

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 22 July 1981

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

PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Petitions signed by 225 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the Beverage Container Act to provide that PET bottles be subject to a deposit were presented by the Hon. W. E. Chapman and Messrs Max Brown and Glazbrook.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 90 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act was presented by Mr Glazbrook.

Petition received.

PETITION: CALIGULA

A petition signed by 93 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit the screening of the film *Caligula* in South Australia was presented by the Hon. W. E. Chapman.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORT LINCOLN DRAINAGE

A petition signed by 138 residents of Happy Valley, Port Lincoln, praying that the House urge the Minister of Public Works to support the provision of a deep drainage system for the Happy Valley area of Port Lincoln was presented by Mr Blacker.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

INVESTMENT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier state why the Government sought to mislead the Industrial Commission in the recent wage indexation case by presenting economic material and statistics which conflicted with other publications of the Government, such as the book *South Australia—An Investment Profile*, a feature in the *Australian* on 11 February 1981 and the special propaganda supplement inserted in the press last Thursday week, and will the Premier now tell the House the true facts on investment in South Australia?

I am advised that during proceedings last month in the Industrial Commission the commission commented on a number of occasions from the bench on 'the accuracy of statements emanating from State publications'. A Government officer, giving evidence at one point in the proceedings, produced a document purporting to show disadvantages to investment in South Australia. However, the commission's attention was drawn to totally different state-

ments in other Government publications. Confronted with this, the witness was forced to admit the conflict.

On the specific question of investment in particular I would like to quote from page 506 of the transcript, where Dr J. B. Donovan, a leading national economist from W. D. Scott and Company of Sydney, who had been called on behalf of the employer groups, was being cross-examined by Mr Felmingham, for the United Trades and Labor Council. I quote as follows:

Q. Mr Felmingham: I would like to quote one or two things that the Premier said when he was in London recently. I take it from the *Advertiser* of Thursday 26 March 1981. It is a report of an address given by the Premier to a resources development symposium held at Grosvenor House Hotel in London. He said 'that in the past year investment in South Australia had increased to \$1 180 000 000 or about \$900 per head of population'. Is that consistent with your view?

A. Dr Donovan: It all depends what he means by 'investment in South Australia'. Does he mean foreign capital being invested in South Australia or what? If it is that sort of thing, then it could be because it's a small component of a large total, it could be growing while the total is falling. If, however, he means investment in general, then I don't know of the source of information of investment expenditure by States. I'm subject to correction. I don't think there is any.

Mr Bleby, for the employers, interposed at this point:

I think with respect this witness is being put in a difficult position, a quotation out of context from a newspaper report. My instructions are that the figure mentioned by the Premier was related to investment intention, not actual investment at all. I would ask my friend to put it straight if that in fact is the position.

Mr Justice Olsson said:

I thought frankly that that was the position we ended up in as a result of the last witness (from Department of Trade and Industry), along with a few other statements emanating from State Government publications which leave a bit to be desired as to their essential accuracy.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The question which has been raised by the Leader of the Opposition is, quite patently, a peg to hang various statements on that denigrate the confidence that is coming back to this State and denigrate the amount of investment.

Mr Millhouse interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite happy to respond to the member for Mitcham, who may now go back to court.

An honourable member: He is here today.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: He has not missed a sitting of this House. I have it on his own word; that is, since my Government came to office. It is a great shame that the Leader of the Opposition, at every conceivable opportunity, tries to knock down the confidence that is rebuilding in South Australia. I am reminded of his comments when he came back to Adelaide after a six-week overseas visit, and of the headlines at the time, 'No boom—Bannon'. I recognise that the Leader of the Opposition, as he so frequently does when he puts his foot in it, immediately went out the next day to try to correct the situation. But it did not really take away from the general impression he gave, and that was that the Opposition in this State bitterly resents the success that this Government has had in attracting future and potential investment to South Australia.

Mr Millhouse: I do not think we are going to get an answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections will cease from both sides of the House.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I can assure the honourable member that I will be delighted to wait for his contribution to the Address in Reply debate. Now that the Leader of the Opposition has given me the opportunity, I will just go through some of the developments that have occurred. I would be very happy to do that for him. It may take a little while.

Mr Keneally: We would be happy for you to answer the question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There has been a massive improvement in proposed—

The SPEAKER: Order! When I explained to the House and indicated that interjections would stop from both sides of the House, I meant to include, and I did include, the honourable member for Stuart.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There has been a massive increase in the amount of proposed investment in South Australia. It is true, and I do not think that the Leader of the Opposition denies it, that the Foreign Investment Review Board's figures are accurate. I give those figures up until June 1980. There has been 12 months since then and figures are not yet available. However, in that time from \$17 000 000 from projected and committed investment, there was a jump to \$1 179 700 000-worth of foreign and joint venture investment in the State.

There is a growing confidence. South Australia's share on those figures of investment approved for all Australia for the year to June 1980 was 22 per cent, as compared with 3.7 per cent in the previous year. I could, I suppose, enlighten the Leader of the Opposition still further by going through the list of companies which have given an undertaking to expand, but I do not think it would be worth taking the time of the House to do that, and I simply refer the Leader to a list of companies which was given in this House in reply to a rather similar question, although it was dressed up as another reason, some considerable time ago.

There was no intent to mislead the court. The whole position put to the commission at that time was placed in a very simple and fundamental context: that there is increased investment opportunity, there is growing confidence in South Australia, there are enormous potentials for development in this State, and those potentials will be realised, provided that private enterprise companies which have committed themselves to developing those projects are able to go on and afford to develop them. The point is simply this: if we go on getting inordinately high wage increases, inevitably the people who promote those increases must recognise that they will cost not only development opportunities in this State and in other parts of Australia, but they will cost jobs.

There is no way at all that wage increases will not seriously affect the prospects, not only of this State's economic recovery, but of Australia's economic situation as a whole. There is no way that money can be manufactured and taken out of the air if this succession of exorbitant wage demands keeps on going, and, indeed, if these wage demands are granted without full consultation and awareness of the effects that they will have on the economy, there is no doubt that jobs will be lost.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: We certainly do not want to get out of line.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We do not want to get out of line. South Australia has very significant advantages over the other States for industrial development. We want to maintain those advantages and we will do everything we can to maintain them. If that means submitting to the Industrial Commission the need to consider the effect of wage increases on potential development opportunities in this State in future, then we will continue to make those submissions to the Industrial Commission. I repeat: not only will it be the State that suffers, but it will be every person in the State who will suffer if these projects which have been agreed to in many cases or certainly firmly proposed are not able to go ahead because of wage costs.

PHARMACY CHARGES

Mr RANDALL: Can the Minister of Health inform the House what arrangements are being made to cater for special pharmaceutical needs of people suffering from chronic diseases following the introduction of charges for some pharmaceuticals dispensed from public hospitals after 1 September? My concern has arisen because of representations I have received expressing anxiety about the introduction of pharmacy charges for dispensing of medicine from public hospitals to those who do not qualify for treatment. The concern is that it will place a financial burden on people suffering from chronic diseases, such as asthma, diabetes, cystic fibrosis, arthritis, and other illnesses requiring continual medication.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I can give the honourable member and the House an assurance that the Health Commission and I are very conscious of the financial burden that could be placed on sufferers from chronic diseases which require continual medication. It is unfortunate that, when I announced the pharmacy charges, the undertaking included in my statement that this matter was being examined was not, as far as I am aware, reported by the media. The Health Commission is currently having consultations with the pharmacists at the metropolitan hospitals to devise a scheme whereby the principle which the Government accepts as being equitable, namely, that people who can afford to pay the cost of services should do so, can be incorporated into a system which enables people requiring continuing medication not to have to pay the full cost of each prescription that they require.

I also point out that there has been inequity in the past, since people requiring prescriptions from public hospitals in the metropolitan area have been able to obtain those prescriptions free of charge, but country people have not been able to do so. The new scheme, which is to be introduced after 1 September, will apply throughout the State and will take account of the particular needs of people with chronic diseases. I give an undertaking that no one suffering from a chronic disease will be required to pay the full \$2.75 for each prescription issued, and that arrangements are being made to ensure that those people are properly looked after.

The SPEAKER: Before calling for further questions, I indicate to the House that any questions directed to the Minister of Industrial Affairs will be taken by the Minister of Transport, and any questions directed to the Minister of Agriculture will be taken by the Minister of Water Resources.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier place the issue of unemployment benefit levels on the agenda of the next Premiers' Conference and will he, in the meantime, join me in urging the Commonwealth Government to increase benefits so that they are at least above the poverty level? An unemployed person under 18 years of age is forced to live on a benefit of only \$36 a week. That benefit, despite inflation, has not been increased since 1975, and for independent young people not living at home \$36 a week means abject poverty. I am informed that the benefit for people over 18 is currently \$53.45 a week, about \$18 a week below the poverty line.

The Premier will be aware that the Commonwealth's Opportunities for Youth Review has foreshadowed the possibility of abolishing unemployment benefits for people under 18 and the Commonwealth Government has said this matter will be decided subject to Budget considerations. The State Government's own report on homeless youth

suggested that independent people under 18 should, after a qualifying period, be eligible for the adult benefit, as their needs are exactly the same. Does the Premier agree? Will he support a move to lift benefits above the poverty line, or does he believe current benefit levels are acceptable?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Let me answer the first part of the explanation first. I do not think that unemployment benefits are every satisfactory, for the simple reason that most people would rather be in employment; I think that that is the important thing. Unemployment benefit levels could well be placed on the agenda for discussion, but I point out to the Deputy Leader, because I know that this is a serious question and that he is concerned about the matter, as we all are, that the matter of unemployment benefit levels is entirely one for the Federal Government.

Having said that, may I say that I share his concern and, indeed, this Government is doing its utmost to create more jobs and to make sure that fewer and fewer people have to depend upon unemployment benefits. I am pleased to say that the job creation position in South Australia is better, and that the latest figures are most reassuring. The A.B.S. labour force figures show that Australian employment levels grew by 2.2 per cent in the year to May 1981. Although the May figure was not as high as that recorded two months earlier, the decline is a seasonal movement, and even the seasonal movement this year has been encouraging.

As honourable members will know, an annual seasonal down-turn occurs, as a general rule, between December and May. In 1978-79, that down-turn was 17 200. In 1979-80, the down-turn was 13 100, and in 1980-81 the down-turn was only 3 900. That is particularly pleasing, and it goes to show that jobs are being created in South Australia, and have been able to be created at a rate which more than takes up what we have become accustomed to regard as the normal seasonal down-turn.

Our growth, too, is especially significant. State Government employment in South Australia fell by 0.5 per cent in the last year, according to the A.B.S. figures, but increased by 1.7 per cent throughout Australia. Therefore, it is pleasing that the growth that has occurred is entirely private sector growth. In other words, our growth is not artificially inflated by costs which constitute a further burden on the taxpayer; it is growth which has come from the private sector, and which is self-generating and self-supporting.

Over the 12 months to May 1981, South Australia's labour force grew by an estimated 8 200. Employment growth outstripped this increase, producing a net fall in unemployment in the year of 4 000 people. With regard to young people (and I know that the Deputy Leader is particularly concerned, as we all are, about the plight of young people), preliminary unemployment estimates for June show that South Australian unemployment declined by 4 100 during the past 12 months. Most encouraging of all is the fact that youth unemployment in South Australia is substantially lower than it was a year ago. In the 15 to 19 years age group the number of South Australians looking for full-time work declined from 17 000 in June 1980 to 11 900 this year.

I think the course that has been adopted by the State Government of encouraging private enterprise and private development is obviously beginning to pay off quite solidly in results. The unemployment levels in this State are still higher than we like; they are the legacy of the last few years of the Labor Administration, but we are gradually overcoming that situation. The trend now is quite positive and is moving towards the national level.

I sympathise very strongly indeed with anyone who is not able to get work. I have, in fact, experienced this situation within my own family for quite some considerable time,

and I know all of the difficulties that go with it. Certainly the matter of unemployment relief benefit is important. However, another matter which must be considered at all times is the question of moral support for those young people who keep on trying to get work but who find themselves rejected and therefore develop an anti-social feeling because they believe that they are just not wanted by society. I think that that is a very sad thing, and that whatever can be done to overcome the problem should be done. I repeat that our major concern as a State Government must certainly be to create jobs to give those young people and everyone in the community an opportunity of proving that they can (and should) play a worthwhile part in society as working members of that society.

TONSILLECTOMIES

Mr SCHMIDT: Has the Minister of Health seen the article in last week's *Bulletin* entitled 'Tragic Cost of Children's Surgery', which documents a number of cases of children who have died as a result of tonsillectomies? Can the Minister advise the House whether she considers action in this State is necessary to discover to what extent, if any, unnecessary surgery is being performed on children and on adults? The article in last week's *Bulletin* highlights the fact that the Australian Paediatric Association, in a submission to the recent Jamison inquiry into hospitals, stated that 95 per cent of tonsillectomies currently carried out in Australia were medically unnecessary. This report follows the fact that the *Bulletin* itself has discovered that in the past eight years some 10 cases of tonsillectomy have resulted in death, eight of these in the past eight years involving children under the age of seven years.

The article goes on to refer to the need for the tonsils, which perform an antibiotic function and protect the child from diseases. For that reason, many doctors now believe that tonsillectomies should not be carried out. It is also considered that Australia has a much higher rate of tonsillectomies than has any other country in the world. The Minister's analysis of this situation would be quite interesting.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have seen the article and it caused me great concern, as I am sure it caused concern to all parents who have had this operation recommended to them for their children and to people generally who are concerned about unnecessary surgery and unnecessary use of health services. The position in South Australia is that in the teaching hospitals there is a well organised system of peer review that I believe is satisfactory in respect to controlling unnecessary surgery. There is also a system of what is known as tissue audit, which is the procedure by which tissue or organs removed from patients by operation are subjected to a pathological examination, the results being known by the staff of the hospital. In other words, if a doctor removes tonsils or an appendix that are demonstrated to be healthy tissue, it is clearly evident to that doctor's peers that the operation should not have taken place. That combined system of tissue audit and peer review is operating satisfactorily in the teaching hospitals.

There is no control over private hospitals in South Australia, although the medical profession here has a good record of clinical practice that is recognised nationally and internationally. The way in which such abuses can be controlled is by establishing systems of morbidity data, so that evaluations can be made of whether operations were necessary. In the Eastern States, collection of that morbidity data is required legally. The South Australian Health Commission is, in conjunction with individual hospitals, reviewing the situation at present with a view to considering

whether changes should be made to legislation to enable the collection of morbidity data. I should say that I would prefer to proceed along the lines of self-regulation and systems of peer review and tissue audit that have been adopted by the medical profession voluntarily but, if the assessment indicates a need for legislative amendment to require the collection of morbidity data, I would consider the matter very sympathetically. In human and economic terms, it is absolutely essential that unnecessary surgery in Australia be stopped, and the sooner measures are taken to see that that occurs the better.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Was the Minister of Mines and Energy, or Cabinet, or both, involved in any discussions and/or approval of the recently announced steep rise of 18 per cent in electricity tariffs, and does the Minister believe that a rise of that order was justified? It has been put to me by constituents that, first, a rise of 18 per cent was not justified when the price of the gas component in the fuel cost of the trust rose by that same amount, bearing in mind that the fuel cost is only a part of the total cost structure of the trust in providing electricity to consumers. Secondly, those constituents argue that the Government welcomed a rise of that order (that is, 18 per cent), because it automatically contributes to the revenue of the State via the statutory levy payable by the trust on the revenue from electricity sales to consumers. The annual report of the trust for the 1979-80 financial year shows that that sum was about \$10 300 000.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Decisions in relation to electricity tariffs are made, of course, by the trust. As the honourable member knows, the trust is a statutory authority, not directly under Ministerial control although, of course, the trust does discuss with the Minister and with the Government any significant proposals that will affect the public. The trust paid us the courtesy, as it always does, of discussing with us what it had in mind. We do have difficulties in relation to the supply of gas; that is one of the legacies we inherited from the Labor Party. The fact is that there has been an increase of about 17 per cent in the price of gas under arrangements which were negotiated by the Labor Party. What the honourable member says is true: that is only one of several components that have to be reflected in electricity tariffs.

The other area in which there have been significant movements is in relation to wages, and we know that our predecessors presided over the granting of a 37½-hour week to the Electricity Trust employees. I am well aware of the fact that other factors are involved. The 6 per cent which is taken from the turnover of the trust was a measure introduced by the Labor Party as one of its taxing measures to scythe off the tall poppies. The Labor Party came into Government on a platform of scything off the tall poppies—it was going to tax the wealthy. What it did was to introduce a tariff on electricity and gas.

This Government is stuck with that tariff; it is built into our budget. We look forward to the day when it can be removed. It ill behoves the shadow spokesman to talk about this levy. We hope that we will see the Opposition supporting the Government in its attempts to get some sanity into the wage claims in this State. I look forward to that support from the honourable member because it is that which will affect electricity tariffs and our ability to employ more teacher graduates and others, and the sooner the honourable member wakes up to that fact the better.

MARIHUANA

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier say whether the Government is considering amending State drug laws to include confiscation of land on which marihuana has been cultivated? I understand that from time to time the Government reviews its legislation and is considering fixing severe penalties for drug offences. I have been told that in one part of the State people are offered \$100 000 cash in advance to grow a crop of marihuana, a sum that covers fines and any gaol sentence. I have been further informed that, whilst police surveillance has been quite good, the people growing marihuana fear loss of their land, and I believe this would act as a greater deterrent than any cash penalty.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I think it reflects the concern which is shown by all members in this House for things which are going on in what is popularly called the drug scene. No consideration has been given to any suggestion that land should be confiscated but that is certainly something that should be examined. Whether it will, on examination, prove to have the effect that the honourable member suggests that it might have, is another matter. I would imagine that if anyone is guaranteed a sum of \$100 000 as a cash advance towards a crop of marihuana to take care of the overheads, so to speak, it may well be that dealers in marihuana will be prepared to give money to cover the cost of the land, anyway. We are talking about very large sums of money, indeed.

The other problem, of course, is that marihuana, as we know from reports received by the police, is grown at locations which are regularly changed to avoid detection. If it is thought that there is any deterrent effect along these lines, I will certainly have the matter investigated and the Government will be prepared to consider acting on it. Loss of land would be a very important factor to many people. Whether or not it will have the desired effect, in view of the very large sums of money involved in this contemptible practice, I cannot say. Certainly, we will investigate it.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION CHAIRMAN

Mr SLATER: Can the Premier say why a Chairman of the South Australian Lotteries Commission has not been appointed to replace the former Chairman who resigned on 1 May 1981? The Premier will recall that the Chairman, Mr Shannon, resigned in protest at the Government's attitude and actions in relation to soccer pools and the revocation of regulations allowing commission agents to act as agents for Australian Soccer Pools Proprietary Limited. The best way I can express this to the Premier and the House is to quote from the letter of the then Chairman of the Lotteries Commission to the Premier, dated 29 April 1981:

This is to formally advise you in accordance with section 8 (b) of the State Lotteries Act that it is my intention to resign my position as Chairman of the Lotteries Commission, effective from 1 May 1981. It has been obvious to me for some time that soccer pools management would seek the Government's support to allow the agents of the Lotteries Commission to also become agents for soccer pools. This was made abundantly clear in the correspondence received from the Deputy Premier on 10 April 1981, in which he stated *inter alia* '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, as you are aware, the control of the commission's agents has been provided for by regulation 19 (1) of the Lottery and Gaming Act which stated 'that no agent of the commission shall sell any lottery tickets other than the tickets he sells for and on behalf of the commission'. It is acknowledged that under section 4 (3) of the State Lotteries Act the commission shall be under the control and directions of the Government, acting through the

Minister. However, the decision now made will, in my opinion, create administrative problems for both the commission and agents. The commission Chairman at that time, Mr Shannon, resigned in protest at the Government attitude and actions regarding soccer pools. I ask the Premier why it is, following Mr Shannon's resignation on 1 May 1981, that the commission has functioned without a Chairman, and what is the reason for delay in appointment to such a position.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: An announcement will be made in due course.

RED MEAT SALES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, say whether the Government has given any further consideration to amending the Shop Trading Hours Act to include the sale of red meats, and if it has, is it intended that the legislation will be changed during this present session? Members will be aware that when the legislation was debated in this House red meats were specifically excluded from provisions of the Shop Trading Hours Act. Red meat producers believe that they are being disadvantaged, since their commodity is not being exposed to the local consumer market to the same extent as are competitor commodities.

When I inquired of the Government nearly 12 months ago, the Minister of Industrial Affairs indicated that proposed alterations had been circulated and that submissions had been considered. It was said at that time that as soon as the final draft of the proposed Bill had been prepared it would be introduced into this House.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, the matter has been under consideration, and I shall get a full report for the honourable member from my colleague when he returns from Queensland.

S.T.A. FARES

Mr CRAFTER: Can the Minister of Transport assure South Australian taxpayers and users of public transport that the proposals which I understand are under active consideration in his department that newsagents should sell bus and train tickets will result in neither a loss of revenue for the S.T.A., increases in fares, or dismissals of S.T.A. employees?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I can assure the honourable member that any such proposals will not mean the dismissal of any S.T.A. employees. The Government has a policy of no retrenchments, and there will be no dismissal of S.T.A. employees. The question of pre-selling of tickets is to be brought in as an efficiency measure. The Government can do one of two things about the S.T.A. deficit. It can either increase charges and fares all the time, or it can try to make the system more efficient. One of the methods of making it more efficient is to introduce the pre-selling of tickets, which will have the effect of making the job much easier for drivers and will also reduce boarding times. It is for this reason that the Government is taking this initiative.

As to whether it will mean a reduction in S.T.A. revenue, if the honourable member means that the ticket seller will receive a small commission for selling books of tickets, and if that is regarded as a reduction in revenue, then of course it would be, but it would be minimal. At this stage I do not know what percentage commission is being looked at in the negotiations taking place between the S.T.A. and the small business men concerned. In Western Australia, I think the figure is 5 per cent as a commission rate, but it does not necessarily follow that that will be the rate here. It will be

as a result of negotiation. The system is introduced as an efficiency measure, along with other efficiency measures which I hope will be introduced into the public transport system in this city over the next few years.

VEGETATION RETENTION

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say how effective the vegetation retention scheme has been? The Minister will be aware that, following the amendment to the South Australian Heritage Act, it became possible for landholders to have areas of natural vegetation on their property set aside in perpetuity as conservation areas. In addition, the Government provided moneys to inform people of the scheme and to assist people to protect the appropriate areas. I understand that this scheme has been operating for some six months or so, so that there should be some indication as to its success or otherwise.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am pleased to be able to inform the honourable member and the House that the vegetation retention scheme has been very successful indeed. The honourable member is quite right in saying that it is just over six months since the Heritage Act was amended to enable heritage agreements to be drawn up between landholders and the Government. It is interesting to note that, over the first six months, there seems to be almost a linear increase per month in the number of coupon responses to the advertisements that have appeared in State and local press, as well as in publications that the department has made available to publicise this scheme. We have had about 478 responses to the coupons, and in that time there has also been a linear increase in the number of applications, and 236 formal applications have been made, representing somewhere in the vicinity of 20 000 hectares of natural vegetation.

The scheme has also been successful in that it has aroused a great deal of interest in other States. We have received correspondence from a number of Governments asking for details about this scheme and asking about its success or otherwise. We have been able to pass on that information. To answer the question; at this stage, with some 236 applications being successful, we are looking at somewhere in the vicinity of 20 000 hectares of land that has now come under this vegetation scheme.

Mr Mathwin: Very successful.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is, indeed, very successful.

POLL RESULT

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier say whether today's *Bulletin* article on South Australian politics by Max Harris is correct when it says that private Liberal polls indicate that South Australia will revert at the next election to being the Labor stronghold it was for so long?

In the article Mr Harris says that the Premier is not deluding himself about the electoral prospects of his Party and is already inculcating into the Party faithful the notion that winning the next election will be 'difficult', and we are aware that the Premier is not a person given to overstatement. I am aware that someone at the Greenhill Road headquarters of the Liberal Party sent a copy of the Liberals' March quarterly Gardner poll to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that questions are to relate to matters of State moment for which Ministers have a responsibility.

Mr TRAINER: I will relate the question, Sir, to the Premier's responsibility to his Party to try to keep it in

office. The quarterly Gardner poll showed support for the Liberals at 28.2 per cent. I understand that the accuracy and authenticity of that poll was confirmed by Peter Gardner himself, who telephoned the Deputy Leader. Yet another Liberal poll result, with an accompanying analysis by Brigadier Willett of the serious implications for the Government, will, I understand, be published in the August issue of the A.L.P. *Herald*. But is the *Bulletin*, which recently reported a slump in the Premier's approval rating, correct in today's Max Harris item?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Ascot Park apparently was not in the House when the Deputy Leader attempted to stir the pot—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Which one?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is a very good point. I am glad that the honourable member for Ascot Park raised the subject of polls. There have been a number of polls recently. The ever popular *de facto* Deputy Leader of the Labor Party is not in the Chamber—

Mr Mathwin: Counting his numbers.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, perhaps he is.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: He hasn't got many to count.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that, in the same article by Mr Harris, Mr Wright is (I can't remember the exact words) 'firmly fixed' in that situation.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: 'Entrenched', I think was the word.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Perhaps it was 'entrenched'. Nevertheless, it was a fascinating poll result, I thought, because it did indicate, and I think this gave everyone a great deal of surprise, that the honourable member for Elizabeth seems to have become rehabilitated very rapidly indeed. I constantly maintain that the only poll that really matters is the one held on polling day when the electorate as a whole put their votes in the ballot box.

Mr Trainer: What else can you say in these circumstances, with 28.2 per cent?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Just let me get round to the honourable member. If, by going on in this way about this technique, and turning on the polls which are conducted on a rather specific basis for the Liberal Party, the member for Ascot Park believes that I will go public and state what is the basis for those polls, and will give the details surrounding their taking, he is very mistaken. I do not intend to do that, not even for him.

I may point out, however, that the honourable member has very carefully forgotten to mention the poll that was, I understand, conducted by the Morgan organisation and published in the *Bulletin*, that journal for which he appears to have a very great regard. If he were to go very carefully into the figures published and extend them, as I understand has been done, he would find that they would show that we would have won and in fact held Government comfortably if an election had been held at that time. I notice that he did not mention that in the slightest way. I understand his concern for our position in Government here, and I understand his burning desire to take over the Government benches, a burning desire I am afraid that he will have to contain for some little time yet—many, many years, I would judge. I would say to the honourable member, if it is of any comfort to him at all, that a similar poll taken concerning the standing of the Liberal Party at the time just before the last election showed the Liberal Party rated 28 per cent support in the community.

MICROWAVE OVENS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Health call for a report from the Health Commission on the use of microwave ovens in delicatessens and shops generally to determine whether these ovens are dangerous to those people who have been fitted with a pacemaker in their heart? Certain constituents have brought to my attention the fact that they have been warned that they should not go near microwave ovens after they have had a pacemaker placed in their heart. To allay their concern, a report brought down by the commission as to whether signs should be displayed warning these people would be of great benefit to them.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes.

