he at least

thinks he is right, regardless of whether anyone else thinks so.

Most of the points raised again by the Leader were answered yesterday; I will not repeat the answers that he should have picked up then. Apparently he is working on the principle that if you repeat a distortion frequently enough it will be believed by the public. I think also he says that if he repeats the fallacy of this Government's financial management often enough that will be believed by the Government, too. However, I throw that approach back in his teeth. Certainly our style is not the style that would be adopted by a Labor Government. By the Leader's own admission, a Labor Government would find it much easier to govern because it would increase taxation heavily. Labor Governments are characterised by big government and high taxation. When we came to office the State's taxes were among the highest in Australia, and the size of our Public Service was among the highest in Australia by comparison on a per capita basis.

We came to Government on a policy of lower taxation and smaller government, and we did that because lower taxation and smaller government is exactly what the people of South Australia wanted. The Leader spent very little time, to my slight surprise, on the remarkable wage increases that have occurred in the last 12 months. Incidentally, I called the wage increases record increases, not the sum put aside. The Leader could not even get that right. They are record increases and are the highest in five years. The year before last they went up by 7.1 per cent, last year by 8.1 per cent, and this year by 15.9 per cent.

It is a simple fact of life that increased wages lead to increased costs, which lead to increased charges. If the Government has to meet these very high wage increases, of necessity it must restrict the money available not only to new initiatives and programmes but simply to maintain existing programmes. The education portfolio, on which we heard an excellent speech from the member for Rocky River and a rather questionable one from the member for Salisbury, is a perfect example of the difficulties that wage increases will bring this Government or any other Government. If the 12½ per cent claim currently before the commission is granted, it will cost the Government \$28 000 000 extra. That amount will be found out of the Budget and not one cent of that amount will improve the quality of education. It will all go in teachers' salaries. It is important that we remember that more than 90 per cent of the education budget is spent on salaries. It is impossible for the Leader to say that wage increases have not been a major factor.

Mr Bannon: You should have allowed for them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader apparently has a crystal ball which he should be looking at a lot harder.

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That the wage increases would go up between 14 and 19 per cent? Once again we see that the former Government, now in Opposition, headed by the Labor guru not only has a crystal ball: the Leader is able and willing to support every wage claim and give in to every claim that has been made. Before very long we will see him standing in this House and supporting the 35-hour week openly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: They have done it overtly, but he will be supporting it, regardless of what it will do for the taxpayers of South Australia. This is the wonderful high tax, big government Party! I know a Labor Party conference is coming up next weekend, but I did not think the Leader would stoop to toadying in this fashion.

We came to office promising to reduce Government activities to achieve smaller government and in that way

we promised to provide significant tax reductions, and that we have done. The additional pressures on the Budget by several factors including wage increases could well have diverted us from our course. It has not. Instead we have held firmly to our course; we have not brought back those taxes or sacked one employee. We have achieved such success that we have been able to cope with an additional \$48 000 000 expenditure—the largest part of it on wages.

The Leader of the Opposition has the gall to stand in this House and accuse us of mismanagement. He condemns increased charges. All he has to offer is increased taxes. We do know that given a chance (and I do not think they will be given it) the Labor Party would revert to bigger and bigger public sector spending and skyrocketing taxes to support them all. If the Labor Party thinks it could avoid increasing charges to keep pace with increasing costs caused by high wage increases to which they have obviously contributed, then they show even less of an understanding of commonsense business management that I thought could be possible. South Australians can be grateful that the State's finances are safe in good businesslike hands.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend at this time of the night to detain the House very much longer.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What about your colleagues? Will they drone on again?

Mr BANNON: I believe that there are substantial contributions to be made by my colleagues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members are only prolonging the debate.

Mr BANNON: I was about to make that point, Mr Speaker. I will proceed without paying too close attention to the interjections of the Minister, especially a Minister who is somewhat derelict in his duty. If he had used the industrial information that was no doubt available to his department and to him to advise his Premier when formulating his budget on the likely wage increases that would have occurred this year, perhaps the Budget could have been framed more accurately than it was. The facts are, as I have made quite clear, that it was not a question of supporting or not supporting wage increases. The claims that were currently before the courts and, indeed, in some instances the cases had been concluded, were ones that in most instances were following what had happened in other jurisdictions.

The flow-on principle of wage fixation is well known in this country. The increases granted to the South Australian Public Service were increases gained by other public servants in other States well before they applied here. As to other aspects of the increases, they had been won in the private sector previously. Again, on some catch-up principles and wage justice principles that were operating, it was obvious that there were going to be substantial wage increases. The Premier under-provided for them. He seeks to blame the arbitration system or the groups attempting to gain those wage increases to get out of his budgetary problems arising from that under-provision. In formulating a Budget it is vital that one uses all the information available, because these things can be predictable. Indeed, he talked of the record increases. The Dunstan Labor Government back in 1974-1975, and 1975-

1976 was grappling with high increases indeed but they were understood and budgeted for. Accordingly we were able to provide for a planned Budget where the result at the end of the year was precisely as planned and in almost all cases there was a surplus. We are often accused in Opposition by the present Government of simply preaching gloom and doom about the economy.

It is an extraordinary allegation coming from the Government and a Premier who described South Australia as a leper colony when in Opposition—something that this House should not forget. We remember some of the extraordinary speeches made from this side of the House when we were in Government and which went far beyond anything we have said about the Government or the economy of South Australia or its future. Occasionally of course, in fact quite often, we are victims of the way in which our statements are reported. I would like to refer particularly to a statement which was attributed to me in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend under the now famous headline 'No boom Bannon'. I appreciated the remarks made by the Deputy Premier the other day on this matter. I would have to agree that, if in fact I appeared at the airport with a bucket of cold water to pour on the State, that would have been an unfortunate thing. I will not back away from the need for realism in assessing our economic performance and the future. One of the most unfortunate things we are suffering from at the moment in this State is over-boosting. The extraordinary statements made by the Premier in the first 12 months of office are still haunting the Government. Expectations were raised so high that everyone thought that this was it, including business in South Australia. The miracle was about to happen—we just had to sit back and wait while the new Government and its attitudes took over. The facts did not accord with it. If the Premier came into office and said some of the things that he has said this year I suspect that we would be in a much better position.

Turning to the article, what I actually said was that we cannot sit back and expect some sort of resources boom to save the State over the next few years. I think that those facts should be realistically stated. I know that the Government is not interested in them but I am not speaking to it; rather I am speaking to the public at large. We are in for hard times over the next few years. The Premier has foreshadowed that. He has not reviewed the full extent of them, but his Ministers would know. They have heard, probably, Treasury submissions on this matter. Those Ministers, particularly with spending departments in the human service areas, will be under the axe and the hammer in the next few years. There will be no expansion of programmes and little money to continue the programmes that they have got. The Minister of Education knows it and the Minister of Water Resources knows that he is going to have difficulty with the vast capital expenditure needed on water quality and other schemes, and one could go on. Money will not be around for the next few years whether they be in Government or whether they will be out at the end of this term. That situation is one that we in South Australia must understand and come to grips with. That is why we cannot delude people into saying that there is a great El Dorado over the horizon or that a Mount Isa is to be built in the middle of South Australia, as the Deputy Premier says.

To that extent, one must say that in realistic terms South Australia is going to have a very hard time, but that does not mean that in the long run there is no great future for us. There is indeed, and that was the piece left out in the *Sunday Mail*. I was asked by the reporter whether I was pessimistic about South Australia's future, and I said, 'On the contrary. After the next few years, and provided we

prepare well enough for it, South Australia will be strongly placed, and we are going to make sure that, on behalf of our community, the benefits will flow and accrue to the people of South Australia.' We cannot do that if we continue with the policies that this Government wants to inflict on us. Realism about the economy is important. I have talked to so many businessmen.

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr BANNON: The Minister who is interjecting has much contact with businessmen. He talks to them and he tries to get feedback from them. They welcomed the election of his Government and worked hard to get it into office and for six months or so they had great expectations. They are saying now that they have been let down, that they were led to believe that certain developments would occur, and they have not occurred.

Another group of businessmen are saying that they did not realise the extent to which they depended on an active public sector. Talk to people in the building and construction industry, and they will tear out their hair as they see what has happened to important chunks of their business which are no longer open to them because the Government has failed to develop public works. That is acknowledged in this debate by the Premier. It is hinted at and acknowledged for the first time.

Building and construction in South Australia is in diabolical trouble, not so much because of a failure in the private sector as a failure in the public sector. Those people who have been actively involved in private enterprise, who believe in small government and in the rhetoric of this Government, have now discovered the harsh and painful truth that their private sector prosperity depended on public sector activity, and unless that is restored there is no hope of prosperity in this State. That is the message around the business community.

The essential feature is realism. They are realists; they are looking at their figures and their returns and saying that the Premier can say and boost what he likes, but that is not the true state of affairs. When we on this side try to make clear the realistic position, we are accused of knocking and negativism. If this State is boosted unnaturally, as it has been in the last 18 months, the crash that will occur when the realisation sinks through will be far greater than if we look at our problems in the cold light of day and try to do something about them. Our economic performance in this State at the moment is dismal. We do not lay all the blame on the Government. The State Government cannot totally control the State's economy. We were told that by members opposite when they were in Opposition, but they realise, as we did in Government, that the State Government does not control all the factors and all the indicators. However, the State Government can have a significant impact on the State's economy.

The problem is that our performance is dismal and, even worse, we are missing out on the general improvement that is taking place in the Australian economy. Whether that is soundly based and whether it will continue in the light of Federal Government policy is uncertain, but there has been an improvement in the last few months. Unfortunately, we are not getting our full share. Let us take the employment figures. There has been a growth trend evident throughout Australia in jobs created, and that is important and something we welcome. From April 1980 to April 1981, employment grew throughout Australia by 3.2 per cent. It grew in South Australia, too, and that is very welcome and a good thing, but in South Australia the growth rate was only 2 per cent, the lowest of all the States. That is cause for concern, and I am glad the Minister agrees.

We have never denied that, once national growth was

restored, South Australian employment would grow and we would share in that, and we are doing so, but we are not getting the full advantage of it. When our Government was in power and unemployment in this country in numbers of jobs lost in States such as New South Wales was reaching record levels, we held our own. It was the first and only time in the history of this State since the 1850's that we were able to go against the national trend in a time of recession. That is an extraordinary record, but we were given no credit for it by members opposite. We survived the 1970's because of the policies of the Dunstan Government.

Employment is one indicator, and I have acknowledged that there is an improvement in that, although unfortunately it is not up to the Australian standard, and it is about time the Government did something about that. It is certainly not as a result of Government policies; the policy meant to create 7 000 jobs—the pay-roll tax incentive scheme—has been a dismal failure. It has been underspent because people are not taking advantage of it. Thank God there is some employment growth, but try going to the people who have not got jobs, the young people leaving school with no prospects of employment, and telling them we have created 3 000 jobs. It is meaningless if unemployment is rising too. Every year our economy must create jobs just to absorb the people who are coming into the workforce, and we are not performing well enough there. Unemployment in South Australia is outrageously high, and the Government is not showing concern for it. It is sitting back and complacently saying that there is some growth in the employment sector, forgetting about the plight of the increasing numbers of unemployed.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What would you do?

