

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 23 July 1981

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

PETITION: EMPLOYMENT

A petition signed by 59 Public Service Association members praying that the House urge the Government to reverse its policies and begin job-creation programmes which will stimulate the South Australian economy and result in more jobs in both the public and private sectors was presented by Mr Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

A petition signed by 25 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 was presented by Mr Randall.

Petition received.

PETITION: REPEAL OF LEGISLATION

A petition signed by 2 664 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to repeal the City of Adelaide Development Control Act, 1976, and the Heritage and National Trust Acts, 1978, as amended, was presented by Mr Hemmings.

Petition received.

PETITION: CRAIGMORE BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 1 092 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to extend either bus route 441 or bus route 432 on a full-time basis to cater for the commuting needs of the Craigmores suburb was presented by Mr Hemmings.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PETROL SUPPLIES

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Honourable members will be aware that petrol tanker drivers in South Australia who are members of the Transport Workers Union have decided to take strike action and that, at this stage, they do not intend to meet again before Tuesday. As a result, the Department of Mines and Energy is now preparing detailed advice for the Government on stocks which service stations are now holding. Later this afternoon, I expect to be in a position to make a further statement following receipt of the department's advice.

However, early indications point to a healthy situation with regard to stocks on hand in service stations. With a continuation of normal demand for petrol, the stocks are certainly sufficient to last for a considerable time. In these circumstances, while the Government will be keeping the matter under close and constant review, it does not see the need, at this stage, to take any further action. At the same

time, the Government would urge the public not to indulge in any panic buying of petrol. To do so would only worsen a situation which, at this stage, is quite manageable so long as there is co-operation from the public.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PET CONTAINERS

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. C. WOTTON**: Cabinet has today given approval for the use of the two-litre PET container in South Australia with a 5c deposit. A deposit of 5c, refundable at can collection depots as approved under the terms of the Beverage Container Act, 1975-76, will apply to each container.

In May 1980 the Government granted approval for the use of the two-litre PET container for a trial period of 12 months. The trial period commenced in July 1980. This trial period has provided the Government and the community with a valuable opportunity to assess the likely impact of these containers and the relative advantages and disadvantages of their use.

The advantages of selling beverages in a safe, easily and cheaply transportable container are clear. However, because this type of container, at its current stage of development, is non-refillable it has the potential to contribute significantly to litter and waste disposal problems.

The Government's decision is an important one in reconciling the interests of the consumer, industry and the environment. The decision reinforces the intention of the Government to ensure continued reduction of litter in South Australia. At the same time it will enable industry to pursue innovative packaging technologies in a competitive environment in line with sound principles of material recycling.

Officers of the Department of Environment and Planning will consult with industry on an appropriate date for the introduction of the deposit. Following these discussions, I will move to repeal the exemption under the Beverage Container Act.

QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: Before calling on questions I indicate that, in the absence of the Deputy Premier, the Premier will take questions; in the absence of the Minister of Industrial Affairs, the Minister of Transport will take questions; and in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Water Resources will take questions.

LEAKED DOCUMENTS

Mr **BANNON**: Has the Premier seen the letter in the *Advertiser* this morning from Mr Ian Fraser, General Secretary of the Public Service Association, replying to the Premier's allegations about public servants leaking documents, which states that the morale of the State Public Service is at an extremely low level and that there is widespread despondency? Does this confirm that South Australia's highly professional Public Service, the envy of Australia, has lost confidence in the Tonkin Government, and what action will the Government take to restore Public Service morale?

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I am obliged to the Leader of the Opposition for raising this subject because it allows me to place on record yet again for the third time this week

my implicit and complete trust in the honesty and integrity of the South Australian Public Service.

Mr Millhouse: That is not what you said to me last week, you know.

Mr Slater: You've changed your story.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: There seem to be some very curious noises coming from opposite and I do not understand them at all. I know it is in the interests of the Leader of the Opposition and his Party, including obviously the member for Mitcham, who has become an adjunct to that Party in his words, actions and deeds in the last few months, to propose that there is a serious problem, and I find it extraordinary that the people who make most use of this material, who peddle this information which is provided to them—and no-one can deny whence this documentation is issued and propagated.

I simply repeat, as I did to the Royal Institute of Public Administrators earlier this week, and as I did by way of a memo to members of the Treasury, when I asked the Under Treasurer to convey those feelings to the members of the Treasury who are under some criticism because some of the leaks which have occurred have obviously originated from the Treasury.

Mr Bannon: Or your office.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat, I have nothing but the greatest respect for the integrity and honesty of the Public Service. I believe it is high time that honourable members opposite realise that in what they are doing they are attacking a fine Public Service which has had a fine reputation for many years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Honourable members opposite may think that this is a funny, laughable matter, but it is not. It is a matter of grave concern, because many public servants have come to me expressing anger and concern at the fact that their reputation is being called into question by the sort of activity which is being indulged in by one or two individuals in the Public Service.

Mr Bannon: Name them.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will name the Leader as being party to the dissemination of much of this information which is being leaked. The Leader asked me to name, and I name. The Leader has been party to the dissemination of this information, and he cannot deny that. I believe that this sort of activity is aimed at bringing discredit upon a Public Service for which I have the highest regard. I will not do anything whatever to support anything which will withdraw any sort of recognition of the fine job that they do. Today I think has demonstrated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:—quite conclusively, if anyone needed any persuading, that it is the Opposition which stands to gain most from what is going on and it is doing so regardless of the effect this has on the Public Service of South Australia. I can only repeat that I very much regret what is being done to the reputation of a fine body of public servants. I resent that happening, and I think it does the Opposition no credit at all. The only people who will suffer from this will, in fact, be members of the Opposition, and they deserve everything that is coming to them.