OVERSEAS CONFERENCES

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Health say what the cost to the State will be for the attendance of senior staff from the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science at a forthcoming conference in Europe? A large contingent of senior staff from the institute will soon be attending a conference in Vienna. Presumably there will be expenses for their fares and for temporary replacements for these people in their absence. Because of the size of the contingent, it has been suggested to me that the cost to the State will be quite considerable. Has any costing been done on this?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I am unable to advise the honourable member on this matter without inquiring as to the cost to the State for the attendance by staff of the I.M.V.S. at any overseas conference. However, I can advise him of the way in which such approval is given. In the first instance, the council of the institute would have to give approval for an officer to be given leave to attend such a conference. Secondly, the submission would have to be considered by the overseas travel committee. Having been approved by the overseas travel committee, approval would then have to be obtained from Cabinet. It is not necessarily the case (in fact, it is very rarely the case) that the State foots the bill for the fares of medical officers who travel overseas. They are entitled, under their award, to conference leave within Australia. Some choose to allow that conference leave to build up and to take such leave by going overseas to world conferences at their own expense. In such cases the cost of their salary, of course, is a cost to the State, but fares are normally paid for by the doctor or scientist himself or herself. I shall certainly obtain information for the honourable member. However, I would not expect that the cost of conference travel for these officers would be at great cost to the State. Certainly all of the submissions would have to be approved by the overseas committee, by the council of the I.M.V.S. in the first instance and, finally, by Cabinet.

FLOODING

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Water Resources discuss with the Minister of Local Government action that may be taken to ensure that watercourses in and near the metropolitan residential areas are kept clean? I have been advised that most people have learned the lesson that much of the flooding that takes place occurs because of complacency: we come to accept that in an average year the streams do not need to be kept clean. Evidence has shown that before white men came to Australia it did not matter whether flat areas adjacent to streams flooded. More particularly, when farms in the near residential areas were

flooded, only grazing land was affected and there was no real concern. In more recent years much of that low-lying land has been built on. Some of the residents of those houses have built, into the streams, walls, bridges, and other constructions that they believed would be of benefit to their lives. However, these constructions cause cluttering up of the streams when debris washes down the watercourses.

More particularly, when much of the land close to the streams was worked, the watercourses were kept clean. The people who worked the land along the Torrens River in particular were fearful of flooding, because that was market garden land; they ensured that the watercourses were kept clean, and by that means the water moved more rapidly out of the area. We have had no heavy rains until recent months, and evidence has shown that problems have occurred because debris has been allowed to build up in the streams and low bush undergrowth has been allowed to grow. Because it is part of the responsibility of the Minister of Water Resources as well as the responsibility of the Minister of Local Government, I ask the Minister of Water Resources to take up this matter to see whether something can be done to protect property owners whose property is being damaged, often because of their lack of interest in what is likely to happen in a flood period.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: A committee has been established for this very purpose and, in fact, it contains representatives from the Department of Environment and Planning, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Department of Local Government and the Local Government Association. As a result of what occurred some two or three weeks ago, that committee also includes, for this specific purpose, representatives from the Campbelltown council and the Onkaparinga council. The committee will consider the very points that the honourable member has raised, particularly in relation to the Local Government Act and the extent to which local government has the power by law to intervene and keep clear some of the creeks to which the honourable member referred. The committee met last week, and work is currently under way. It is anticipated that the committee will be in a position to report fairly quickly as to what action needs to be taken from a legislative point of view to overcome the problems.

MENTALLY ILL VETERANS

Mr ABBOTT: Can the Minister of Health provide any information to the House about the effect of the Federal Government's decisions in relation to mentally ill veterans under section 49 of the Repatriation Act? As announced, it is the Federal Government's intention to abolish deductions for maintenance that currently reduce veterans pensions by half and to hand control of disability pensions to State authorities. The Touche Report states that the States will be given control of the pensions. Will the States have control of the pensions in the same way as the Repatriation Commission at present has responsibility under section 49, or does the Minister have some other recommendation in mind? Regarding the repeal of section 49, I would be interested to know what role the State authorities will assume under State law.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I will make inquiries about the matters that the honourable member has raised and provide him with a report.

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

Mr MATHWIN: Is it the intention of the Minister of Education to ban the book by Grover on pro-nuclear matters

that is allegedly being sent by the publishers to all school libraries within the State?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I must admit that I have not read this book completely: I gave it very little more than a cursory examination.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: That is all it warrants.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I do not know about that. An initial examination of the book indicated that it was not worthy of censorship, any more than thousands of other books that are on open access and available for purchase in schools are worthy of censorship.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That is scurrilous.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I did not think so. All secondary schools have librarians, who are professionally trained to assess the merits of all literature, either purchased or unsolicited, that is placed either on open access or on restricted access in school libraries. This matter was raised yesterday evening by a member of the Opposition during the grievance debate, and I wish to inform the House generally that, as a matter of personal policy, as a trained librarian I was always more interested in placing a cross-section of material on library shelves but at the same time ensuring that, if ever and whenever material of a propagandist nature, irrespective of the subject, was sent into schools, it would be removed: it would not even be placed on school library shelves.

A vast amount of material is sent into schools, into Parliament House and into homes which might be construed to be of a political nature and, while this book was one of the few pieces of literature which in my experience has been sent anywhere on the pro-nuclear lobby, it was my personal experience in education that two matters were repeatedly the subject of propagandist and on occasion well-informed material being sent into schools. One of these was the anti-nuclear lobby and the other was the pro-marihuana lobby, which I will not enter into at this stage.

Let me also say that, in raising the issue of anti-nuclear matters and suggesting that one book should be banned, the wider issues were in no way canvassed. I spent 25 years in a large industrial city which burned nothing else but anthracite and bituminous coals. It was a filthy town, and the amount of disease and degeneration of body that occurred both above and below ground there and the hundreds of people across the world who are killed in coal mining accidents alone is the other side of the story that is never told. Of course, the fear that is generated by the anti-nuclear lobby is based on what might happen, but I can tell you what does happen in the environment I mentioned. Literally hundreds of thousands of people in metropolises across the world are dying every year either through accidents in the mines or through those long-standing carcinogenic diseases, born of cancers through the coal fumes. Buildings are degenerating because of the burning of those coals, which are the better quality coals, not the sub-bituminous and the lignites and almost peats which are heavily water bearing and contain droplets of SO² and SO³ which mix with the water and result in mild carbonic and sulphuric acids which rot clothes, lungs and buildings. These things are never mentioned. When I left the north of England the Clean Air Act had just been introduced. That Act regulated against the use of coal, not nuclear power. It was against the traditional filthy, dirty, human lung destroying material. That information is never given. Here, we are being asked to ban—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You were lucky to survive, by the sound of it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am speaking of a country with large conglomerations of cities. Think how lucky we are in

Australia with literally millions of square miles across which we can spread our cities and industries. We do not need nuclear power in Australia, because we have the space in which to establish single coal-fired boilers which can generate electricity. We are fortunate, but about one-third of the population of the Western world needs Australia's power, Australia's energy, irrespective of what it is.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Would you recommend the INFCE documents for school libraries?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I think so long as material is non-propagandist and presents a balanced point of view, as long as the material is there—when I have read it I will tell you whether I recommend it or not. I repeat that Australia is a lucky country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is all right. We have not even got to the stage, as the honourable member is implying, where nuclear industries exist here. We are encouraging people overseas to enter that game while we burn our 300 year or 400-year supply of coal in our vast country which is relatively free of pollution. We have to think about the rest of the world.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: COAL DEPOSITS

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I wish to inform the House that, at a meeting this morning with the Minister of Mines and Energy and me, C.S.R. Limited advised the Government that it has established the existence of deposits of brown coal in the Sedan area which the company considers to be suitable for electricity generation.

C.S.R. has stated that its drilling in the area to date has outlined 212 000 000 tonnes of measured and indicated reserves in the Sedan and Anna deposits, which are situated in the northern part of the company's Mannum-Sedan licence area. Drilling is continuing. This is a most important development, and the Government welcomes this announcement by the company. These deposits constitute a significant resource and they are generally similar in composition to other South Australian brown coals.

Following our meeting this morning, I will be asking the Electricity Trust to evaluate the deposits in conjunction with others which are potential sources of fuel for the generation of electricity. At present, the trust is evaluating, in particular, indicated deposits of about 1 000 000 000 tonnes at Kingston in the South-East and more than 2 500 000 000 tonnes at Wakefield in the Lower North as potential sources of fuel on which to base South Australia's next power station after the new northern station at Port Augusta, due to come into operation from 1984.

Factors to be taken into consideration in the assessment of all of these deposits must include comparative mining, infra-structure and transport costs, and environmental impact, particularly as it might relate, in these areas, to surface and underground waters. The Government will await the outcome of this assessment with great interest.

This latest discovery at Sedan extends the limits of the previously known brown coal resources along the western margin of the Murray Basin, where coal was first reported almost 80 years ago in boring for water. Subsequent exploration has disclosed a number of deposits of coal extending from the Bower locality to these deposits at Anna and Sedan, and through to Moorlands and Kingston.

The Government is also pleased to record that this announcement comes at a time when there is widespread

exploration for coal and oil shale throughout the State. Exploration is being undertaken in the Eucla, Arckaringa, Pedirka, Cooper, Poldia, Murray and Otway Basins, principally by major Australian and internationally-based energy companies. The results to date have been sufficiently encouraging to extend company interest in exploration for coal to remote areas and to unprecedented levels.

It has to be recognised that such exploration requires a significant commitment of financial and manpower resources by the companies concerned, and it is particularly pleasing that the companies are making such a commitment in South Australia, especially when deposits so far identified do not compare favourably, in quality, with those located in the Eastern States. In relation to mineral and petroleum exploration in South Australia generally, the Minister of Mines and Energy has provided figures to show the record levels of exploration which have been committed since my Government came to office.

To summarise the situation: the number of mineral exploration licences granted since June 1979 has increased three-fold, expenditure on mineral exploration in 1980 was three times the expenditure in the previous year. Thirteen companies are now engaged in onshore petroleum exploration projects with commitments to spend more than \$200 000 000 during the next five years. The level of interest in this area has increased three-fold during the past 18 months. The number of companies with approvals for offshore exploration projects also totals 13, with expenditure commitments of more than \$100 000 000 during the next six years.

The announcement today by C.S.R. is further confirmation of the potential which this exploration effort holds for South Australia. The State is on the threshold of major developments in mining and mineral processing and use of its energy resources of the type which are vital to the State's economic future and to the well-being of all South Australians.

There has been a generally held fallacy throughout South Australia for many years that, following the discovery and utilisation of copper in the early part of this State's history and the development of iron ore deposits on the West Coast, South Australia was in some way different from the other States in not having the vast sources for potential mineral development. It has become abundantly clear, in recent months, that South Australia does have opportunities and potential equal to and greater, in some cases, than those in other States, and that all that has been lacking is detailed exploration and development.

As well as the companies involved, I commend in particular the efforts of the Deputy Premier, as Minister of Mines and Energy, and his department, for the dynamic and realistic approach now being adopted to secure this level of interest in South Australia by major Australian and internationally-based companies.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HOSPITAL COMPUTER SYSTEM

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yesterday, in another place, the Opposition spokesman on health made a series of allegations about the acquisition by the Government of a hospital computer system. The statement contained many errors of fact, implications and innuendo which cannot be substantiated. The statement demonstrated a serious lack of understanding of the complexities of hospital computer systems. I will deal, in turn, with the matters raised, but I

believe it would be useful if the House had some background to this issue. In December 1980 I told the House that tenders had been called for a common patient information system for major teaching hospitals in South Australia. I indicated that the system should be capable of installation in South Australia in a short time at a low cost, and that it could be acquired on lease or rental for two or three years so that it could be tested. The total cost was estimated to be between \$180 000 and \$260 000 per annum. The hospitals were seeking a system which could be implemented with a minimum of risk based on systems already developed and operating in organisations of a similar size.

After a thorough assessment, including contact with overseas hospitals, the Health Commission believed that no response to the original call offered an acceptable low-level risk at an acceptable cost. The reason that I did not make a statement on the issue at that time was that the matter was before the Supply and Tender Board and it would have been improper for a Minister to comment publicly on tenders which had not been resolved. The fact that Dr Cornwall chose to use confidential information improperly obtained could have prejudiced the tender process. Action of this kind by members of Parliament is to be severely condemned.

The Supply and Tender Board gave approval for the commission to negotiate with computer suppliers to provide an interim patient information system. The commission's major objective was to clearly establish the cost of proceeding before committing any public money. The board's approval allowed the commission to negotiate directly with I.B.M. and Burroughs for the supply of an appropriate solution. At the time, I discussed with the Chairman of the Health Commission the desirability of making a public statement in response to Dr Cornwall's allegations. However, as the negotiations were still proceeding with the Supply and Tender Board the decision was taken that it would be inappropriate for me to make any public announcement.

I shall now return to Dr Cornwall's specific allegations. Dr Cornwall alleged that the Medical Director of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Dr S. Britton, recommended that the computer system at the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital in Sydney should be used. This is not so. It demonstrates Dr Cornwall's willingness to be totally unscrupulous in making false allegations, as evidenced repeatedly since this Government came to office. Dr Britton did recommend that officers of the Royal Adelaide Hospital should visit the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital to examine the operation of a patient information system in that hospital.

Dr Cornwall alleged that eight officers from the Health Commission's automatic data processing section were dispatched to Sydney at great expense to inspect this system. This is not so. One officer from the Health Commission's computing services branch, who is project co-ordinator for the patient information system, went to Sydney with four staff members from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The staff from the Royal Adelaide Hospital, whose trip was approved by the board of the hospital, were the hospital's computing officer, an acting medical director, a medical records officer and a nurse. This trip, which was essentially to provide these operational staff with the opportunity to examine the application of computer services to their specific areas of responsibility, is proof of the prudent approach of the Royal Adelaide Hospital to this issue. Whilst in Sydney the officers also saw an I.B.M. presentation on its new patient management system.

Dr Cornwall alleged that I indicated I was happy to have either an I.B.M. or Burroughs computer, provided that it was the same as the Royal Prince Alfred Hospital system. This is not true. I have never indicated a preference for

any system, nor have I ever expressed a view about computers. These decisions are entirely left to the Health Commission and the Supply and Tender Board, which will, in due course, make recommendations to the Government.

Before a decision can be made on either of the systems for which the Supply and Tender Board had given approval for further negotiation, it was considered essential that they be evaluated in operation in a hospital environment. As none of the systems is operating in Australia, this can be achieved only by evaluation in hospitals overseas. The visit to overseas hospitals was aimed at studying various features of the system, including:

- degree of integration of the system with hospital manual procedures and the level of implementation effort required to achieve the integration;
- flexibility of the system to adapt to local hospital requirements, including the level of technical resources necessary to modify screen and report formats;
- contractual approach used by the hospital to protect its interest against the vendor;
- ease of operation of the system including administrative structures to support the operation, plus the computer operation staff required to keep the system available on a 24-hour basis.

The recommendation to send two officers overseas was approved by Cabinet and the Overseas Travel Committee. The officers were Mr Ray Blight, Director, Management Services in the Health Commission, who is to evaluate the computer system itself, and Dr S. Britton, Medical Director at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, who is to evaluate the clinical application of the computer to the hospital situation.

Dr Cornwall's statement gives the impression that Mr Blight was associated with the debacle at the Flinders Medical Centre under the previous Government. This is not so. Mr Blight joined the Health Commission after that time, and, in fact, has been responsible under this Government for the development of a computer policy and a strategic plan which is recognised as being among the best in Australia, in marked contrast to that which existed or failed to exist under the previous Government. I would have thought that Dr Cornwall would be extremely reticent about making reference to that deplorable situation and the A.L.P.'s appalling record.

Dr Cornwall has alleged that Government officers have been accompanied by the Australian Manager of Burroughs. This is not only not true but is a farcical allegation. It is unlikely that the Manager of Burroughs would be welcome on the I.B.M. hospital computing sites in the United States and Canada which are being visited by Mr Blight and Dr Britton.

As can be seen from the above facts, the Royal Adelaide Hospital is totally involved in the selection and introduction of a computer system at that hospital, and Dr Cornwall's claim that the hospital is being prevented from putting its data processing in order is untrue.

To answer Dr Cornwall's specific questions: installation of a patient information system at Royal Adelaide Hospital will depend on the evaluation of the tender offers made by I.B.M. and Burroughs. These offers close on 3 August with the Department of Services and Supply. Installation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre, which already have limited patient information systems, will depend on the strategic plan for health computing which is being developed by the South Australian Health Commission. This will provide a detailed plan for the introduction of more extensive on-line systems at the major teaching hospitals.

The cost of sending four officers of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and one officer of the Health Commission to Sydney was approximately \$1 650. The amount approved

by Cabinet for economy class air fare to the United States and Canada for Dr Britton and Mr Blight, together with the standard daily allowance, was \$11 000. These costs have been fully met by the Government and are regarded as responsible expenditure to ensure that a sound decision is made in respect of a purchase which could be of the order of \$200 000.

Finally, Mr Speaker, I am confident that the Health Commission has most carefully followed procedures as laid down by the Supply and Tender Board and has kept the Data Processing Board informed at each step of the way. What the Health Commission has been trying to do is avoid the debacle in health computing which took place under the A.L.P., which was highlighted so well by the Public Accounts Committee and which cost the taxpayer \$2 000 000.

I am disappointed that the *Advertiser* was prepared to give some prominence to Dr Cornwall's allegation, without taking what I would have regarded as the minimum of journalistic effort to contact the responsible Minister to find whether there was any substance in these allegations. I regret very much that both the Health Commission and officers of the Royal Adelaide Hospital have been impugned and slurred under Parliamentary privilege, and that the responsible Minister was not given an opportunity to put the facts on behalf of those people so that they could be accurately reported in the media.

At 3.22 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 21 July. Page 87.)

Mr BECKER (Hanson): To further illustrate the point I was making last night, I shall quote a further resolution passed by the Australian Labor Party Convention in June, as reported in the *Herald* of July this year.

Mr Trainer: Why didn't you go? You could have got it first hand.

Mr BECKER: I wish you had sent me an invitation. It is probably better than being here sometimes. The way everyone is leaving the Chamber, I reckon I would get a better audience there than here. The resolution states:

Convention notes with abhorrence the attacks made on the public sector and its employees, in particular by the Liberal Razor Gang. In the light of these attacks, Convention re-affirms Labor's belief that:

(1) The community as a whole has as much right to organise economic and administrative activities as has any smaller group of citizens.

(2) There are many activities which it is in the social interest to have conducted solely or mainly by the public sector.

(3) The cause of efficiency is ill-served by across-the-board cuts and the wholesale liquidation or sale of public enterprises.

(4) The best administration of Government services is to be obtained from a career Public Service in which there is adequate prospect of promotion, security of employment and realistic remuneration.

Accordingly, Convention urges the F.P.L.P. to take action upon coming into office:

(1) To repeal the CERR Act, and CEEP Act, and other anti-union legislation placing public servants in a worse position in relation to their employer than any other employees.

(2) To cease attacks by the Government on public servants and their work and to encourage the mass communications media to do likewise.

(3) To undertake administrative reviews only in conjunction with public servants and their respective organisations.

In the meantime, Convention urges the Federal and State PLPs and all other units of the Party to undertake a campaign fostering appreciation in the general community of the great value of the public sector and its employees.

—A. Dunstan/
G. Thompson*

That would be by Andrew Dunstan, submitted by Mr G. Thompson. That illustrates clearly the attitude of the Opposition Party to what we are trying to do. Particularly I note that 'the cause of efficiency is ill served by across-the-board cuts and the wholesale liquidation or sale of public enterprises.' One would have thought that by now it would be obvious from the examples brought to the attention of this House by the Public Accounts Committee that any political Party that would make that type of statement does not really care for the role of the taxpayer. It is obvious that, after all those years of waste and mismanagement under Labor Governments in this State, if they ever did get back into power either at State or Federal level we would be subjected again to continual tax increases, and money would be spent without any settlement.

To further support what I have been saying, let me quote from a speech by the Premier to the Royal Institute of Public Administration on Monday 20 July 1981. The Premier said:

People will no longer tolerate an ever-growing expansion of public sector activities, or the ever-growing taxation burden which is associated with it. It is a matter of record that public interest in and support for California's Proposition 13 was not limited to the United States, although its precise application was limited to that system of government.

The basic principle underlying Proposition 13 captured the growing mood of the public, and fired the imaginations of taxpayers wherever it was reported throughout the Western world. It represented, in specific proposals, what more and more people were thinking at the time, and there is no sign of that interest, concern, and sense of personal involvement in the spending of taxpayers' money becoming any the less as time goes on. The fundamental challenge facing governments and their administrators has always been to ensure that revenues from taxpayers are used effectively.

But clearly there has been a renewal of that challenge, and to meet it we must adopt mechanisms which will satisfy society's requirements for greater accountability in all areas of government. This is why we have adopted programme performance budgeting as one of the tools which will enable public administrators to function more effectively.

Here I must interpose to the effect that the Public Accounts Committee some years ago recommended to the then Government the programme performance budgeting method. The Premier continued:

As you all know, it is not enough simply to allocate and spend money on the basis of last year's expenditure. We must rather adopt techniques to identify the purposes or programmes for which taxpayers' money is being spent:

To determine the total net cost of achieving an objective;

To identify the relative importance of those programmes or objectives within the Government's overall priorities;

To decide whether they are being fulfilled in the most effective way, or indeed whether they are worth continuing with at all.

This has been the thinking behind the government's introduction of programme performance budgeting and the development of the Estimates Committees' consideration of the Budget.

As I said last night, we should look now at an entirely new system of dealing with the State Budget. We should look at bringing down the Federal Budget in, say, February of each year, and then introducing State Budgets towards the end of February, so that, by the middle of June, each Government department would know exactly where it was as at the beginning of July for the current financial year. It is not good enough. It is poor management and poor economics to bring down a Budget, whether Federal or State, a third of the way into the financial year.

If we go on form, as we have in the past, it is sometimes October before Government departments know what money

they have been allocated and what new programmes they can undertake. We then see, by December, Government departments starting to spend the money. It then comes around to about May in the financial year, and the departments suddenly find that they have an excess of funds and the big spend-up really starts. It happened again this financial year in South Australia, even though the Premier issued a warning to departments to exercise constraint, so we still have not got the message through to certain people within the Public Service.

If those people are not going to follow through and adopt the Government's economic policy, if public servants are not going to act in a responsible manner, then so far as I am concerned I know what I would do—I would replace them. I would have no hesitation in replacing any public servant who was not prepared to carry out the economic package of this Government. We cannot afford to have people in the Public Service sabotaging Government programmes. That is simply a hard, cold fact of life. We have the A.L.P. trying to butter up the Public Service by ensuring that public servants have permanency of employment. In the time I have had the opportunity to look at the Government accounting system and the various programmes in Government departments, I believe that no public servant should demand the right of permanent employment—public servants should be on the same footing as people in the private sector. In other words, the Government should have the right to hire and fire, and, if people are not prepared to carry out the Government's programmes, out they go.

In America there is no hesitation about this. The top stream of public servants are all under contract. Here in South Australia I believe that the heads of departments, and certain people within those Government departments, should be on a five-year contract. If people are on a five-year contract, they either shape up or have the opportunity to opt out of that contract. We are not going to get efficiency in Governments, whether they be Federal or State—and I challenge any State Government in Australia to dispute this—under the current system. Certainly, we do not get efficiency when the State Premiers and Treasurers have to go cap in hand to Canberra, as happened as late as a few weeks ago, to find out what their Loan programmes are going to be and what they can expect to receive in tax reimbursements so that they can prepare their Budgets. The State Budget is still being prepared. This is not good enough, so we have to start with a change of attitude in Canberra.

The Federal Government must own up to its responsibilities in relation to the economy of this country and bring down its Budget within the first week in February for the forthcoming financial year. That, then, allows a few weeks for the State Governments to bring down their Budgets. This Parliament, thanks to this Government, now has Estimates Committees. If what I have suggested happens, we can spend three months examining the State Budget. Members of the Opposition would need that time to understand the document. Some of us could help to educate them, but I believe the Parliament should examine the Budget far more closely.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The member for Gilles would need help in understanding recreation and sport.

Mr BECKER: That is true. The Board Regulations Department is battling with the ridiculous situation that it does not have enough staff while other departments with a surplus of staff will not let that surplus staff go. That is another area with which I disagree. I believe that if the Parliament had three months to go through and investigate the whole of the Budget casually, and if we set up, under the structure of the Parliamentary staff, an Analysis Com-

mittee, everybody would fully understand what was to be in the forthcoming Budget.

You think about the ramifications, Mr Speaker, if a State Government brought down its Budget in February, because, in the normal course of events, elections are held in March in most States, certainly in South Australia. The people of South Australia would then go to the polls straight after the Budget was brought down and would know what they were voting for in the next financial year in exactly the same way as the shareholders of any company know where they stand. I believe that the taxpayers of this country are paying far too much for little information and, certainly, very little effort is being made by most State Governments in relation to economy and efficiency. At least this Government and this Premier are doing something about it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: The Public Accounts Committee is having its accounts checked on.

Mr BECKER: I am pleased to hear that; that is the whole aim of my political career, to try to bring a little more efficiency to Government. As I said in 1970, all I want to see is efficiency on behalf of the taxpayers. If that is filtering through, at last I have made some achievement in my life. The Premier went on in his address to the Royal Institute, as follows:

However, as I have said before, a very grave deficiency in this whole consideration is the fact that a very significant portion of public expenditure is not in fact included in the Budget at all.

That is a shame, and I think that the Public Accounts Committee might have something to say about that, too. He continued:

A wide range of Government functions is undertaken by statutory authorities which are not accountable directly on a day-to-day basis to Parliament.

We know that both the Adelaide University and the Flinders University are not accountable to this Government, or to the Federal Government. In fact, they have placed themselves in a very neat situation where they can do what they like and one dare not criticise or even write a letter asking them for information, as the Public Accounts Committee found out. It is time that the universities in this country were brought to heel. I could tell some stories out of school from my banking days of how they used to spend money at the Adelaide University, but I am still bound by my deed of secrecy. The Premier continued:

Just as we have strengthened the Public Accounts Committee and are reviewing the Public Works Standing Committee, we are now in the process of setting up a Parliamentary committee to examine the activities of statutory authorities—

I know that the member for Stuart will be interested in this explanation—

They are no less subject to accountability than are any other sections of Government activity. This will add a further dimension to the emphasis which this Government is placing on the involvement of Parliament, and thus of the people, in the assessment of Government spending.

I wish that the airport controllers would move the airport flight path so that planes would not fly over the city and interrupt my speech.

Mr Slater: You have another supporter. I couldn't agree with the honourable member more.

Mr BECKER: The honourable member is too late. The Premier continued:

Basically the committee will resemble the Public Accounts Committee in its activities, but will have the responsibility of examining the operation of statutory authorities. It is quite patently obvious that some of these bodies have long outlived their usefulness, and these will be the subject of repeal in the next and subsequent sessions of Parliament. But in many instances it will not be at all easy to assess the performance of statutory authorities, boards and committees, without a proper examination of what they are about. Fundamentally it must be asked: 'Are the objectives and functions of each body consistent with Government policy?'