Mr BANNON: Listen to the facts.

Members interjecting:

Mr BANNON: The interjections are aimed at trying to avoid the harsh facts. The Government does not want this message to go to the Australian people. The Premier says he does not like to hear these things again and again, because he believes the public will eventually begin to understand and believe it. We will say these things again and again, because it is important that the facts are known. The C.E.S. figures are to be abolished by the Frazor razor gang. At last, that embarrassing monthly recount of the dismal state of Australian employment is to be got rid of, and the C.E.S. figures will no longer embarrass the Federal Government. The last figures, published in March, looked at on a seasonal basis, were the highest ever for South Australia since the C.E.S. began publication. That is a terrible record.

Let us look at the Australian Bureau of Statistics figures. For April 1981 there were 46 200 Australians without work, more than in April 1980. Some jobs have been created, as the Government states, but the numbers of people coming on to the labour market have far outstripped those jobs. In that respect we are working against the national trend. We are under-performing in growth of employment, going completely against the trend in the fall of unemployment. While there was an increase in South Australia between April 1980 and April 1981, national unemployment was falling. In fact, it decreased by 27 000 nationally, and that is completely counter-trending.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: In March of this year employment grew—

Mr BANNON: I am talking about the April figures—the latest available. Let us consider the unemployment rate. South Australia's level is the highest in Australia; it has been consistently so under this Government and stands at

7.5 per cent, while the national average is 5.6 per cent. I wonder whether members recall what the Premier used to say about a population exodus from South Australia? He said this was an example of the dreadful state of the South Australian economy. People were leaving in droves, he said. There was certainly a net loss of population at that time and that was shared with a number of States, including Victoria. The most interesting and alarming fact is that since this Government has been in office that trend has accelerated markedly. This situation does not involve people retiring and going to the Gold Coast, taking their savings with them, to relax in the sunshine; young people with prospects are leaving this State to look for jobs, because work is not available for them here. This is disastrous for the long-term future of South Australia.

The population loss in 1980 compared with 1979 showed an increase of 41 per cent, and reflects the impact of the Tonkin Government. A total of 7 739 people net left South Australia in 1980. One other State experienced more people leaving than South Australia: about double the number here, about 14 000, left Victoria, but if one translated those figures into proportion of population one would see that the people leaving South Australia would total over 20 000 compared with 14 000 leaving Victoria. That is quite alarming. Proportionately, South Australia experiences the greatest loss of population of any State and that is an indicator of the difficult economic situation that we are faced with. The Premier should not try to pretend that that is not true. It is happening.

I have already referred to the dreadful state of the building industry. In 1980, 7 733 new dwellings were approved, compared to 8 677 in 1979, a fall of 10.7 per cent. That is a lot of houses and a lot of people who are not being housed. We had an indication of the tip of the iceberg of that problem by way of the Victoria Square incident a few weeks ago. Our public housing is in a parlous situation and there is a general lack of dwellings. Home building, in particular, has been severely recessed under this Government.

During the first two months of 1981, only 929 new dwellings were approved, compared with 1 231 in the same period last year. In other words, 1980 was bad and 1981 looks as if it will be worse, unless something happens in the latter part of this year. Motor vehicles are another important indicator. The Premier kept talking about South Australia's share of national motor vehicle registrations being an important indicator. South Australia's share has steadily declined and is well below our share of the national population.

The Premier need look no further for reasons for our poor financial state than his own ill-chosen raising of expectations that cannot be fulfilled. Instead of telling businessmen the truth, sitting down with them and working out what a Government-private sector partnership could achieve for this State, he has insisted on slashing into the public sector and leaving the private sector to wallow in the wake of his indecision and bad economic planning. A circle is involved. As was pointed out in the Budget debate, one reason why the Premier's Budget deficit has blown out and his revenue side is in such a terrible mess is that there has not been the general up-turn in the economy that was predicted. Pay-roll tax receipts, as a classic example, have not met the expectation that the Budget had of them. They relate to employment and economic activity.

There is a circle. If expenditure and activity in the public sector is increased, that in turn will create increased activity in the private sector, which will lead to increased revenue by the general economic up-turn in the State and the tax collections and other benefits that come from that.

They are interlocked: they are circular and depend on each other. If the Government starts cutting back in the drastic way that has happened in the public sector and the Loan programme, and starts using its Loan programme to fund revenue accounts because there is day-to-day trouble with finance, immediately it will create a down-turn in the private sector of the economy and more revenue will be lost.

There is a vicious downward spiral. That must be reversed, and the first stage is to change the policies overnight, sit down with businessmen and industry and say, 'The Government is back in business with you once again. We will try to raise some Loan moneys, institute public works programmes and create employment. Join us in that and we will get the State moving again.' That is what a Labor Government would do, and unless this Government does that soon it will be a long slow haul back to prosperity for this State.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I take this opportunity to say a few words about an incident that occurred yesterday (Wednesday) in regard to the activities at the Port Lincoln Gaol. At 10 o'clock yesterday, a meeting was held at the gaol, which was attended by two members of the Australian Government Workers Association. An assurance was given to workers at the gaol that any decision made at the meeting would be abided by. I understand that the meeting lasted for about one hour and five minutes and a vote was taken whether the men would go on strike. There are 11 employees at the gaol, one employee was absent and, allowing for the Chairman who did not exercise a vote, nine persons voted.

Mr Keneally: Was it a secret ballot?

Mr BLACKER: That is more than I can say. The vote was eight to one. An undertaking had been given that any decision would be abided by, and that was all very nice. The two A.G.W.A. members went back to Port Lincoln and later returned to the gaol. They said that they had been directed by Adelaide that the employees should go out on strike at 5 o'clock. I received a telephone call late this evening. The employees were a little concerned that they had had a democratic vote, by far the majority of members voted not to go on strike, and yet they had been overruled. The pressure that was being applied meant that, if they reported for duty this morning, their A.G.W.A. union ticket would be revoked (and this was the threat put to them), which meant that they would not be able to be employed by the Department of Correctional Services because they would no longer be members of the union. Therefore, the Public Service Association would become involved and they could not be employed.

Those members wanted to go to work: they did not want to create any unnecessary difficulty or place themselves or their families in jeopardy. They contacted me on that basis, and since then I have endeavoured to ascertain the real position. I understand that the threat was made on the basis of a previous Government's internal ruling that preference should be given to unionists. I understand that that ruling no longer applies. The present Act would give every protection to those employees should they turn up for work. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has advised me that the Department of Correctional Services can offer these people a job even if they are not members of the union. The direction that operated in the Minister's office in relation to union membership has been rescinded.

Mr Hamilton: Have you checked this with the A.G.W.A., and, if not, why didn't you?

Mr BLACKER: Because they are not at work at this hour of the night. The workers are protected under the Act against harsh action by their union should that come

about, but I have no reason to believe it will. For example, the union cannot fine the members for working during a strike. I make those comments because the persons concerned were in a vexed position at 9 p.m., since they were due to return to work at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning, and they wanted clarification as to their position. They had had a democratic vote; they had voted with a majority of eight to one to return to work and they wished to comply with that vote. They were given to understand as of 10 o'clock yesterday morning that that vote would be abided by. I do not know whether those workers will roll up to work at 7 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr Keneally: What did you advise them to do?

Mr BLACKER: As requested, I endeavoured to find out what their position would be. I have advised them that they have a right to turn up to work tomorrow morning.

I now refer to road funding. Last Friday I was invited to a meeting at the Polda pumping station midway between Lock and Elliston to receive a petition organised by the Deputy District Clerk, Mr Graham Silby, and the former Chairman, Mr Peter Penna. They have had the petitions circulating at Elliston since Easter. In that time, 1 337 signatures were collected from people actually travelling on that road. We have heard a great deal about a certain road in the near metropolitan area and its so-called disastrous state, the difficulties in traversing it, and all these things. The point I make is that there are schoolchildren who cannot get to school on the Lock to Elliston road. Four-wheel drive vehicles can use it, but the school bus has been withdrawn from the run, and the mail bus does not do the full run because it cannot get through.

Mr Keneally: Is it bull dust or corrugation?

Mr BLACKER: It is totally worn out. At the moment it is muddy, slippery and covered with water. It is blocked by water in 11 places as of yesterday morning. When one talks about road funding one should appreciate that there are citizens within this State who do not even have a decent access road. This is an arterial, not a local road; it is a main east-west road across Eyre Peninsula, and is quite essential in the service of that community. The petition states:

The humble petition of the undersigned residents of South Australia sheweth that:

1. The Lock to Elliston Road is in a deplorable state of repair.
2. Such conditions restrict the access of mail services during varying weather conditions.

The condition of the road is such that, because of the length of time that students take to get to school, children have been withdrawn from school and are taught by correspondence, yet they live only 30 miles away from school. The problem now is that they are not getting mail services. They are really isolated. The petition continues:

3. During wet weather, the road is impassable to all traffic.
4. The condition of the road is a safety hazard to users.
5. During wet weather, students are prevented from attending school because the school bus is unable to traverse the road.
6. The impassable condition of the road prevents regular participation in sporting fixtures and community activities.

There were some 35 or 40 people at the Polda pumping station on Friday. It was the first time that I had received a deputation quite like that. I was quite surprised when I reached the station to find such a number of people. They were there for a good reason. The request that I make is that the Minister visit that area and traverse that road, together with his Commissioner.

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

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I refer to pollution in St Vincent Gulf. The electorate I represent is almost completely encircled by the waters of the gulf and the Port River and any pollution of those waters will affect people who live in Le Fevre Peninsular and who use the sea for a living or for recreation and sport. Pollution basically occurs in two ways. One is the form whereby you can see it in the water, and the other is the insidious and unnoticeable effects of a cumulative build up of heavy metals, chemicals and other substances which have the capacity to seriously affect marine ecosystems.

Some time ago a *Nationwide* programme dealt in some detail with the matter of pollution of the sea and the lack of effective controls to prevent such pollution. Dr Hailes of the Adelaide University was a participant on the show and he was critical of the role of Government and of the lack of prevention of marine pollution. The doctor's comments prompted a question in this House the following day from the member for Eyre, which was replied to by the Minister of Mines and Energy (I assume that he was speaking for another Minister at that time). His reply was as follows:

The Government receives advice and coordinates marine investigation through the South Australian Marine Environment Advisory Committee which reports directly to the Minister of Environment. On that committee are representatives of Flinders and Adelaide University and the Departments of Marine and Harbors, Engineering and Water Supply, Health, Fisheries, and Environment.

Those reports do not appear to be available to any person other than the Minister. I tried to get copies for reference from the library but they are not on file, so it appears that the general public or even an inquiring member of this House cannot find out what those reports informed the Minister of.