AIRPORT CURFEW

Mr OSWALD: Is the Premier in a position to refute rumours circulating in the western suburbs that it is intended to lift the curfew hours at the Adelaide Airport to coincide with the introduction of new classes of jet traffic? This matter was discussed by the Thebarton council, and

the Glenelg council received a communication from that council. I will quote from the minutes of the Glenelg council meeting held on 7 July:

From the Town Clerk of Thebarton advising that at a recent meeting of his council it was resolved:

That in view of the recent publicity concerning the possible lifting of the airport curfew that councils in close proximity to the airport be requested to support the Thebarton council in expressing deep concern to the proposal to the Department of Civil Aviation.

That, of course, is now the Department of Transport. A motion by the two councillors in St Leonards ward was moved and seconded:

That the correspondence be received and referred to the Secretary of the Metropolitan Regional Organisation Western for inclusion on the next ROC agenda and further that the Glenelg council support the Thebarton council in taking this matter up with the Department of Transport.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am able to refute such rumours. I must congratulate the member for Morphett on the concern he has constantly shown about this matter.

Mr Slater: What about Heini?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Slater: And me?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If anyone had any doubts as to propriety and the correct behaviour in Parliament, or about responsible government, they certainly would have no doubt about the inadequacy of the Opposition in this matter from its performance this afternoon. I am able to refute those rumours. The member for Morphett, together with the members for Hanson and Glenelg—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I understand that members opposite do not seem to care much about the curfew, or the airport, although the Leader has been keen to jump on the bandwagon of airport development.

In response to the representations made, the Minister of Transport made a special visit to Canberra to see the Federal Minister for Transport and he has obtained his reassurance that no such lifting of the curfew is contemplated—nor has it been contemplated. Why such rumours should arise in those areas is something about which we must draw our own conclusions. I suggest that this will not be the only time that this rumour is promulgated in the area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is unnecessary interjection from my left.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find it quite amazing that the Leader of the Opposition, who only a short time ago was such a strong advocate of Sir Freddy Laker's aeroplanes making international flights into and out of Adelaide, should suddenly have moved away from that situation. That highlights what I have been saying, because by innuendo, by way of interjection across this House, the Leader of the Opposition seeks to suggest that this Government supports a lifting of the curfew. One does not have to look very hard to find the source of the rumours that the curfew would be lifted.

Mr Bannon: What about the Governor's Speech?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think this should be put on record: the Leader implies, by way of interjection, that the Governor's Speech refers to a lifting of the curfew. Any examination of the Governor's Speech will show quite clearly that this is not true. I think that categorises the Leader's statements concerning this matter.

Mr Bannon: Read the Speech, where it refers to upgrading to international status, with no assurances whatsoever about—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Keep going—the Leader is getting in deeper and deeper. What a petty performance

the Leader of the Opposition is engaging in. I give an unequivocal reassurance, if any is needed, that there is no question at all of a lifting of the curfew at the Adelaide Airport. I would warn not only the members of those fine councils in the area, but also residents of the area that in the future they could very likely be subjected to similar rumours peddled around by people for political purposes. I can only tell them that this Government has no thought whatever of changing the present curfew which applies to the Adelaide Airport. If they hear these rumours, either they should discount them, treat them with contempt, or take steps to reassure themselves by contacting the Minister of Transport, who will be happy to amplify and reinforce the assurance that has been given today.

CONSULTANTS

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say whether it is true that Mr Chris Geckeler, a consultant employed by PA Management, is being paid at a rate of around \$800 a day to sort out the Government's budgetary procedures, and does the Premier believe that this rate of payment can be justified? I understand there is growing resentment in the South Australian Public Service about the proliferation of lucrative consultancies being awarded by this Government, because many of the consultants employed are simply duplicating the work of public servants. I understand that this exorbitant payment to Mr Geckeler has been confirmed to a journalist, on an 'off-the-record' basis, by a member of the Premier's own staff.

I also understand that the South Australian taxpayer, in a time of cutbacks, is paying for expensive overseas trips by consultants, all of which should be publicly justified. The Opposition has called on the Premier to establish an inquiry into the fees paid by the Government to consultants so that the public can be sure it is getting value for money. I understand the Premier has rejected such an inquiry, or the use of the Public Accounts Committee as a watchdog over consultancies. There are times when outside consultants are required by Governments—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader is now commenting, and I ask him to desist from that practice.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Thank you, Sir. I understand that there is a concern in the Public Service about the relationship that one consultancy firm has with this Government. I am told that that consultancy firm has received many Government contracts and is said to have had ties with the Liberal Party prior to the last election. An inquiry would certainly clear up suspicion of political pay-off, which I am sure is not the case.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I will deal with the last question first. The Government has no special relationship with any firm of consultants, any more than the previous Government had any special relationship with a firm of consultants, no matter how much appearances might have suggested the reverse in that case. I am prepared to give details, if the honourable member would like me to, at some future date. Let me deal with the question that was asked. Mr Chris Geckeler is the head of the consultant team that is dealing with programme and performance budgeting. The fee that is being paid to those consultants is exactly the same fee that is paid on the same basis to every other consultant that does work for the State Government.

In regard to the difference in the amount that is being spent in consultancies by this Government, may I point out to members opposite (and they would do well to listen to

this) that the amount paid for consultancies by this Government varies very little indeed from the amount paid by previous Governments, including the last Government, over the years. As the Deputy Leader attempted to comment, consultancies are necessary from time to time and have been used by Governments from time and time in the most responsible way. There is no question of any additional or marked increase in the amount paid by this Government for that service, and the Deputy Leader should be able to find that out for himself by an examination of the Budget documents. In regard to overseas trips—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Will you deny that the fee—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have already made the point that the fees paid to consultants are exactly the same on a consultancy basis as those paid to any other consultant who has been employed by either this Government or the last Government. In regard to overseas trips by consultants, I am not at all sure to what the honourable member refers. If he is referring to the overseas visits that are being undertaken by Government officers to investigate, for instance, the installation of computers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, I think he would agree that, after the complete mess that was made of the Flinders Medical Centre computer purchase by the former Government, that is money well spent.

As far as I am concerned, consultants will continue to be employed, although a little concern has been expressed recently by consultants generally at the freeze that has been placed on new consultancies. That has been brought about by financial stringencies, which in turn have been brought on the State Government by Federal Government decisions. Apart from that, I suggest that the Deputy Leader would do well to examine the details of the consultancies that were let during the time his Party was in Government before he makes any comment either in this House or publicly.