There, for the benefit of the member for Stuart, is the difference between the role of the Public Accounts Committee and the new Statutory Authorities Committee. The statutory authorities will be asked:

Are the objectives and functions of each body consistent with Government policy?

They will further be asked the following:

Is its activity directly related to the statement of objectives? What is the degree of efficiency in achieving performance goals, given the financial resources being allocated to the programme? Does the programme (at the cost involved) represent the best possible use of resources, in achieving the stated objectives? Or would it be possible to use the assets and recurrent expenditure devoted to the programme in some better way? In other words, is the statutory authority, board or committee really necessary, and, if it is, is it operating in the most efficient way possible?

Clearly, it will not be difficult to assess the necessity factor in the case of statutory authorities like the Electricity Trust and the State Transport Authority. But in the case of these larger authorities it may well be possible for an assessment of their current activities to result in more efficient and cost-saving methods of administration and operation. Thus, while the committee could well recommend the abolition of some statutory authorities, boards, or committees, in most instances it is more likely to recommend modifications to their administration and activities, aimed at greater efficiency and accountability. The outcome must be not only better administration but greater scope for the managers to manage, and added benefit to the taxpayers by way of money saved. More activities could thus be undertaken using the same resources; charges to the consumer could be lowered, or taxation reduced.

The Premier went on:

I am of course aware that there are still some members of the Public Service who resist the suggestion they should not only be accountable for the spending of the money over which they have control but should be seen clearly to be accountable. Perhaps this is because of a lack of understanding of the growing emphasis which taxpayers generally are placing upon accountability. Perhaps it stems from what is perceived personally as a threatened insecurity if things are changed from the *status quo*. If it is the latter, then I am sure the fears are groundless. We have already undertaken changes in the level of public sector activity without retrenchment, and I have no doubt this can be achieved within statutory authorities.

The member for Playford and the member for Stuart last night made great and continued mention of Proposition 13. It seems to me that the Opposition is paranoid about the situation. Let me clear the record: we have not adopted any part of Proposition 13.

Mr Slater interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Proposition 13 is an entirely different system and an entirely different operation from what is happening in South Australia. The fundamental principle of Proposition 13 is efficiency of Government.

Mr Slater interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! The member for Gilles will have his opportunity when the time comes.

Mr BECKER: Let me inform members what Proposition 13 is all about, and I shall quote from a document on the analysis of the effect of it on local government which was prepared by the Legislative Analyst in California. In the introduction of the report he said:

Proposition 13, approved by the voters on 6 June 1978, added Article XIII A to the California Constitution. Article XIII A limited property tax revenue to 1 per cent of the market value of property plus an amount necessary to repay existing voter-approved debt. Article XIII A also rolled back the assessed value of property to 1975 levels, limited increases in assessed values to 2 per cent per year, and restricted the imposition of non-property taxes by state and local governments. Proposition 13 did not specify how the remaining property tax revenue would be distributed among taxing jurisdictions.

Various chapters of the constitution and the statutes provided for this distribution of property tax revenue and provided \$4.4 billion of state funds as fiscal relief to local governments in order to partially offset the loss in property tax revenue.

The California Government Legislative Analyst said in a summary of his findings published in October 1979:

Proposition 13 reduced local government property tax revenues in the 1978-79 fiscal year by about \$6.9 billion, or 55 per cent, from the estimated level which would have been levied if Proposition 13 had not been enacted. The property tax reduction was about \$5.9 billion, or 51 per cent, compared to the prior year's (1977-78) actual level of collections.

There was little change in the total amount of revenues received by local governments between 1977-78 and 1978-79, with the exception of nonenterprise special districts. However, there was a significant change in the sources of this revenue. Property tax revenues declined substantially, while a large increase in state aid and a moderate annual increase in revenue from other sources offset the local property tax decline.

The 1978-79 budgets adopted by local governments do not indicate a widespread increase in the use of service charges to finance the provision of local government services. They kept service charges down.

The projected increase in city and county revenue from service charges is not significantly greater than the increases during the preceding three years. However, there may not have been sufficient time prior to adoption of their budgets for local governments to effect such increases. Since then, local governments appear to have increased or adopted fees or service charges to a significant extent, although there are no reliable data concerning such increases.

Most local governments did not reduce expenditures in 1978-79 below 1977-78 levels, although sizable cuts may have occurred from the budget levels proposed prior to passage of Proposition 13. Generally, local agencies did not eliminate entire programmes or reduce expenditures on an across-the-board basis in 1978-79. Instead, selected expenditure reductions were made most frequently in those services which are provided at the local government's discretion.

Regular school classroom programmes were not significantly affected by Proposition 13. Those expenditure reductions which did occur were generally in non-classroom-related programmes, such as janitorial work, maintenance, books, and supplies.

In May 1979, local public employment in California was 9 per cent below May 1978, the month prior to passage of Proposition 13. This represents a reduction of about 100 000 employees. Much of the reduction was achieved through attrition, rather than layoffs of existing employees. Local government layoffs reported to the Employment Development Department total 17 000 since the passage of Proposition 13.

That was the report of the Legislative Analyst made in October 1979 concerning the impact at that stage of Proposition 13. I want members opposite to read this report and other books that I have brought back concerning Proposition 13.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Do you think it is good?

Mr BECKER: I am not saying whether it is good, bad or indifferent. Just to get the message fairly is all I want members opposite to do, because somehow the Opposition believes that it has not worked. It is working extremely successfully. It provided 500 000 jobs. Let me now update the situation with further information on Proposition 13. A report to the California Legislature from the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, Office of the Auditor-General, dated 14 May 1980, stated:

Changes in the composition of Local Government revenue since Proposition 13: Local government financing has changed dramatically as a result of Proposition 13, Article XIII A of the State Constitution, and subsequent long-term financing legislation adopted in 1979. To compensate for reduced property tax revenue, some local governments have expanded their use of discretionary revenue sources by increasing charges for services to reflect the full cost or a greater portion of the cost of providing services. For example, in fiscal year 1978-79 counties increased their reliance on discretionary revenue by approximately 25 per cent and cities increased use of discretionary revenue by 13 per cent from fiscal year 1977-78.

Discretionary revenue, however, still constituted a relatively limited portion of country and city total revenue, approximately 9 per cent and 16 per cent, respectively, in fiscal year 1978-79. We also analysed the difference between property tax revenue projections made for the Conference Committee for Assembly Bill 8 in 1979 and actual property taxes levied. We found that property taxes levied in fiscal year 1979-80 increased approximately 13 per cent as opposed to the 10 per cent increase originally projected. As a result, total statewide property taxes are approximately \$150 000 000 higher than originally projected for fiscal year 1979-80. The dif-

ferent units of local government will receive varying benefits from these increased property taxes.

As I said earlier, property taxes were reduced to 1 per cent of the market value as at 1975 values. If a person owned a property prior to 1975, the 1975 assessment would be brought out and the property taxes would be 1 per cent of the valuation at that time. If a person bought a property yesterday, whether it was in Sacramento, San Francisco or Los Angeles, he would pay 1 per cent of the purchase price as property tax. Therefore, Proposition 13 slashed property taxes by 55 per cent but the Government still received far more income than it had estimated. Since 1975, a property assessment of 2 per cent increase per annum has been in force.

It is a fact that there was a large reduction in property taxes, but this created 500 000 jobs and gave back to private enterprise the initiative necessary to increase employment and productivity. It also gave the Legislature the task of meeting budgets and programmes according to the income received. This is how inefficiency in Government was overcome. This financial year, 1980-81, will be the real test for Proposition 13, because this will be the first year in which the reserves cannot be relied on. Local government was financed in some areas by existing reserves, but we must remember that the American States must bring down a balanced Budget: that is a constitutional requirement. This puts further pressure on the Legislature. It has access to the Government's and President's Budgets, and can amend them if it likes, but the Budgets must balance. Once the money for the various programmes runs out, that is the end of it.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: They cannot have deficit funding, can they?

Mr BECKER: There is no such thing as deficit funding. There were surpluses in California, and they went into the reserves. The summary of the report to the California Legislature states:

Local government financing has changed dramatically since the passage of Proposition 13 in June 1978. Proposition 13, Article XIII A of the State Constitution, limited the *ad valorem* tax on real property and mandated that local governments could impose special taxes only with approval of two-thirds of the voters. To compensate for the estimated \$7 billion reduction in property tax revenue resulting from Proposition 13 in fiscal year 1978-79, the Legislature provided approximately \$4 billion in State 'bailout' money in fiscal year 1978-79. The Legislature subsequently enacted long-term financing legislation in 1979, which altered the financing of various Government services. Additionally, in November 1979, the passage of Proposition 4, Article XIII B of the State Constitution, changed local government financing by limiting the growth in appropriations of local governments to changes in the cost of living and in population.

Since the passage of Proposition 13, local governments have expanded their use of discretionary revenue sources, that revenue which local governments can control to some extent. Local governments which are increasing their use of discretionary revenue sources are doing so by eliminating or reducing the previous Government subsidy of services and increasing charges for services to reflect the full cost or a greater portion of the cost of providing services. The revenue sources which local governments have discretion over are, however, subject to certain practical and statutory consideration.

In the United States of America and in other places overseas, the taxpayers are now adopting and accepting the principle that the user pays for services. If one wants a service from the Government or private enterprise, he pays for it, and that is something the Opposition will have to recognise.

Mr Keneally: That smashes the ability of the poorer people in the community to have adequate services provided for them.

Mr BECKER: Programmes have been developed in America through the various Government agencies to assist the under-privileged and the disabled (or whatever classi-

fication you want to give these people). The scheme is still working and is expanding through the various American States. I want to prove that we believe in small government. We believe in getting Government controls out of the way of free enterprise. We believe in effective and efficient government, so that we can hold down Government taxes and charges. However, holding down Government charges has been difficult, because people are paying a fee for a service, such as that provided by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. We know what the problem is—it is over-staffing. The Joint Legislative Audit Committee report continued:

We found that county revenue from discretionary sources increased approximately 25 per cent in fiscal year 1978-79 from fiscal year 1977-78. Similarly, cities' use of discretionary revenue increased approximately 13 per cent in the same time period. Discretionary revenue, however, still constitutes a relatively limited portion of total county and city revenue, 9.15 per cent and 16.33 per cent, respectively, in fiscal year 1978-79.

Non-enterprise and enterprise special districts have been affected differently since Proposition 13. For example, non-enterprise recreation and park districts experienced an approximate 6 per cent increase in their use of discretionary revenue in fiscal year 1978-79, while their total revenue declined nearly 25 per cent. On the other hand, enterprise county water districts showed an increase of approximately 9 per cent in discretionary revenue at a time when total revenue was increasing by approximately 3 per cent.

The problem of dealing with water and sewerage rates is world wide. The report continued:

Since school districts receive limited revenue from discretionary sources, their reliance on discretionary revenue has changed little since proposition 13. Case studies conducted in seven counties and six cities indicated that the increase in the use of discretionary revenue in fiscal year 1979-80 may be diminishing somewhat in counties but is continuing in cities. The case studies conducted in five special districts showed mixed changes and did not indicate any specific trend.

I was most concerned about that point, because I have heard from Opposition members that proposition 13 has had a tremendous impact on education in California, and that schools were being closed and the educational system was in a state of chaos. I discovered that the schools buildings that had been closed were closed because they were actually condemned under the new earthquake safety regulations.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Were they replacing them?

Mr BECKER: They were not tearing straight in and doing it. Where could they get the money from? It is not the Government's fault that the area is subject to earthquakes. No-one has control over that—perhaps the member for Mitcham might have but I do not think anyone else has. That was the problem with which they were faced. This situation was forcing on the education authorities—

Mr Millhouse: What did you say about me? I cannot stop earthquakes, but I would stop you if I could.

Mr BECKER: I have waited all this time to give you the opportunity of being recognised, so that the record shows you are back from the court. The problem in relation to school buildings in California is that capital money is not available to replace the buildings that have been condemned, and this has forced the education authorities to look at the total aspect of restructuring and resiting the schools in areas that are being developed. The report continued:

We also analysed the difference between property tax revenue projections made for the Conference Committee for Assembly Bill 8 in 1979 and the actual tax levies reported by the State Board of Equalisation. Property tax levies in fiscal year 1979-80 increased approximately 13 per cent, as opposed to the 10 per cent increase estimated for the Conference Committee for Assembly Bill 8. As a result, total statewide property taxes are approximately \$150 000 000 higher than originally projected for fiscal year 1979-80. The different units of local governments will receive varying benefits from the increased property taxes.

Even though property taxes have been slashed by 55 per cent, the huge turnover of properties in California has meant that this reduction has not had such a dramatic effect on the ability of the Government to raise its own finances. In principle, the system is still working but the test will be during this current financial year because of the huge impact of interest rates on the economy generally, not only in the U.S.A. but throughout the world. It all comes back to the one principle: no matter what country one visits today one finds that the taxpayers have had enough. They are demanding greater accountability and efficiency from their Governments, and I am pleased my Government is doing something about this problem.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): It is with pleasure that I rise this afternoon to address the House on the Governor's Speech. Before doing so, I would like to indicate my feelings and condolences to the Playford family on the death of Sir Thomas Playford, who was a great statesman in South Australia and who earned himself, by virtue of many things that he did over time, a place in the history of this State. I agree with the comments of Sir Walter Crocker who feels that, in many ways, by being limited to the State's sphere, he did not earn the recognition in the Australian political scene that he deserved.

He certainly did much good for South Australia, but we must remember that not even a statesman always does things that are good for the State's development. There were some areas in relation to which either his Government or he had some degree of myopia and did not advance the State as well as might have been the case. Social change in South Australia was not advanced as much as might have been the case under his reign, and during his term in office this State lost its record for being a leader in Australia in regard to social change, and certainly the electoral system was anachronistic during that period of time. Education, the area with which I am particularly concerned, did not achieve the significance in Governments of his time as it deserved.

Mr Millhouse: Sir Baden Pattinson was one of the best Ministers of Education we have ever had.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Those criticisms having been made, I return to the point that undoubtedly he has earned a place in South Australia's historical record.

During this debate many comments have been made about the content of the Governor's Speech. I notice that education receives only four mentions in the Speech. They relate to the 'Into the 80s' document on education; the moves in curriculum development; the commitment of this Government to the school-to-work transition programmes; and the Aberfoyle Park Primary School complex. I am not going to argue against any of those, because I think those four moves are certainly reasonably worthy and even interesting moves.

The document 'Into the 80s' has a part to play in what I hope will be a great debate on educational issues in this State in the years ahead, a debate which I hope will focus on the educational aspects and not on other peripheral aspects of less significance to education itself. Curriculum development is not a new measure to this State, and I do not think the Governor was trying to imply that all curriculum development changes took place after 15 September 1979; that is certainly not the case. Some of the most imaginative changes in curriculum development took place in this State in 1970s under the previous Government, but certainly in many ways some of that work is continuing.

I am a little ambivalent about school-to-work transition programmes. Whilst I support the need for programmes to assist the transition of the student from school to the work place, I feel that the present programme that we have in

this country and the present support that is being given by the Federal Government leaves something to be desired. A number of comments made to me indicate a worry about the lack of guidelines as to how specifically this money is to be used at the school level. It has also been mentioned to me that, as a result of the increased funding made available on 4 June this year, there is a fear that the school-to-work transition programme that was developed in this State may be narrowed down in its focus to be entirely vocationally oriented, and will ignore all other aspects of life which must play an important part in any student's future.

I am also concerned about the motives behind the Federal Government's school-to-work transition programme. When the announcement was made on 26 August last year, there was a press report about some of the views of the Prime Minister. The *Australian* on 26 August reports the Prime Minister as saying:

This assistance [the transition from school to work assistance] would not be necessary if schools did their job properly.

I fear that in many ways this programme is being viewed as a patch-up job to correct alleged mistakes of the education system, and that indeed the education system is being castigated at the same time as being offered this money to develop school-to-work transition programme. I am somewhat ambivalent about the programme, and I think we will need to thrash out all aspects of the programme in much more detail.

The Aberfoyle Park Primary School complex certainly has all the makings of an interesting experiment. I certainly wish it well, and I will be interested to see how it does develop. Perhaps it may be the fore-runner of many similar projects in this State, not only achieving exciting interesting developments in education but even achieving economy in the use of available resources for the various avenues of Government and non-government involvement in education.

Education rates only those four points in the Governor's Speech. I partly understand why because there is not much else to talk about that is worthy of being put in the Speech. Certainly, the record of this Government in education is poor indeed, from a wide variety of aspects, summed up, of course, by the fact that we have now had the first strikes by teachers in South Australia's history. That will become a memorial to this Government and to its lack of capacity to deliver educational services in this State. Without belabouring that point, I would remind members of the comments I made on 3 June when I spoke about the fact that the disputation that took place was, from the teachers' point of view, educationally linked. The primary concern was for the quality of education, and industrial matters had little relevance as far as the teachers themselves were concerned. That is a point which I believe has been lost sight of many times in debate over recent months.

It is easy enough for those who are critical of the present Government to focus all their blame on the present Minister of Education. He helps a great deal to attract that focus. He, perhaps, is one of the biggest boons to after-dinner speakers this State has had, as he provides a constant stream of anecdotes that they can relate about the way he handles one issue or the other. I have one in a moment to relate that I think is worthy of record. However, if I were to go through all the anecdotes that I know, I would be here for some hours.

It would be a mistake to feel that all the Government's faults in education rest on his shoulders alone, because they do not. A degree of incompetence has been demonstrated by other Ministers, likewise in the field of education. Also, there is the basic fact that philosophically this Government is doing to education what is quite natural for it to do, what is in line with statements it has made over many years. It

is quite in line with its approach that education does not bear any more priority in a Government programme than does any other particular aspect. In that light the policy statements made by the present Government before the last State election were an aberration. They contained many positive and progressive points, but that was just an aberration, as history has shown the case to be, as the Government of the day has returned to its previous attitudes towards education.

The present Minister compounds those problems by his own inability to handle the situation, an inability not just made up of his propensity to incompetence, but also made up of his absolute unwillingness to consult with anybody in the department. It is also compounded by his dilatory way of handling issues. Many members will know how long it takes to receive a reply from the Minister on any number of matters. In fact, one issue that became known to me, because I confess I had forgotten about it, took place initially before the Estimates Committee last year.

On 1 October, I, along with some colleagues on this side of the House, asked the Minister a variety of questions about education for which the Minister confessed at the time answers could not be provided. He said that we would be provided with those answers at a later time. He was certainly correct; it was a later time. On 4 June this year, I received a letter from the Minister stating:

You may recall that during the 1980-81 Budget debate on education you raised certain questions to which answers were promised . . . I now enclose the replies.

That is a magnificent effort—eight months in arriving! One would not have wanted that information to deal with educational matters in the interim, because it certainly was not available. What I am saying is summed up, I suppose, by an incident that took place in another place late last year. The Hon. Anne Levy, asking a question about religious education in October, received very poor treatment at the Minister's hands. She asked a question seeking only statistical information of a very basic sort which was easily available and which could easily have been obtained within the Education Department. On 19 November the Hon. Anne Levy was forced to re-ask the question. She received a reply from the Hon. Murray Hill, who was representing the Minister in that Chamber, that read:

I regret that I have not been able to obtain a reply to this question from the Minister. I respectfully suggest that she places the Question on Notice for Tuesday next.

On the following Tuesday, 25 November, the Hon. Anne Levy re-asked the question. This time the Hon. Murray Hill, who I should imagine was probably somewhat red-faced, said:

I regret that I have not received a reply from my colleague to this question. I recall that last week I indicated that I would make every endeavour to obtain that reply. I have done that but I still have not succeeded.

Finally, on 2 December 1980, the member in another place received the answer for which she had waited so long and for which she had battled across the Chamber in a bipartisan spirit with the Minister in that Chamber to try to have something come out of the Minister of Education's office.

That really indicates that the Minister's inability to proceed speedily with matters is not on a partisan basis; it is not directed just at us, but also at his own Ministerial colleagues. They are no more able to get information out of him quickly than we are. That makes us feel a little better about it. But that merely provides icing on the cake of a Government policy and philosophy about education, and that is more serious. We would make a mistake if we attempted all the time to focus attention on the present Minister. Instead, we should be rigorously analysing this

Government and its members' attitude towards education. Some members on the Government benches contribute to debate on education issues from time to time. It is a pity there are not more who take part.

It is certainly true that education in this State faces a great many problems. The back-drop, so to speak, to any Government attempting to handle education at the State level contains some very worrying factors, which cannot be lightly dismissed. I say 'any Government', because some of these factors are partly beyond the control of this Government and will affect a future Labor Government. Declining school enrolments have been noted in statistical data. The magnitude of that problem is possibly something about which different policies can be formulated, but the problem will not go away.

School enrolments, as many members will realise, are not entirely due to demographic factors. Some other factors are involved. Certainly, the demographic factors are quite significant. It is true that the Second World War baby boom has now largely passed through the education system, and has not yet had all its own children to create a succeeding mini-boom in enrolments, which will come in the late 1980s and early 1990s, as the figures show.

The decline in the birth rate compounded the problem. We now find that there is an easing of enrolments due to that. Also, there is the matter of the alleged trend from the Government system to the private system. Many points are being made as to why that trend is taking place. Some people suggest that it is nothing more than a vote of no confidence in the State education system, and that those who have the resources are fleeing from the Government system to put their children into what they believe is a better education system. It may well be that some parents are making that assessment, but there are other factors that we have to recognise as important.

The Schools Commission, for example, identifies the fact that more places are now available in the private system throughout Australia than was previously the case, and that, therefore, it is more possible for demand for the private school system to be met than was previously the case. I know that to be so in my own case. My electorate, which in 1976 had only one non-government school, a Catholic primary school, now has three non-government schools, two primary schools and a high school. So that, naturally, residents in my area are more able to participate in the non-government system by virtue of the places being available.

In a sense, the reduced participation that we have seen in this State for many years may have been artificially low, because places were not available; had the places been available participation rates may well have been higher. Certainly, there is also some evidence to suggest that the participation rates are not climbing from a permanent low position previously but are in fact climbing from a trough that existed in the 1960s and 1970s, the participation rate in the 1950s having been somewhat higher than now.

Another factor in the decline in school enrolments is the decline in senior school retention rates. This is a very significant area, which any Government has some capacity to control, by virtue of its policies. It is true that Australia, and South Australia nonetheless, has had very low retention rates at senior school levels as compared with Western industrial developed countries. It is something about which I do not believe our education systems can be particularly proud, something we should have been questioning much more vigorously for many years now, to find why we cannot keep our children at senior school in as great a proportion as do many other countries. Not only have we had lower retention rates in the past, but we now find that the retention rates are declining, particularly among male students,

and to a lesser degree among female students. That is a matter to which education departments and governments should address themselves.

Why is that happening? One of the reasons, doubtless, is that students are making a vote with their feet and saying that they are not convinced that the education system is offering them what they want, and that the curriculum is not attuned to their direct needs. We know that, in recent years, many education authorities have tried to make that point time and time again. Indeed the Keeves Committee is by no means the first on that line. It makes the point that much of the senior school curriculum is directed to only 20 per cent of the student population at that level, and that one cannot hope to combat and reduce the retention rate problem unless one addresses oneself to the question of the curriculum content available to the other 80 per cent.

Another factor of some importance relates to the education for jobs nexus. I believe that, in some ways, we in this country and people in many Western countries have perpetrated, no doubt unwittingly, what can be regarded only as a major confidence trick regarding education, a confidence trick that started some time after the Second World War. We ourselves, as students, were brought up on it and those of us who participate in education re-enacted it and may be still doing so today. That confidence trick was that we said clearly, distinctly, and quite dogmatically, 'Get a better education and you will get a better job.' We left no doubt about the conjunction; it was 'and', and it was quite specific that they were there for one purpose and that that one purpose would come to fruition.

If we had chosen to have any sense about it, if we had looked at it any more than cursorily or superficially, we would have found that demography worked against that being so. Certainly, the technological change after the Second World War was such that the number of 'better' jobs did increase to a certain extent, but there were limitations as to how far it could increase. In the mix of jobs of all sorts, there will be only so many of the 'better' type, and we should have realised that finally the equation of the graduates available and the better jobs available was not going to meet. That problem was compounded in the 1970s by the economic down-turn internationally, which meant that not only did that equation not take place, but there was a reduction in the total number of jobs available.

What reaction has there been? The reaction, not only among parents but among employers and students, has been a spirit of disillusion with the education system, and that spirit is such that they have said, 'You promised that education meant a better job. You have not given us a better job. Therefore, education has been wrong.' I believe that we should have been saying all these years, 'Get a better education, because it is a better thing to do. Certainly it will improve your employability; it will improve your chances of obtaining work and of coping with the work that you obtain. However, that is only part of its total purpose.' Had we done that, I think we would have seen better retention rates at senior school level than exist at present, because students who are presently still linked to the 'get a better job' connection would see that there were other reasons why they should stay on at secondary school.

Another problem that any State Government has to combat is what can only be termed the flight of the Commonwealth Government from responsibility in the area of education. There has been a progressive decline in total education funding being made available by the Commonwealth Government to State Governments, and indeed South Australia is suffering some worse aspects of that, as its share of the cake is declining. In 1974-75, 9.6 per cent of the Commonwealth Government Budget was on educa-

tion, but by 1980-81 that figure had declined to 8 per cent. A very interesting feature is that that decline has not been evenly observed. In fact, the private school sector has had an increase in resources made available to it, whilst the Government sector has had a decrease. By the private school sector, I refer to all schools in the private sector, the very wealthy as well as the poor parish schools. I am not about to object to the absolute right of the private school system to be brought up to the Government standard of education, but I find it sticks rather much in my throat to see funds directed to very wealthy schools at the expense of Government schools that desperately need the funds. There is something decidedly wrong with that philosophical approach, yet day by day we see that approach more and more from the Commonwealth Government.

In some specific ways we are seeing problems at this level that we will have to cope with. The vaunted abolition of the Curriculum Development Centre is one of them. That centre in Canberra played a significant part in curriculum development projects in this country, and such projects are mentioned in the Governor's Speech. One such project is the Social Education Materials Project, a very highly thought of project in terms of the role it has played in social sciences in our schools. The Federal Government has said that unless State Governments pick up half the tab for that centre by next year it will go.

Another area is the virtual gutting of the Schools Commission, which has had much of its research capacity virtually wiped out, including much of its ability to assess the current state of Australian education, to determine where needs and priorities exist in this country, jobs which it did so well since its establishment in 1974. The previous State Government had an excellent record in education. It brought South Australia back from a very mediocre record to being in general terms the leading State in the nation. But it still must be said that basically the capacity of the State Government education system was to provide resources across the board, and that the actual ability to meet special needs and special priorities was not met so much by the State Government's capacity but by the Federal Government's capacity, through the Schools Commission.