I also find it significant that representatives from two bodies on that committee have publicly stated their fears for the future of the ecology of St Vincent Gulf, namely, Dr Hailes, Director of Environmental Studies at the Adelaide University, and Dr J. R. Ottaway, Queen's fellow in Marine Science who is at the Flinders University. With due respect to the members of the committee who represent State Government departments, I believe that the considered opinions of those two learned and trained men carry a greater impact in any situation relating to the marine environment.

In the *Sunday Mail* of 18 January this year there was a special report headed, 'The threat to our gulfs—we could be poisoning South Australia's playground'. In that report no less than six marine scientists expressed fears about the future of the St Vincent Gulf and Spencer Gulf. In it Dr Ottaway is quoted as saying:

The greatest danger is ignorance. We know so little about increasing social and industrial pressures on the gulfs. What we do know is enough to fuel strong fear for the future. Yet there is no co-ordinated scientific effort towards remedying our lack of knowledge. I believe that is courting disaster. The very damage we fear, which could have far-reaching consequences on the health of our gulfs as marine environments, sources of healthful food, as sources of recreational pleasure, may be occurring right now.

His statement must surely throw some doubt on the beneficial effects to the State of the Marine Environment Advisory Committee. It is probably doubtful that it is producing anything at all.

Another document from which I would like to quote is called 'Marine reserves in South Australia—proposals for some future directions'. The document was prepared by

four people who were involved in the seas around our coast. One was Dr Ottaway from the School of Biological Sciences at Flinders University. There was a Mr Oak, Chairman of the South Australian Underwater Photographic Society, who has 26 years diving experience; Mr Bossley, a lecturer at Hartley College and a keen diver and author of eight scientific publications; and Mr Gardner, Chairman of the Scuba Divers Association of South Australia, also an experienced diver of some 16 years. All of these men have had a chance to study at close hand changes to our underwater world. What they state in print bears reporting, as follows:

Most of the inter-tidal and sea floor regions within St Vincent Gulf and Spencer Gulf of South Australia do not support a great density of life. A delicate balance exists between the organisms of these communities and their environment. Although some biological components of the local marine communities are of little use to industry, commerce or to the majority of the public, there is ample evidence to suggest that excessive disturbances are taking place.

Because of my concern over the differences in the reports, I asked the Minister of Health a Question on Notice (No. 1266):

Are regular tests made upon crustaceans, shell fish and pelagic and demersal fish from St Vincent Gulf to ascertain the levels of contaminants contained in their flesh?

The reply that I was provided with stated:

Seafoods commercially available for human consumption in South Australia do not pose a hazard to health. This is confirmed by results found during the National Health and Medical Research Council's 'Market Basket Surveys'.

The reply further stated:

There is no justification for a regular broad sampling programme to test fish samples from St Vincent Gulf for contaminants. Tests are normally done when contaminations of the gulf is known to have occurred in the event of specific natural events such as algae blooms or other potentially toxic situations or in response to specific complaints.

I would like to refer back to the report of the four people involved with the marine environment of our State. I will quote again from that report as follows:

Unfortunately, we are equally ignorant of what effects will become evident on a local scale even within the next few decades. As a specific example, some of the shell fish taken from St Vincent Gulf contain gut and mantle levels of the heavy metal cadmium about three to 12 times more concentrated than the maximum level permitted in shell fish for human consumption by the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council.

That is the same body referred to in the answer from the Minister as saying that there are no findings of any contamination. There were two conflicting reports. Because there appears to be some doubt and because there is no sound organised assessment on the situation in our gulf, the matter should be looked on as one of some importance, and some system of logically and progressively assessing the effects on the shell fish and free-swimming fish in our waters should be undertaken.

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

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): Earlier during the sitting today my name was linked, by the member for Spence, with the Ralkon Aboriginal project. It is appropriate that I should place on record what my involvement has been with that company, what my involvement has been with the Aboriginal community at Point McLeay and why, as a member of Parliament in a suburban electorate, I took an interest in an Aboriginal

community in an electorate which was not mine. This needs to be explained and placed on public record so that readers of *Hansard* will know about it.

First, my background history of involvement in the community before I became a member of Parliament and whilst I was in the Northern Territory led me to become involved in dealings with Aboriginal people in a number of ways. One of the frustrations I faced as an average person in the community and a taxpayer was seeing the amount of dollars poured into Aboriginal projects and burnt up in many cases by Europeans on Aboriginal reserves, as they were called in those days. It concerned me that there was no accountability and that whilst Aborigines needed money, a lot was being absorbed in administration and was not getting to where the problem was.

Having had that background of interest and now finding myself in a position in which I can make significant inquiries and get some answers and make a positive contribution, I have taken an interest in Aboriginal affairs in this State. I was interested to read the Public Accounts Committee report on Wardang Island which reinforced some of the problems which Governments have when pouring money into Aboriginal development and the apparent lack of accountability. Whilst it may look good that Governments are spending money on behalf of Aborigines, what we are getting is sometimes questionable. In some cases, what the Aboriginal people are getting finally is also questionable.

When I was first elected and had sent to me by the Ralkon Agricultural Company a pamphlet which stated that Aborigines could develop a farm, make a profit, organise their future, manage their own affairs, etc., (it went on to detail what the Ralkon Company was doing in South Australia), it whet my appetite to go and have a look. Here I believe is what Aborigines should be able to do and can do in this community if they are given a free hand—that is, to develop a company, run it themselves and to be on an equal footing with the European community, as they should be, and as in many cases they desire. I do not think the group at Point McLeay are looking for a handout. All they ask is for the right to be registered, known and seen as a company, and to be able to borrow like any other enterprise, to go to the local bank and ask for money to develop an area, and to be accountable to the bank or to other financial institutions.

Unfortunately, the company cannot do that, because it does not have the title to the land, and therefore is restricted in its area of gaining financial benefits. This presents a problem when one traces back the history of the company, and I intend later to detail into *Hansard*, into the public record, the long-term problems which have been generated in this area. It boils down to a conflict of interest as to whether we, as Governments, believe that we should be controlling Aborigines and giving them special treatment, or whether we should give them their freedom and let them go it alone. Perhaps some will make mistakes, and perhaps some dollars will be lost, but surely in the long term the amount of dollars lost in such a venture will be less than the amount poured into the fruitless exercises of which we read time and time again.

There has been from time to time some sort of campaign launched against this company by various groups, by various public servants wanting to retain control of the company, by people wanting to make sure that the Government still had control and not wanting to risk public money. I wrote to Giles and Giles Pty Ltd in relation to the Ralkon Agricultural Co., and its reply was as follows:

We advise that our company has acted for Ralkon since November 1976 when we were approached to undertake

accounting and taxation matters upon the resignation of A.A.C.N. as consultants to the company. During that time we have prepared the annual financial statements for the years ended 30 June 1976 to 30 June 1980. In addition, we have prepared various statements of income and expenditure, various interim financial statements, lodged the company's income tax returns, recorded minutes of meetings of directors and shareholders, maintained a share register and lodged the company's annual return. The undersigned has also acted in an advisory capacity on the Ralkon Consultative Committee.

I have in my office four or five files full of papers of conflict between a company of Aborigines and Government departments that have been trying to sort out the mess over a number of years. The member for Spence was quite right when he asked, as I have asked the State Minister, to use what power he had, although it is limited, to encourage a settlement. I know that the Federal Minister, Senator Baume, would like to see a settlement of the dispute, which is impeding the progress of the company. The company is at a standstill. The profits made over a number of years are wasting away in the bank, yet the company desires to pour them back into the property and to develop and expand the company so that it can provide further job opportunities for Aborigines. The potential is there and it needs to be developed, but the major problem has not yet been overcome.

The company consists of all shareholders in the Point McLeay community. Every person has an opportunity to buy a share, but no matter how many shares they buy they have only one vote in the company. It is a properly constituted company with its own articles, which are listed and which can be looked at, and it can be seen to be in operation. The company elects its directors, and in this case they are all Aboriginal people.

One significant factor is that these people have learnt, through having these hassles with Government departments, how to cope with Government bureaucracy, how to understand company law, and what channels to go through in attempting to achieve a resolution of problems. As a group of Aboriginal directors, one of whom is now Chairman of the Aboriginal Council at Point McLeay, they have learnt to use our system effectively. They understand the financial system and they have had help from a manager, Mr Hallock, who has been on the farm for a number of years. It is a conflict between Europeans, and it is seen to be a conflict between Mr Hallock and members of the Aboriginal Development Commission here in Adelaide and the manager here. Unfortunately, that conflict is impeding the progress of resolution of the problem.

When I first became interested and was seen to be aligned with Ralkon, I found great difficulty in getting any information from the Aboriginal Development Commission in Adelaide, and it was a bit of a challenge, because I was spurred on to dig deeper. Eventually, I wrote to the Ombudsman, because I found that most reports to me were based on the uncompleted report of the Ombudsman. Because of that, I have written to the Ombudsman and I await his reply when he finally indicates where he stands and why the reports was delayed, and perhaps there will be some further information which we can use to correct this problem. I am concerned that here is an Aboriginal company with prospects of development in this community.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I express my support for the statements made earlier in this debate by our Leader.

At least our Leader can be confident that he has the support of his Party behind him, which is more than can be said for a lot of Liberal Leaders at the moment in more than one State and at the Federal level. It occurred to me, when the Leader was referring to the disillusionment in the business community with the Liberal Government, that it had a Dickensian tone about it, except that the Charles Dickens titles have changed. Whereas for a while the business community had *Great Expectations*, we now have *Hard Times* and *Bleak House*.

It is to the subject of hospital funding that I now turn, and the failure of this Government to obtain Federal funding for the nursing home at Windana. Through bureaucratic bungling, the Federal Government has been allowed to get away with using the loophole of defining Windana as a State responsibility by saying that people who suffer from senile dementia are mental health problems and that that is a health responsibility for the State. Earlier, in other debates, the Minister and I both used the term 'psychogeriatric' in various contexts, and in their application to the Commonwealth for funding for Windana, right up until the end of last year, the term 'psychogeriatric' was being used to describe a major group of people who were going to be treated by the place.

The Minister accused me of not being aware of the distinction between psychogeriatric problems and those associated with senile dementia. As I pointed out in a personal explanation, I had quite clearly put down on the record, in a statement in the press, the following:

There is an urgent need for facilities to be provided for elderly people whose mental faculties are failing and it is a very fine dividing line that determines whether their mental symptoms are a result of a physiological complaint or a psychiatric one.

Many people connected with the area of care of the aged have put it to me that there is almost an interchangeability between terms such as senile dementia, chronic brain failure, brain deterioration and a psychogeriatric condition.

Surely it should have been obvious to the Minister that the Federal Government would use this particular loophole. Some of the people who in one way or another were connected with the negotiations for Southern Cross Homes and the Health Commission were aware that the Federal Government would use this legal loophole to avoid funding if the term 'psychogeriatric' was used to describe the category of persons who were to be looked after at Windana.