TRANSPORT STRIKE

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Tourism advise the House of the effect that the current transport strike is having on tourism in South Australia? The public should be made aware of the indirect effects that such a strike has on the community, and of the loss of goodwill which has been built up by this Government and on which tourism relies.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I sought a report from the Department of Tourism this morning as to the likely effects of the transport workers strike on the tourist industry in South Australia, and the information I received was very disturbing indeed. The effects occur in several areas. The effect of the dispute at present is limited to tourist traffic that travels by road, by bus or on scheduled services. At this time of year, the principle income for operators comes from scheduling services either to the Flinders Range or to the Victorian snow fields. Once the revenue from those trips is lost, it cannot be replaced. Many operators rely very heavily for their profit on those tours.

Those operators who are barely making a profit could be forced to the wall as a result of this strike, and that would have powerful flow-on effects in South Australia. In the hotel and motel sector, since these months of June, July and August are the lowest occupancy months of the year and profits are reduced, some operators could be forced into a loss situation, which obviously would be very serious indeed. Most of the hotels and motels in the city are operating on very low profit margins at this time of the year, and those margins could be severely jeopardised as a result of the strike.

Mr Hamilton: So are the workers operating on a low sum of money, too.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The honourable member refers to the workers. The people who will suffer and suffer dreadfully as a result are the workers themselves, because the multiplier effects on tourism spread throughout the community, and there is virtually no individual who does not suffer as a result of strikes of this nature. If the honourable member will listen to what else I have to say, he will discover that the people who are embarking on irresponsible strikes of this kind are cutting not only their own throats but also the economic throat and the life blood of Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I said that coach tours are affected. Another area in which coach tours operate extensively is in winery tours to the Barossa Valley and the Southern Vales. I was informed this morning that one of the principal wineries in the Barossa Valley regards the stoppage as serious from its point of view in terms of visitors and sales, and the department expects that that view will be reflected among the other wineries. Again, the rights and privileges and indeed the future of those workers must be taken into account when one considers the action of the transport workers.

The most serious effect is the psychological effect on potential travellers. Already, cancellations are being made of business trips through fear that the aviation refuellers might go out on strike. My information at the moment, although I doubt that it has been publicly announced, is that that is what has occurred. If this strike drags on over any period, we are likely to face the same sort of situation as we faced when the air hostesses were on strike earlier this year, when South Australia lost \$2 000 000 by way of direct revenue in the tourist industry in hotel and motel accommodation as a result of that strike. In mentioning a figure of \$2 000 000, I do not refer to the multiplier effect of the tourist dollar, a sum estimated at \$2.62 for every tourist dollar spent. So, in fact, more than double that \$2 000 000 was lost and that is what we can anticipate if this strike continues. I think every member of this House would regard with the greatest gravity the strike action that is taking place and the suffering and economic results which will occur.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I suggest that the honourable members who are defending with such vigour—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already given a general warning to members on my left. I ask them to desist from this persistent interjecting; if they do not, the consequences are known to them.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Members opposite, who are defending with such vigour the right to strike, which I also defend, should also consider that a balanced view must be taken and that that right must be used only in the most extreme circumstances, otherwise the community as a whole suffers, and that is what is happening throughout Australia at the moment.

CYS PROJECT

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Transport, representing the Minister of Industrial Affairs, say whether the State Government has a plan to continue to fund and assist Community Youth Support projects in South Australia if the Commonwealth withdraws financial support in the next Budget? For about 10 months, the Thebarton Community

Development Board has put in an enormous amount of work in establishing a CYS project in the Thebarton community. Preparations for the project have reached the final stages, but the board has been advised by the head of the CYS section of the Department of Employment and Youth Affairs that CYS guidelines were to be changed. Those changes were supposed to be announced by the Federal Minister by June. Nothing has yet been announced, and Thebarton unemployed youth are still waiting. Will the Minister ask his Federal counterpart what is going on?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Many members of this House support the CYS scheme. I understand that there is a tremendously successful CYS scheme operating at Henley Beach, so my colleague from the area informs me. The State Government has been discussing the Community Youth Support scheme over the past few weeks. When the Minister of Industrial Affairs is ready to make an announcement, no doubt he will. The matter is certainly under consideration.

PORT RIVER MOORING FEES

Mr RANDALL: Is the Minister of Marine aware of press speculation that mooring fees at the Port River are likely to rise considerably in the next few months? No doubt, the Minister is aware of the steady demand for mooring facilities at the Port River. Many people from the various seaside electorates who have boats moor them at the Port River are keen to. They are anxious to know what is the Minister's attitude towards mooring fees.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: The honourable member is quite right; there is a big demand for mooring facilities at the Port River and at all State harbors. He is also right that there has been a good deal of speculation about steep rises in mooring fees at the Port River. The Department of Marine and Harbors is currently examining those mooring charges. At some sections of the river charges are made annually, and it should be noted that those charges have not risen since 1931, so they are meagre. At some parts of the Port River no charges are made at all. Currently, 150 boats of varying sizes are moored in the river, and there is a waiting list of approximately 120 boats. The department is reviewing the total mooring system in the Port River. No conclusions have been reached, and it will be some time before this decision is made. However, I assure the House that the department is looking at the matter in terms of demand and interest in this very important boating industry.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Education say why South Australia is to remain out of step with other States of Australia when it comes to the question of in-transit supervision of handicapped children? For some time now, I have been following with increasing concern a matter directly connected with the Woodville Special School in my electorate—the supervision of handicapped children while they are travelling to and from school. In April this year, the secretary of the school council forwarded to me copies of correspondence to the Minister of Education, following his reply to earlier correspondence from the school council seeking supervision on the buses used to transport handicapped children. The Minister advised the Council on 27 March 1981:

At present we are unable to provide the additional resources which would make such a procedure possible . . . In extreme cases it may be necessary to withdraw a service in the interests of the safety of other children but we have not yet contemplated such action.