It was the Schools Commission research branch that determined where needs existed in Australian education, and that was the branch that said what sort of finance should be made available, and what sort of programmes should be run to meet those needs. Yet now, when we must surely all agree that needs still exist in education, despite the absolute path of regression that we seem to be on at the moment, we must recognise that someone should be able to assess needs. If it is not going to be the Schools Commission, who will it be? We need some statement from the Minister in this House as to how the State education system will pick up the pieces, how it will be able to respond to needs-based education in this country.

The flight of the Commonwealth Government from responsibility in this area has met with varied responses. I will read a couple of points from the Australian Teachers Federation, which has closely analysed the impact of the Schools Commission Report earlier this year and the comments made on it by the Federal Minister for Education. They outline the abandoned commitments by the Schools Commission. The report states:

The following basic commitments have been abandoned: the primary obligation of Governments to Government school systems. That is something, Sir, that is very interesting. I believe that the Minister in this House has also indicated that abandonment. I have heard him on occasion quite clearly indicate where his preference lies—that it lies with the private schools system. He does not have an overwhelming

commitment to the Government system first. The report continues as follows:

'Equality of opportunity' as the fundamental principle governing school funding.

What else should there be but equality of opportunity? What else should an education system be designed to do? The report continues:

Concern to ensure minimum acceptable standards for all children.

There we come to the needs basis that I was talking about. The report continues:

'Maintenance of effort' as a condition of funding.

That relates to the private schools system—that they have to show their energy in the raising of funds before they can be guaranteed access to the much-vaunted 'taxpayers' purse' which we hear so much about and which people talk about being thrown around. Surely, it is being thrown around if we are not expecting the private system to show its capacity to raise funds as well. The report continues:

The funding of schools on a 'needs' principle.

That is critically important. There are other aspects that are of importance to any State Government of any political persuasion. First, there is the matter of public attitudes towards education. I believe that educators, regardless of their persuasions, have perhaps been insensitive in the past to community and parental attitudes. They have felt that some criticisms that have been made of the education system by parents or the community are ill-founded and wrong. Well, it may be that they are ill-founded and it may be that they are wrong, but it does not take away from the point that they are still being felt and that, just because you refuse to acknowledge their existence, that does not mean that they will go away. Indeed, they have not gone away. I think that any State education system must address itself as a matter of urgency to assessing what the community is feeling about that system, to develop models so that it can learn community opinions and respond to those opinions from throughout the community and not just from limited segments of it. If it does not do that, public restlessness will not go away; it will fester on and ultimately do extreme damage to the quality of education that is, in fact, being provided in this State.

Other factors which deserve attention and which I know have been addressed in this House on a number of occasions are such financial matters as the effect of incremental creep on teachers' salaries and the way in which in real terms an education budget has to grow in excess of the rate of inflation if it is to keep at a constant level the resources available in the classroom. The incremental creep factor in this State is valued in the education system at \$5 800 000 a year, so that amount has to be made available to any State education system over and above compensating factors for inflation.

Another aspect that I think is very important, particularly in terms of the public debate on education, is a point of view that is becoming more widespread—that is, the aspect of the financial ledger achieving supremacy in analysing education. Education is a human services area, like certain other areas of Government budgeting. It therefore, by definition, involves not only a financial ledger but also a social ledger, and that social ledger attempts to weigh up the social costs and benefits of anything that is done within the education system. That is critically related to the actual quality of education and how successful it is. In other words, you cannot clearly, in the short term, equate your social ledger and your financial ledger; they are two goals that should be aimed at, quite distinct in many ways, and you cannot interpret in marginal productivity terms the social ledger.

It is not possible, in my opinion, for anyone to be able to say, if they are given \$1 000 extra, how many students will achieve X per cent of better marks, because you cannot quantify in such definite terms. The matter becomes even more complex when one looks at the broader issues of social education that schools are also supposed to be on about. In that line, certain comments that have been made over recent times about the Education Department and its capacity to meet or not meet financial restraints deserve to be analysed very closely.

I was somewhat concerned to see in a major report last year the term used about middle level teachers, not the concept of them as educators but the concept of them as managers. I certainly agree that good financial management is vital and important. The Education Department is the spender of a very large sum of money, and that money must be well spent. But those in education are primarily educators. They should be doing that well. They should be doing that with proper use of Government moneys. Their prime goal, however, is to see what is the quality of education that they provide in the classroom. I know that many people in education are concerned about this, and I will read from a Primary Principals Association letter some comments it has made about the mooted application of programme and performance budgeting, that little pet project of the present Government, at school level. The Secretary of that association wrote a letter on 24 March this year, as follows:

As a result I wish to advise that the Primary Principals Association rejects the concept of programme and performance budgeting on the grounds that it is singularly inappropriate to educational needs.

The letter continued later:

The proponents of programme and performance budgeting and similar concepts, as contained in the P.A.C. report, completely misconceive the school purpose and fail to understand that the qualitative aspects of children's education are to a large extent intangible.

There we come directly to the social ledger to which I referred. The letter continued:

They cannot be measured in quantitative terms in the same way that other Government departments can, where these departments deal with the laying of roads, the transport of goods and the quantity of gas passing through the pipelines per hour.

Even where aspects of the educational process can be quantified, the costs to ascertain these would require the immediate and significant increase in the provision of non-teaching staff.

That, Sir, against the background of a 4 per cent cut in assistance to schools, indicates that they are going to be in absolute chaos if they are expected to apply that sort of approach.

That is the backdrop to education in this State. It raises questions to which any State Government of any persuasion will have to address itself. This Government has exacerbated matters by a series of blunders, mistakes, ineptitudes, and assertive behaviour where it has misread the actual situation at hand. I believe that we can read some of the aspects here as being as follows: first, there has been an appalling consultation mechanism by this Government. I am almost tempted to say that there has not been one. The numerous crises that this Government has been in over a time have largely been the result of bad consultation or no consultation at all.

One can look at the issue of corporal punishment. The Minister is on record in *Hansard* as saying that he thought that there was consultation. He then discovered that there was not consultation, and he had to back down. The Independent Schools Board issue was another example of the same thing. We on this side were putting what we believed was philosophically the correct point of view, but we had consulted the people and knew where they stood on that

issue. The present Government had no consultation and had to back down.

The school assistants dispute, for all the Minister says about negotiations taking place, has been a sad and sorry story of biased negotiations or non-existent negotiations at critical times. The times when negotiations were needed they did not take place. In times when they were attempting to patch up the job, I acknowledge there were some negotiations then.

I also believe that the Government has misread the character of public restlessness. I believe the Government attempted to play off parents in the community against teachers over the assistants dispute. I believe the Government felt that it could have the parents say that these teachers were nothing short of bludgers who were again wasting taxpayers' money and were not concerned about their children, so they would not support them in that issue. That may or may not be so, that many parents have a concern about what is happening in schools. I believe that they do have some concern. Some of that concern may not be justified, but some may be. The parents know one thing very well—that if they are not happy with the state of education at the moment, they are certainly not going to be happy with it if the Government cuts resources to it.

They know that, if it is not providing what they want at this time, it will be less able to provide it with cuts. They very wisely made that judgment and supported the school assistants and the teachers in their stand on this matter.

Secondly, I believe that there has been no clear indication very often of what the publicly observable rationale behind Government behaviour is, that is, why the Government does certain things, what the pattern is, what the formula is. So often it seems to be random decision-making, that the Government has just been clutching at straws from the air, and then backtracking in many instances because, of course, the Government has not done its homework properly. By these methods the Government is creating a lot a damage in the education system. It is no good thing to see that happen. Nobody can be proud of that. There may be some short-term political advantage for some in that decline in morale in the Education Department, and there may be some short-term advantage to be had because of the disarray, but the damage that that will have done to the department will be quite profound, and it will be some years in the mending. Certainly, I, as the alternative Minister of Education, am not happy that an Education Department under a future Labor Government will have as one of its prime priorities restoration of its morale, restoration of its sense of purpose, and restoration of its sense of enthusiasm, because the present Government has battled and belittled what is happening in the school system.

The quality of education in this State is good. The Keeves Committee of Inquiry reported that education is in good heart. Studies done on the capacity of the education system to teach literacy and numeracy indicate that we should not be ashamed of what is happening in our schools. Despite all the political rhetoric that has gone on in various quarters in times gone by, this State is holding its head up high in comparison with other States in the Commonwealth concerning the way in which it can teach our kids to read and write. So, the quality of what is happening in that regard is good. Curriculum development programmes have been imaginative; the Education Department has been attempting to address itself to the problems that education faces in this State, and we should be proud of what is going on there and should seek to support that in future.

Much more of the present Government's behaviour will see a lot of that dwindle, because the enthusiasm upon which that rests for its success will not be there. Certainly, we all know that in any employment situation there are

some who attempt to bludge on the system, some who attempt to take advantage of it, some who attempt to reap the perks without giving the work. However, we also know that in any given work situation the bulk of people have enthusiasm and dedication to their work, and certainly that is true of the education system. The bulk of the teaching profession brings with it a well-spring of enthusiasm. It is upon that well-spring of enthusiasm that we rely so much for the success of education being provided.

I turn now to some specific areas of concern with the education system and directions in which I see us going. It worries me that, with the flight from responsibility by the Commonwealth Government and with the constant intimations by the State Government that we are going to see cuts in education, much more of the burden from the costs of education will be thrown on parents and on the community. It is interesting to note that in 1980 a survey was done by the School Management Systems team in this State, which had the task of obtaining information on parent input into fees, and fund-raising and the hire of facilities, together with details relating to voluntary labour. Also, the team was asked for its comments on the effect of centralisation and expenditure decisions. Its findings were that average parent contribution for deposits, fees, voluntary contributions and fund-raising ranged from \$30 per year per student in a country primary school to \$41 per year per student in a metropolitan high school.

It also found that the voluntary labour contributed to the schooling system ranges from 2.6 hours per student per year in a country high school to 8 hours per student per year in a metropolitan primary school. By some rough calculations it can be ascertained that that is approximately worth 1 000 000 hours of voluntary labour per year, the equivalent of 500 full-time employment positions, with a salary value of perhaps of the order of \$5 000 000 a year, which is being contributed as a kind of tax, so to speak, from parents in this State for the education system.

There is a lot of enthusiasm from parents and from people who want to make that contribution to their school, but an education system should not be built upon relying upon such contributions, upon expecting it to happen. We should not take advantage of that willingness of parents in the community to assist in education. Our system should be built not to take advantage of that. Yet, there are some things that worry me about trends ahead. Certainly, with regard to school fees, I see a trend to more and more reliance on parents funding through school fees, and there are some things that seem to be happening at the moment which, I fear, will be permitted to continue. One of them relates to those who do not pay their school fees. The rate varies upwards to 10 per cent. One primary school sent a note around to all parents which said in part:

Council Notes: Book Accounts . . . In accord with sound business principles, outstanding amounts have been carried forward on to this year's account with 10 per cent interest added.

I think it is a pretty poor state of affairs when schools are no longer providers of educational services, when they are now credit providers. I think it is a pretty poor state of affairs where they are now running around as debt collectors. I think that it is something that should be responded to by the Minister urgently. I have written to him about the matter and I am awaiting a reply—we know what that means. The Minister did, in fact, make some comments about the problem of unpaid fees, unpaid amounts to schools, in answer to a question that I put on notice in the last session, Question No. 333. In his reply the Minister said:

I am aware of the problem which some schools are having in attempting to recover unpaid school fees. Funds are not available within the budget of the Education Department to meet any

shortfall caused by the non-payment of fees by parents. The Director-General of Education has nevertheless sought an examination of this problem to be made by his officers with a view to determining what recovery options could be instituted. That investigation is still proceeding.

What an appalling approach! I would have thought that if schools are having difficulty receiving all the money (and the school I asked about is in my own electorate, and I know that it is having trouble receiving that money because of economic conditions in this State, because parents are not able to meet all the financial costs upon them, and yet are not given access to the free book system because that does not automatically apply to everybody: they are in that range of people who just lose out on getting the benefits of the free book system and yet are still struggling financially), the response of the Minister would be that the Government would help schools meet that money by paying it. However, that is not the response; it is to examine what can be done to recover that money. I am very worried about that. I see, in fact, that perhaps the 10 per cent interest matter that I raised before will spread with that kind of philosophy. On 6 August last year, with regard to fund raising and its role, the Minister said:

It has been obvious that for the last several years there has been a steady increase in the amounts of money expended in such areas by parent organisations. Whether this reflects an increased need for expenditure—

that is interesting, that is, whether it means that the schools are having to pay more of their own amounts of money without Government support—

or whether it is simply also a reflection on the ability of some schools to raise more money than others, I cannot say.

He ought to be able to say, because, if we are going to have a school system that is based upon those schools that are in more affluent areas being able to raise more money than those that are not, then we ought to be debating that issue as a matter of urgency.

Other trends that are of concern involve the moneys that are paid per student to schools for grants. I received a letter from the Pinnaroo Area School dated 2 June, which stated:

Several years ago it was rumoured that the primary text book and materials grant . . . was to be increased somewhere in the order of 100 per cent. That never eventuated and instead we have seen the progressive devaluation of this allowance in real terms.

That is quite interesting, because it is certainly true that there has been an increase in the allowance of 10.6 per cent, up to \$12.50 per student, but the school did a study of the cost of the materials that its students are required to have. I will not go through all of the materials that were related to me, but I will mention some of them. First, the overall increase in the cost of all of the materials was 29 per cent. For example, the cost of materials to help with spelling, which is part of the three R's, increased by 18 per cent in one year, and that increase is to be met by a 10.6 per cent increase in Government funding. The cost of maths materials to help with numeracy increased in the range of 31 per cent to 54 per cent, which again was to be met by a 10.6 per cent increase in funds from the Government's coffers. Is that an indication of the Government's commitment to the three R's? I believe not. This sum will not pick up the shortfall that must be met. I do not know what response the Minister will give. I know he is committed to so much in that area, but somehow his commitments never seem to come to very much.

Some very interesting things have happened in recent times in regard to building programmes, which might be slightly whimsical if the matter was not of vital significance to some communities. The Munno Para Primary School was told that it ought to have a community hall and, indeed, the Public Works Committee, in its report published in 1980 (Parliamentary Paper 158), stated:

There is a need for a community activity hall to serve the urgent needs of the school and those of a developing but deprived community . . . There is a serious lack of community facilities in the Munno Para area and in these circumstances the provision of a larger hall than normal is desirable.

To date, no hall has been built. The saga (and that is all it is) that has taken place in Munno Para is quite depressing. Many letters have been written by many people, but not an awful lot of letters have been written by the Minister of Education. On 9 July 1980, the member for Napier wrote to the Minister expressing his support and asking the Minister what was happening and when the community could expect the community hall to be built. Surprisingly, with amazing alacrity, the letter was acknowledged immediately. The date of acknowledgment was also 9 July. That acknowledgment was pending consideration, the one we so often see that is supposed to keep us happy, showing that someone is considering the matter, still no reply had been received. On 22 September the member for Napier wrote again to the Minister of Education indicating that he was still concerned about the matter.

Mr Slater: Was that in the same year?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Yes. Would you believe that there was no reply? On 5 November 1980, still another letter left the office of the member for Napier, but still there was no reply. At least the member for Newland gets wrong or inaccurate replies, but the member for Napier could not get any reply. In May this year, the honourable member's electorate secretary thought it was about time something started to happen. After three letters had been sent, surely someone in the Government could do something! She rang the Minister's office and spoke to Mr Burleigh, who acknowledged that a letter had been written but had been misplaced.

Mr Slater: They did that to one of mine once.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: They found the letter. The electorate secretary said, quite reasonably, 'That is O.K. We will forgive you this time. Send on the letter.' At this instance, in private conversation between the member for Napier and the Minister of Education, the Minister had indicated that the community hall would go ahead and, indeed, that was the gist of the misplaced letter. When the electorate secretary asked for the letter to be sent on nevertheless, she was told, 'The letter is not now appropriate.' When she asked about that, it was intimated, or actually said, 'There have been changes. Things have happened since then and priorities are different now.' That is shocking and shameful. We have a report that identifies the needs of that community; many who live in the area are concerned; the member for Napier tirelessly wrote to the Minister of Education; but the best the Minister can do is lose his reply and then change his mind.

From the contacts I have had with the Munno Para community, I know that it will not accept that situation, and one public meeting has already been held on 24 June this year. No Government Minister turned up in response to the invitations that were sent, and the community is not too happy about that. The issue will not go away. A similar situation has been experienced in my district in regard to the Paralowie R-12 school. The member for Newlands would know all about the R-12 school, because the first such school was established in his district—the Heights School.

The Paralowie school, formerly Salisbury North R-12, formerly Salisbury North High School and formerly Salisbury North Technical School, has a large holding school on its grounds for the primary grades. The school was told by the Public Works Committee that a new school should be provided from 1981. That was the commitment of the previous Government. There have been many unfortuna-

effects of the previous Government's no longer being the present Government, and this is another example. This matter has been deferred, deferred and deferred. In the first session of this Parliament I asked a Question on Notice (No. 502) about the plans for that holding school, and I was told the following:

... the current planning provides for the availability of additional solid construction at the beginning of 1982.

That involved a year's delay, but I suppose we always expect a delay of something like that. I became a bit concerned when the Budget papers did not show any funds allocated to that school, and I could not believe that it would be built, right from the architectural plans to the unlocking of the front door, in six months, so I asked a question about it. In answer to Question on Notice No. 781, I was told by the Minister of Education the following:

Later discussions indicated that more time was necessary to be realistic to enable for settling in, gaining of community expertise in planning, and community participation in consideration of the eventual solid facilities needed. The programme was therefore lengthened with completion envisaged in May 1983.

That involved more than a year's delay. The reason was that discussions were in train and were not finished. I supplied the school council and that community with that information, and I was met with consternation. These people had not known that discussions were in train, because discussions had never been started. There had been no discussions at all. In fact, these people were somewhat offended that the Minister chose to use that excuse to delay the spending. Could he not even have the courage to say that, if he did not want to spend the money, he just did not want to spend it, rather than coming up with false reasons?

Certainly, that school and other schools in the State should not have to put up with the situation that schools such as Angle Park have had to put up with for years and years. Honourable members may recall the Angle Park saga. In 1960, the community was told that it would get a new school in one year. It was told not to mind the temporary buildings. The only solid buildings on that campus were the toilets, which were brick: everything else consisted of old transportables. The people were told to wait a year and they would get a new school. The doors of the new school were opened in 1976, and it was the planning and work of the previous Government that got the school the community now enjoys. The new school is one of the best schools of its type in Australia.

There are no grounds at all for supporting the duplication of that particular story to other schools in our community, to the Paralowie or the Munno Para situation, and we must fight that as much as we can so that we do not end up with the 'permanent temporaries' as are being used so much.

By interjection, the member for Mitcham criticised me for criticising a previous Liberal Minister of Education. It was under that previous Liberal Minister of Education that permanent temporaries became a way of life. It was under that particular Minister, among others, that kids had to swelter in those classrooms, and put up with substandard conditions, and put up with a higher rate of temporary school buildings in this State than in any other State in the Commonwealth. That is what I have to say in response to his comment.

I want to mention now the Alberton Kindergarten which is a kindergarten that predominantly meets the needs of Aboriginal children. Aboriginal children make up 70 per cent of its intake and the children come from a wide geographical area. Studies have been done that show that it is an educationally valuable institution. It assists, by having a majority Aboriginal participation, in the success rate of those children in later schooling. They have much better pass rates, of academic and general educational suc-

cess, in their later schooling if they have been there for that necessary preschooling. They have lower truancy rates and by and large they adapt much more easily to the educational system than otherwise they might. However, to maintain that facility, to maintain that degree of Aboriginal participation, it is necessary that the children be transported there. In the past, a minibus was used and then that disappeared and taxis were used in the first term of this year, but that system ended at the end of the first term. I wrote to the Minister as a matter of urgency at the end of the first term, as follows:

I believe it is urgent that action be taken to meet the needs of the kindergarten and to make a positive decision regarding the purchase of a minibus ... Accordingly, I ask for your urgent consideration of this matter with a view to an early response so that minimal dislocation will take place for the kindergarten itself and the maximum benefit can be achieved, both for the kindergarten and the State Budget. I await your reply.

Indeed, I await it still. The second term, in relation to which I wanted a response that they would be given transport facilities, has nearly finished and I have heard nothing at all from the Minister. The kindergarten put a submission as to how—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Mathwin): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr RUSSACK (Goyder): I support the motion, and follow other members in the recognition of the late Sir Thomas Playford. A concise summary of the achievements of Sir Thomas was outlined in His Excellency's Speech. Many words have been spoken by many members on both sides of the House, and without exception they have been words of commendation. I would add to those statements and extend to Lady Playford and members of the Playford family sincere condolences on the passing of a wonderful South Australian and a wonderful statesman, not only from the point of view of this State but also having regard to the contribution he made through this State to the nation as a whole.

Last evening the member for Playford said that the speech delivered by His Excellency was just a collection of words. He said:

His Excellency's Speech is clearly an enforced requirement of an uninspired and dispirited Government that promised so much so wrongly and has too slowly realised it does not have the capacity to give what it offered.

I would say that those words do not in any way at all describe the activities and the achievements of the present Government. I commend the Government for what it has done in about two short years in office. The word 'promises' is often used loosely. I would suggest that aims are outlined in election speeches by those who would attain the office of government, and some major aims were outlined by the Liberal Party in 1979 prior to its election on 15 September of that year. I think it is right and proper that the people of South Australia should be reminded that at least five major aims were achieved in a short time.

The first aim was the abolition of succession and gift duties. I would suggest after what we were told yesterday that the present Opposition accepts that move because it has been said that no future Labor Party Government would reintroduce those taxes. I am not saying that they would not introduce some other measure which would be just as iniquitous and which would retard progress in this State.

Mr Keneally: Are you saying Tom Playford introduced iniquitous legislation?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr RUSSACK: It does not matter who introduces any measure; it is a matter of what time proves is right or wrong. This Government believes that it was proven over the years that succession and gift duties were wrong taxes,

and they have been abolished with the agreement of the majority of the people in this State, who regard the abolition as being to their benefit.

There has also been a remission of stamp duty on the purchase of a first home, not only for young people but for anyone who is purchasing a home for the first time. It is all right for the members of the Opposition to be amused about this particular aspect. Might I remind them that, from November 1979 to May 1981, 13 293 first home buyers qualified for stamp duty remissions, which totalled more than \$6 500 000 at an average exemption of \$490. I know that the Government and the Opposition are concerned about the escalating rate of interest on home loans. Let me say at the outset that the Government has acknowledged this problem, and the Premier has written to the Prime Minister and to the financial organisations asking that something be done about this matter.

I believe the Government has done more than that to assist in this escalation of interest rates. In view of the current rises in interest rates it should be pointed out that, on a \$30 000 loan, the stamp duty saved, as a result of this policy and aim of the present Government, more than compensates for a 1.5 per cent rise in interest rates in the first year of repayment, so that has been a signal benefit to those first home buyers in the first year.

I am not saying that that is all that should be done, but in that first year it has been of wonderful assistance. This fact should be emphasised to those opposite. This Government has done a great deal by providing stamp duty rebate which will offset in the first year up to a 1½ per cent rise in interest rates. With bank mortgage rates currently at 11½ per cent, a remission of \$500 in stamp duty on a \$30 000 loan is a direct State Government subsidy of 15 per cent of first-year interest payments. So, the Government has made a major contribution in this area. Another assistance to the home owner that would be beneficial to those paying heavy mortgage repayments is land tax abolition on the main place of residence.

Mr Slater: How much do you save?

Mr RUSSACK: It does not matter what the amount is; it is a saving, and more than the last Government did in that respect. Precise figures on the cost to revenue of abolishing this land tax on the principal place of residence are not available. However, the best estimate available from the Treasury is that home owners saved an aggregate of about \$6 000 000 through the abolition of this tax in the first year, because it was not possible for this tax measure to become effective until 1 July 1980. This Government has done something to assist those people purchasing homes in regard to their financial obligations.

The Government said that it would discontinue SURS, and it did so. It was better, in the Government's view, that there be some permanent employment rather than spasmodic employment. This policy was implemented in two areas. First, in certain country areas where there was manufacturing industry, pay-roll tax was remitted. Then, if employers throughout the State saw fit to employ one or two persons under the age of 20 years, they would have certain remissions in pay-roll tax. This policy has made a definite difference in relation to jobs in this State.

I have here a graph which shows the number of persons employed in South Australia from August 1977 through to 1981. Of course, we have a month to go until August. As at August 1977, 568 000 persons were employed in South Australia. A year later, in August 1978, the figure had dropped to 553 000. By August 1979, another year later, 547 400 people were employed, a drop of some 20 000 in the two years. No wonder the people desired a change of Government. From 547 400 in August 1979, a year later the number employed had risen to 550 400, a few months

later to 554 500, another few weeks later to 560 200 and, in recent months, to 561 300. So, in this Government's life we have almost redeemed the number of people employed in South Australia. I know that the employment situation is not acceptable, but I point out very strongly that there has been an up-turn in the number of people employed in this State from August 1979 until now. Some of these people have been employed because of the pay-roll tax incentive.

Last Saturday night I attended a social function and spoke to a man involved, as an executive, in a business on Yorke Peninsula. He expressed gratitude for the exemption from pay-roll tax, granted because of the type of business it is and the area in which it is situated. Some 18 months ago the firm was in certain financial difficulty. A manager was employed. Today, from a staff of 28, it now employs 44 people. I hasten to say that I did not bring up the matter: this executive told me that the pay-roll concession had been a major factor, plus the change in managerial oversight, contributing to employment of additional people in that enterprise. I stress that the keeping of those five major promises outlined in the Government's policy when elected in this State has greatly benefited our financial position. Paragraph 7 of the Governor's Speech states:

In line with my Government's move towards deregulation and improvements in public sector efficiency, it is proposed to repeal several obsolete Acts and to abolish the bodies established by those Acts. Legislation will also be introduced to establish a Parliamentary committee to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of statutory authorities.

The Premier has already reported on the progress of the deregulation unit, but I read recently the following interesting facts concerning regulations and Governments, headed 'Costs to business':

In the 20 years to 1979 the Federal and State Governments passed 16 631 Acts of Parliament and 32 551 rules or regulations, making a total of almost 50 000 statutory instruments created over the two decades. A substantial number of the Acts and regulations are directed at private business.

We heard an outstanding address given yesterday by the member for Rocky River on small business and the ill effects of certain Government regulations on such businesses. The survey to which I am referring continues:

The cost of Government regulation of business is now greater than Commonwealth Government expenditure on education, health or defence. According to a survey conducted by the Confederation of Australian Industry, the cost to the private sector of Federal and State business regulations was \$3 720 000 000 in 1978-79.

Among other points to emerge from the survey was the fact that, for every dollar the Federal Government spends on business regulation, the private sector must spend at least \$3 just to comply with those regulations. The private sector must set aside 13c in every dollar of income just to comply with Federal and State business regulations. Fifteen thousand five hundred Federal public servants are employed full time to administer business regulations. The private sector must provide 16 000 people to comply with those regulations, and a further 38 400 private sector employees are required to comply with State regulations.