I am advised that the application from Southern Cross Homes, particularly more recently, sought funding in terms that were not predominantly for psychogeriatric cases. Funds were sought for an ordinary nursing home for the elderly, because people were aware that the Federal Government might try to use the loophole. It seems that someone in the Health Commission, against all advice, persisted in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government in terms of the home being a psychogeriatric centre. There was apparently some sort of bureaucratic bungle. I am advised that one member of the Health Commission persistently conducted his correspondence with the Commonwealth Government on Mental Health notepaper. That certainly would not have done the cause any good.

I also notice that the letter from which I quoted at some length in my explanation of the question this afternoon and which was written by the Hon. M. J. MacKellar, Federal Minister of Health, advising Senator Jessop, Liberal Senator from South Australia, that no funding would be provided for Windana, contains several references to Windana as a psychogeriatric centre, and it

gives the clear impression that representations had obviously come from the Minister and the South Australian Health Commission in those terms. It is quite despicable for these two Governments to keep passing the buck. This sort of thing should not occur when there is such an obvious need for help to be given to the weak, elderly, senile members of our community.

I wonder whether the Minister, or the Federal Minister, has ever had the strain of looking after a relative in the home. A Letter to the Editor a couple of years ago from a person who worked in a nursing home pointed out the difficulties that relatives face on the domestic scene looking after this type of person in the home. In response to a letter on another subject, this person wrote:

I cannot help wondering whether the writer has yet had the experience of having to look after a relative within the family home. Where a person needs attention any hour of the 24 hours in a day, it becomes a very difficult situation. I feel quite strongly that on occasions the strain between those concerned can kill the love that once existed.

This letter came from the Matron of a private hospital in the Lockleys area. She further stated that everyone who works does so for money, but there must surely be easier ways to earn money than working in a geriatric home, unless one has a genuine love for the elderly. That comment applies to most of the people on nursing home staffs. In general, they have a love for the elderly. Certainly, it is obvious that those who are waiting to provide care for the people seeking admission into Windana have that love for the elderly.

Shortly after the television crews left Windana yesterday, one of the day-care patients (of the large number who attend each day from Glenside and other institutions in the area for day care), a poor old man who was suffering badly from senile dementia, went on a wild foray up and down the corridor, smearing faeces from one end of the corridor to the other, and all over himself. The area into which he wandered and in which he made this dreadful mess fortunately (and I use the word in a different ironic sense) was a section of the hospital that was closed. (It is not hard to find corridors that are closed off, because most of them are closed off: only the day-care centre is operating.) The situation was probably not as totally disastrous as it otherwise might have been, but it constituted a difficult job for the staff. Imagine how much more difficult it would be for relatives to cope with someone who barely exists and who is prone to that sort of behaviour. If it is difficult for the staff at a nursing home, how much harder is it for those relatives who have to care for a person at home?

I know of a case involving a woman in her sixties suffering from senile dementia; she would cook her husband five or six meals a day because her memory had gone and she could not remember having cooked the meals. The food cupboards were full of mould because she could not remember how to look after the food. She wandered all over the metropolitan area and, when placed in Kalyra, she would get dressed and sneak off into the bushes. The situation in regard to care of those people with senile dementia is tragic, and the Minister must do everything in her power to speed up the negotiations and have funding provided for Windana.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I refer to the reduction of hours for school assistants. In representing an area with a very strong ethnic population, a large percentage of single parents, low income earners and a very high rate of unemployment, I am most concerned about the effect that these cuts will have on schools within my district and the western region of Adelaide. Most schools in this area draw

their pupils from populations that suffer grave socio-economic disadvantages. The Government has a major responsibility to fund these schools according to needs rather than political expediency. There is the need to provide scope and opportunity for the gifted as well as effective education for those who are in any way disadvantaged.

Following the Premier's address to a Liberal Party garden party, a copy of which was sent to all school council chairpersons, a point of view was expressed by the Principal of a primary school in the western districts of Adelaide, and a copy was forwarded to me by an official of the Education Department. For the benefit of the Premier and the Minister of Education, I indicate that the letter is dated 8 May, is entitled 'Just who really is doing the prostituting, Mr Tonkin?' and states:

It gravely concerns me that the Premier, Mr Tonkin, should publicly denigrate the teaching profession to the extent he did when addressing a Liberal Party garden party at Burnside recently.

I have studied the full text of his speech and found it full of sweeping generalisations and charged with irrationally emotive language. It was a blatant attempt to discredit teachers in the eyes of the public. He inferred that all teachers and school assistants are easily led, unthinking, stooges of some so-called 'activists' within S.A.I.T. and P.S.A. which in turn are being manipulated by the A.L.P.

Rather disgracefully, Mr Tonkin asked why teachers should 'prostitute their profession' for 'some perceived political advantage'. I consider the morality of teachers' actions in fighting to maintain the quality of education for children to be of the highest order. I would ask Mr Tonkin: 'Why should honesty in Government be prostituted for the sake of political survival?'

The scenario for the speech was carefully contrived—a passive, 'on-side' audience of people who undoubtedly would be quite remote from the education scene, and a fully attendant media who had been invited to hear a major speech by the Premier. In this highly receptive, unchallenging situation, Mr Tonkin attempted to divert public attention away from the real issues and create fear and uncertainty in the community by using the time worn 'reds under the bed' ploy.

He is obviously becoming increasingly aware that he and his senior advisers have seriously misread the present mood of school communities and also underestimated the depth of their concern about the quality of their children's education.

In alleging omnipotent union leadership, he casts aspersions on both the intellect and independence of thought of staff members in our schools. It also discloses an ignorance on Mr Tonkin's part of the rules and policies of S.A.I.T. in respect to sectional stoppages.

Our union leaders are not able to arbitrarily call members out on strike. He should know (or prefers to forget) that each school had to conduct independent ballots, and that, unlike most other democratic processes which require only a simple majority, S.A.I.T. rules required two-thirds of members to be in favour of a work stoppage before it could be authorised. That meant that two-thirds of members in each work situation:

- had to believe very deeply that the Government was very wrong in what it is doing in prejudicing quality education for children;
- two-thirds had to believe that all other courses of action had been tried and found to be useless;
- two-thirds had to believe that strike action was perhaps after all the most effective way of demonstrating their deep concern;
- two-thirds had to believe that a day's pay was a small premium to pay to help assure a better educational future

for our children, before a work stoppage could be held in their school.

It is significant that in 146 schools at least this proportion of teachers held these beliefs and voted their schools closed. Even more significant is that, in the great majority of schools, well over half of their staff members voted in favour of striking, and it was only S.A.I.T.'s two-thirds majority rule which prevented considerably more school closures.

In exhorting his audience and the public to believe that the unions' motives are 'exclusively political' Mr Tonkin clearly showed his own Government's present strategy—keep the public debate on education as political as possible and try to prevent it from focusing on the real issues. With great fervour he proclaimed that our children's 'education and their future is the price being paid for the strikes and street marches'.

How much further from the truth could this statement be? The prime reason for strike action was precisely a deep concern for our children's education now and in the future. Mr Tonkin was indulging in base politicking in its most literal sense: He asserted that teachers through their unions are really only interested in 'peddling propaganda' and 'orchestrating misleading advertising', and that while professing concern for children they are really aiming to 'sabotage our education system' and bring about 'the defeat of my Government'.

I would like to ask, 'What level of concern does his Government really have for our children, when it systematically undoes gains made in education over the last 10 years? How much do they really care about the development of our most precious natural resource, our children, when they divert funds from education into uranium mining, and channel Federal funds for multicultural and migrant education, minor works in disadvantaged schools, and transition education, into general State revenue? Where is their level of concern for our children when they dishonour almost all of their publicly stated education policies?'

Is there no room for any honesty in this Government at all in the education sphere? What hypocrisy exists when on the one hand Mr Tonkin questions the example teachers are setting for children, while on the other hand he is leading a Government which has broken nearly every pre-election promise about education that helped bring it to power.

Our Premier conveniently labels school newsletters to parents as propaganda. We know that these information sheets carried to parents descriptions of how schools are being affected by the cuts in funding and the reductions in ancillary staff. They also indicated to parents the depth of concern that staffs were feeling. The plethora of newspaper advertisements reinforced the issues which were at the heart of the dispute. 'Political propaganda' he called it, 'printed with facilities funded by the State'. What hypocrisy! At the same time his Government was spending approximately \$15 000 of taxpayers' money on full page newspaper advertisements stating the Government's point of view. By his own definition \$15 000 of public money was therefore spent on 'political propaganda'.

In his speech, the Premier gave 'fair warning' to the unions' leaders, of the growing numbers of parents and teachers who believe that the Government has been reasonable for long enough! The message I keep hearing from increasing numbers of people is that the Government has been unreasonable for too long. A classic example was their obstinate refusal to 'play ball' in the industrial commission when they refused to accept the 'referee's' decision.

Mr Tonkin proposes that the community must take a stand and get politics out of education and our children out of politics. I suggest that as a community we must take a stand and try and get honesty back into Government. Then, school

staffs and communities wouldn't need to become involved in politics, education wouldn't be the political football it has become, and we could get on with the job we love and know best—helping children learn.

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

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I noted that the member for Spence mentioned the newsletter sent from schools to parents about the school assistants dispute and the comments he made about the Government's response, that this was blatant political propaganda—indeed, that was the charge levelled by the Government against many schools for the material they sent home. The Minister of Health wrote to one of her constituents in the following terms:

In view of the inaccuracies, distortions and blatant misrepresentations that were being conveyed directly to parents by staff in some schools . . .

She then went on to use that as some justification for the Government's wasting of taxpayers' money for advertisements inserted in the papers. Members will recall that on 18 May the Premier was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying that I and the unions, presumably through the school staff, had 'used young children in the most insidious way by asking them to carry home blatant left-wing propaganda'. I wrote to the *Advertiser* about that, saying that as far as I was concerned it was a defamatory and libellous statement and that it was totally irresponsible of the Premier to have made it. I know from the information that I had available that it was an inaccurate and libellous statement to make about letters that went home with children. The Premier in his speech to the Liberal ladies' luncheon said:

Parents don't want their children bringing home political propaganda—propaganda distributed in their schools, and printed, in many cases, with facilities funded by the State. Yet this is what is happening now in many of our primary and secondary schools. Five-year-old children are being used as post boxes by political activists.

Let us look at the situation. Not once has the Minister in this place read out one of those political documents. Not once have we been able to see the real currency of the claim that he, the Premier and the Minister of Health are making. They are not prepared to read out any of these letters, so I will. I have a selection of letters here from schools which have had the courtesy of sending me copies of letters sent home to parents. I am sure the same has gone to the Minister, so he would have these letters, too. On the whole, they are all very interesting in the approach that they take. Almost without exception they make some reference to their school's decision as to whether they will strike or not. There is some reference in all these letters to the voting pattern that took place. That is not an unreasonable item to include.