The school council, very worried about this reply, wrote again to the Minister on 24 April, repeating its request and stating, in part:

Over the past months you and your department have received deputations, phone calls and letters from parents and from concerned members of the public about unruly behaviour and dangerous acts by handicapped children travelling on school buses. The department has also been made aware of alleged interference with children by drivers on some buses.

The letter concluded:

Finally I feel obligated to point out that many parents of children at our school . . . are extremely dissatisfied with the lack of action to date.

In the course of the letter the council advised the Minister of research it had done concerning the practices followed interstate on matters of this sort. It was discovered that Victoria, Tasmania, the A.C.T. and the Northern Territory provide supervisors on all buses servicing handicapped children. Queensland provides adult supervisors on most buses transporting such children, while in Western Australia supervision is provided in special instances. The concern of other States to provide a service of this type was perhaps best summed up in the words of an officer of the Northern Territory Department of Education who wrote:

Current provisions have developed in response to emerging needs and the Northern Territory's historical, geographical and education context. I anticipate an early ratification of existing practices . . . as we move into the International Year of Disabled Persons.

The Minister's response to this was brusque, when he wrote to the member for Spence on 7 July, as follows:

I do not agree that a simple programme of supervision is appropriate.

The Minister did suggest the use of ancillary staff in training these children to travel on buses but then qualified that statement by saying:

At this stage I am unable to say whether our budgetary position for 1981-82 will allow any expansion of this service.

In this year of the disabled, why does the Minister insist on keeping our disabled children disadvantaged in this respect against the mainstream of current Australian practice?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I did hear some slight tut-tutting as the honourable member was asking his question, but I am not sure to which direction that was addressed. Let me assure the House that whatever the relationship between South Australia and other States, this Government has indeed provided some slight improvement on the practices which were in effect when I became Minister, so if there is any adverse criticism, it lies fairly evenly on the previous Government, which was in office far longer than we have been.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You've been in long enough to fix the lot. That's what you said you'd do.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They speak well.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I would not agree with that.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They speak well, but they do not say anything.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Members will realise that this Government has not only increased the facilities generally in South Australia by making additional special educational facilities available and by increasing grants to a wide range of different organisations involved in special education, but we are also recognised across Australia as leading in the special educational field, an example which was admittedly set by the previous Minister to some extent and on which we have built. To suggest that we are going backwards simply by quoting one special case in isolation would be rather ridiculous.

We analysed a number of cases in which there were particular difficulties, and we have made available some supervision in those cases. We have also drawn the attention of parents to the fact that on occasions youngsters who are slightly handicapped (not the extremely handicapped who do not move around very largely) have been waving hands out of bus windows. In winter it is expedient to keep the windows closed, but in summer, having regard to the need for ventilation, it is not always so convenient to do so. The general attitude of the Government has repeatedly been to provide greatest emphasis on the people regularly supervising the children in classrooms. Wherever it is possible and really desirable for youngsters to be supervised in transit, we have tried to make arrangements to do that. We cannot always do that when there are one or two isolated cases on infrequent occasions where a youngster—

Mr Whitten: It's Woodville—do you know that?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The case in point has been under review for some time.

I do affirm that the financial constraints, plus the emphasis that we have placed on classroom teaching, supervision and staffing has not enabled us, any more than it enabled the previous Government, to make a blanket policy of providing people for supervision to and fro (a lot of wasted time) on the buses that ferry handicapped children. A lot of parents have acknowledged that it is partly their responsibility to take youngsters from home to special centres such as Woodville. They do that with the aid of our additional transport allowances, not always with pleasure, but they do at least do it to co-operate and to make sure that their youngsters go to an educational facility. I heard another 'shame' comment when extreme cases were mentioned. Let me say that there is a grey area of extreme cases, and that is an area of deciding whether in fact these youngsters are to be medically or educationally supervised.

Mr Whitten: Will you be able to assist in the next Budget?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We will tell the honourable member about the next Budget when he comes along to the programme performance budget sessions. The education budget is still being finalised.

Mr Whitten: Will you consider it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We are considering it, obviously.

FLAGSTAFF ROAD INTERSECTION

Mr GLAZBROOK: Will the Minister of Transport advise the House what action the Highways Department intends taking to upgrade the intersection of Flagstaff Road and Blacks Road at Flagstaff Hill? The Minister will be aware of the representations made to him by me, the Meadows District Council and residents about the most dangerous condition of this intersection due to the many blind spots causing restricted vision for motorists and the fact that there is no channelisation and no appropriate road markings at that spot.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I am well aware of the representations made to me by the honourable member, his constituents and the District Council of Meadows. There is no question that that intersection is inadequate, and action will be taken to improve the 'channelisation' he mentions and, in particular, the sight distance. There is no doubt that if present sight distances are allowed to remain it is quite possible that a serious accident could occur. Unfortunately, to improve the sight distance it will be necessary to remove, I think, three or four pine trees. I am happy to say that my department has carried out a study under the terms given it by the Department for the Environment and has the agreement of the District Council of Meadows to remove

those trees. When that is done, I am sure the danger will no longer be present at that intersection.

MATRICULATION EXAMINATION

Mr MILLHOUSE: My question, which is directed to the Minister of Education, is as follows: in an attempt to put into effect the Government's policy to raise standards of literacy and numeracy, will the Minister cause an inquiry to be made into the policies and activities of the Public Examinations Board in view of the great dissatisfaction among Matriculation markers and examiners and, if necessary, back that up by introducing legislation to amend the Public Examinations Board Act? The Minister may recall that about ten days ago there was a report in the *News* of the resignation of Dr Baxter, who for four years had been the chief mathematics examiner and, for two years, Chairman of the Chief Examiners Committee. In a statement he made, he branded the Matriculation examination as worthless. I have been shown a number of documents concerning other subjects, particularly chemistry and English, and with your permission, Sir, I will quote briefly from a couple of documents on the English examination. The first of these is the draft report prepared by Mr Peter Moss, the Chief Examiner in English, and he says this, in part:

The quality of scripts has settled so comfortably into general mediocrity that the Matriculation English examination paper 2 is a farce. One experienced marker put the situation trenchantly: 'The most depressing aspect of the whole affair (the examination in English) is that we have clear evidence that the average Matriculation student is unable to read, with any understanding, simple passages of the sort that can be found in newspapers, nor can most convey what limited understanding they do have in any adequate fashion. Yet the structure of the P.E.B. system ensures that not only will most of them pass, but they, their parents, teachers, and the public at large will remain in blissful ignorance of the whole appalling situation.'