It is true that many regulations are necessary, some indeed being requested by business itself. Nevertheless, the facts I have quoted indicate the frightening state of interference and over-regulation. In the end, we all pay, and I commend the Government on the establishment of the Deregulation Unit. I am sure that we will find in future that regulations will be culled and that unnecessary and obsolete legislation will be repealed and abolished in an endeavour to assist the business enterprises of this State, especially small business.

For the past 19 or 20 months, I have been involved with the Public Works Standing Committee.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You have been Chairman. That is more than being involved.

Mr RUSSACK: As the member for Mitchell has suggested, I have had the honour of being Chairman of the committee for that time. I commend committee members on their participation. As most people would be aware, the committee comprises members from both Houses of this Parliament and from all political persuasions, and it looks at its task in a unified way, with the express purpose of assisting in the saving of unnecessary expenditure on capital works in this State, mostly in projects costing more than \$500 000. I said 'mostly', because I will mention in a moment that in my opinion, and I think in the opinion of the committee, other public works should come under the scrutiny of the Public Works Committee.

I turn now to the question of cost savings and architects. The client departments bringing projects costing more than \$500 000 before the committee include the Education Department, Engineering and Water Supply Department, Health Commission, and the Police Department, at times. The client departments put forward a schedule of all the desirable features to be included in the public work, rather than listing the items required. Until now, the designing architect has tended to bear the brunt of the flak resulting from excessively high prices, whereas he is merely doing his best to satisfy the client department. Even allowing for that, however, there should be critical examination within the departments themselves with the object of setting a budget standard within tight price controls, rather than setting a standard that includes all the desirable features put forward.

I liken public buildings to a married couple setting out to establish a new home. Society has changed over the years, and it seems to be the rule rather than the exception that young people today want to move into a home that is complete in every way, fully furnished, and with the garden paths set so that there is no requirement for later additions. Although that might be a simple analogy, I liken this to the standard at which many Government departments expect their buildings to be when they enter them. I suggest that we must have a fresh look at this general practice that seems to have grown up over recent years.

I believe that capital works associated with statutory authorities should be considered. As well as reporting on individual projects referred to it, the Public Works Committee is required, under its Act, to make each year a general report to the Governor on its proceedings, and these reports are required to be tabled in Parliament. The committee may, on its own prerogative, call attention to any matter connected with public works or proposed public works of the State on which, in its opinion, Parliament should be informed. The committee has done this on numerous occasions in its annual general report. In its fifty-third general report, tabled on 18 September 1980, the committee brought to the notice of Parliament, as it had done for quite a number of years, the statutory authorities and guarantees and the money being spent by those authorities without any scrutiny from the Public Works Committee.

As at June 1979, the liability of statutory bodies on which debt charges were payable amounted to \$956 000 000, and that figure was increasing by between \$50 000 000 and \$60 000 000 a year. Other borrowings had been obtained from the Loan market or Government guarantee to the extent of more than a further \$500 000 000. It was most gratifying to learn from His Excellency's Speech this year that the Government is to form a committee to look into the needs of statutory bodies and other organisations. I suggest that this matter has come forward largely because of the reports of the Public Works Committee brought to

the notice of the Government. I wish to point out some aspects that the committee has noted over the years, and more particularly in recent months. In doing so, I want to emphasise that the committee does not consider only education buildings.

It considers many other works from other departments, although this afternoon I will use for an example one or two buildings that have been considered by the Education Department. The committee has been very concerned about certain aspects of projects, such as site works. It has been concerned about the standards of certain buildings. Let me turn to site works and compare the Hackham South proposal that came before the committee in 1980 and a proposal for the same school that came before the committee in 1974. The school was to be built for the same number of students—330. In 1974 the school was to be built for a proposed cost of \$720 000. In 1980 the proposed cost was \$1 530 000, the school to be built in two phases.

The thing that concerned the committee was that in phase 1 the site works and drainage were to cost \$400 000. In phase 2, because of the type of ground, abnormal foundations were to be installed at a cost of \$108 000, and there was to be further site development costing \$200 000, a total cost for site and foundations of \$708 000, just \$12 000 less than the whole school would have cost in 1974. The unfortunate aspect is that it is believed that in some instances schools are left with undesirable sites which create great disadvantage. I believe that was the case in this instance. It was possibly the worse site available in that area.

The school at Morphett Vale township was closed and a school established at Hackham West. It was soon realised that there was no further room for expansion at Hackham West. Even though the immediate area in Hackham South was not occupied by homes, Hackham South school had to be opened to take the overflow from Hackham West. I am sure that, had there been further research and greater consideration, a great part of this cost could have been saved. I would go so far as to say that it would possibly have been better, as it would have been in this case, for the Education Department to purchase some other land, rather than having had it provided by the South Australian Housing Trust, for, say, \$200 000, where only nominal site works had to be done. It would then have been able to get through much more cheaply than the \$708 000 envisaged for site works on its existing block.

Another matter concerning the committee is the escalation in price from the time when work is approved until it is completed. I will give one or two illustrations. On 11 October 1972 the erection of the forensic science building was approved at a cost of \$3 470 000. To date, \$9 341 000 has been spent on that building. Approved expenditure to date is \$9 400 000. The Kilburn Community College, which is now called the Regency Community College of Further Education, had a proposed cost in 1974 of \$14 900 000. To date, there has been an expenditure of \$28 539 000. The approved expenditure is \$30 798 000. The Flinders Medical Centre, phases 1 to 3, was approved on 14 April 1972 at a cost of \$33 000 000. To date \$72 883 000 has been spent. Approved expenditure is \$95 323 000.

I realise that there has been a steep inflationary trend. However, it would be advisable for further scrutiny of this particular type of work as the price increases. I could give other examples of projects which have not escalated to nearly that degree. For instance, the Marine and Harbors building at Port Adelaide was approved on 10 September 1975 to be built at a cost of \$4 200 000. To date \$5 099 000 has been spent on that building. Approved expenditure is \$5 661 000. Therefore, in six years there has been nowhere near the escalation in price for that building that there has been for the other examples I gave.

I realise that, in 1974, \$1 000 000 would buy much more than it will in 1981, but there has been such a multiplicity of escalation that it is desirable that, when a steep increase in cost is detected, that is the time to have the matter reassessed. I commend those who responded to the report of the Public Works Committee last year when the committee was reported as saying the following:

PROGRESS OF PUBLIC WORKS

This information is provided by the Commonwealth Public Works Committee in its general report and information has been sought by the South Australian committee along similar lines, but the information to date has not been forthcoming.

It is suggested by the Public Works Committee that there should be a surveillance of the progress of public works.

I commend the Minister of Water Resources and his department for the action taken on this comment made in the annual report of the Public Works Committee, because that department has produced a document of proposed work, progress that has been made, estimates of termination of the work, and its price.

Mr Becker: Have you found management far more efficient in the E. & W.S.?

Mr RUSSACK: So far as the Public Works Committee is concerned, it has the responsibility only of scrutinising projects and references that come before it. The Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee has a wider field and the responsibility of looking as far as the managerial side of matters, whereas my committee has the responsibility of looking only at a particular work.

Mr Becker: The documentation is pretty good, isn't it?

Mr RUSSACK: With regard to documentation from the E. & W.S. Department, I have just commended that department and the Minister on the manner in which the work has been done. I might say this: there have been referrals back to the Public Works Committee from the E. & W.S. Department because of the reasons I have outlined. One of them was the Berri irrigation headworks project, which came back before the committee for reconsideration. That is a desirable process which should happen.

Another matter that is causing the committee considerable concern relates to the fact that there is a tendency for good buildings to be demolished for the sake of aesthetics or for the sake of conforming to design standards. I can give a couple of examples of this. One concerns the Thebarton High School redevelopment. The committee saw on that site (and this was in the report on this project) a very solid building which, in the opinion of the committee, should have been involved in the planning of the redevelopment. Another project concerns the Glenside Hospital redevelopment, where there are buildings which it is proposed to demolish but which are of a very strong structure. The committee visited and inspected that area three times with a view to being satisfied that the right thing was being done.

Another matter concerning education buildings is the continuing trend that exists in the department towards smaller class sizes, but the overall size of education buildings is not being reduced proportionately. This causes undesirable effects on both capital and running costs. When students were taught in conventional enclosed classrooms, the standard area allowed per student was about three and a half square metres, but with the changed school design and teaching methods the area allowed per student now is in the vicinity of seven square metres, with a resultant heavy increase in capital costs. With the reduction of class sizes, there is also a need for an increase in the number of teachers. Members are well aware that the running costs, including teachers' salaries, represents between 85 per cent and 90 per cent of the total cost of education. Thus, the trend towards more teachers per student will have the effect

of substantially increasing education expenditure, which in turn will have the effect of less money being available for other necessary areas of activity.

With regard to the public works programme for this year, 27 reports have been issued by the committee involving an expenditure of about \$60 000 000. If the standard of these works had been trimmed to the extent of, say, 10 per cent, about \$6 000 000 would have been available for other public works, and I am sure members can readily call to mind desirable or necessary activities in their respective districts for which this money could have been used. This is an area where the constructing departments should be authorised to exercise a stringent cost control over the client departments before the projects are referred to the committee. In this way we would achieve more public works for the funds that are available.

I refer again to my comparison with the home and associated running costs of a home and to the fact that people are now finding it more difficult to maintain the money that they have borrowed and to pay the upkeep and servicing of mortgages, together with the running costs of that home. I suggest that the same thing applies to public works. I strongly urge that buildings should be designed for practical purposes so that they can be used in a practical way without necessarily being of the highest standard possible.

I hope that I have not oversimplified the matter. For the year ended August 1980, the Public Works Committee considered projects worth \$85 000 000, and in the 10 months to June 1981 the Public Works Committee considered projects worth \$60 000 000. Millions of dollars could have been saved and made available for other projects if only standards could have been reduced by a mere 10 per cent.

I would now like to deal with certain aspects in my own electorate. Also, I want to refer again to comments made by the member for Playford last evening when he was referring to the Governor's Speech and to agriculture and the weather conditions in this State during the early part of the year. The honourable member said that the information in the Governor's Speech was incorrect. He said:

There was a weather forecast but even that was wrong. I think I was one of the few people taking notes. The member for Semaphore said to me at luncheon that day that the paragraph dealing with the weather forecast did not sound right to him. I rang a friend in the bureau and said, 'Does that sound right?' and he said that it was totally wrong. He said that there was good rainfall throughout March and then there was a bad and unpredictable season until June and July. Throughout that it has been good and there have been even rains. That was wrong, and I do not know where the information came from. I refer to the serious matters inside this State.

May I say to the honourable member that the matter of the weather and how it affects country areas is a most serious matter for country members. South Australia covers a wide area with a varying rainfall. In most of the agricultural areas, during the first part of the year until the last couple of months there was a very dry period, and rainfall, if there was any, was only patchy. Now the situation has changed altogether, and in some areas seeding has been delayed. In fact, in the area where I live on Yorke Peninsula, I have heard farmers say that they have never sown as late as they have done this year. I would say that rain in most parts of this State, particularly in the Mid North and around the peninsula area, is always acceptable, and there is every prospect now that we will have a reasonable year. I say that the matter is serious because over 60 per cent of exports from this State involve primary production. In the electorate of Goyder, of course, there are various aspects of primary industry, growing of cereals, and the raising of cattle, sheep and poultry. There is a diversity of interests.

Mr Lynn Arnold: And market gardening.

Mr RUSSACK: Yes, market gardening in the very important area of the Adelaide Plains. I intended to mention that a little later, as I wish to raise a matter that concerns the Adelaide Plains, which is possibly a unique area. The very soil in the area is unique as far as vegetable growing is concerned, and productivity is of an excellent standard.

Primary industry is very important in our State, because of the returns that it brings. Only yesterday, the Premier, in opening the annual conference of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, mentioned that this State has a great history associated with primary industry, that then came the industrial interests, and that in addition the State has had the development of natural resources. He said it was necessary that we consider all three areas. Everyone, those involved in primary production, those in the city and those involved in mining, should understand the other areas perfectly so that all can work in unity to endeavour to assist the State not only towards economic success but also in the quality of life.

In the interests of primary production, a document was produced by the Minister of Agriculture which states that at the election there were 34 specific aims (or I could use the word 'promises') in regard to agriculture policy. The Minister said that 31 of the 34 aims have been realised; or, if they have not been completed and fully realised, they are well under way and in progress.

Mr Lynn Arnold: What are the three that have not?

Mr RUSSACK: I was about to mention that. I do not have the time and the House does not have the patience to listen to me read out all that has been achieved, but I say sincerely that the aims are in the interests and for the advancement of agricultural interests in this State. First, there was an aim to promote a better understanding and communication between city and country dwellers, which has been fulfilled. The Department of Agriculture, through its extension services (and I will dwell on the Adelaide Plains by saying that an adviser has been appointed to the Virginia-Salisbury area, which will benefit my constituents and also the constituents of the member for Salisbury), provides an information service to urban and rural urban fringe people and a home gardens advisory service to all South Australians. There is a general promotion within city areas of the contribution the agricultural sector makes to the economic and social welfare of South Australia.

One aim, which has not yet been realised, is the standardisation of equipment. The policy stated that the Liberal Party will encourage machinery manufacturers to standardise components in the future so that spare parts are readily interchangeable and so that tools and fittings are uniform wherever possible. The Department of Agriculture currently has no means or expertise to implement this policy. Informal talks have shown that some manufacturers are reluctant to change designs that are the subject of patents.

Another aim involved superphosphate:

The Liberal Party will hold discussions with all sections of the industry in furthering the establishment of bulk superphosphate supply depots in the major farming centres throughout South Australia.

Yet to be achieved, this requires liaison between agriculture and transport.

The only other aim is outlined in item 32 of that document, concerning liquid fuel. The aim was to encourage extended on-farm storage of fuel stocks to enable continuation of farm programmes in times of industrial disruption. Still to be achieved, in consultation with the Premier and the Deputy Premier (the Minister of Mines and Energy) are the methods of encouragement that may be used. That is a creditable record: 31 of the 34 aims in agriculture have been achieved. I now refer to mining and the development

of our natural resources. Paragraph 4 of the Governor's Speech states:

Mineral and petroleum exploration activity is at an unprecedentedly high level. Expenditure related to mineral exploration alone in 1980 aggregated \$31 137 000 (compared with \$10 468 000 in the previous year) and commitments in relation to exploration for oil and gas, both onshore and offshore, approximate \$250 000 000.

The figures relating to expenditure on mineral exploration in South Australia since 1973 indicate the increase in expenditure resulting in Ministerial statements such as we heard today, that there has been a new find of brown coal that will be of significant use to this State. In 1973, the South Australian Government spent \$4 340 000; in 1974, the then Government spent \$3 450 000; in 1975, \$3 860 000; in 1976, \$4 630 000; in 1977, \$6 450 000; in 1978, \$7 270 000; and if we take the inflationary trend into account, no additional sum was spent in those years of the Labor Administration. In 1979-1980, \$10 400 000 was spent on mineral exploration, and in 1980, \$31 100 000 was spent in South Australia. We realise today the benefit that is accruing from that exploration.

South Australia is missing out on royalties. Receipts of royalties per head of population for New South Wales in 1977-1978 totalled \$49 062 000; Victoria, \$48 446 000; Queensland, \$53 651 000; South Australia, \$4 109 000; Western Australia, \$54 519 000; and Tasmania, \$2 093 000. Those royalties brought into New South Wales \$9.79 per head of population; Victoria, \$12.69; Queensland, \$24.76; South Australia (the lowest of any State), \$3.19; Western Australia, \$44.58; and Tasmania, \$5.06. That is why the other States have been able to spend money to develop their areas to a greater extent than has South Australia.

This Government is to be commended for expressing a keen interest in exploration. Money is being spent in the exploration and development of mineral resources in this State. A test has been conducted in my district in regard to coal: 2 500 000 000 tonnes of coal is involved. Admittedly, it is saline coal and is not good quality, but a test hole has been dug, which cost over \$5 000 000. To date, 700 tonnes of this coal has been exported to Germany and America for tests.

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

Mr RUSSACK: Although the results of the experimental lots of coal from the Port Wakefield and Bowmans area that were sent overseas are not yet available, it is reasonable to assume, because of the significant progress that has been made in engineering technology over the past 50 years, that the possibility of successfully using the lower-grade coal from the Port Wakefield and Bowmans field for generating electrical power could be compared with the situation that existed when Leigh Creek coal was first used, and the situation can be faced with confidence.

Again, I bring to the notice of the House the need for an adequate water supply, although not just for the electorate of Goyder, where there are some specific needs. I refer, for example, to the Adelaide Plains, in the very important market gardening area. We have perhaps reached the time when there should be a serious reassessment of the water supply allocations in that area.

At Watervale, in the Mid North, where there is no water supply, there is the potential of industrial expansion and development. Also, I speak of the hundred of Moorowie on the lower part of Yorke Peninsula, where there is a desperate need for water. I thank the Minister of Water Resources for the progress that has been made in this area. These specific areas and, indeed, the whole State need attention in relation to a quality of water that will be acceptable to the people.

It is known that during the past summer months there was concern regarding amoebic meningitis, and I am pleased that the Government has announced that plans are being drawn up for a filtration plant to be established near the Morgan-Whyalla main. The Premier and the Minister of Water Resources are to be congratulated on the outstanding submission entitled 'A Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem', which has been well prepared and presented to the Prime Minister. It is to be hoped that this project, which will permanently assist and eradicate the salinity problem in the Murray River, will be taken up, and that we will see, in the bicentennial year, at least a start on this major work in order to assist with South Australia's water supply.

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

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I, too, join with other members who have spoken in this debate and support the motion moved by the member for Todd. I regret that this is the last speech that we will hear from Mr Keith Seaman, who I believe has been a great Governor. I took note of paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech, which states:

In order to ascertain the need for legislative change to meet current and likely future developments in industrial relations, my Government has initiated a comprehensive review of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, and has sought submissions from all those interested in contributing. It is anticipated that a report will be made to the Government on this important matter early next year.

I hope that, considering the present state of industrial relations, the report will be to hand much earlier than some time next year. We certainly know that, when the Government says 'next year', it means just before the next election. I am greatly concerned about the state of industrial relations not only in South Australia but in the Commonwealth generally. Certainly, the Commonwealth is the leader in this field in relation to causing bad industrial relations.

I hope that the member for Todd does not leave the Chamber for a moment, because I do not wish to refer to an absent member. However, I see that the honourable member is leaving the Chamber. I am sorry about that. However, the honourable member will keep. I am disappointed also that the Minister of Industrial Affairs is not present in the Chamber this evening, as I certainly believe that he has much for which to answer in this State.

An honourable member: He's doing a good job.

Mr WHITTEN: You might think he is doing a good job, because he is certainly creating all the trouble in the world with unions in this State, and that is not the job of the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Mr Randall: Which union?

Mr WHITTEN: If the honourable member wants me to talk about one particular union, he can listen. I have a cutting from this morning's *Advertiser* that I did not intend to use. However, now that the member for Henley Beach has decided to put his bib in, I will have something to say about it. Under the heading 'Government blocks move for 72-hour fortnight', the report states:

The State Government intervened in the S.A. Industrial Commission yesterday to block an agreement on shorter working hours.

Mr Ashenden: A very responsible action.

Mr WHITTEN: Do you believe that?

Mr Ashenden: Yes.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Keneally): Order! I ask honourable members to come to order and cease interjecting. The Chair will, as I have said in reply to queries that have been directed to me, be very even handed. Also, I ask the honourable member to refer to members as 'honourable members' and not as 'you'.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you, Sir, for your protection. I assure you that I do not require protection from the Chair when replying to interjections because, if members opposite wish to interject as the member for Todd interjected a moment ago, I can certainly answer them if members so desire. I remind the House that this was a freely negotiated agreement with Associated Co-operative Wholesalers Limited, a South Australian company that employs a lot of storemen and packers. Negotiations have been continuing over a long period, and the Minister has stopped an agreement taking place in 1983.

Mr Olsen: What are the flow-over effects of such an agreement?

Mr WHITTEN: It will create good industrial relations and maintain better productivity, so the workers of this State and the employers will benefit.

Mr Ashenden: What about the number of jobs?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Langley interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: I realise that the member for Unley knows as well as I do that Government members wish to create trouble. However, the report to which I have referred states:

The Government's intervention yesterday accorded with its announcement on 18 March that it would intervene in the public interest when the company—

the company, mind you, not the union—

sought to register its agreement in the Industrial Commission. Mr Apap—

in case Government members do not know who he is, Mr Apap is the Secretary of the Storemen and Packers Union—warned the Government during the hearing yesterday that, if it tried to delay the agreement's being registered, the unions would have no option but to engage in industrial action.

I thought that this Government, and in particular the Minister, wanted, as the Minister said yesterday in reply to a question, to have good industrial relations, and that this would be his prime objective. Mr Apap continues:

We don't want to harm the company or the community. However, if the Government says it would be against the community interest to register this agreement, it is even more certain that it would be against the community interest not to because the result could be that they won't get any groceries at all.

This agreement was freely negotiated between the company and the unions, which had agreed to its being phased in over a period. In fact, at present they are working in such a way that they have one day off a month and receive their normal pay.

Mr Lewis: Who will cover the cost?

Mr WHITTEN: I shall ignore the member for Mallee, in deference to your ruling, Mr Acting Speaker, but I shall still deal with the member for Todd, because he does not tell the truth. I shall prove that. Yesterday he handled the truth very recklessly in referring to a resolution when he deliberately altered the context. The member for Todd said yesterday that members of the A.L.P. are bound to support the introduction of a 35-hour week, and that this position arose out of the convention on the June holiday weekend. I know that the member for Todd was not at the convention, but I attended every session. The report of the convention is available to anyone who wishes to see it. That does not happen with the Liberal Party, which meets behind closed doors, and even then its decisions are not binding on its members.

Mr Olsen: That is an inaccurate statement.

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Todd needs to be educated a little to understand—

Mr Olsen: The annual meeting of the Party has been open to the media for—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Rocky River should cease interjecting.

Mr WHITTEN: So that the member for Todd will understand the resolution carried at the convention in relation to the shorter working week, I intend to read it.

Mr Mathwin: I've got it on the Notice Paper.

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Glenelg is also up a wattle. I do not want to be rude, but I have heard him called 'Mr Mouthwin'. I know what his name is, but if he would only control the first part of it I could help him out. Let me read the resolution.

Mr Mathwin: It's on the Notice Paper.

Mr WHITTEN: It is not, and if the honourable member will cease interjecting I will read the resolution, which states:

The State Labor Government will, on return to office, implement its existing Public Service policy, which requires the abolition of all forms of discrimination in the conditions of employment between Public Service employees by bringing about a reduction in the ordinary hours of work of all Government employees who work a 40-hour week down to 37½ hours per week with the maintenance of full wage standards.

Mr Lewis: As long as they join a union.

Mr Langley: What about the U.F.S.? Isn't that a union?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides of the House should come to order. The honourable member should be able to give his speech as he wishes, but at the moment he is being prevented from doing so.

Mr WHITTEN: The resolution continues:

Further, a committee of the Government and unions shall be established to monitor and advise the Government of the effects of reduced working hours, with the aim of reducing the working week to 35 hours per week, consistent with current Labor Party policy.

That motion was moved by Mr Jim Doyle, seconded by the Deputy Leader, Jack Wright, and carried without opposition. Its objective is to eliminate all forms of discrimination in Government work.

Mr Ashenden: And bring in a 35-hour week.

Mr WHITTEN: Certainly, and I will say that I support the 35-hour week. I am in agreement with several major companies in Australia which support it.

Mr Ashenden: Shame!

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Todd will stay for a few minutes, I will explain why a 35-hour week is inevitable in Australia. If he does not believe that, he is putting his head in the sand and he does not understand the situation.

Mr Ashenden: Who will pay for it?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I do not wish to be personal but I am sure that, if the member for Todd had had shop floor experience instead of administrative experience, he would understand the situation. The wages of workers have been greatly eroded since 1975. Before then, workers had some opportunity to get wage justice, but under the Fraser Government, and with the subservience of the South Australian Liberal Government, there is no opportunity for wage justice.

Mr Lewis: Piffle!

Mr WHITTEN: The member for Mallee might think that, but if he would try to understand the plight of the workers he would be better educated. The Liberal Party has enunciated a policy of free enterprise, allowing prices to be charged in relation to what the market will stand. The Liberal Government says that it will abolish price control, because supply and demand will take care of the situation and prices will find a reasonable level. Anyone who is honest would say that wages will find their own level in a free enterprise society, allowing the market to find its own level. The Liberals have tried to do away with price control and with the Prices Justification Tribunal, before which companies have to justify their prices, but they require the unions to justify every cent they can get. There

has been tremendous erosion of wages and conditions in the past six years, and it is no wonder that we have industrial disputation. I do not want members to think that I support industrial disputation. I was involved in the trade union movement for a long time, and my objective always was to keep talking with the employers, because, while we were talking, there was always the possibility of wringing out a drop.

Mr Lewis: You believe in closed shops.

Mr WHITTEN: Certainly I believe in closed shops. Members may have noticed that the Prime Minister said recently that the wage indexation guidelines were no longer of any use, a sentiment that has been echoed by the Deputy Prime Minister and Leader of the Country Party, Mr Anthony, who is saying that the guidelines are crook. Certainly, that is so—otherwise we would not have had disputation in Telecom. Telecom wished to give its employees their just wage rates. Something similar has happened with the transport workers strike. No-one can tell me that a transport driver who drives a heavy truck is not worth more than \$199.10 a week, which is what he is paid. Erosion since 1974 has amounted to much more than the \$10.45 the court is being asked to agree to. The Australian Transport Federation, in discussion with the Transport Workers Union, has agreed that that is the amount that should be paid.

But no, the Arbitration Court is not allowed to pay them and it cannot allow them to agree to that. It is not allowed to ratify that agreement because it is outside of wage indexation guidelines.

Mr Mathwin: Obviously you want collective bargaining.

Mr Hemmings: That's what the Prime Minister wants.

Mr WHITTEN: That is what the Prime Minister is already saying. Someone who comes from the United Kingdom, as the member for Glenelg does, would know that that is all that takes places there. There is no arbitration and conciliation court in the United Kingdom; it is collective bargaining.

Mr Mathwin: You are not going to hold that up as a great example, are you?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Keneally): Order! I note that the member for Glenelg is not listed to speak tonight.

Mr WHITTEN: This disputation would not have occurred if it were not for the guidelines that have been laid down. Now that I have warmed to this subject, I will turn to the proposed 35-hour week which, I believe, is inevitable. I give full credit to the Director of a certain Government department. Members might think it surprising that I would give full credit to the Director of a South Australian Government department who was appointed by probably one of the most Tory and conservative members of the Liberal Ministry, and I refer to the Minister of Health and the Minister of Tourism. She has appointed Mr Graham Inns, who has been a dedicated public servant for many years. I hope I am not going to hinder his future by giving him credit, but I believe in giving credit where it is due. At times I have even been known to give credit to the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Not often.