There is some comment about the reduction in school assistant hours, in particular some comment on how the school in question is being affected by that. In many cases they outline in some detail what school assistants do in their school, so that parents can be fully aware of what is going on. I suppose the crux of the matter is how these letters end up—what they suggest should be the case, what course of action they believe should be undertaken by the parents, if any, because that is the crux of any investigation whether or not these newsletters represent the use of children as post boxes by political activists. I will read out selected quotes from some of them. I am willing for any member of the House to read the entire letters to confirm that I am not being selective in my quotations. First, I refer to one from Seaclyff Primary School. Its reference to the action by the Government is as follows:

The teachers who are on strike will lose a day's pay but they are confident of your [the parents] support because the Government must be convinced that if there is need to reduce expenditure in education through lack of finance it should select an area that has less effect on children and the quality of education.

That is hardly a benchmark of political activism. That is hardly a suggestion to vote for Labor or against this Government at the next election. It is a call on the Government to reconsider its position. What more reasonable response could one expect?

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Particularly inane interjections. The next submission was from Glossop Primary School. Its pertinent comment is as follows:

We wish to point out that we support the actions of the South Australian Teachers Institute in their efforts on behalf of the school assistants.

That institute, through its executive, is on record as saying that it had not supported any one political Party in this dispute, because it is concerned with the industrial and educational issues, and not the political issues.

Mr Randall: Read the one from Kilkenny Primary School.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, Kilkenny is an interesting one. I refer to the submission made by the Brahma Lodge school, which states:

If you wish to help please ring the Central Northern Regional Office and leave the message that you are opposed to Government cuts in teacher aide time.

That is merely a means of getting to the Government somehow parental opinion. What can be wrong with allowing the Government to canvass parental opinion? That is hardly the basis of political activism. That is hardly the insidious dissemination of left-wing propaganda. I refer to the Cowandilla Junior Primary School letter, which states:

Teachers and parents must fight to stop Government cuts in education spending. You can show your support by signing the tear-off slip and returning it to school as soon as possible.

We will send all responses to the Minister of Education, Mr Harold Allison.

All that again is providing for is the canvassing of parental opinion, so that the Minister can be fully aware of just what parents are thinking about these matters. We can go further south to the Reynella East Primary School. The letter states:

We seek your support in any way possible to bring to the Government's attention the above ideas so that the existing quality of education will not be downgraded.

Another letter is from Parafield Gardens High School and was a three-page document clearly outlining the effects that the cuts in school assistants' hours would have on that school. In the first part, it set out the Government's reasons for undertaking the cut in school assistants' hours—an objective approach to the whole thing. It set out the Government's reasons and then analysed the impact of that on the school in question, coming down with the result that the school in question would be prejudiced by those cuts. That document was for information. It did not suggest to the parents any course of action at all.

The further two that I am particularly interested in come from Brighton Primary School and Adelaide High School. They are quite interesting because we have the various references that Government resources are being used to disseminate political propaganda. I have just outlined that the newsletters I quoted in fact have been information

documents outlining events and realistically stating what is happening to the schools in question. Two of these schools—Adelaide High School and Brighton Primary School—went one stage further and decided that they would prepare their own newsletters at their own expense and in their own time. I will be interested to know whether the Minister of Education prepared a newspaper advertisement in his own time at his own expense. I would be interested to know whether the Premier in his letter to school council chairpersons disseminating those blatant distortions, misrepresentations and terminological inaccuracies did that, in his own time. I doubt it.

The question in each of these again has been the dissemination of information clearly outlining the case. I believe that this has been another factor in this whole dispute where the Government has attempted to misrepresent what is really going on. I suggest that if one goes through many of the letters that went home from schools one would find the same to be the case. The Government has not chosen to do that. It has chosen to pick on paragraphs here and there in one or two letters that may have gone home from a couple of schools and has ignored the bulk of the newsletters that have gone home from the majority of schools. That seems to be the Government's style—to find out what might conceivably support its case, and then ignore the majority information.

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): In this grievance debate, I wish to show my concern at the effects of what appears to be very lenient sentencing given out by some courts. Indeed, a soft line has been adopted by some courts recently. These matters go back to the Labor Government because we are dealing mainly with people of 20 years and over who are the graduates of lenient handling of juveniles under the previous Administration. Do not let us get away from that fact. Suspended sentences in the courts have caused public objection and concern. Many members of the public are concerned that the courts are failing in their responsibility to society generally by some of the sentencing handed out recently. There is a general demand in a great many countries of the world, by people who have thought about this.

Many countries of the world are demanding that a tougher line be taken in the area of violent crime particularly. By that I refer to assault, armed robbery and especially rape. The shocking crime of rape is well known to most people with any responsibility in their hearts and minds.

The offenders are able to hide behind the unsworn statement, which should have been law in this State by now had it not been for the actions of the Opposition in refusing to allow the matter to go through earlier this year. Had that not been so, there would have been some protection for rape victims and the offenders would have been in a situation where they could be questioned by the courts instead of hiding behind the unsworn statement, as they can do at present. This Opposition in this House is responsible for that provision not having been passed, and I hope that members opposite are proud of that.

Talking specifically of rape cases, offenders are often allowed out on bail. We have had within the last couple of weeks a shocking gang rape in which the alleged offenders, who were seen at the scene of the crime, were allowed bail. The victim of the crime is petrified and frightened to leave the house, but her alleged attackers are free and able to wander around, and they will be able to do so for months until the case comes before the court.

Mr Keneally: Did you take—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! It is out of order for the honourable member for Stuart to interject when he is not in his seat.

Mr MATHWIN: No-one would expect a murderer to be allowed out on bail, and I believe that rape is not far removed from murder. No alleged criminal in a rape case should be allowed bail. Certainly, the courts have misread what is expected of them by the community. More protection is expected for the victim, and the community does not expect the leniency shown to some offenders in our courts today. I hope that those responsible for sentencing in these shocking cases, certainly the violent offences, realise that the community expects more protection from the courts than is being afforded.

Honourable members no doubt will recall the case which happened only a couple of weeks ago. A young girl was dragged into a car by four thugs, accompanied by the wife of one of them. They were alleged to have said, 'You'll do', and she was taken to a house and ill treated in a shocking way. It is one of the most shocking cases that the police have seen in South Australia, and yet—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr MATHWIN: Those young people no doubt graduated from the previous treatment of juveniles in this State. They are now in their twenties.

Mr Hamilton: Wipe your chin and get rid of the dribble.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member knows what this is all about. He ought to know, although the honourable member has not really been here long enough to know. However, I will give him the credit for having a reasonable amount of intelligence. The honourable member ought to know that on many occasions in the past young rapists who have been put into McNally have been allowed out on weekend leave. One rapist was allowed out to see his mother and went immediately to the Adelaide—

Members interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Members opposite should listen; they will hear something that is of value to them. This young rapist then went to the Adelaide Hospital nurses' quarters and raped a young nurse there.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Olsen): Order! The honourable member for Albert Park will get his call in a moment.

Mr MATHWIN: I do not know how on earth the member for Albert Park can support that type of action. I am surprised and disappointed with the honourable member. How he can condone that sort of situation disgusts me. Let the honourable member not forget that situation. A number of people in that institution were let out and given very lenient treatment therein. These young men are, of course, now in their twenties. Let us not forget that. I am referring to the way in which the courts deal with these thugs, the lowest of the low as they are. I remind members of the recent rape emanating from incidents outside the Hilton Hotel, when the court allowed those people to be released on bail, yet the victim is imprisoned in her own house because she is petrified and too terrified to leave it.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I will catch up with the member for Glenelg in a later debate regarding the drivel with which he has gone on in the past couple of minutes. I should like now to refer to a statement made by the Premier on 11 February, when he attacked me about the number of questions that I asked in the Parliament, and

when he referred, in particular, to the cost of printing the Notice Paper. He said that that printing cost \$100 a page. He is also reported in *Hansard* as having said:

I do not regard, for example, Question No. 1 020—'What is cystic fibrosis and what are the symptoms of the disease?'

The Premier failed to refer to the other five questions that I had asked regarding that matter. It is interesting to see that on 2 June I received a three-page letter from the Minister of Health detailing all the symptoms of this disease and all the drugs used in relation to it. I appreciate receiving that reply, although it was a little tardy in coming to me. Numerous drugs can be used to treat this very serious hereditary disorder. The Minister of Health referred to the types of machine that are available in various hospitals to assist these people who are unfortunate enough to have inherited this disorder.

The Minister's reply also goes on to refer to the types of restrictions that apply to these drugs and to say where they can be obtained from hospitals, and whether or not they are free. One can imagine my surprise when I happened to read in the *Age* newspaper a month ago that the Western Australian Liberal member, Mr Bungey, asked 963 questions, which were placed on the Notice Paper and asked of, surprisingly enough, his own Government in the Federal Parliament.

One wonders what the cost would be to taxpayers throughout Australia for those 963 questions that were put on the Notice Paper by Mr Bungey from Western Australia. We have not heard one peep from the Premier about that cost. Democracy for the Liberal Party at any cost, but when it comes to the Opposition asking questions of the Government, the Government does not believe in that kind of democracy.

I now refer to an issue that I have raised continually since I have been in the Parliament, and specifically in October 1979, regarding the problems of the disabled people in the community and in particular the need for a heated therapeutic swimming pool in my district, at the headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Service Unit at Royal Park to service those people in the western districts. The Premier attended the opening of this unit and, in response to a request for additional funds, he somewhat stupidly, I thought, replied, 'I have three new words in my vocabulary since becoming Premier. The first two are "How much?" and the third word is "No".' The Government has continually denied these disabled people that facility even though the Minister of Industrial Affairs has gone on record in the Parliament as saying that he wants these people to be rapidly rehabilitated back into the community so that they can play a useful role. It is about time he put his money where his mouth is. From the latest information I have received, the Western Rehabilitation Service has still not been able to obtain that money and the Government is too mean to update the plans for that centre. I received correspondence on 15 May which states, in part:

As you are aware, numerous approaches have been directed to the Health Commission and, as yet, no commitment has been given. The present situation is, as I understand from the commission, that funds for the construction of such a facility could not be made available until the 1982-1983 financial year. More recently an approach was made to the commission to seek approval to engage architects to update the existing design and specifications which are now some two years old. We have since received a response, dated 24 March 1981, from the Chairman of the commission stating that the commission had given a great deal of time and consideration to our proposal but, unfortunately, due to increased economic constraints and

pressure for funds for capital works, the commission were unable to foresee when they would be able to fund the proposal. They went on to say that it would not be prudent to document the scheme at this stage. The scheme would be reviewed in twelve months.

Our committee of management are disappointed with the response from the Health Commission and currently are discussing the possibility of seeking a deputation with both the Chairman and the Minister of Health.

As we have indicated before, we see the facility on site would provide hydrotherapy and fitness training for up to 30 people per day, five days a week. At the moment, we are only able to offer a limited facility for approximately 30 minutes per week using other public pools in the area. Consequently, only minimal gains can be achieved.