I may say that that marker is now a Senator. Recently, Mr Moss sent an open letter to teachers of Matriculation English. This is the last quotation I wish to make, Sir. He said:

I enclose a copy of my 1980 Matriculation examination report. You will note that it is different from the official P.E.B. report.

He goes on later:

My report was written by me alone, after careful readings of 68 markers' reports. My document represents the consternation felt and the frustrations expressed by the large majority of markers—specifically, two-thirds of the group—nearly all of whom were practising schoolteachers. After pressure from the English subject committee, my report was rejected by the board by 13 votes to 10, and it was decided to appoint a committee to rewrite it. The official English report was created by this committee, who composed it without reading the markers' reports.

It is known that standards in many subjects are not satisfactory, and because of the policy of the board that fact is being kept from the teaching profession and the community. I may say that every time I have approached the Minister of Education on a matter concerning the P.E.B. he has shuffled off any responsibility—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE:—by saying that it is an independent body. I must say that I have felt frustrated. I hope that is not too much of a comment, Sir. I can tell the Minister that if he will not do what I have suggested in this question I shall move in this House for such an inquiry.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: By sheer coincidence I happened to have the relevant material at hand as the honourable member rose to ask his question. However, it was not in anticipation of his question, because this issue has been before me for quite some time. In fact, members may recall that some two years ago, or more, before this Government came into office, there was the matter of the Jones Report,

commissioned by the previous Government, concerning public examinations generally in South Australia. That report did come forward with a recommendation that the wide range of subjects already examinable at Matriculation level should in fact be further increased. Consideration of that matter with a view to its being finalised was deferred when I instituted the Keeves Committee of Inquiry, which has brought down an interim report. The full report on curriculum matters generally, the final two terms of reference, is not due to be brought down until the end of the year. Of course, some further consideration will be given to the Public Examinations Board and the Jones Committee of Inquiry Report.

Meanwhile, however, I point out that the gentleman to whom the member for Mitcham referred, Mr Moss, who wrote the open letter to English teachers, was Chief Examiner for two years, finishing in 1980, and he did not in fact claim to be comparing the present standards of English with those of previous years or, indeed, previous decades. There have been other allegations from Dr Baxter (or Professor Baxter—I am not sure which), who resigned after four years examining in mathematics, and there have been other comments about the chemistry examination, generally referring less to the P.E.B. or to the Jones Report than to the standard of preparation which had been arrived at or achieved in our secondary schools.

That really is the key point, irrespective of whether the honourable member wishes to bring in legislative amendments relative to the Public Examinations Board. The key issue that Mr Moss and others are raising is whether the method of assessment and the method of finally handing out an examination with a letter or number on it is relevant to today's society and, particularly, whether it is relevant to academicians in the universities.

Mr Millhouse: Not only relevant, but whether it has any meaning.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I will explain, if the honourable member will hold his horse for a little. I point out that about five or six years ago, instead of all examinations being marked, finalised, and the person, if the result was that 17 per cent was top in one subject, being given credit for having 17 per cent and being top, and a person in another subject having 70 per cent and being top in that subject, it was decided that the universities, the colleges of advanced education and the Institute of Technology would have a package deal. Instead of assessing the marks that were very low in one subject and therefore probably militating against that student when it came to final acceptance at tertiary level, the low mark would be equated with the top mark in another subject and that examination would be subject to scaling.

The first decision was to arrive at one mark towards which all other subjects would be scaled. This really posed the question of whether students should have an honest appraisal on an examination paper. There are two possibilities, for example, if the youngster is top in, say, English, with 25 per cent in that year (which is highly unlikely); the reason for the low mark could be poor preparation or that the examination paper was so difficult that even staff in secondary schools found it hard to cope with. I assure the honourable member that that has happened in certain subjects to my knowledge over 16 years of teaching. Over the last few years, the cut-off point for youngsters wishing to go into law, medicine or even speech pathology, because of the highly competitive nature of courses such as that, was 325 marks. All marks are scaled towards an average and, therefore, the 325 marks represents the cut-off point over five subjects. Nothing can be done either in legislation, in altering the composition of the board, or anything else, if

youngsters are not being trained properly in the first place, because that is outside the ambit of the P.E.B.—

Mr Millhouse: The problem is that the board is not telling them what the trouble is.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I have a memo from the Chairman of the P.E.B., Professor Mills, who has suggested that we again come together (and by that I mean the group that met only a couple of weeks ago, comprising senior representatives of the universities, colleges of advanced education, the institute and the Education Department) to decide whether the method of scaling, the actual method of accreditation, should be changed. Once we have established that, we will make public our recommendations as well as, in the broader issue, considering whether to reconstitute the board in a different form or whether simply to reappoint different members to the board, because the board's term of office concludes in the very near future. All of these matters have been before me for quite some weeks and are still under discussion. I am quite sure that the honourable member will be among the first to hear of the decision when I release the information to the House. Meanwhile, I thank him for raising the question, because I had intended to raise the matter in the House.