Mr WHITTEN: No, he does not often give me the opportunity. In the *Sunday Mail* of 21 June 1981 an article about Mr Graham Inns stated:

There needed to be 'some very serious thinking' about industrial relations in the tourist industry, the head of South Australia's Department of Tourism said yesterday.

'Having spent many years in the industrial relations field, I do not believe that confrontation, exchanges of well-worn cliches from a distance, or conceding to every demand that is made, provide the answer,' he said.

That is my view, too, and it is completely in accord with that of most of the leaders of the trade union movement

and the Australian Labor Party. In that article Mr Inns stated:

The aim would be to work through the impact on the tourist industry of factors such as the 35-hour week, penalty payments, and current methods of industrial negotiation, and to come up with some agreed approaches which enable the tourist industry to grow while ensuring that workers in the industry are able to receive some of the benefits of that growth. That dialogue needs to occur at both national and State levels, and the initiative for it may have to come from this State and in particular my department.

That is not coming from the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is very interested in the contribution by the member for Price, but is not so interested in interjections.

Mr WHITTEN: The article continues:

Mr Inns said that in a recent address to the New South Wales Travel League, Bob Hawke, the former ACTU President and now Federal Shadow Minister for Industrial Relations, had said a 35-hour week was inevitable in the travel industry and would do the industry no injury whatsoever.

'In fact, he believed it would provide a boost to the industry, in conjunction with five weeks annual leave, since it would lead to an increase in leisure time,' Mr Inns said.

Mr Lewis: That's rubbish.

Mr WHITTEN: I know that the member for Mallee would say that that is rubbish. I draw his attention to what Mr James, from the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, had to say yesterday. Mr James was very critical of workers having extra leisure time, and he did not think it was the right thing to do at all.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! What about giving the member for Price the opportunity to speak.

Mr WHITTEN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker; I certainly need it. The member for Todd has said that he hopes he is not going to be accused of union bashing, but then proceeded to go through the whole lot of it. He pointed out what a wonderful crowd Mitsubishi is. He did not give much credit to G.M.H. or Ford, only to Mitsubishi. I do not know whether it is the Japanese influence on him.

Mr Hemmings: That is his ex-employer.

Mr WHITTEN: I did not wake up to that. It is his ex-employer, and he is afraid that after the next election he will need another job and he will want to return to Mitsubishi. I have been discussing the transport workers and Telecom. I do not like to be classed in the same company as the present Prime Minister of Australia, but I have to agree with him when he says that we must relax the wage indexation guidelines. A recent article on this subject states:

The Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, yesterday supported a relaxation of wage indexation guidelines to allow more industrial disputes to be heard by the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission.

Mr Fraser acknowledged that the present strict guidelines were driving some unions into industrial disputes.

From the other side of the fence the Federal Secretary of the Transport Workers Union, Mr Hodgson, stated:

The strike would continue until the union achieved its full pay claim. The union and employers had been negotiating the pay claim since September last year, but had been blocked by wage indexation guidelines.

As I have said, there was an agreement between employers and the unions that they would agree to the \$10.45, but the guidelines, as laid down by this awful Liberal Government in Canberra, deny workers their justice.

There have been 150 metal workers on strike in South Australia for 12 weeks. Those workers have each lost between \$2 500 and \$3 000 in wages, and they are in very dire straits. In the main, those workers belong to two unions, the A.M.W.S.U. and the Federated Ironworkers Association. I have raised this matter previously and I have pointed

out that there was a claim for a nine-day 70-hour fortnight, and that is totally in line with A.C.T.U. policy. I believe that they will achieve that claim, but at what loss? It was a great loss to the company, Clyde Engineering, and I believe it could afford it, and it was a disastrous loss to those workers and their families who have been deprived of what they should have been able to receive along with a loss of wages between \$2 500 and \$3 000.

Mr Russack: What is the dispute?

Mr WHITTEN: It involved Clyde Engineering, which is a large engineering workshop that brings many dollars into Australia through the work it does in rebuilding locomotives for the New Zealand railway system. Not only that, the firm does a lot of general locomotive work. The efficiency at Clyde Engineering has been lauded throughout Australia. I will talk a little more about Clyde Engineering, because as negotiations with the company continued an agreement was reached that a small working party to discuss over-award payments and a shorter working week should be established.

The over-award payments would have brought South Australian workers closer in line with workers doing the same job for the same company in New South Wales and Queensland. I point out that workers in South Australia are receiving \$22 a week less than similar workers receive in New South Wales. A small working party was to be set up consisting of members of the two unions and the directors of Clyde Engineering.

Unfortunately, one of the journalists from the *Financial Review* got hold of the story and published it on the front page of that paper on the day that negotiations were to take place. There had been an agreement between the union and Clyde Engineering that there would be complete confidentiality on that matter. Somebody leaked the information to the press, which blew it up, and that was the end of negotiations, and the men went out on strike.

There was a hearing in South Australia before Commissioner Johnson in the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. The manager in South Australia for Clyde Engineering at the time is a man named W. W. Cole. I feel I must tell the Parliament what Commissioner Johnson had to say, as follows:

The Metal Industry Association of South Australia expects me to become a blacksmith who would be foolish enough to put his hands into a red hot fire and lift coals out without the aid of tongs.

I think that is very apt. Clyde Engineering has endeavoured in some ways to keep in touch with its employees. I have a letter which was sent to one of the employees of Clyde Engineering, dated 1 July 1981, as follows:

We are taking this opportunity to communicate with you on behalf of the company as we are disappointed that the current industrial dispute had been such a long period and we are anxious that you, as one of our valued employees, are fully aware of the problem which faces the company.

The current dispute is not a domestic issue. The 35-hour week question is an argument between the union movement as a whole and the law of the land as established by Government. We have no argument with you as our employee or with the union. You as an employee and the company as an employer are the victims of this dispute.

That is what I have been trying to point out to this Parliament. It is not the employers so much, and certainly not the union or its members, but it is the guidelines and laws that have been laid down by this vicious Federal Government to stop workers from getting wage justice. The letter continues:

As you know, the Rosewater factory has considerable orders on hand, the prices for which were negotiated before the 35-hour week issue arose. This work is covered by contracts, mainly with Governments, which contain specific conditions which preclude us from recovering the substantial additional costs involved in granting a 35-hour week unless it comes about as a change in the law.

This is where the Government is protecting the companies that have the ability to pay—it is not allowing the 35-hour week to be implemented because it knows that the profits of the people it represents will be somewhat eroded. However, if it is introduced lawfully through the Arbitration Court, costs can be recovered from clients. The letter continues:

The company has always taken the position with regard to changes in rates of pay and working hours that, provided these changes are agreed to by the Arbitration Court, we are happy and willing to grant these improved conditions.

However, as you are aware, the Arbitration Court has consistently refused to accept a reduction in the 40-hour week. The management of the company has sought the help of your unions in trying to persuade the court to change its attitude but they have been unsuccessful.

The letter is signed 'W. W. Cole, Manager,' of Clyde Engineering (S.A.) Pty Limited. That shows us—

Mr Mathwin: That is showing that the union has flexed its muscles pretty hard in that case.

Mr WHITTEN: My answer to that is that it is not just one union campaigning for a 35-hour week but many many unions, and many industries have agreed voluntarily to it. I would think that the few members on the opposite side here tonight could benefit if I were to give them the history of what has happened in the Labor movement in the last 100 years.

Mr Lewis: There are more members here than there are there.

Mr WHITTEN: I think you would agree, Mr Acting Speaker, that it is the Government's responsibility to keep up the numbers in the House, not the Opposition's. I have prepared a summary of what has happened. The eight-hour working day was gained for the first time by the Labor Movement 101 years ago. That was obtained by the bricklayers union in Victoria, and it was the first breakthrough where hours were laid down. Remember, it was not a five-day week but an eight-hour day. From 1904 to 1920 there were many claims for a 44-hour week.

Mr Mathwin: I will give you the history of that lot.

Mr WHITTEN: The honourable member for Glenelg would be anti-union, and probably anti-worker as well.

Mr Mathwin: That is not true. I like you, George.

The ACTING SPEAKER: The honourable member for Glenelg will cease interjecting.

Mr WHITTEN: From 1904 to 1920 the 44-hour week claim recurred from time to time. In 1909, New South Wales coal miners commenced a campaign for an eight-hour working day. Remember that the coal miners did not have that in 1904, so they campaigned for a 44-hour week with an eight-hour day, and four hours on Saturday mornings. At the same time, the maritime and transport workers came into the picture. Then, in 1915, the waterside workers were able to get a 44-hour week that no-one else got. I now refer to the 44-hour week in the engineers award and timber workers award. In 1920 some Queensland State awards provided for a 46-hour week and in Western Australia a 44-hour week was agreed to. Unfortunately, after the Government in Western Australia legislated to reduce hours worked to 44 for all workers in Western Australia and it may not have been in its ambit to do so, the employers appealed against that ruling and the Legislative Council (being the conservative Tory body it had always been) returned the hours to 48. In 1927 a 44-hour week was worked under the metal award, and in 1937 the 44-hour week was extended to the whole of industry in Australia. Not quite all however, because I can recall that when I was a young bloke in the country I had to work 48 hours a week.

In 1937 the 44-hour week was supposed to be general. I come back to 59 years ago, to 1922, when the Full Bench

of the Arbitration Court restored the 48-hour week for timber workers and workers under the engineers award—it changed it from 44 hours back to 48 hours a week. Also, in 1922 a Nationalist Government repealed the A.L.P. 1920 legislation for a 44-hour week and returned to a 48-hour working week.

In 1924 Queensland legislated for a 44-hour week. I quote as follows:

In 1924 Queensland moved to legislate the 44-hour week and was followed by New South Wales in 1925. In Western Australia in 1926 the Labor-dominated Lower House passed a Bill providing 44 hours, but the Conservative Legislative Council rejected it. Unfortunately the South Australian Government, despite considerable pressure, failed to act.

Perhaps that contributed to its later defeat. I continue the quotation as follows:

In 1925 the High Court ruled that Federal awards were paramount, and no State machinery could vary them.

Perhaps this reflects the attitude adopted by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. This happened in 1925 but, being the troglodyte he is, he would be going back to 1925 and saying that the South Australian Industrial Court should not have altered the wage indexation guidelines and the like to enable workers in South Australia to get full indexation. Perhaps the Minister of Industrial Affairs has gone back and read his history books and seen that in 1925 much the same was happening, and he has adopted a similar stance. In 1926 an Arbitration Court application to reduce the 44-hour week was a test case for standard hours in Federal awards. In 1930 key industries conferences of unions resolved that a 40-hour week was a method to offset unemployment. This was in the depression years, when the position was much worse than it is now. Today unions and industrial people are saying that this is a way of reducing unemployment, that is, to reduce hours. In this regard I was absolutely disgusted by what the member for Todd had to say—that workers want a 35-hour week only so that they can get on to overtime earlier and get five hours extra on overtime rates. That is certainly not the policy of the trade union movement, whose policy is to reduce hours to create more work and greater leisure time so that workers will spend money and create more employment.

Mr Mathwin: It won't happen that way.

Mr WHITTEN: It certainly will not happen while we have Tory Governments, and in that respect I agree with the member for Glenelg. In 1937 the A.C.T.U. Congress supported industrial action to obtain a 40-hour week. Queensland meatworkers achieved the 40-hour week through the Queensland Arbitration Court. That was later also cancelled. In 1938 the 40-hour week for meatworkers was reintroduced. In 1939 there was a considerable breakthrough, because the 40-hour week was granted in five shifts for underground coalminers and Queensland breweries.

In the war years, from 1939 to 1945, whilst the A.C.T.U. and trade unions had a policy for reducing working hours, they agreed that, in the interests of the war effort and because of the necessity to produce as much as possible, all claims and industrial action would be suspended. In 1945 the unions pressed the then Federal Labor Government to legislate for a 40-hour week but that request was rejected by that Government because it did not have sufficient powers and it was unconstitutional to legislate. In 1945 a Commonwealth Arbitration Court hearing led by the Printing Trades Union, was joined by all other appropriate unions, and that case became a test case for 37 unions. The court dilly-dallied for 12 months, and in October 1946, just 12 months after the commencement of the hearing, the court approved a 40-hour week, although it did not grant

it. It was not until September 1947 that the court granted the 40-hour week.

The first claim lodged in the courts for a 35-hour week occurred in 1957. The unions got nowhere with arbitration, but there have now been considerable breakthroughs. In 1971 the stevedoring industry was granted a 35-hour week after much agitation; in 1971 the coal industry obtained a 35-hour week as did the oil industry in 1975 (and the member for Glenelg would be aware of this in regard to the situation applying at Port Stanvac. He cannot say he has been unable to get petrol through lack of production, because all those agreements involved a pledge, which has been carried out, that there would be no reduction in productivity).

Mr Mathwin: It's more expensive.

Mr WHITTEN: Of course it is, and that is because of the actions of that burglar in Canberra who is taxing us on world parity prices for oil. That is why petrol is dearer. It is not because workers are getting more wages. I am honest when I talk to people about such matters, and I have already said that there has been no reduction in productivity.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Keneally): Order! The member for Glenelg will cease his interjections. I have asked him three or four times.

Mr MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. I appeal to you in this matter. The honourable member is inciting me to interject.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member has not raised a legitimate point of order. The honourable member for Price.

Mr WHITTEN: You would agree, Mr Acting Speaker, that I have been baited by the member for Glenelg. As I have said, in 1975 the oil industry obtained a 35-hour week. In 1976 the power industry obtained a 37½-hour maximum and a 35 hour minimum week. The South Australian Government agreed to a reduction to 37½ hours, provided there was no reduction in productivity. This year the big chemical complex at Altona, which involves workers from many unions and various companies, has agreed to a 35-hour week. That was also ratified in court, complete with the agreement that there would be no reduction in productivity. As recently as last week the press stated that the glass industry had obtained a reduction in hours. That is a little different from what came out in my union's journal a fortnight before the announcement in the local press. The report, headed 'Glass industry cracks on the 35-hour week', stated that the 35-hour week had been won by glass industry workers across Australia, and also that five Sydney ship-building and repair companies had agreed to a shorter working week. I would like to read a list of some of those companies that have agreed to the shorter working week, not one of the companies that I will name being a small or minor company. They are large companies which realise that they are making sufficient profits and, with the agreement of the unions that these profits will be maintained, they have agreed voluntarily to a shorter working week.

Mr Ashenden: What sort of pressure was put on them?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I do not know what pressure is needed. It is a freely negotiated agreement which shows that there will be no reduction in productivity and no increase in costs. The member for Todd cannot understand that. He cannot understand that workers are dinkum. He looks at the matter through Liberal eyes, which certainly gives him a different view altogether. Some of the major companies listed are

Colgate Palmolive, the Federal Match Company, Johnson & Johnson, Kelloggs, Lever and Kitchen, Masterfoods, Pilkington ACI, the *Sydney Morning Herald*, Rothmans, and Unilever.

Mr Ashenden: Are there any small businesses that can afford it?

Mr WHITTEN: There are 40 companies.

Mr Ashenden: Can small businesses afford a 35-hour week?

Mr Max Brown: What small businesses are left under the present Government?

Mr WHITTEN: I thank the member for Whyalla for that point. What is happening in South Australia is that small businesses are going to the wall.

Mr Ashenden: Can they afford a 35-hour week?

Mr Max Brown: What small businesses are you people talking about?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I have listed a few of the companies out of the 40 that I know of which have agreed to the 35-hour week in New South Wales. In Western Australia there are Swan Breweries and B.P. Refinery. Certainly the oil industry here in South Australia and the power industry also have come down to the 35-hour week. Then there are the tobacco companies—Philip Morris and W.D. and H.O. Wills, as well as Heinz, Peters Icecream, and Altona Chemicals. I could go on and on. It is not only the Australian Labor Party that is advocating a shorter working week. I refer to a company in Victoria, Sidchrome Tools, which would make the best tools in Australia. A Liberal who has ratted on them (he is probably still a Liberal at heart, the same as the member for Mitcham) is now the spokesman on industrial relations, Mr Siddons. An *Advertiser* article on 20 July stated:

The Australian Democrats have proposed a form of profit-sharing for Australian workers. The Party's industrial relations spokesman, Senator Siddons, said yesterday he would introduce a private member's Bill in the next session of Parliament to try to bring profit-sharing into effect.

Referring to the Arbitration Court, the article continues:

'Like any 80-year-old piece of machinery it's out of date and grinding to a halt,' he said. The Democrats would advocate a 37½-hour week, consisting of four days of 9½ hours.

'If you work that out and you pay normal overtime rates for the 1½ hours extra each day, you get a 40-hour pay for 37½ hours,' he said.

'You get one less working day a week and permanent long weekends.'

I could not agree with that. I believe that the eight-hour day is something that is sacred. As I said earlier, it was 101 years ago that a small band of workers gained that eight-hour day for a six-day week. I do not believe that workers should work more than eight hours on any day. Also, it is not the policy of unions to work overtime. Overtime is soul destroying to workers; it ages them before their time. I have been a boilermaker, but I am not bad at lip reading at times. I believe the member for Todd said 'Rubbish.'

Mr Ashenden: I did.

Mr WHITTEN: If I had not been looking at him I would not have known that he said it. He does not know what he is talking about. He does not know about unions.

Mr Ashenden: Why do workers demand overtime as part of their package then?

Mr WHITTEN: There has been quite a deal of talk about what the cost will be to implement a 35-hour week. The Metal Industries Association of Australia, which controls major metal manufacturing in Australia, claims that it will cost 21 per cent more to implement a 35-hour week. However, its counterparts in the United Kingdom say that the 35-hour week would raise labor costs by between 6 per

cent and 8½ per cent. Returning to what I was saying earlier about award wages and how unions have been subjected to wage injustice for so long, I want to quote some of the current award wages for skilled tradesmen. I refer to the Metal Industry Award 1971 (Federal)—Part I—Variations—date of operation, first pay period commencing on or after 7 May 1981. This document is new, and it is correct. For someone in my trade, a boilermaker, the base rate is \$194.90. Of course there are supplementary payments attached to that, including the tool allowance, which brings the amount up to \$207.40—a magnificent sum!

Mr Langley: I bet the member for Todd didn't work for that.

Mr WHITTEN: He probably didn't work at all.

Mr Ashenden: I worked a heck of a lot longer each week than you would have, without overtime payments.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: That serves you right. If you did not have an organisation to stand up for you and obtain your just wages for the time that you put in, either you were gutless or the organisation that you belonged to had no right to be taking your dues.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should refer to the honourable member as the honourable member for Todd, and not as 'you'.

Mr WHITTEN: In the Metal Industry Award there is a base rate of \$157 plus a supplementary payment of \$6.30, making a total of \$161 a week. I suppose a person might look at it this way: that \$161 would put himself and his wife \$1 over the amount whereby Fraser (and probably the Minister of Health), could say, 'You will have to be registered and pay for your hospital coverage.' The other thing that annoys me about award wages is the rates paid to unskilled workers compared to the rates paid to tradesmen, who served a four, five or six-year apprenticeship (most apprenticeships have been reduced to four years now, but a few years ago they were five and six years). For a female switchboard attendant, the rate under the Clerks Award is \$198.10. A welder tradesman gets \$196.80, but if he is a mechanic he gets only \$194.90.

You cannot tell me that the Metal Trades Award is just, and that the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union does not have a right to organise to get better wages and a 35-hour week. A study has been done in the United Kingdom and Europe, and the other day I looked up one of the publications available from the Parliamentary Library about European Economic Community debates and cuts in working hours. The report states:

Despite employer doomsaying, shorter working hours are coming to Western Europe.

There is a claim at present to reduce hours by 10 per cent and that will bring the hours in France, Sweden, Germany and Italy down to 36 per week. To support their argument that a 10 per cent reduction in the work week from 40 to 36 hours would result in a 50 per cent increase in productivity, better worker effort, and better worker organisation, the unions maintain that a 10 per cent cut in the working week really amounts to only 5 per cent, because increased productivity brings the effective working week up to 38 hours from 36. Senator Siddon said much the same thing when he talked about his four-day week. He said there would be no reduction in productivity whatsoever, because with different starting times, fewer smokos, and fewer lunch breaks, the changed conditions would be more than compensated for by increased productivity.

Mr Ashenden: Aren't they working flat out now, if they can increase productivity?

Mr WHITTEN: I am sorry. The member is so—

Mr Hemmings: Dumb.

Mr WHITTEN: I did not want to use that word. He does not understand. If you worked at Chryslers and looked at the line, you would see that, when a man clocked on and went to his job, it would be a minute or two before he had his plant adjusted. If he is oxywelding, by the time he gets his plant going and gets his tools ready, a few minutes have gone. The same thing happens at morning smoko and at lunch time. There is a minute or two before each starting and stopping. Can you not understand that there is no loss in productivity?

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion so ably moved by the member for Todd and seconded by the member for Henley Beach but, before addressing myself to the motion, I would like, on behalf of the residents of the District of Morphett, to express our sorrow at the passing of Sir Thomas Playford and to express our condolences to Lady Playford and her family.

The 1970s brought many changes to South Australia. During that period we acquired the title of the cultural State. From the foundations of the Festival Theatre, laid by the Liberal Premier Steele Hall, rose the centre of the arts in this State. Certainly some aspects of the quality of lifestyle in South Australia improved. We have more restaurants per head of population than any other State in Australia, hotels open at night, the most liberal licensing laws in Australia, and gambling laws are liberated. The laws of censorship have been relaxed to the extent of offending many people, but, in the eyes of the previous Labor Government, this did not seem to matter, and I do not think it matters very much at the moment to them. The mid-1970s saw the introduction of the great leap forward in consumer legislation from the pen of that great socialist lawyer and former Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth.

The member for Elizabeth may be proud of his legislative measures as Attorney-General and Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs, but while consumers are now better protected, the ex-Minister must accept criticism for introducing consumer oriented legislation in his desire for rapid changes, when he overlooked the need to investigate the full ramifications of many of his actions. He must personally accept the blame for many businesses that no longer exist in South Australia, either having gone bankrupt or moved interstate.

The 1970s also saw the introduction of legal and racial reforms, including abolition of capital punishment, abolition of public drunkenness as a criminal offence, outlawing discrimination on the basis of sex or marital status, criminalising race discrimination, humanising rape and sexual offences trials and pre-trial procedures for the victims, and making rape in marriage a criminal act.

The 1970s also saw the decade of the promises of achievement by ex-Premier Dunstan. In his 1973 policy speech, Premier Dunstan gave strong emphasis to initiatives of his Government which would ensure that South Australia would be a 'State in which everyone willing to work can find employment'. They were powerful words in those heady days of the socialist experimental laboratory of South Australia. It was in the 1973 policy speech that Mr Dunstan states that his 'Labor Government would continue to develop this State industrially'. He added that 'further major industrial developments will occur over the next 18 months, with decentralisation being a fundamental planning aim.' In fact, it was in this speech that Mr Dunstan made the announcement that was correctly perceived by the media and the electorate as a *fait accompli*, that in fact a

petro-chemical industry of world scale would be established at Redcliff.

After the Second World War, under the Playford Liberal Government, the State moved rapidly to establish an industrial manufacturing base with activity concentrated in steel production, in motor vehicle assembly and component production and in the white goods industry. Before the Dunstan decade, these industries flourished and provided employment for the majority of South Australians who wished to work. During the days of the Dunstan Administration we saw our industrial base eroded and almost destroyed. Rationalisation in the white goods industry, consolidation and modernisation in the motor vehicle industry, and an improved outlook on world markets for steel have made the situation more optimistic.

It is indisputable that the future of South Australia is closely tied to our potential to develop our resource base industries in close conjunction with our primary and manufacturing industries. It is a continuing blight on this State that there are members of the Parliamentary wing of the A.L.P. opposite and officials of the industrial wing of the A.L.P. situated in Trades Hall on South Terrace, who have a vested interest in ensuring that the resource-based recovery of this State does not take place. There are those who argue that the resources boom promises few jobs. There are also those who are obsessed with the idea that a resources boom means that the international corporations will increasingly control our economy. They see South Australia becoming enmeshed in subordinate relations with foreign corporations and they fear that the surplus generated by these projects will be privately appropriated, with the bulk of it going overseas. They see every major resource development as a sell-out of Australia's national resources through a combination of restricted public and local equity participation combining with limited company tax collections by the Government, the underpricing of energy inputs such as gas and electricity, and they see the public subsidising the infrastructure.

They are not concerned that we need overseas capital to commence projects or to pay the massive exploration costs, although all workers, I note, are happy to put out their hands on pay day, regardless of the source of those funds. The left sees—

Mr O'Neill interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I get a response. The left sees the proposed resource projects as predominantly capital and energy intensive, export oriented, foreign controlled, extremely profitable and the sell-out of our national resource. They would prefer to leave the resource in the ground. An industrial recovery will mean more jobs, stability in the work force and mining royalties that will be available to be spent within the community, producing a general prosperity for all. For every one job at the mines, four jobs are created in the cities. Mining royalties mean that more Government services can be provided at less cost to the taxpayer. What is wrong with that?

It is in this atmosphere of prosperity that the radical left-wing element of the A.L.P. cannot sow its seeds of discontent and disharmony in the community. That section knows that the people of South Australia will not return a Bannon Government for another dose of social experiments while progress, security and stability are becoming evident in this State once again. I have tried very hard to find resource-based projects that can be attributed to the successive A.L.P. Governments so that I could compare them with significant resource-based projects that have been coming on stream in South Australia since 1979. The fact is that there are none, because of the destructive ideological in-fighting in the A.L.P. between the radical left-wing factions, led by the member for Elizabeth, and the moderates

at the centre, who are now too frightened to show their true colours in case they lose preselection for their seats in Parliament.

The disastrous thing for South Australia is that the radicals in this place, at Trades Hall and at the shop floor level, who so successfully prevented the moderates from getting any semblance of resource development under way in the Dunstan era, are the same radicals who will be around in force and in control of the present A.L.P. when the membership lines up to face the election and the people in two years. It is so easy to trace how the ideological split in the A.L.P. prohibited any chance of a resources boom in the 1970s.

From the lessons learned in those heady days, it is easy to see what little chance South Australia has if the A.L.P. is ever returned to power. The early 1970s was a saga of promises of achievements, mines, exploration, new industry and jobs—promises, promises and more promises. There were promises, while behind the facade of the Dunstan propaganda machine there was deception, double dealing, in-fighting and general radical political upheaval as the factions fought to impress their brand of socialism on South Australia. Goodness knows how Don Dunstan kept the lid on the internal power struggles that were going on under his command for as long as he did.

It was fascinating for those of us outside the Labor Party to watch this saga and to see the left wing becoming slowly more and more impatient and finally turning the knife in Mr Dunstan's back when he chose to visit Europe in 1979 to seek evidence to back up his desire to change his Party's mind on the whole question of uranium mining and enrichment in South Australia. February 1979 is not so long ago that we have forgotten the trip to Europe that was made by Don Dunstan to pave the way for a change in attitude to the mining of uranium. The trip was so hasty and secret that many of his Cabinet did not even know that he was going.