Quite clearly, the Government is not prepared to put its money where its mouth is. The Ministers speak with a forked tongue. They make hypocritical statements in this Parliament about the need to rehabilitate people but, especially in the International Year of the Disabled Person, we get a knock-back from the Government.

One wonders about the credibility of Ministers opposite. Finally, I would like to refer to another issue which I raised on 7 August 1980, when I informed the Minister of Transport about the intention of the Australian National Railways Commission in relation to country rail services in South Australia. In part I stated:

We have seen the gutless display of our State Minister in not taking the Federal Minister to arbitration.

That was in relation to the curtailment of services. I also informed the Minister on that date that there would be a discontinuation of less than car load consignment loading in South Australian country areas. Sure enough, that will now take place. Yesterday, in the presence of the local member, I received a copy of a letter from Mr A. W. Lawson of the Tailem Bend Sub-branch of the Australian Railways Union which he forwarded to the Editor of the *Murray Valley Standard*. In part he states that there are over 50 country rail stations that will not be able to load less than car load consignments. So much for this Government looking after people in country areas. We have heard a great deal tonight about the cost of upgrading roads in country areas. A reduction of services in these areas will mean additional road transport on these roads carving up country roads and placing additional pressure on those roads and the finances of this State. This Government and its Federal Government colleagues kowtow to the big road hauliers in this country.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to briefly speak this morning. I did not intend to take part in this debate, but I found a letter in my box—

Mr KENEALLY: Mr Speaker, I believe the member for Eyre has a right to a quorum, and therefore I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: I was referring to a letter addressed to the Premier and written by the Principal of the Kilkenny Primary School, Mr A. M. Talbert. This letter is a disgrace to the person who put his signature to it. The third paragraph of the letter states:

I must confess that whilst I was listening and watching your performance on four television channels, for a moment I thought I was listening to Dr Goebbels, former Minister of Propaganda in Nazi Germany. Then I realised, however, that there were significant differences, for Dr Goebbels was slightly more plausible, slightly less given to hysteria, and you do not have a club foot.

Apparently the Leader of the Opposition thinks that this is funny. I believe that it is a disgrace. Any person employed

in the public service of this State who would make such disgraceful allegations and who slurs the Premier of this State in this way is unfit, in my view, to be in charge of school pupils.

An honourable member: Who wrote the letter?

Mr GUNN: Mr Talbert, the Principal of the Kilkenny Primary School—

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I do not care who he votes for. This particular document is a gross misrepresentation of the facts and it is written on departmental letterhead. It is obvious that the gentleman has not correctly read the education policy yet. He claims to have copies of the Liberal Party policy, but it is obvious that he does not understand it, or if he does, he has a twisted imagination. I would say that any reasonable or fair-minded person who has studied and considered the actions of the Government in the field of education could not help but be impressed. The Government has taken a realistic approach to the problems of education. An attack was made by this gentleman when he said, 'Harold Allison has probably been the most ineffective and most useless Minister of Education in this State's history'. That is a blatant untruth which can be substantiated by facts.

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member will never get the opportunity. We all know very well that the previous Minister was only the gentleman who signed the dockets; Mr Hudson made all the decisions. We know that there has been a consistent campaign organised by the extreme left wing of the Institute of Teachers to discredit this Government, and they are doing a grave disservice to the teaching profession and to those well-meaning people in this State who are genuinely concerned about education. The campaign that has been promoted by the member for Salisbury has done nothing to improve education. All he has done is to organise a group of extremists. We saw one of them on television the other night attempting to debate with the Minister of Education. By that sort of activity those people are doing a grave disservice to the people of this State and to the people they purport to represent.

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr GUNN: The member for Salisbury came into this House with a fine record. He was a person who had led marchers through the streets of this city. When he thinks of all those people who had to flee for their lives and of those people whom Amnesty International was appealing for today and yesterday, he can feel very proud of his involvement in selling those people out. The member for Salisbury came into this place with a fine reputation which is something he should be very proud of every night when he goes to sleep.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I think it is important to point out to Mr Talbert that in real terms this Government increased education spending, even with falling enrolments. That is something that appears to have escaped those gentlemen who are purportedly so concerned. The member for Salisbury gave some very selective quotes concerning a school in the Glenelg District. It was interesting to note the schools. The policy of the Government has done a great deal for education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre never needs any assistance, and particularly not at 4 o'clock in the morning.

Mr GUNN: In conclusion, I want to say that I hope that I am not again plagued with the sort of nonsense that Mr Talbert has been circulating. I suggest that he concentrate

on teaching instead of putting his time into malicious and inaccurate documents such as he has circulated.

Motion carried.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 1), 1981

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 June. Page 3698.)

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I am pleased to indicate the support of the Opposition to this measure, a necessary one for the running of the State.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I feel inclined to say at this late hour that that is the finest speech that the Leader of the Opposition has made today.

Bill read a second time.

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

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

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable member for Baudin speaking as lead speaker for the Opposition, with the concurrence of the Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): Yes, Sir. I want to raise the matter of natural bushland and scrub clearance. One only has to look at maps of vegetation cover in South Australia as recently as 1945 at the end of the war to see the extraordinary extent to which the natural bushland of this State has been cleared. While one would like to believe that this problem has now largely been arrested, it would appear that there are still large stands of natural vegetation which are at risk. I refer particularly to large remaining areas on Eyre Peninsula, where it is said that those stands of vegetation are at risk. There has been a concerted attempt since the mid-1960's in this State to place large representative samples of various varieties of vegetation cover under some sort of control, which of course found its statutory form in the National Parks and Wildlife Act of 1972 as a national park, a conservation reserve, a game reserve, or something like that. Such areas effectively protect the natural vegetation which, in turn, is habitat for our native fauna. There remain large areas of natural vegetation which are outside of those protected areas and which therefore remain at risk.

One of the problems in this matter is the Commonwealth income tax laws as they relate to clearance of scrub. The Income Tax Assessment Act, 1936-1973, in section 75, listed a series of circumstances under which expenditure incurred in a year of income by a taxpayer engaged in primary production could be claimed as a deduction. The Act provides:

(a) the eradication or extermination of animal or vegetable pests from the land;

(b) the destruction and removal of timber, scrub or undergrowth indigenous to the land;

(c) the destruction of weed or plant growth detrimental to the land;

Perhaps paragraph (f) is important here too, which provides:

The draining of swamp or low-lying land where that operation improves the agriculture or grazing value of the land;

I think that perhaps paragraphs (b) and (f) are the important ones. In 1973, the Whitlam Government amended that section, and basically it first amended

section 75 of the Act to provide that that section would only continue to operate in relation to a contract which would be made on or before 21 August 1973. Instead, a new section 75a was struck which largely repeated the conditions under which deductibility could be claimed, and provided that the deduction would be allowed over a 10-year period with one-tenth of the deduction occurring in any one year. This was obviously less attractive to the would-be land clearer, and there were those people in the Commonwealth Parliament who opposed it on those grounds. One need only turn to the comments made by the then Mr Philip Lynch (page 3750 of Commonwealth *Hansard*):

The Opposition is particularly concerned by the proposals in the legislation to eliminate the productivity incentives for primary industry. Clauses 17, 18 and 19 of the Income Tax Assessment Bill seek to abolish the present deductions for the cost of certain capital expenditure on land used for primary production. The deductions now cover vital expenditures such as clearing and preparing land; internal fencing; the provision of water and the storage of fodder. We would agree with the observations of the Coombs Committee that such concessions can be abused by other than genuine farmers and that in some instances they enforce the process of destruction of native flora and fauna. However, the removal of these concessions from bona fide primary producers is, we believe, entirely unwarranted. This action will hold back the required expansion in some areas of rural production which is required to increase the supply of important primary produce.

Those views were echoed by Mr Adermann, of the Country Party, and others. Despite that, the amendment as I have outlined was carried and, with the exception of one amendment about a year ago to which I will refer, that has largely remained the position. I suppose it really depends on where you place your priorities, whether you really believe it important to primary production that large still remaining unproductive areas be brought into production, or whether you believe that already the process of the clearance of natural vegetation has gone beyond what people would regard as desirable and that there should be no incentives for further clearing. I believe in the latter principle, that there should no longer be incentives for clearance, and I believe that is one way in which we can protect what remains of our indigenous flora and the habitat for our indigenous fauna.

An honourable member: What about food production?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I would see that as largely being a matter of more intensively using the land we already have. In any event, other things can be done beyond simply removing the incentives for the clearance of land, because I have noticed (this is reported in the April edition of *Habitat Australia*) that at least two States in Australia have sought to make incentives for reafforestation of natural scrub. I know that our present Minister of Environment has introduced legislation that would have the effect of providing incentives for primary producers and other landowners and others, to—

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: It's good legislation, too.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Indeed. It is something that the Labor Government was in the course of preparing.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: That Government was taking a long time to do anything about it.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not going to comment on the time table. The Labor Government did a lot in environmental legislation from the time this was the first State to have a Minister of Environment. In any event, I applaud the legislation which is such as to give an incentive to people to retain the virgin scrub that is on their properties, but New South Wales and Victoria appear to

have gone further and have looked at incentives for encouraging the regrowth of areas that have been cleared in the past. In Victoria, there is the Victorian Tree Growing Assistance Scheme, which has been set up by amendment to the Forests Act. Under this, landowners can get assistance of up to \$12 000 in any one year. They can use this for the purchase of trees for regeneration and for the fencing off of areas that are marked down for regeneration.

There have to be safeguards to ensure that the expenditure is in the interests of the community generally, and not simply the individual landowner, and so the money, in whatever form it is made available to the landowner, has to be approved by a committee of management.

In New South Wales the Landscape Conservation Review Committee has put forward a proposal for a landscape conservation incentive scheme. This would provide \$4 000 grants as well as in some cases valuation and rate relief for landscape improvements, and I would imagine that the forms of landscape improvement that might be gone into would be similar to what is being done already in Victoria, which the New South Wales people may have initiated. It is not clear from the report in *Habitat* how far they have gone.

One of the things that Geoff Mosley of the Australian Conservation Foundation, the writer of this article, suggests, is that, although tree planting is something that is very satisfying to conservationists and to people generally who are concerned with regeneration, in fact natural regeneration is probably the better way to go about doing this. It means fencing off an area where there are seed trees, and allowing nature to take its course. Of course, this could work. I look forward to getting up to the Flinders Ranges National Park some time. Many years ago, I can remember visiting what was then called the Orparinna National Park, which had only a short time before that been bought by the Government. It had been a pastoral property. The ranger at the time was pointing out evidence of regeneration which had occurred once the stock had been taken off the property. It will be interesting for me to see what has happened in the last eight or nine years with regeneration.

Geoff Mosley suggests that we need a national strategy for regeneration of native flora, and he has a five-point plan which he suggests should be taken up. I commend this whole scheme to the Minister, as I would commend any efforts he can have with the Commonwealth Government to do away with the incentives which apply for scrub clearance. I am particularly concerned, for example, with the Fleurieu Peninsula and that area around the present conservation reserve at Deep Creek. When one looks at the vegetation map for 1945 and sees the area of the peninsula which in those days was under native vegetation, and when one looks at the lamentable picture that is occurring right now, one can see the scope for regeneration.