EFFLUENT AND DRAINAGE CHARGES

Mr ASHENDEN: Is the Minister of Water Resources aware of public statements that have been made by the Mayor and the Town Clerk of the City of Tea Tree Gully in reference to State charges for common effluent system drainage and annual council rates, and can he inform the House whether he agrees with those statements? I have been approached by a number of constituents, who are concerned at comments that have been made in the *North-East Leader* by the Mayor and the Town Clerk of Tea Tree Gully, alleging that the \$5 increase for the removal of common effluent system drainage and the use of notional values will result in a steep increase in rates to ratepayers in that city. I would appreciate it if the Minister could answer the concerns that my constituents have raised because of those statements.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The honourable member has raised two issues, the first of which relates to the increased charge for the disposal from the common effluent system into the Engineering and Water Supply Department sewerage facilities. Some 10 years ago the charge was set at \$10. At that time the minimum sewerage charge was \$8, but everyone would be well aware that the current minimum sewerage charge is \$48. The charge for disposal into the system from the common effluent system has been raised from \$10 to \$15. Had parity been maintained with the minimum sewerage charges, we would be looking at about \$60 today, so I do not believe there is any ground whatever for the council or the Mayor to be suggesting that the increase from \$10 to \$15 over a 10-year period is excessive when one considers the current minimum sewerage charge.

The other matter raised was in relation to land valuation and the amendments to the Valuation of Land Act, especially in relation to notional values. There has been considerable comment in the press, particularly in the area referred to by the honourable member, to the effect that the council would be significantly disadvantaged. A number of avenues are open to a council in this situation. Generally, the amendments to the Valuation of Land Act and what they will mean to evenly spread the burden of revenue raising measures have been well received across the State. I recognise the area of concern mentioned by the council, but it has the ability to offset the disadvantages it has

highlighted. First, councils have the ability to adjust the values made by the Valuer-General, and also the ability to introduce a differential rate. It is still well within the powers of the council to readjust the scene within its council area so that no-one is disadvantaged, and I believe that it is necessary for the council to do precisely that; otherwise, there will be certain areas of ratepayers who will be distinctly disadvantaged. I repeat that the council has the ability to make those variations in valuations or to introduce a differential rate which will completely restore the situation to that which prevailed prior to the amendments to the Act.

POWER GENERATION

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Deputy Premier, give the House a firm date by which a decision will be made concerning options available for power generation in South Australia following the completion of the Northern Power Station in 1983-84? Can he assure the House that committed power generation capacity in South Australia is sufficient to meet present industrial development plans? All members of the House, with the possible exception of the Minister of Education, were rather pleased yesterday to hear the C.S.R. announcement that commercial quantities of coal were available near Mannum, and that this might be a site for a future coal-fired power station. However, the trust's programme for new generating plants provides for two 250 megawatt units in the Northern Power Station, to be commissioned in 1983 and 1984 respectively. At present, there are no firm commitments beyond this.

I am informed that ETSA is considering four options for providing extra generating capacity by 1988. They are a new gas turbine plant using oil fuel; interconnection with New South Wales or Victoria; a new power station burning imported Eastern States coal; or, finally, a third unit in the Northern Power Station burning Leigh Creek coal. I am also informed that, because of considerable incentives associated with both availability and price of future natural gas supplies, new plant using this fuel cannot be considered as a practical option, nor can a coal burning plant be considered on the basis of a time scale which would apply and prevent any plant or equipment being commissioned at a date before, say, 1990, as I think all members will agree.

ETSA is very concerned that some industrial development programmes will overload the present transmission and distribution system. In fact, my Leader, only a week ago, pointed out that the proposed new pulp mill at Snuggery would require a special transmission line which would cost approximately \$40 000 000. The Deputy Premier on Tuesday this week described the announcement by my Leader as 'a cock and bull story'. He said it was based on documents six months out of date. In fact, the document in question is dated 2 April 1981, and states in part:

The stage has now been reached where Australian Paper Mills is proposing to install a mill requiring a load of 46.4 megawatts no later than 1984 in order to finish the pulp for newsprint and have requested the trust to supply details of any charges and tariff rates associated with this supply.

A load of the proposed magnitude could not be supplied in 1984 without reinforcing the present transmission and distribution system . . . It is doubtful whether such a line could be built within the required time even adopting a crash programme, but every effort would be made to achieve the programme if this project eventuates. The total cost of the line and associated substation works, including escalation, is estimated to be approximately \$40 000 000.

The SPEAKER: I call on the Minister of State Development.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I take great pleasure in that portfolio, also. Let us deal with the transmission line right

from the outset. The suggestion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in some context (I cannot remember which of his imaginative perambulations around the truth he was indulging in this time) and now by the member for Mitchell implies that there are severe difficulties in the provision of a transmission line. That transmission line is not a special line designed so that the pulp mill can go ahead. It has been on the forward planning, as the honourable member for Hartley would know—

Mr Bannon: By 1986, it will double—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Dear oh dear, what a reaction we always get from members opposite. They just cannot contain themselves when they are put right. That transmission line was on the Electricity Trust's forward planning.

Mr Bannon: Not that long ago; this line requires double the capacity that was planned for.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not too sure why the Leader of the Opposition persists in making such an ass of himself, but he does. I suppose that is his business and not mine. The line is part of the planned programme. It has been brought forward. I would like to congratulate the trust on making it possible in its planning to undertake that that line will be completed in time to provide the necessary load for the pulp mill.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In what year?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the honourable member has had quite enough goes.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: You said you've got it in hand.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be far more impressed by this exercise opposite if I thought for one moment that members were really interested in the State's welfare. Quite clearly, from their reaction, they are not. The commitment, which I think is what the member for Mitchell is talking about, is being supplied at present by the building of the Northern Power Station for some 200 or 250 megawatts. There is a very advanced stage of planning for the addition of a third 250 megawatt unit at the Northern Power Station, operating on Leigh Creek coal. It is proposed that building and installation will continue immediately after commissioning the second 250 megawatt unit. As far as further planning is concerned, a great deal will depend on an investigation of the Mannum coal deposit that was announced yesterday.