Mr Ashenden: What about the member for Elizabeth? Did he know? I think he must not have.

Mr OSWALD: We are of the opinion that he did not, and I will refer to that shortly. I think all honourable members will remember the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 2 February 1979, under the heading 'Safe waste near, Dunstan', which stated:

The solution to the problems of final safe disposal of highly radioactive waste was much nearer than we thought, South Australia's Premier, Mr Dunstan, said today.

The Premier, who will end his two-week European study of developments in nuclear safeguards today, said the Swedes were a long way ahead.

By the end of this year they expect to meet all the requirements laid down by their Parliament and they talk about establishing complete safety within two years, he said.

That was in 1979. The article continued:

They and the French were early leaders in the field of vitrification of waste in glass compounds.

The French were operating a pilot plant on a commercial scale and would soon have a new plant for the vitrification of all spent fuel.

So, as I said last weekend, the question of ultimate safe disposal of nuclear waste has altered dramatically, Mr Dunstan said.

He has the message. The article continued:

All the conditions which South Australia would want can be provided in the next couple of years. . . . Mr Dunstan said his European trip had cleared up some areas of concern.

In 1979, there was an effort to change the tide in South Australia. While the former Premier was away, the left wing acted very quickly and flexed its muscles, as it is wont to do. Those members were not going to stand any nonsense from Mr Dunstan on this matter. Perhaps members opposite would like to hear how the *Advertiser* reported the goings on in the left wing that occurred while the former Premier

was trying to put together evidence that would allow the radicals to see reason.

Mr Hemmings: We would like to know.

Mr OSWALD: Right. An article in the *Advertiser* of February 1979, under the heading 'A.L.P. supporters reaffirm ban on uranium', stated:

A meeting of 103 A.L.P. supporters, including the Attorney-General, Mr Duncan, and several other Labor MPs, last night strongly opposed the mining of uranium in South Australia.

This appeared in the context of Mr Dunstan's absence overseas: he was trying to get evidence to change the minds of the radicals. The article continued:

The meeting, attended by many trade union representatives, reaffirmed A.L.P. policy on uranium.

The meeting also decided to oppose entry of all atomic powered vessels into South Australian waters.

Goodness knows what effect that would have. The panic was on. It further stated:

The meeting was the second in a fortnight called by A.L.P. supporters over the uranium issue. The Premier, Mr Dunstan, is overseas to study safeguards relating to waste disposal of uranium.

MPs who attended last night's meeting at the Australian Government Workers Association office, Sturt Street, city, were MLCs Mr Foster, Mr Sumner and Miss Levy and Assembly member Mr Hemmings.

Mr Ashenden: He wouldn't be left wing, would he?

Mr OSWALD: That was the attendance record. If we are to compare the performance of the A.L.P. in Government in the 1970s to test its competence to take the Treasury benches again, perhaps we should consider some of the pathetic forays into resource development. I mentioned earlier that Premier Dunstan used his 1973 policy speech to announce to the electorate that the Redcliff project was a *fait accompli* and it would be the lynch pin of his decentralisation programme for the Iron Triangle. Redcliff was described as the take-off point, and for the next five years Mr Dunstan hung his hat on the *fait accompli* nature of that project. The 1973 policy speech also referred to that matter in the following terms:

The Government is already in an advanced stage of negotiation for the establishment at Redcliff, 17 miles south of Port Augusta, of a \$300 000 000 petro-chemical industry of world scale, together with a fully integrated refinery to treat the Cooper Basin and imported crude oil.

Mr Dunstan said the works would be enormous and would be established in such a way as to avoid ecological and environmental damages or pollution in the general area. Mr Dunstan obviously misled the public in stating the Government's negotiations were in an advanced stage, and certainly his environmental considerations have also received scant or almost non-existent attention.

It is interesting to examine the attitude of the Whitlam Socialist Government to Redcliff, because it further highlights the falseness and deception addressed by the former Premier to the people of South Australia. Any member who has any knowledge of Federal-State relations would know that from the extent to which the Federal Government was subsequently asked to finance the Redcliff project, and because of Federal approvals required for such matters as export of l.p.g., pipeline construction and foreign equity, it would have been logical to assume that before Premier Dunstan was able to announce the project in the manner in which he did in 1973, he would have cleared up these matters with his colleagues in Canberra.

In fact, subsequent statements and attitudes of Canberra to the project show that the Redcliff announcement was another example, as was Monarto, of Premier Dunstan seeking premature personal kudos for development which was by no means assured or adequately studied at the time it was announced. It is interesting to note that, regardless of the initial attempts by the present Opposition to insinuate that the new Tonkin Government had lost the Dow Chem-

ical investment at Redcliff, the former Premier misled the public in 1973 with his announcement based on an inadequate study of all the approvals necessary to ensure the viability of the project, and an inadequate study of the environmental impact, particularly as it affected the fishing industry.

Had the then Federal Minister of Minerals and Energy, Rex Connor, chosen Dow instead of the I.C.I.-Alcoa-Mitsubishi consortium, to develop the project, a petrochemical industry would now be operating in South Australia. The loss of Redcliff by the Government in 1973 was as big a disaster to South Australia as was the saga of an attempt by the Dunstan Government to establish a uranium industry for this State. The latter years of the Dunstan era must have been sad years for those A.L.P. members who fought so hard behind the scenes against the ideological doctrine espoused by the member for Elizabeth and his supporters.

Statements made before the infamous Federal A.L.P. conference in Perth in 1976 show that former Minister, Hugh Hudson and other senior Labor Ministers supported Premier Dunstan in efforts to get a uranium mining industry established in South Australia. Since 1976 no-one in the A.L.P. is game to speak with the conviction of his beliefs—a great shame for the future of South Australia.

The South Australian branch of the A.L.P. must look again at its policy on uranium mining and export. Surely it must see in the turmoil arising from events in Iran and the Middle East that its policy is way out of touch with reality. After seven years in almost virtual limbo Australia is back in the uranium business, and South Australia is gearing up with no thanks to the local A.L.P. branch. Since the A.L.P. defeat in 1979, new faces have appeared in this place and also in the industrial and organisational wing of the A.L.P. on South Terrace, but let it be quite clear that the faces only have changed: the aims are the same.

In the 1970s the decade began with great hope following the discovery of Australia's first sedimentary uranium deposit in the Mounter Painter area of the Northern Flinders Ranges and the Lake Frome Plains. Within a year the Mines Department and the Industrial Development Branch of the Premier's Department had prepared a joint submission for the McMahon Federal Government seeking the selection of a site in South Australia for the establishment of Australia's first uranium enrichment plant. This site was selected, although hidden for some time from the public. When the Federal Government announced in October 1972 that it had opened the way for the construction of the plant by offering to give interested companies all the information gathered from its own feasibility studies, Premier Dunstan told Parliament:

South Australia's case for getting this plant has been fully put to the Commonwealth Government and in any question of siting the plant here all the cost and environment factors were fully considered before the submission was made.

It is quite clear from that statement that Don Dunstan was on side with uranium mining and wanted it to go ahead if he could get it past his left-wing factions.

The proposal was given further impetus when the world energy crisis began to bite hard following Middle East oil embargoes in late 1973. At this time, Dunstan, in Tokyo, had discussions on the possibility of Japanese interests in an Australian uranium enrichment plant and as a customer for Australian uranium. In May 1974, the Federal Minerals and Energy Minister, Rex Connor, named the Northern Spencer Gulf region as the most ideal site in Australia for a uranium enrichment plant, and a joint Federal and South Australian feasibility study was announced. The South Australian Parliament was told in the Governor's Speech in 1974:

Such a project is a furtherance of the declared policy of my Government that maximum use will be made of energy resources within its jurisdiction.

That is a quote from Sir Mark Oliphant's speech in opening State Parliament on 23 July 1974. Mines Minister Hopgood gave an even more optimistic outlook in November when he said he was more confident than ever that South Australia would get a uranium enrichment plant following contracts signed by the Whitlam Government with Japan for the supply of uranium. I ask whether we can see the current member for Baudin committing himself as a Minister of the Crown and really believing in what he is saying today. I cannot.

The Japanese deal and Mr Connor's public favouring of South Australia also prompted the State Government to establish a Uranium Enrichment Committee in December 1974 to evaluate the Federal Government Policy, environmental factors and hazards, available technologies and costs, possible sites and likely arrangements for ownership and control. The committee's initial report was taken overseas by the then Minister of Mines (and now Member for Baudin) in 1975 and a second interim report was presented to the Government in February 1976.

The second report outlines an eight-year plan for investing \$1 400 000 000 in an enormous processing and enrichment complex at Redcliff which would be Australia's largest single industrial complex and the world's first full-scale uranium enrichment works to employ the new centrifuge technology. The Government did not publicly admit the existence of the second report until in the *Bulletin* of 3 July 1976 when details of its contents were leaked.

It is now a matter of public record that, during 1976, the A.L.P. left-wing was able to rally sufficient support to block future uranium mining. In May 1976, the Australian Railways Union invoked A.C.T.U. policy and banned transportation of uranium from the Mary Kathleen mine. The union called a 24-hour national stoppage over the issue and the South Australian Attorney-General (now the member for Elizabeth) telegraphed his support to the union saying he had contacted the A.C.T.U. urging it to adopt a similar 'unbending' position. Uranium mining and development was also raised at the 1976 South Australian convention of the A.L.P. in June, when the following resolution was passed:

This convention calls on all levels of the Australian Labor Party to oppose as strongly as possible any decision or plans for mining, treatment, export of uranium and by-products until an independent public inquiry can show that the known safeguards regarding the disposal of waste and the safe transportation of such material or its by-products can be closely approached and guaranteed.

Left-wing and conservation factions within the Party had urged a stronger line, but were strongly opposed by Mr Dunstan and Mr Hudson. Immediately after the convention, Mr Hudson went overseas with a copy of the Uranium Enrichment Committee's second report, and the Federal Government was informed of its findings. However, it was too late: the die was cast. Those in the real positions of power in the Australian Labor Party in South Australia at the time had decided that there would be no uranium mining. The Apaps, O'Neills and John Scotts had spoken.

The second interim report that the Uranium Enrichment Committee produced in February 1976 makes interesting reading, and it must have been a Hugh Hudson with very mixed feelings who went overseas in 1976 with the second interim report in his brief case. Let me refer you, Sir, to some of its conclusions and recommendations. Some of the conclusions, which must be read knowing that they had the full support of Mr Dunstan and Mr Hudson, are as follows:

1. Australia has the largest and richest reserves of uranium in the southern hemisphere.

2. Owing to the very high uranium prices on overseas markets, these reserves can now be developed to become Australia's most valuable mineral resource and can provide substantial overseas

credit, revenue for the Commonwealth and State Governments, substantial returns for shareholders in the mining companies, and employment opportunities in mining and treatment plants.

3. The processing of the crude mine concentrates (yellowcake) and the export of refined products, namely, hexafluoride and enriched uranium, will give stability to the industry and make provision for the possibility that Australia may have a need for nuclear fuel in the late 1980s.

4. The quantities of materials, effluents and products to be handled by the proposed uranium centre are only a fraction of those which were involved in the petro-chemical development proposal for Redcliff, and present fewer environmental problems. As a result of overseas experience, the necessary handling safeguards which minimise operational hazards to people or the environment have largely been defined.

5. South Australia's claims for the establishment of the proposed uranium refinery centre in the Spencer Gulf region are based on the centralised geographical and seaboard location of the proposed site, its proximity to associated industries and services, and a stable work force capable of supplying construction and operational requirements. The site appears to require a minimum of investment in infrastructure and is probably the most economic available.

6. The uranium treatment centre will secure greater industrial and employment stability in South Australia with a broader base for Adelaide's manufacturing industry.

7. The proposal to offer the Redcliff site to the Commonwealth Government is consistent with South Australia's regional growth objectives.

8. The proposed development is comparable to the Snowy Mountains hydro-electric scheme in magnitude and long-term benefits to Australia.

I now refer to conclusion No. 12, which is as follows:

A comparison with the benefits which would have accrued from the proposed petro-chemical plant shows that the uranium processing centre would give permanent employment in the Redcliff area to 1 500 people, compared with 1 100 operating personnel for the petro-chemical plant. The infrastructure cost for the uranium centre would also be only a fraction of that of the petro-chemical project and the financing of the whole scheme should be much easier, with the probable willing co-operation of those countries wishing to contract and supply the technology for our assured uranium supplies.

I now refer to the recommendations contained in the report, which, once again, were supported by former Premier Dunstan and his Mines Minister, Mr Hudson. There are six recommendations in the report. The first recommendation (and one should note that this was in 1976) is as follows:

1. The establishment of the uranium processing centre at Redcliff, as presented in conceptual form, is recommended, comprising initially a uranium hexafluoride plant of 5 000 tonnes uranium capacity per annum, to be operational concurrently with the availability of yellowcake from Australian uranium mines. Estimated cost: \$A50 000 000 at 1975 values.

That is a small outlay. The recommendations continue:

2. The growth of the centre to be planned on a progressive basis related to the export, trade and availability of yellowcake. An expansion to at least 10 000 tonnes of uranium as uranium hexafluoride and 5 000 tonnes separate work units (SWUs) per annum of enriched uranium is considered to be a realistic development in the 1980s to enable exports to be mainly in the form of enriched uranium.

3. The full development for the above-mentioned tonnages to be considered as a national development project, for establishment primarily by the Commonwealth Government but with full State Government support and participation.

4. Export sales of uranium from Australian mines to be conditional on the refining and enrichment of such sales in the uranium processing centre, as capacity permits.

5. The decision as to whether to proceed with the project should be made with all speed to ensure that export sales of uranium are made subject to refining and enrichment in Australia.

6. The uranium refining and enrichment centre to be debt financed by the purchasers of Australian uranium.

I think we can thank the member for Elizabeth and his supporters that none of these recommendations were adopted and the State economy has continued to go down the drain.

Mr Ashenden: Until 1979.

Mr OSWALD: Yes, as the honourable member says, until 1979, when the South Australian public woke up to what was happening. Since 1977, the public record is quite

clear as to the internal squabbling between senior A.L.P. Ministers regarding whether the policy should be changed. By this time, Messrs Hawke and Whitlam had joined Mr Hugh Hudson, but the left wing in South Australia refused to budge.

I submit that the equivocation and division among the leaders of the A.L.P. in 1977-78 was no different from what it is now among the current leaders. Amongst those who wish to form a Government in South Australia in two years time we have the current Leader of the Opposition saying in the media on 21 February:

I don't think a major political Party has the right to react emotionally on an issue as important as this.

The Leader was saying that it is now possible that uranium mining could be placed in the safe category. There were machinery techniques and technologies that allowed it to be seen in this way. As a result of this statement, the Leader of the Opposition was jumped on from a great height by Mr George Apap and the Semaphore Branch of the A.L.P., which reacted very quickly and passed a motion of censure. It took fully twelve days for the left wing to rally its forces and bring the Leader back into line. On *Nationwide* on 5 March 1981, the Leader said:

I believe that uranium mining at the moment has not been proved safe, that waste disposal has not been established, that international safeguards are no way in a state that would allow Australia to embark on a nuclear fuel cycle. It is reckless to do so. It is just not on.

That was on *Nationwide* on 5 March 1981. In other words, the Leader of the Opposition had had his knuckles rapped by the left wing. I wonder how Mr Dunstan felt after his trip to Europe, when that press release appeared that I quoted earlier in my speech, at a time when he was preparing the groundwork two years ago, saying that in Sweden everything was quite okay. It would do members of the Opposition good to ponder on some of the words of advice from one of the left-wing leaders of the British Labour Party, the great white god of the Labour Party left-wing in England, Dr Tony Wedgwood Benn, who continues to echo Britain's reliance on nuclear power in his recent book *The Arguments for Socialism*. I should like to quote briefly from that volume, as follows:

If we look ahead to the mix of fuels which we think we shall need in this country in the year 2000, it is not possible to abstract the nuclear component without running a serious risk which no Energy Minister could recommend. That is the argument which has to be presented. If for the best reasons in the world the case against nuclear power were to prevail, our energy policy as it has developed by general agreement would have to be completely recast. British industry would be greatly affected, the self-sufficiency upon which we rest so much would no longer be assured, and the economic consequences of seeking to import energy to replace the nuclear power would transform our long-term economic prospects.

On the question of safety, Benn has written in this book, as follows:

... it is not only nuclear energy that could prove dangerous. From 1947 to 1976, 8 001 miners were killed underground and 49 971 seriously injured in the U.K., while in the nuclear industry there has been nothing like the same number. Another example is that over the same period 200 000 people have been killed by the motor car and 9 000 000 injured. Had there been a Select Committee to consider whether a new piece of technology known as the motor car was to be approved and someone had been able to predict confidently that in the next 30 years it would kill 200 000 people and injure 9 000 000, Parliament might not have approved it.

We must not give the impression that only environmental factors arise from nuclear power. If you take the mining case and go in for open cast mining, it has a terrific effect on the countryside. If you're going to go for windmills, of the size planned, the effect of this, as compared to pylons which used to be much criticised by rural environmental groups, is going to be formidable.

If you're going to build the Severn barrage, which will cost £4 000 000 000, probably twice as much as the fast breeder reactor, the impact of this on the ecology of the Severn basin is unpre-

dictable. So we should not give the impression that it's only nuclear power which has environmental hazards.

Current British planning for nuclear power is to increase the proportion of electricity served by nuclear power from 13 per cent to 30 per cent by the end of the century. From 1982, there is a commitment by the British Government, supported by the socialists, to begin construction of one nuclear reactor of 1 000 megawatt capacity each year and bring it on stream each year until the turn of the century.

The dramatic improvement in investment in this State since 1979 is the direct result of the election of the Tonkin Government, which is not crippled by ideological disputes within its ranks, and is a Government which can look forward to producing clear positive programmes for this State.

The A.L.P. and some sections of the media are very active in their attempts to undermine the progress made by the South Australian Liberal Government since it came into office. The result speaks for itself, with 12 800 additional people having been employed in South Australia in our first year of office. This has been a dramatic increase, particularly when one compares it to the dismal record of the previous Labor Government which presided over the worst employment decline in the State since the great depression in the 1930s. From August 1977 to August 1979, the number of people employed in our State fell by 20 600, or nearly 4 per cent.

These figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics monthly labour force survey demonstrate that our Government's policies, coupled with significant Government assistance to industry through the establishment payments scheme, the motor vehicle industry scheme, the pay-roll and land tax concessions to decentralised manufacturing and processing industry, and the provision of assistance to small businesses, have significantly strengthened the economic base of the State and employment opportunities.

The South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry Journal has noted in a recent editorial that there is a small but vocal band of pessimists in South Australia which continually attempts to denigrate the improvement in employment opportunities which has occurred in South Australia since the Liberal Government came to office. A recent survey by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry is yet another indication of South Australia's improving economic outlook. It can be read as further encouragement to industry, the work force, and all South Australians that the Tonkin Government is setting the State on the road to recovery.

Two years ago, committed and likely investment in South Australia's mining and manufacturing industries stood at \$133 000 000. Today that figure has multiplied 20-fold, with the added prospect that it will rise much further with the current boom in mining and exploration. In the 1978-79 financial year the Australian Investment Review Board received and approved only \$17 000 000 in applications for further development of South Australia. Last year that figure rose to \$1 180 000 000. At the end of 1980, 361 mineral exploration licences were current in South Australia. This compares with 123 licences current at the end of June 1979, and reflects the tremendous upsurge in exploration activity in South Australia since this Government took office. During 1980 about \$21 000 000 was spent on mineral exploration in South Australia, double the expenditure of the previous year, while exploration drilling increased by 37 per cent on the previous year. Also, 42 companies held exploration licences at the end of June 1979, and approximately 70 companies are now participating.

What really worries the people of South Australia is that the member for Elizabeth and his supporters in the A.L.P.'s

political and industrial wings are still running around opposing any industry or development associated with uranium, and are on record making statements which clearly put their point of view, that they will stop Roxby if they come into office, and repudiate all contracts.

Briefly, I would like to refer back to a statement reported in the *Advertiser* in February 1979 made by that gallant band that I referred to earlier of members of this House and another place who attended a meeting of 103 Labor Party supporters at the Australian Government Workers Association office in Sturt Street, city. From the Legislative Council were Messrs Foster and Sumner and Miss Levy. From the House of Assembly were the Hon. Peter Duncan, as Attorney-General, and Mr Hemmings. One of the resolutions they passed there, that gallant band of very pro-South Australian people, we thought, was that Labor would repudiate any commitment of non-Labor Governments to the mining, processing, or export of uranium.

Let us just see how committed they really are to the development of this great State of ours. If the Australian Labor Party ever regains office in South Australia, our resources boom will again be stifled. As a further illustration, let me again quote from the recent A.L.P. State convention, so we will have another idea of the attitudes of these saviours of this State of ours. It states:

That State convention approve the establishment of a nuclear hazards committee consisting of eight persons whose task it will be to undertake all activities necessary to promote Labor's policy on uranium and nuclear power; such activities to include the conduct of community education programmes to offset the propaganda [as they call it] of the Liberal Party and mining corporations on this issue.

Further:

That this convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear-free zone and requests the South Australian A.L.P. to examine the implications and report back to the next convention [which is a year away; keep it going] on the feasibility of such a declaration, and that the water catchment area of the Adelaide Hills be declared a nuclear-free zone as a first step,

It is an undisputable fact that the left wing of the A.L.P., led by the member for Elizabeth, now has sufficient control of the A.L.P. of this State to coerce and whiteant the more moderate members opposite to support their point of view. Even the Leader of the Opposition is sadly in their grasp, so is it any wonder that the public fear the return to the Treasury benches of the left-wing-dominated social democrats opposite.

Since entering Parliament, I have learnt many things about members of all Parties. We are all different; we feel differently; we think differently; we all look different; we all talk and walk differently; each one of us has to make up his own mind about matters brought before us that affect this State; but underneath, I believe that most of us are all the same and we are part of the South Australian community.

It is with that sentiment that I would wish that all the responsible members of all Parties can come together to promote the full resource development of South Australia for the benefit of the generations to follow, free from the ideological bitterness which is threatening to tear this country apart. Let us be warned by the British experience and not let it happen here in South Australia. I support the motion.

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): I rise to support the motion, and in so doing I refer to paragraph 16 of the Governor's Speech, which states:

My Government will continue to give high priority to its commitments through the Housing Trust to provide quality welfare housing, particularly on a rental basis for low and moderate income earners and pensioners. Additional support has been provided for the Emergency Housing Office and plans are underway to establish

fifty dwellings that will provide minimally supervised housing for homeless young people.

I was a little disappointed to learn earlier this week that, whilst the Governor has been led to believe that those 50 homes are under way, he has obviously not been made aware of the fact that apparently they have been priced out of the reach of those people who should be able to take advantage of them. It is to the area of housing, and particularly home ownership, which I wish to address my initial remarks. However, before doing so, I wish to say that, like the member who has just resumed his seat, I have observed my colleagues in this place since entering Parliament, and last year I may have taken a somewhat harsher view of members opposite. In recent months I have learnt that, in the main, they are compassionate people. On a personal basis they certainly have feelings which have come out in my dealings with them recently, which have impressed me, and I am much more attuned to them than perhaps I was last year.

Having said that, I think that the wishes of the member for Morphett that we could all come together behind the policies that he enunciated are wishful thinking on his part, because we all have our own opinions on things. Whilst we have those opinions, that does not necessarily mean that those opinions are factual. I believe that quite a lot of what he has said was not factual. He chose to bring my name into the argument, and he was totally wrong about some of the insinuations he made about my role in certain matters. I am not ashamed of the role that I played at those times, because it was consistent with A.L.P. policy. I know that he was totally wrong about some of the assumptions he made about the actions of former Premier Dunstan. I cannot help what is printed in the *Advertiser*; if he wants to take that newspaper as gospel, that is his business.

As I have said, I want to discuss the problems that have accrued under the policies of a Liberal Government, State and Federal, in relation to the home owners of this State, and undoubtedly in other States, as I will mention later. Interest rates are causing my constituents grave concern. I imagine that some members opposite would have in their electorates people who are also suffering. Indeed, in my electorate the interest rate escalation is causing widespread unhappiness, hardship and fear.

The rapid increase in the interest rates on home loans is causing grave financial problems for thousands of South Australians, I would imagine, and certainly to hundreds of people in my electorate. Because of the continuing increases in interest rates, many established home buyers are finding it impossible to meet increased charges on their loans. Because of this fact, for the first time in their lives they are probably being confronted with the spectre of bankruptcy. In addition to that, many aspirants to home ownership, particularly young people, are finding that higher interest rates are an insurmountable barrier to acquiring a home of their own. They are finding that the so-called great Australian dream is nothing but a pipe dream for them. They work and work and save and save but cannot afford to buy. In fact, a young couple that I know very well entered into a contract only two or three months ago and, because of the actions of the Federal Treasurer, they have now had to back out of that contract at considerable financial loss to themselves. They have to pay legal charges made by the solicitor who acted on their behalf and they also have to pay some compensation to the big-hearted company which conned them into the contract in the first place. If they had gone ahead with the contract they would have been bankrupt by Christmas, I would imagine, because they would not have been able to pay the rates needed to service the loan which was far and away beyond their means, even under the earlier interest rates provided.

The uncontrolled surge of interest rates is also causing increased rental charges as a consequence of the failure of people to be able to buy their homes and the subsequent demand generated for rental accommodation. Not only that, but in this great country, where people are told that it is possible to have a home of their own, it is becoming quite clear that even if you own your home freehold you still face danger because local government and public utility charges are also increasing (in part, because of interest rate rises). In fact, today's *Advertiser* carried an article which addressed itself to this problem. The article makes the point that I have been making for some months at various times when I have spoken about this matter, as follows:

The fall-out from the explosion in interest rates in the past 12 months is threatening to make permanent changes in Australia's social structure.

This raises a point to which I think I should refer now. Although I believe that members opposite are compassionate men, I do not think that they can see what is happening at the national level. I put them in a different category from the national Leader of the Liberal Party, who is now something of a demagogue. I think that he has set out on a deliberate exercise to change the whole fabric of Australian society, and that he wants to set up what was referred to in the last century as a bunyip aristocracy. He wants to have around him the people he considers to be on his own social level and standing, and the rest of us will constitute the middle and lower classes. Maybe that is taking the point of permanent changes in Australia's social structure a little further than did the author of this article, but I think that that is what is happening under Fraser's leadership.

I gather from reading *Rydge's* magazine in the library earlier today that the honourable gentleman's attitude and behaviour at a national level are giving some cause for concern to what might be called the real Liberals in the Federal Liberal Party. Talking about splits and schisms, as the previous speaker did, I suggest that he do some reading about the problems that exist in his own Party and between members of the Federal Coalition. Returning to the article, I quote:

... home ownership has slipped beyond the grasp of the average Australian.

This is one of the legacies of the great resources boom we have heard so much about in this debate. The article continues:

... before World War I it took 18 months' pay for the average family to buy a house. Today, it takes four years' pay.