I note that a Mr Quentin Wollaston, who runs a nursery at Delamere, has been writing to the press about this matter recently and vehemently opposing the concept of the Deep Creek park containing some areas which are currently used for pastoral purposes; not that he believes the sheep should be turned off it, but rather he believes that the Minister should sell those cleared areas and use the finance for the purchase of other areas under scrub. I would very much oppose the Wollaston position in this, because I would like to see those areas eventually regenerated so that what we now see as the Deep Creek Conservation Park may eventually be a core area for a very much larger area under native vegetation.

Clearance still continues along the South Coast, I am afraid. I was at Victor Harbor a few weeks ago and I was told that an area near Newland Head had been rolled and burnt not long ago. I had been told before going down there that in fact the local landowner had offered the property to the Government for conservation purposes. The Government had decided that it did not have the money or could not put the priority there, or something like that, and in desperation the gentleman involved rolled the scrub and burnt. I was told at the time that it was not too late to save some of this area but that, if the Government dithered about it for very much longer, the whole lot would go.

I am pleased to see that the Minister is with us to hear this debate. I know that he is listening carefully to everything that I am saying and that he will have his advisers read *Hansard* to enable them to give him further advice on these matters probably later today or tomorrow. It is serious enough to warrant a Ministerial statement from the honourable gentleman.

People generally in the conservation movement are concerned about where we are going with scrub clearance. Some people would like to see a complete moratorium on scrub clearance. Just what sort of legislative adventure would be involved in that, I am not too sure. However, we do have sovereignty in the matter, so I am sure that legislation could be introduced. I am not at this stage advocating that course of action, but I am certainly advocating that there should be, first, a dispensing of those current incentives applying to scrub clearance and also the draining of swamp lands and that sort of thing.

I would urge close examination of the Victorian and New South Wales initiatives currently being taken in order to get some reforestation so far as native vegetation is concerned. Too often in reforestation people talk of the planting of exotics. Of course, in the past the Woods and Forests Department in South Australia was very much involved in the clearing of scrub land and the planting of exotic softwoods. I understand that that is no longer the department's policy. I hope that that is the case and, if it is, I applaud that policy. In future, exotic softwoods will be planted in areas that are already cleared, so that there will be no further decimation of our bush.

I did say earlier that I was going to refer to the 1980 amendment to the Income Tax Assessment Act. I do not want unduly to prolong my remarks because of the time. I make the point that, where it impinges on this at all, it is only in relation to the flooding of land; that is to say, it relates more to swamp lands than it does to the clearing of native vegetation. So, section 75a continues to operate in the form in which it was left by the Whitlam Government. I am sorry that that Government did not go further in view of its lack of a majority in the Senate and in view of the criticisms, in any case, that were brought up by Liberal and Country Party members. It possibly felt that that was as far as it could go at the time. It was a great pity that some Government since then has not gone further.

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): I rise in this debate to grieve about a situation that I predicted earlier today. We now learn from today's *Advertiser* that yesterday, because of the situation at the Yatala Labour Prison in my electorate, three prisoners went over the wall. The very things which the prison officers raised with me this morning and which I related to the House today (in which opinions I concurred) have happened. The report in the *Advertiser* states:

Three prisoners, caught soon after escaping from Yatala Labour Prison yesterday, should never have gotten free, according to striking gaol officers.

The prisoners climbed the prison wall about 3.30 p.m. near

the north-western lookout tower which the gaol officers say was not manned because of the strike. Chief prison officers caught two men near the wall and police caught the third in a Highways Department depot, about 400 metres away, within about 25 minutes.

Police said authorities had seen the men escaping on closed circuit television and chief prison officers rushed to the wall. But gaol officers picketing the prison said the escape proved surveillance cameras could not replace patrolling officers.

The President of the prison officers section of the Australian Government Workers Association, Mr K. R. Fowler, said the escape would not have happened if full staff had been working. 'Cameras do not catch people, they only assist people on the ground,' he said.

The point has been made quite firmly that, while the cameras play a role in the control and containment of prisoners, they cannot stop prisoners from escaping. I hope the Government will review the situation and consider listening to the arguments and points made by the men whose responsibility it is to ensure that prisoners serve out the sentences imposed on them by the courts.

I am also concerned about an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* today in regard to the report that the Chief Secretary tabled in the House earlier. The proposals contained in the report will place the South Australian prisons in a worse situation than they are in at present. Prison officers believe that they handle their jobs fairly well and I have heard no requests for the things that are recommended in the report, such as the provision of sufficient restraining equipment including handcuffs, tear gas, and batons to all institutions. The very thought of those pieces of equipment must conjure up in the minds of many people scenes that have been witnessed in prisons in other States of Australia and in the U.S.A. I wonder about the mentality of the people who prepared the report.

Frequent surprise cell and body searches at random intervals not to exceed 20 days will, no doubt, be objected to. I cannot see that those measures will make for a more desirable environment in the correctional institutions. They are a bit incongruent in light of the method by which the department has apparently tried to get around periods during which prison officers have been forced to take industrial action and withdraw their labour. Peace has been bought at the prison by officers promising remission to prisoners on a day-for-day basis: for every day that the prison officers are out, if the prisoners behave themselves, they receive one day's remission from their sentence.

It seems there is some potential for improving discipline in the prisons by considering that aspect of prison control, which is certainly not consistent with some of the very vocal arguments put forward by members of the Government and their supporters in the community when the Parole Board makes decisions in regard to remissions of sentences. I understand that those remissions are made after considerable investigation and deliberation of a number of factors, such as prisoner behaviour, the response to rehabilitation procedures, and so on. We have a situation where there is a direct trade-off by the Government in its attempt to buy prison security at the expense of prison officers who are involved in an industrial dispute.

After having discussions with a number of people who have young sons imprisoned at Yatala, I am concerned at the way in which some of those young men have been imprisoned there. One thing that concerns me is that a number of young men are imprisoned there for traffic offences. It never occurred to me, until it was explained to me, that many young people were brought up in a society which relies heavily on the motor car and were taught in schools and in the home a few years ago that it was the

right and entitlement of every Australian youth to get a job and own a motor car. That was the ethic.

Unfortunately, many of these young people have not been able to obtain employment, so they rely on social service benefits. They cannot afford to purchase good cars, so they buy clapped out heaps. Then, because of the way petrol prices have been escalated by the Government in this State, they are faced with a dilemma because they cannot afford to register the car and also buy petrol. Therefore, in their opinion, they come to the logical conclusion that a motor vehicle can be run without registration, but it cannot be run without petrol. Therefore, they drive their vehicles on the roads unregistered, are apprehended by the police, are dealt with by the courts, and quite often they lose their licences.

These young men then decide to take another chance, and in many cases are unaware of the fact that if they drive under suspension they can receive a gaol sentence. In fact, that happens. Therefore, a number of young men are imprisoned in Yatala who have not committed a really criminal offence but have only tried to get around an impediment to their acquiring something which their upbringing and education has taught them should be the right of everyone.

There is another group of people imprisoned at Yatala for stealing offences. That offence is also related to the unemployment situation and the fact that many people in our society live in poverty. There appears to be a Robin Hood ethic amongst young people, because their upbringing has led them to believe that if you are suppressed by the rich you act like Robin Hood and rob the rich to feed the poor. Those people are also imprisoned at Yatala. In fact, I believe they are political prisoners. They are prisoners of a system which cannot adequately provide for society. I am greatly concerned that the Touche Ross Services report has come up with propositions which smack of a police State.

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

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I wish to take this opportunity to raise a matter of great concern to a small number of constituents in my electorate. Nevertheless, they are a group of constituents who have suffered for many years as a result of Government policies. They are the people whose properties are to be acquired for the building of the O'Bahn bus system. I refer to this matter because it raises an important legal dilemma brought about by statements made to these people by several Government Ministers prior to the 1980 by-election in the Norwood district.

I point out to the House that this was part of the Liberal Party's transport policy, which was widely advertised prior to the last general election, and particularly quoted in the *News* of 21 September 1979, as follows:

It [the O'Bahn] would require the construction of only one bridge over the River Torrens and not the seven as required by the tram link.

As I said, this was widely publicised on television, in the newspapers and throughout the electoral district surrounding the Torrens River. That was a proposal which attracted much attention. No doubt many people were attracted to vote for the present Government simply because that policy meant that the bus route would not pass through the lower sections of the Torrens River Valley. However, we find that that is not really the policy that the Government is now espousing. Therefore, the Government does not have a mandate for the action that it is currently advocating, and indeed works are being carried out along the Torrens to erect a preliminary stage of the O'Bahn

busway.

However, the Government still persists in pursuing this line. In an advertisement which appeared in the *News* after one year of the Government's term, on Monday 15 September, the Premier was quoted as saying that one of the greatest achievements of his Government had been to halt the environmentally destructive NEAPTR scheme and introduce the O'Bahn north-east transport system. I imagine that the interpretation of that statement is that the O'Bahn system is less environmentally destructive than the previous Government's proposals. However, we find that the O'Bahn system will require 10 bridges for that section—not one, as referred to in the Government's policy statement. A recent advertisement for consultants which appeared in papers around Australia points out the need to erect 24 bridges and associated works. Therefore, there is a massive departure from the promises held out to the electors at two elections in my electorate.

Worse than that, however, is that personal representations were made to these people by the Minister of Transport and by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and Employment. They visited many of the owners of properties which were to be acquired under the former scheme and told them that there was no possibility of a Liberal Party transport system traversing that lower section of the Torrens Valley, that is, the section from Lower Portrush Road to Hackney Road. As a consequence of those personal representations which were accepted in the good faith in which they were given, those people went out and spent money on their properties. In fact, one of my constituents spent in excess of \$13 000 on renovations to his house. Many others spent very large sums of money on renovations.

As members would be aware, there have been many proposals for the development of a transport corridor along the Torrens Valley over some 30 years. This was the first opportunity they had been given to clear that part of the corridor from any transport route. The people had been waiting for many years for either acquisition of their properties or for some decision to be taken with respect to the future requirements of that area. Many of their houses had been allowed to run down, as their plans had been deferred from time to time. This was the opportunity they had to carry out their work. They expended that money in the belief that what the Ministers had told them was true. Soon they were to have their hopes dashed and their money thrown down the drain, so to speak, because the Government announced, contrary to its stated policy, contrary to its election promises, contrary to the personal representations made by Ministers of the Crown, that the Government would still take a transport corridor through that lower section of the Torrens Valley and that those houses would be compulsorily acquired. Therefore the money expended on those properties could not be recovered without an incredible amount of arguing and heartbreak in the process.