Members will know full well the very great difficulties there have been with dewatering the Wakefield coal deposits. A great proportion of the money spent on that project went on dewatering. Although I am not able to comment on the scale, it is very likely that the same sort of difficulties are likely to be found at Kingston, where the underground water supply is so very plentiful. Therefore, that makes the coal deposits at Mannum and Sedan particularly interesting, when one considers that they are not subject to such heavy watering problems.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am happy to put on record the fact that the exploration for this deposit has been going on for some considerable time, indeed for many years.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: In 1978.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Even before 1978. Coal was found in that area by drilling for water a number of decades ago. To give due credit to the previous Government, it undertook exploration in that area. The former Government, if I remember rightly, continued to issue exploration licences for uranium for some considerable time, too. Whether or not it was prepared to let uranium mining go ahead has been made quite clear.

It is because of the Liberal Party's election in this State that private enterprise and C.S.R. have decided that there is a future in developing the coal deposits which have been found, because without the demand for power, which the

industrial development programme will bring, there would be no future for South Australia at all. That would be the situation under a Labor Government.

Getting back to the details, I point out that it is now a matter of great urgency that we examine the Mannum coal deposit to see whether it can be utilised before Wakefield or Kingston. Regarding the utilisation of and building of that power station, if one is decided on based on Mannum, there is no reason why that has to wait until the completion of the Northern Power Station, even the third stage of that station. I assure the honourable member that the Government is very well aware of the demand for power which may well arise from the imaginative and forward-looking programme of industrial and mining development we are undertaking. We will certainly be doing everything we can to make sure that the energy required is available. All indications at present are that it clearly will be.

The SPEAKER: I take the opportunity to advise the House, since there was some concern when I called the Premier as the Minister of State Development, that the opportunity has been taken since we returned last Thursday to identify the question with the particular area of Ministerial involvement. This procedure fits in much better with the Votes and Proceedings. Earlier this afternoon, I called on the Minister of Tourism and the Minister of Marine, and earlier this week I have referred to the Treasurer rather than to the Premier. I believe that it is an advance in the call from the Chair. It may not always be possible to relate a particular question to a particular Ministerial area, but an attempt will be made.

At 3.10 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 22 July. Page 150.)

Mr O'NEILL (Florey): Last evening, I was referring to the problems confronting many people in my district arising from the uncontrolled increases in interest rates and the fact that many people who had hoped to own their own house are now faced with losing it and many people who had hoped to buy a house are now finding that that is beyond their financial capacity. Generally, it is a sad situation. I was appealing last evening to members of the Government to support a call on the Federal Government to do something about it.

Many problems exist in my district which relate to the financial policies of the present Federal and State Governments, and I certainly could not cover them all in the time available to me. One area which is of particular concern to me is that of schools. I have 20 schools in my district, all of which have problems in relation to which not much headway is being made with the department. First, I refer to the Ingle Farm Central Primary School, to which I was recently called at about 4.45 p.m. I accompanied three distraught teachers to have a look at flooding that had occurred at the school as a result of the heavy rains that had fallen.

I believe the flooding was directly attributable to a failure to carry out necessary maintenance, a failure brought about by the restrictive financial policies of the Government in relation to many areas of public works. The box gutters had

become blocked with pigeon droppings and nesting materials. It may be hard to believe, but two rooms on the first floor were flooded to a depth of about 5 centimetres. Although the library was not actually flooded, the carpets were damaged and many books had been destroyed by water coming into the building because of the blocked gutters, which I believe is directly attributable to the failure to spend money on necessary maintenance.

That school is built on slightly sloping ground, and there is an area which is part of the playing area on which there are wooden sleepers used for retaining walls, concrete tree guards, and so forth. That area was extremely slippery. I tried to walk on it and almost slipped over. The teachers were making every effort to keep the children off it so that they would not severely injure themselves. Following requests made to it, the previous Government had programmed the upgrading of the school at about the time of the change of Government, but despite promises, nothing has been done. Letters I have seen quite freely attribute this failure to improve the situation to the economic policies of the Government. I would hope that, in response to my letters, the Minister will see that the area is upgraded soon.

Strathmont Primary School has an area in the playing section containing steel playground equipment which is concreted into the ground, and the concrete bases are exposed because of lack of maintenance and failure to return filling to the area as a result of either playing there or weather conditions. A dangerous situation has arisen because of the exposed concrete. I have referred this matter to the Minister, calling for immediate action and I have sent copies of clippings from recent issues of local newspapers drawing attention to the dangerous nature of some of the playground equipment. The situation generally in that playground is one which I am sure would facilitate a claim of negligence on the part of any parents of children who might be injured. I would hope that, out of economic considerations, the Government will do something about that.

I could go on about the schools in my district, but during Question Time today matters were raised which I think need attention. Before I do that, I want to comment on the disgraceful state of the paintwork at the Ingle Farm High School that has resulted from neglect and the failure to carry out a scheduled repainting. At Enfield High School the louvres, which cover the windows facing the sun, are damaged; they are falling to pieces, and look generally tatty. I would hope that funds will be made available by the Minister soon to upgrade all this necessary maintenance, because it is not of any economic advantage to ignore necessary maintenance. The costs in the long term are far greater in trying to return a particular building or equipment to a usable condition, than they are if ongoing maintenance is carried out. I would draw the attention of the Government to that fact.

Many other areas in relation to education concern me, particularly the pressures on parents to pay for all sorts of things out of their own pockets. I think it would be fair to say that it is a joke to refer to free education in this State any more. About the only thing that the Government does not do now is put turnstiles on the gates and charge admission in the morning to let the kids in. Nonetheless, I hope the points I am making will be considered and something will be done about them.

Because of the furore which was generated earlier and the performances by certain Ministers opposite about the industrial situation currently prevailing in Australia and South Australia particularly, I feel I must say something, because certain journals available in the library quite clearly indicate the real cause of the problem. One would never guess by reading the daily papers what the real cause

is. I would offer the following to give some indication of where the real problem lies. It is fine to blame the transport workers for the fact that necessary household goods are in short supply, or to say that it is the fault of the transport workers that we cannot get petrol. The Minister of Tourism can go on about the effects on the Department of Tourism of the strike by transport workers. I will deal with that aspect later.

Rydge's business journal of July 1981 refers to another ongoing dispute which the Government has managed to get into a nice old mess. The heading is 'Posturing leads Government astray', and the article states:

The Fraser Government's humiliating climb-down in the Telecom dispute may, hopefully, have taught it some lessons. It has been a long time in learning.