I think it goes a little further than that, and if I have time later I will refer to the interest scale. For instance, if young people such as the young couple to whom I referred earlier tonight sign up now with a bank for a \$30 000 loan over 25 years at 11.5 per cent, that family home will cost them, by the time they pay for it, over \$90 000.

According to the General Manager of the Housing Trust, the trust has received a record 11 500 applications for rental accommodation in 1980-81. This compares with 10 258 applications in the previous year. The trust study has shown that rental for an average house in the private sector in Adelaide has risen from \$54 to \$65 a week a year later, an increase of 12 per cent. We can see what is happening in the rental market as a result of the pressures on home ownership. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the undertaking given by the Government to continue to give high priority to welfare housing is not only continued: it will have to be severely stepped up if we are going to be able to house the citizens of South Australia.

In my electorate I have come across many cases needing immediate attention. Whilst I am deeply grateful to officers of the Housing Trust for the help I have received in trying

to overcome these problems, unfortunately a number of cases must be left for the time being because, according to those officers, there are cases of greater need in the electorates of other members. There are some things that make a normal person's heart bleed when he hears of the things that confront young Australians who, as I heard a member say earlier (I believe it was the member for Salisbury) were educated to have certain expectations under earlier Governments and earlier conditions. They were brought up to believe that in this great country they would be able to grow up, get a job, get married and be entitled to protection against illness and accident, and also be able, if not initially to buy a house, to rent accommodation with a view to saving sufficient money to buy a house at a later stage.

Recently a young couple who came to see me said they had been married and had gone off to a country town full of expectations. The young man got a job as a labourer with an assurance that he had a permanent job. After 18 months or two years, the family then including two little children, the husband was told that he was redundant and, as a consequence, he had no income but social security payments. He was unable to keep his family and pay the rent on their accommodation, so the family returned to Adelaide, where they were unable to get accommodation.

Unless circumstances have altered in the past few days, that family's accommodation is such that they are able to park their car in the back yard of the young woman's parents' house. They cannot be accommodated in the house because the parents still have other children living there. The young woman and the two children sleep in the car. The husband has to go off to a friend's place some kilometres away, where he sleeps, and he comes back in the morning to see his family. They use the bathroom and toilet facilities at the young woman's parents' house. This is a sad state of affairs in an affluent country.

Mr McRae: It is disgraceful.

Mr O'NEILL: Yes. A second case is that of a young deserted wife who is receiving post-operative treatment for cancer. She was ill, and apparently her husband left her with two small girls, one of whom has a behavioural problem. This woman has battled on with a single parent's pension to maintain a relatively stable situation as regards the area in which she lives, because the little girl with the behavioural problem has settled down at the school she is attending. Because of rental increases, this woman has come to me to see whether she can get a Housing Trust home, as she will now have to move, and when she does so and takes the little girl away from that school she fears that the behavioural problems will return.

I made submissions to the Housing Trust and was sympathetically heard, but that does not alter the fact that the trust can do nothing for nine months, so there is another family in terrible trouble. The third case I mention involves an age pensioner, a gentleman who I would imagine is in his late sixties and whose wife has left him. As she has claimed her half of the family home, it has to go on the market, and the gentleman concerned, who is now in the position where his house will be sold up and he will have a few thousand dollars, I imagine, has come to me to see whether I can assist him in getting accommodation through the Housing Trust.

The trust tells me that it has a number of similar cases and it regrets that it will be unable to do anything for him for at least four years. There is a strong possibility that this gentleman will pine away and die before the welfare housing organisation can do anything to help him. It is a small list of unfortunate cases that I have quoted, but the list is endless, I imagine. Certainly, I have not come to the end of it in my district, because people come in week after week.

Mr McRae: Out in the north-eastern suburbs we have become agencies for the Housing Trust.

Mr O'NEILL: If the member for Newland was present he would probably indicate that he has had similar experiences. I imagine that many of the people whom he represents and who went into low deposit, high interest contracts in his district would be in diabolical trouble, too.

We all know that the unemployment situation is terrible in that area, that many people went into those places on a two-income family basis but now have only one income and are fearful that the one job may go because of the tenuous nature of the so-called employment recovery in South Australia. I notice that yesterday, in reply to a question on interest rates, the Premier stated:

I suggest to the lending institutions that they should show a degree of compassion in dealing with these increases in interest rates which would lead to increased payments. I believe it is possible for lending institutions to lengthen the term of the loan rather than to require any increase in the amount of instalment which is paid.

All I suggest that it is doing is lengthening the chain which binds these people. It gives them a little more room to wander around in, but people are still in trouble and still have to pay extortionate rates of interest. We know from a statement by the Minister of Industrial Affairs where the blame must lie. Indeed, I am not blaming the State Government for the explosion in interest rates. The Minister of Industrial Affairs, who was referring to another matter, which I will not have time to cover tonight, was commenting on the diabolical problems which confront small business. Those problems certainly have nothing to do with the Labor Party or the previous Labor Government, State or Federal. Those problems are attributable directly to the current national Government. In relation to the shocking interest rates being charged, the Minister stated:

The major solution must come from action at the national level where bank finance is controlled.

That is perfectly true—control lies in the hands of the Federal Government. Whilst I believe the Premier is truthful in expressing feelings of compassion, I have come to a different conclusion based on statements made by the Prime Minister in Western Australia on 13 July. The Prime Minister obviously holds no such feelings of compassion, and I quote from the *Western Australian* of that date. The press report states:

Mr Fraser held out little hope yesterday that housing loan interest payments would be made tax deductible. 'I would not want to raise expectations too much,' Mr Fraser said.

Obviously, Mr Fraser is not particularly concerned. The *Australian* of 7 July states, 'Four Premiers lash rise in interest rates.' It refers to four Premiers, but unfortunately the South Australian Premier was not one of them. The Premiers of Queensland, Western Australia, Victoria, and New South Wales all had a piece of the Prime Minister over that matter, but the South Australian Premier did not get a mention.

However, in today's *News* I see a report that really concerns me. This report highlights the absolute contempt of the Prime Minister for homeowners or would-be homeowners in Australia. The report, on page 2 of the *News*, states:

Rises in interest rates on home loans could be delayed until after the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, returns to Australia from the Royal wedding. The on-again-off-again interest announcement was expected to be announced yesterday, but it is believed Mr Fraser was concerned about any major row erupting before he leaves for the wedding.

How callous can one get, adopting such an attitude to a problem that is tearing this country apart. It has always been accepted in Australia that it should be a reasonable aspiration to have a home of one's own. The great resources

boom that is being touted by members opposite and the influx of thousands of millions of dollars of foreign currency, combined with the attitude of the Federal Government in throwing overboard any controls on interest rates, are denying that aspiration to thousands of people. For that reason I have presented the petition brought to me by certain constituents. I believe similar petitions are circulating in a number of areas, requesting this House to call immediately on the Federal Government to reduce interest rates, to ensure that home buyers with existing loans are not bankrupted or evicted as a result of increased interest rates, to develop a loan programme to allow prospective home builders to obtain interest at reasonable rates, and to grant sufficient Commonwealth funds to provide welfare housing to overcome the shocking deficiencies in this area.

I imagine that every member opposite would support such a petition wholeheartedly. I know that many members opposite are loath to chastise their Federal colleagues, but it can be shown that their Leader, the Premier, can do just that. I ask Government members to help the people of South Australia get the message across to the Prime Minister and the Federal Treasurer regarding their preoccupation with financial controls, and to point out to them the amount of misery that their policies are spreading.

Some members opposite may have heard the Treasurer recently hedging when he was pinned down by a radio reporter about interest rates. The Treasurer said that the problem was that there was not sufficient money around for those people who require it, and so there is competition for the available money which is forcing up interest rates. The reporter put to the Treasurer that surely he must control the amount of available money, and the Treasurer agreed that the Government did so. If there is not enough money around, who is responsible? The Treasurer and the Prime Minister are deliberately creating a situation which is placing in jeopardy the homes of millions of people in Australia. The Prime Minister is not particularly interested in whether these people support the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or the Democrats: all he is interested in is proceeding along the lines of his own economic and political philosophy which, incidentally, as I understand it, is consistent with that of the British Prime Minister. If I get time (possibly tomorrow), I will touch on that matter, because I heartily agree with the fears held by the member for Morphett regarding the terrible situation that is being generated in Britain. Perhaps the honourable member cannot see, as I can, that the very things that he fears are being generated by people who follow the same political ideology that he is backing.

If any member has any doubts about the problems that have been created in this society by political leaders and their economic policies they have only to refer to the *Sunday Mail* of 19 July, that is, last Sunday. I think it is quite disgraceful and shocking that we should find such an article in an Adelaide paper. This concerns the great South Australian society that is going so well. The article, titled 'Hundreds shiver in misery', states:

Hundreds of South Australians are living miserable lives this winter because of lack of warmth. According to an Adelaide Welfare Agency rising prices of accommodation have made the situation worse than previous years. They say: at least five men are believed to have died as a direct result of the cold. Many lone mothers are sleeping without blankets so their children can be warm, and teenagers are sleeping with inadequate covering in parked cars, public toilets and under bridges.

A member on this side of the House earlier referred to the disgraceful situation that prevails in respect of so-called social service benefits to teenagers between the ages of 16 and 18. They get \$36 a week. Surely members on both sides of the House are concerned about that situation. It is disgraceful. In my electorate during recent months I have

been approached by the Salvation Army concerning a problem which I am sure overflows into adjoining electorates. The problem is that of unemployed youth in the area, and probably concerns homeless youth, too. In fact, I must admit that the Government made a small contribution towards the scheme, but it was not anywhere near the sum we would have liked to see the Government give, but it does not make funds available for causes like this as the previous Government did. The problem was that young people in that area had nowhere to go and they were hanging around a shopping centre at Ingle Farm. As long as they had a few cents in their pockets they were allowed to stay around the place, but as soon as it was realised that they were broke, they were thrown out by the security officers in the area. They were having problems in other areas as far as entertainment was concerned because they did not have the price of entry. The Salvation Army officers in that area have put up a proposition to provide a mobile service (in fact, a converted bus) to give young people somewhere to go to have a cup of coffee, and the Salvation Army social workers would be available to help them and talk to them and give them some comfort in their hour of need.

I refer now to a problem which was raised by some high school teachers. Together with a couple of my colleagues I went to talk to these people, and the problem was that the homeless youth in the area, young teenagers, were actually sleeping in the school grounds and under school verandahs at night because they had nowhere else to go, because for various reasons they were not living at home, and they were using the toilets and showers at the school in an attempt to cope. These situations are appalling. Maybe members opposite who might represent more affluent areas than I do would not come across these situations. However, believe me, they really exist in sunny South Australia and it is an indictment of all of us that we allow such situations to persist. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. W. A. RODDA (Chief Secretary): I move:
That the House do now adjourn.

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want to speak briefly on an issue which was discussed in this House yesterday by the member for Stuart and which concerns the suggestion by the Federal member, Mr Ralph Jacobi, of the establishment of an Institute of Freshwater Studies. I take up the challenge that the member for Stuart gave that a Liberal member of Parliament should express a view. In so doing, I hasten to add that I express my own views in this respect and not necessarily those of the Government. I think it is an important question because, as we all recognise, South Australians face this great problem of the quality of the Murray River water. However, I do not believe that we can automatically assume that the way in which we solve these problems is by establishing an institute. There are arguments for and against. I think we must weigh all of those arguments before we decide what is the best approach.

I guess that there has always been throughout history a temptation for public figures to leave after them a monument of some sort, and it normally ends up being bricks and mortar. Traditionally, we blame local councils for building edifices that are much larger than required, and throughout my lifetime the traditional beef that people have is that politicians build edifices as memorials to themselves. That is a temptation but I would hope (and I accept

it in this case) the motivation is genuine concern for South Australia. Nevertheless, I think there are real arguments on both sides that we have to face, and I want to pass through some of them.

First, if you establish an institute, there are some advantages, and I will refer to the ones that I can think of. If in the research work that we want carried out people require specialised equipment of high capital cost, then we can more effectively utilise that equipment if we establish one institute where a group of scientists can share the use of that equipment. I cite by way of example the Australian Institute of Marine Sciences, which was established in Townsville some time ago by the Federal Government and which needs, as part of its equipment, ocean-going vessels to conduct research. Of course, if this research was scattered around Australia among the various universities, really they would need one of these each, so we can see that, by gathering this type of research into one institute and one location, there is an advantage in that people can make better use of those funds that are tied up in expensive capital equipment.

In addition, there are advantages in that more intensive efforts can be directed to a specific area of research. If we want to solve a very specific problem, we can draw people from right across the nation or perhaps right around the world into an institute to work on a very specific problem. The research will then be more directed and more controlled because people are working closer together and there is a more specific charter for that institute. Therefore, there are advantages in that respect.

In addition, a third advantage is that it could provide the opportunity to bring people from wider disciplines closer together. Some people who work on these problems may be bacteriologists, engineers, botanists, or zoologists. They may come from a wide variety of scientific disciplines. In the normal research institutes, which in Australia are mostly the universities or C.S.I.R.O., they would not normally have the opportunity to work alongside each other, and therefore there would be advantages in drawing them together and having them work alongside each other.

However, I believe there are also arguments against such an institute, and we must weigh these up when we consider the case for the establishment of an institute to study fresh-water problems. The main problem I can see is that, when an institute is established, bricks and mortar are put up and a separate edifice must be established with separate support facilities. It is inevitable that the major part of the recurrent funding of that institute will go to these support services, whether they be clerical, technical, or even for a gardener to mow the lawns and trim the bushes surrounding the buildings. Those support services are required, and they consume funds.

I note that the cost of the Australian Institute of Marine Science in Townsville is about \$10 000 000 per annum, although I am not sure of the exact figure. One can readily see that, if that \$10 000 000 per annum were scattered around the universities, a lot of research could be done. The money could be directed purely at the sharp end, where the research is done, to the vital equipment and support that is needed for scientists who are working on various problems. In addition, within the universities, if research is being conducted in those areas, there is cross fertilisation from different disciplines and projects, and that counter balances the other argument I have mentioned in regard to cross fertilisation.

A third point is that an institute would have to be located in one position. In Australia there is a diverse range of water problems associated with the different water systems. The Murray-Darling system is obviously the system with which we in South Australia are most concerned. There are

different water problems in relation to the south-west areas of Western Australia, and areas in north Queensland experience different problems again. Different areas in Australia experience different problems, and if one water institute was established, obviously some of those problems would be ignored.

Another problem is that, when an institute is established, the support for that research is restricted to a small elite body of researchers, an arrangement that has several disadvantages. One disadvantage is that after a time the researchers must inevitably become introverted in their line of research. Secondly, by supporting a wider group of researchers, a much wider group of people is supported, because research across the nation is supported. Finally, in putting a case against the establishment of an institute, I point out that we do not have the kind of argument for high-cost capital equipment for fresh-water research that we have in relation to marine research. Some equipment may be expensive, but it is not a large component.

The final comment I wish to make is that the remarks made by the member for Stuart seem to ignore the fact that there is a Water Research Foundation in Australia to which funds are contributed and which disperses funds to research projects in various research institutes around Australia. That may well be as effective a method of supporting research as any other method. As I said I would do, I have presented arguments both for and against the establishment of an institute, and I believe that it is not an automatic decision.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I want to devote the few minutes that I have at my disposal in this grievance debate tonight to some remarks made some time ago in the speech by the member for Eyre. It is a great pity that the member for Eyre is not present tonight to listen to what I have to say. I hope that it will be drawn to his attention on his return.

In several speeches made in this House by the member for Eyre, he has attempted to discredit people working in isolated areas of South Australia. He seems to be against people with quite considerable qualifications and expertise, and those with solid community support.

On 26 November last year, in his reaction to an article written by Mr John Treganza on Pitjantjatjara Aboriginals, the Member for Eyre criticised among others the Community Welfare district officer at Coober Pedy, who has since transferred to another district. In his speech the member for Eyre said:

The campaign of vilification launched by the Member for Stuart and his colleagues is not isolated to Yalata. It has taken place by his colleague, Mr Poblocki, of Coober Pedy, and by other people based in Alice Springs and in other areas in the North-West.

Later, in his speech, the honourable member said:

I make no apologies for that. I want to demonstrate clearly that there is an orchestrated campaign designed to get people like Mr Lindner and Mr McCormack at Coober Pedy, as well as others. We had the example not long ago of groups from Alice Springs coming down to try to get rid of the adviser at Fregon. That was a deliberate campaign, and fortunately the local community got rid of those stirrers.

The honourable member continued:

We know what happened to Mr Albert McCormack; another person like Mr Lindner with strong Christian beliefs. He came under considerable attack from the friend of the Member for Stuart, the Community Welfare worker up there. That particular person assisted a Mrs Hudson to write letters to the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in relation to that particular person.

We can only presume that the Member for Eyre wished once more to slander someone who had upset him and, of course, he knows that Parliament is the safest place from which to make cowardly personal and slanderous attacks.

This time he chose Mr Stan Poblocki, the District Officer of the Coober Pedy community welfare office and a person for whom I have a great deal of respect.

The member's enthusiasm to attack Mr Poblocki has resulted in his first mistake. He has in fact confused the names of his champions. He should have been defending Mr Arnold McCormack, but confused him with a Mr Albert McCormack. One is employed by the Aboriginal community and one is a miner. Perhaps their employment explains the honourable member's confusion—he cannot tell the difference. The honourable member stated:

The member for Stuart is in cahoots with his mate at Coober Pedy, Poblocki, and we know his action backfired at Coober Pedy.

Firstly, it should be pointed out that the member for Stuart has no connection with Mr Stan Poblocki—so much for being 'in cahoots'. Secondly, the issue in Coober Pedy is certainly not finished. Mrs Hudson, who happens to be a highly respected Aboriginal woman in the Coober Pedy area, is a member of the Umoora community. She works as a school assistant at the Coober Pedy Area School, and is the South Australian delegate to the National Aboriginal Education Commission. She has been very concerned, along with many other Aboriginal people in the area, about the quality of the service of the community advisor, Mr Arnold (not Albert) McCormack and the way he has been performing at Umoora.

Mrs Hudson sought the assistance of the only professional support in Coober Pedy, the Department for Community Welfare. The answer that Mrs Hudson received from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs was in her opinion not satisfactory, and I understand that the issue is not yet resolved.

Regarding the orchestrated campaign designed to get people like Mr Lindner and Mr McCormack at Coober Pedy, as well as others, Mr Lindner may know Mr McCormack, but Mr Poblocki does not, and has never had dealings with Mr Lindner. Mr Poblocki, Mrs Hudson and others attacked by the honourable member are too busy in their constructive efforts to assist Aboriginal people than to be involved in the puny point-scoring that the honourable member seems to enjoy.

There is no 'orchestrated campaign' to get the honourable member's friends as he accused. Rather, it becomes obvious that the campaign comes from other directions. Through the honourable member, there is an attempt by his friends, within the safety of this House, to vilify and slander all those who do not please him. So much for democracy!

Let us have a brief look at what the member for Eyre sees as the two opposing sides, or points of view, one represented by Mr McCormack, and the other by Mr Poblocki. Mr McCormack has no known formal qualifications that fit him for the highly complex and difficult job of Community Adviser. On the other hand, Mr Poblocki has a long list of appropriate qualifications and experience.

He was a psychiatric nurse for two years, won a scholarship to the Institute of Technology, and completed a course in group work. He was employed by the Central Methodist Mission as the Senior Group Worker with the alcohol rehabilitation programme, won the Rotary youth leadership of the year award, undertook a further year's study for the Department for Community Welfare, was employed by that department in Whyalla, where he was instrumental in establishing the Youthline telephone counselling service (a service which has had enormous success over the past seven years), and was appointed District Officer in Coober Pedy in 1977. Subsequently, Mr Poblocki was the Senior Social Worker and representative of the Department for Community Welfare in the North for nearly four years.

Mr Poblocki is so highly thought of in D.C.W. that it supported him in his successful application to Bradford

University in Britain to undertake a master's degree. For a man with those qualifications and experience to be compared with Mr McCormack and his fringe knowledge of community work is an insult to all professional people. The fact that the member for Eyre can support Mr McCormack before Mr Poblocki is only an indication of his ignorance or pure prejudice against people who know their work and will not keep Aboriginal people repressed.

Let me now add a couple of facts to fill out the picture. Mr Arnold McCormack has held a temporary position for seven years, and still the council cannot conduct its own affairs. One of his brothers does the majority of the contract work for the Umooora community, and another brother, who owns an opal buying and selling business, dictates the pricing of opal sold by the people in the Umooora community.

Given this situation, and the fact that the Aboriginal people in Coober Pedy, especially those living in the Umooora community, have no effective say over decisions affecting them, is it any wonder that an educated, intelligent and aware Aboriginal woman like Mrs Hudson should express some concern about her people's future in a situation like this? Furthermore, concern by the Coober Pedy Aboriginal people is surfacing because they see that, instead of achieving the Government's stated goal of self-determination and self-management, they are being exploited.

Mr McCormack is renowned for reacting in the same paranoid fashion as the member for Eyre. All Mr Poblocki has done is that he attempted to support the Aboriginal people in their efforts to run their own affairs. As a result of some very questionable relationships involving the member for Eyre—

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

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): In this grievance debate tonight, I wish first of all to direct a few remarks to the shadow Minister of Education, and to make an observation which I would like to pass on to him. I was somewhat surprised, at a school council meeting I attended recently, to hear that the A.L.P. has no education policy. That surprised me, because I looked back over the number of years when the previous Labor Government regularly went to the people before its time, almost on a two-yearly basis. If an election were to be called tomorrow, I wondered whether the A.L.P. would have a policy to put to the people of South Australia regarding education. It appears to me that it has no such policy at this stage. I do not know whether or not that is true, but I put that question to the shadow Minister, the member for Salisbury.

The person who was making those comments said quite clearly that the only point he had to raise was that, if the A.L.P. were to be re-elected at the next State election, it would reinstate the 4 per cent cut in ancillary staff. That was made quite clear. The A.L.P. was committed to the policy of a reinstatement of the 4 per cent cut. I wonder whether that person was quoting facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach does not require assistance.

Mr RANDALL: I know that, in due time, the Labor Party shadow Minister will put me straight on that point. My principal aim in speaking tonight is to make some comments in relation to the Port Adelaide Community College. Although the problem is solved—and I thank the Minister of Education for solving it—I wish to raise the point because it shows quite clearly some of the problems faced in the community. The matriculation students at the Port Adelaide Community College felt under threat, and they chose a form of solving the problem with which I

disagree. They went to the press to blow the matter up as much as possible and, hopefully, to make a political story of the situation.

By doing that, they made my job as a Liberal back-bencher more difficult if I were to help in resolving the problem, because it became a political problem. If the students had taken appropriate steps and had had a deputation to the Minister, much worry could have been saved. They were rightly concerned. I have a large number of them in my electorate, and if they had seen me and raised the matter, as a back-bencher I would have gone to the Minister. No doubt, with some discussion, we could have resolved the problem and saved much worry.

The media coverage, both electronic and printed, caused quite a momentum of action in the area, and the students were taken away from their studies for a week or 10 days. It would have been much more beneficial to them if they had carried on with their studies. The press paid much attention to the matter, which was promoted in some ways by the shadow Minister of Education. He made a statement with which I disagree. He was reported in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 14 July, as Opposition spokesman on education, saying that it could only be interpreted that Mr Allison did not care about the Port Adelaide community.

The fact was that no decision had been taken by the Minister of Education to close those adult education classes at Port Adelaide. I stress that: no decision had been taken. I informed the Principal and the student representatives before those comments were made to the press that no decision had been taken by the Tonkin Government to close the Port Adelaide Community College. I was concerned to see the amount of coverage in the printed and electronic media.

In due course, a number of letters were written to the Editor. I, too, decided that it would be responsible of me to write to the Editor of the *Advertiser*. Unfortunately, that letter was not printed, but I would like to read it to the House to ensure that it is inserted for those people who are following this debate with interest. I wrote:

Dear Sir, I have read with interest the articles which have appeared with relation to the Port Adelaide Community College's Adult Matriculation Unit. As the local member of Parliament representing some of the affected students, I wish to clarify some points. The Tonkin Liberal Government has not decided to close the Adult Matriculation Unit at Port Adelaide. Its operation like many others is reviewed annually as budget plans are drawn up. It is therefore extremely unfair to say that the Minister of Education, Mr Allison, does not care about the Port Adelaide community. He does care, because he has allowed me to put before him my reasons why the Adult Matriculation Unit should continue to serve the western suburbs before he makes a decision.

I also care and need to know facts in order to put strong representations to the Minister. I have spoken to the Principal, the student representative, staff and students in order to gain a clear picture. We are doing our homework before making any decision which will obviously affect opportunities for people in the catchment area of the Port Adelaide Community College to further their education.

It is unfortunate that that letter was not printed to clarify the situation.

Mr Slater: Who wrote it for you?

Mr RANDALL: I wrote it myself. Some points which are still to be resolved in this whole area of adult matriculation need to be put on the record. It seems to me and to some other people that perhaps the Port Adelaide Community College was singled out for a particular reason. I believe that we as a Government need to review the overall area of adult matriculation courses conducted in other D.F.E. colleges. Questions need to be asked about the Kensington Matriculation School, for instance, and I ask three specific questions.

First, Kensington had 160 full-time students on 27 March 1981. According to the 'Guidelines for operations' should

not that mean that their staff should be 11 lecturers and two senior lecturers? It is true that they have in fact 11 lecturers, two senior lecturers, one deputy head and one head.

Secondly, why are three lecturers only teaching three classes? No doubt two of these three lecturers are senior lecturers but nevertheless shouldn't the head, deputy head and student counsellor be able to handle the administration and other 'matters' of the school? Should a promotion to senior lecturer mean less work? (One senior lecturer has been the sole administrator at Port Adelaide for about 70 full-time students for a number of years.)

Thirdly, the Department of Further Education has indicated that the purpose of employing full-time lecturers was to teach full-time students and that, wherever possible, full-time lecturers should teach full-time classes. Why is it that only three lecturers at Kensington are fully engaged in teaching full-time students? Those questions are yet to be resolved. I also wish to place on record the Minister's decision, which was announced to this House on 16 July during Question Time, as follows:

The report from a number of sources was that the whole thing referring to the Port Adelaide Community College Matriculation Unit was going to be dived. That was never on. The happy news

is that the full-time course will not be closed down, but all matriculation studies have been put under considerable review as a result of this question during the past two or three weeks, and I thank honourable members for their interest.

As was quite clearly shown by the Minister, the unit will continue at Port Adelaide. Unfortunately, it is a recurring question that is raised at about this time of the year. Last year it was brought to my attention that the whole college would be closed down. We were able to find out that the real message was that the college at LeFevre would be closed but that it would be shifted to a new upgraded Steamship building.

Finally, I wish to place on record a concern of one of the students. He has addressed a letter 'to whom it may concern' and states:

I attended the first of Port Adelaide's adult education classes in 1975. My employment level immediately previous attending this one-year matriculation course was storeman and packer for a local distributor. I completed one year of re-education at matriculation level and sat for four subjects at the final term. I achieved pass results in three of those four subjects.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.25 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 23 July at 2 p.m.