The question that I raise and on which I would appreciate some indication from the Government is as to what special compensation will be given to those people. I imagine that they would have some action at law for negligent mis-statement. There is a fiduciary relationship between a person holding a responsible office in the Crown and to a subject of that Crown and a person who acts on that information and has caused damage as a result of the negligence of that information. An action would then lie. I would hope that it would not be necessary for people to pursue legal remedies and that the Government would in good faith adequately compensate these people for a most unsatisfactory set of circumstances. It is the sort of behaviour of breaking of promises that destroys

people's credibility in Governments and politicians in particular.

The people along the sections of the Torrens River have had threats of acquisition holding over their heads for many many years. This is the straw that has broken the camel's back. These people are older people in the community who are not normally able to defend themselves against the powers of Government. It is in this sense that I raise the matter in this House so that opportunity can be given to the Government to give this matter due consideration and hopefully that special consideration and financial compensation can be given to those people who have been harmed by this most unfortunate and unsavoury style of politicking and holding out of carrots in the worst sense of political campaigning. The resultant programmes that will now take place in the building of these 10 bridges in this lower section will cause incredible destruction to the Torrens Valley, and dislocation of people will be much greater now than it would have been under the previous Government's proposals. This further agitation that has been caused to citizens is something that I deplore and hope can be remedied without delay.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): This morning I want to talk about a matter that has caused me a great deal of concern as well as a large number of people in Port Adelaide. It refers to the possible closure of the special clinic at Port Adelaide. The special clinic is the venereal disease clinic. There are only two in Adelaide—one at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the other at Port Adelaide. I would have hoped that the Minister would be here this morning, but I realise that it is 4.50 a.m. Being so charitable myself, I can understand why one of the weaker sex does not front up at this time of the morning, and I do not blame her. I would think that she has a little more sense than we have. I received representations on 10 April this year from people expressing—I am pleased that the lady I referred to is now in the Chamber. I would not wish to speak behind her back. I will now dish out a little punishment.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There is no intention of closing it. I signed a letter two hours ago to reassure you. I hope I have not destroyed your speech.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You can just sit down now.

Mr WHITTEN: Do not worry about that. I want to relate to the House the situation I have been involved in and the concern caused to many people in Port Adelaide by the possible closure of a very important clinic there. Perhaps the Minister of Health could say that venereal disease should not be as prevalent in the community, but the fact that venereal diseases are prevalent and that causes me much concern.

I was advised of the possible closure of that V.D. clinic. I was told that the doctor in charge would retire at the end of April and that no-one was to be appointed to take his place. The people concerned with the clinic were also very fearful that there might not be any employees at the clinic. The clinic operates very unusual hours, in as much as most of the patients attend in the hours of darkness. Few people go there before 4 p.m. and the clinic is open until 10.30 p.m.

The clinic provides a very necessary service, because, in the three months to the end of 1980, 351 patients attended that clinic. Members will agree that that is a large number and perhaps a number that should not have to attend but unfortunately they do and I think we will be seeing this for some time. The clinic is still operating. I would like to think that the response I made to the Minister was successful.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There was never any

intention to close it.

Mr WHITTEN: Why could not the Minister have said that when I sent her a letter on 10 April? I will read the letter. I believe that I couched it in terms that had no stand-over tactics in them. I asked the Minister for information to clear the air. The letter states:

I regret to advise that it has been drawn to my attention that it may be your intention to close the special clinic at Port Adelaide. You would be aware that the Port Adelaide clinic is the only V.D. unit other than Adelaide where patients may seek examination and attention. I am sure you will agree that a large percentage of those attending the unit at Port Adelaide do so because the clinic is open until late at night, they can remain anonymous, can be examined and receive immediate treatment without reference to their family doctor.

I think this sort of operation is extremely good, because I know that some people who attend are children as young as 12 years of age from schools. In the main, those attending are very young. They do not want their parents to know the problems they have and they are able to go to this clinic (a clinic that I praise: it is doing a good job) without parents' reference to a family doctor. The letter continues:

During the last three months of 1980, 351 patients attended the clinic, the majority from an area extending from Mansfield Park through to Osborne-Taperoo—an area which includes all the electorate of Price. As the only other V.D. Clinic at Adelaide closes at 4 p.m. it is difficult for employed persons and students to attend and receive treatment.

Should this very necessary service be withdrawn from Port Adelaide, I feel that the health of many people may be at risk due to those persons who may have contracted venereal diseases, may not seek immediate attention, if the services of the V.D. Unit is not readily available and so therefore infect other persons.

I do express my grave concern at the possibility of the closure of the Special Clinic at Port Adelaide and trust you can assure me that it is not your attention to do so or allow it to become ineffective from a further reduction of hours.

There had been a reduction in hours, and that is why I said that it would become ineffective. I was pleased that, on 13 April, the Minister's Secretary replied to my letter, as follows:

Dear Mr Whitten,

I have been asked by the Minister of Health to acknowledge your letter of 10 April 1981 concerning the Port Adelaide Venereal Disease Clinic.

The Minister is considering the matter and she will write to you as soon as possible.

Now here we are, and it will be eight weeks tomorrow since I sent the letter.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There is a heavy volume of mail in my office.

Mr WHITTEN: I can understand the pressure that the Minister would be under, but I suggest that some of it has been brought about by the Minister herself. If there is no intention to close the place, why not let me know? Why not say something to me about it? The letter was acknowledged on the first working day after I sent it, and I appreciated that, but I am disgusted and concerned about what I have had to tell people in Port Adelaide who have come to me. I have said, 'All I can say is that the Minister is considering the matter. She has had it for only two months and she will make up her mind one of these days. After all, she is a woman'. Perhaps I am sexist.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Thank you.

Mr WHITTEN: I was trying to be charitable. I could understand it if the Minister had not been here tonight, because perhaps those of the weaker sex have more sense

than we have and they would not be here. I am pleased that the Minister has said tonight that the clinic will not close and that she will send me a letter at some time in the future. I hope to receive it next week.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): In the time allowed me tonight, I want to raise a few issues of importance to the people in my district. First, I would like to have recorded in *Hansard* my appreciation of the actions of the Australian Railways Union in lifting its ban on the defunct Glanville to Semaphore railway line, which allowed the line to be removed. It was an action that will allow Semaphore Road to be upgraded and it will convert an area that has created many difficulties over the years for residents, especially the elderly in our community, into a considerably more serviceable, practical and attractive thoroughfare, a road that I believe has the potential to be one of the best seaside areas in Adelaide.

There are two other areas of considerable concern. Only one of the Ministers concerned with these matters is present in the Chamber. There are a couple of problems on the peninsula. I think they have been in existence for long enough, and it is time that something was done about them. They are matters that affect people's lives and their lifestyles, and they are sufficiently significant to bring to the attention of this Parliament. The first relates to the beaches in our area. All members will recall that, in the last few days, the metropolitan area has been hammered fairly significantly by storms, high tides, and high winds which have created some damage, although I believe it was controlled somewhat by the sand replenishment scheme.

In reply to a question from the member for Albert Park today, the Minister said that all metropolitan beaches have been inspected by officers of the Coast Protection Board.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: Were being inspected.

Mr. PETERSON: They were being or were about to be inspected. The Minister said that repairs would be effected where necessary. I think that I am correct in saying that.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: I can't remember saying that.

Mr PETERSON: Ministers have that ability. The Minister said something to that effect. Undoubtedly, sand will again be needed for the replenishment programme of the southern beaches. I know that I can say that our beaches will be viewed once again as a source of sand for that replenishment programme.

Mr Mathwin: How are you fixed for seaweed up your end?

Mr PETERSON: That is down the list. The honourable member will have to wait. We have had experience of the sand removal programme over the years, and I have asked the Minister to investigate fully the problems experienced previously with sand removal in our area. There has been quite a bit of resident disturbance and disruption to the beach. There must be difficulties in removing the quantities of sand that have been moved, but surely it could be done in a way that would create the least possible lifestyle disruption for residents and leave the beaches in some sort of sensible order, without the gutters that hold up the seaweed in the areas in which it is not normally held, thereby creating many more problems than we really need.

Another problem with our beaches that causes a continual nuisance is the seaweed build-up. Now Government members can clap. This has been a problem for a considerable time. I accept that it was a problem before this Government came to office, and it is still a problem. I raised this matter when I first entered this Parliament, and I have spoken to the Minister and his departmental officers. However, we have not been able at

this stage to elicit an effective response. After the storm of which I have spoken in the past few days in the Taperoo area, seaweed has been driven high on to the beach above the normal area. The stench is overpowering; it is really bad.

Mr Mathwin: Why don't you sell it?

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member can have all that he likes. I will give it to him. This seaweed is creating problems. Indeed, it blocks the beach in the summer, and in the winter it holds up into these areas; the stench is overpowering. I do not know what is the answer to this problem, which must eventually be solved. I ask the Minister once again to have a look at that area of concern and see whether an answer can be found. There must be an answer somewhere.

Mr Mathwin: Don't forget that the Minister inherited that situation.

Mr PETERSON: If the member for Glenelg had been listening, he would have heard me say that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections from a member who is out of his seat are grossly irregular.

Mr PETERSON: This has been a long term problem that needs to be answered. Let us not blame anyone for it but rather find an answer to it. Once again, I ask the Minister seriously to examine this problem.

The other problem in the area is the concern that has been expressed about by the proposal to put a standard gauge railway line through the area. Unfortunately, the Minister of transport is not in the Chamber at the moment. I raised this matter a considerable time ago when we debated the railways agreement. That must have been 12 months ago, or close to it.

The Minister said that the State had the option of going to arbitration if there was anything about the agreement that was not satisfactory. I raised at that stage the problem of running the line up the centre of the peninsula, and I proposed an alternative route on the eastern railway corridor where all the industries are located. I know that every Minister in this State and every Government department connected with the scheme, as well as every industry on the peninsula, the local council (namely, the Port Adelaide Council), and every resident along the line support the eastern rail corridor route.

The Anrail environmental study supports that route, but we cannot get an answer. They will not come out and say which way they are going. That may not seem to be much of a problem to members but there is a problem to which I have referred previously: if the line goes a certain way, it will mean that at least two houses must be demolished. Those properties will have to be purchased and the houses removed. This will cause considerable disruption to the lifestyles of those people. One family has moved in only recently and will have to move out. That is, therefore, a problem.

The other problem is that, if the line does go up the centre of the peninsula along the passenger line, it will disrupt every person who lives in the vicinity of or adjacent to that line. The line will still have to be run back to the eastern corridor to service the industries, and there is no feasible, reasonable or practical reason why it should not go on the eastern corridor. However, I cannot get an answer. I have written to Canberra and have been to Anrail here, and I ask now that representatives of this Government obtain an answer for the Semaphore people regarding the route that the standard gauge line will take. An answer must be given eventually.

I believe that the line will be into Adelaide in 12 months, and I think that the route on the peninsula is supposed to be there a short period thereafter. A decision

must therefore be made. I ask Government representatives please to ascertain where it is going so that the people on the peninsula can be told. The worry that this is causing some of these people is unnecessary and unwarranted. As the answer must be given eventually, why cannot it be given now? Why should these people be made to wait?

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through Committee without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.10 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, 4 June at 2 p.m.