It has not learned a thing, judging by recent developments. The article continues, later:

The main one is that political posturing and displays through the media of images of 'toughness' are no substitute for rational industrial relations policies.

That quite clearly sums up the matter, and it bells the cat. It shows where the responsibility for this whole sorry mess in Australia lies—it lies fairly and squarely with the Prime Minister and his Ministers, who are supposed to bear this responsibility.

The latest posturing of toughness by the Government is the exercise where it is saying that it intends to deregister the Transport Workers Union. Anyone who knows anything about industrial matters knows that deregistration does not do much at all to resolve problems; it usually expands those problems. As the Federal Secretary of the Transport Workers Union quite clearly pointed out, a deregistration move is an attack on the whole of his 105 000 members, and that is probably the number of people who will be involved if the Federal Government goes on the way it is going. Of course, there is the Telecom dispute. An article in the July issue of *Rydge's* states that it hopes the Government has learnt a lesson. From today's paper, we see that it clearly has not learnt a thing, because it is still trying to portray this image of toughness. The Government is calling on the commission to deregister the Transport Workers Union. What does the article in *Rydge's* have to say about that? The article relates to an appeal by the Government to the Arbitration Commission to bend its wage indexation guidelines—and remember that the Fraser Government has said on many occasions that these cannot be breached, unlike the guidelines that apparently apply to gentlemen in Federal Cabinet. The article states:

The commission refused to be drawn into what had now become a public relations exercise to save Government face.

That is another exposure of the Federal Government and its industrial attitudes and activities.

The Arbitration Commission has been described in many ways over the years by different groups, employer bodies and trade unions, and an article in *Rydge's* states:

The Arbitration Commission has functioned in this country for 80 years now as an independent judicial body. Sometimes it has performed its job well; at other times it has made mistakes. But the principle that the commission should be free from the whims and interests of politicians is a well-tested one.

I agree with the last part of that statement, because it is a statement of reality, of real life. I commend it to the Minister of Industrial Affairs in South Australia, because I understand he has been making some interesting comments at the conference in Brisbane. The high dudgeon of the Ministers earlier, of course, was not directed at the people who are obviously at fault. Members opposite prefer to attack the workers, to whose plight they, in large degree, have contributed by agreeing to changes in the taxation structure in this State, to increases in Government charges, and to the pressures being placed on home buyers which

further reduce their economic circumstances and force them to apply pressure to maintain their existing living standards. Their performance here today can be summed up in the terms of a further quote from the article in *Rydge's*, as follows:

As the events of last month demonstrated, politicians who come in talking off the tops of their heads do more harm than good.

I think that, in respect of the gentlemen and the lady opposite, that is certainly the case.

We hear a lot from members on the other side about industrial relations. Their ignorance amazes me. They stand and speak with all the authority of appalling ignorance. Getting back to the Minister of Tourism and her contribution about the state of the tourist industry in South Australia, I am amazed that she has the gall to make that statement, because what is the real reason for people not travelling as much as they used to do and not using facilities? The extra money they had in their pockets at the time to do these things has been soaked up by the very things to which I referred earlier—high interest rates and Government charges, and the petrol policy.

I turn now to the Government's petrol policy. What do we have here? The Opposition pointed out what was happening here before the last election because of the world parity pricing policy of the Federal Government. It has been acknowledged by people since that this is another arm of the Australian Taxation Office and that Fraser is using petrol pumps to tax people. There must be roughly \$4 000 000 000 that has been reefered from the pockets of Australian motorists, part of which may have gone to the tourist industry in South Australia if it had not been taken from people and they were still as mobile as they used to be. Never mind that; the very Minister who is complaining has been party to decisions which have taken another \$100 000 000 out of the pockets of South Australian motorists because of the debacle and absolute bungle in the past six months over petrol pricing in South Australia, during which time anybody who was fortunate enough to travel would have known that in every other State of Australia petrol was 3c to 4c a litre cheaper.

We have seen a climb down by the Government on that matter in recent times. There are other aspects of the present Government's policy which have taken out of circulation that money which might have been spent on holidays and to utilise other tourist amenities around the State. It is very hard to believe that the Minister is interested in expanding tourism when she, along with her colleagues, fights so hard against any attempt to provide people with more leisure. This Government has no compunction about providing thousands of South Australians with a lot of leisure time by forcing them out of employment, but unfortunately people who are on so-called 'unemployment benefits' are not very well placed to take advantage of the nice motels or to visit the interesting places we have in this State. Nevertheless, the Government complains about the fact that we cannot use these facilities while placing every impediment it can in the way of people doing so. I do not think we can place much credibility on the Government's arguments.

The member for Morphett raised some matters last night which concern me greatly because I, like he, am concerned about the possibility of the nasty things now occurring in Britain happening here for the same reasons, namely, a Conservative Government which shows no compassion at all for the ordinary people of the country, a Government which has a major preoccupation with profit and inflation, although for all its words it does not seem to be doing anything about reducing it. However, there is a problem, and the honourable member may have noticed, as I did, in Tuesday's *Advertiser* an article headed 'The Seeds of De-

struction', which was a report on a speech given by Sir Mark Oliphant.

I note that the Australian Rostrum Movement conferred on Sir Mark their highest honour, namely, the Companion of Rostrum for his services to 'Truth and free speech'. So, I have no qualms about quoting from this article written by a man with that recommendation. The article begins:

The capitalist, free enterprise economy has led the way in all aspects of the modern technological revolution.

I am sure that that must make some members opposite proud and happy. But then Sir Mark said:

The trouble is that it ignores human values, pursuing only those of the market place.

That is correct. We have heard members say in this place that the primary concern must always be profit and that 'If we can do anything for the multitudes afterwards, then maybe we will, but we must be concerned with profit.' Sir Mark went on to say:

Ordinary men and women will not forever accept growing unemployment and for those who have jobs, slavery to the machine and to the greedy entrepreneurs who own it and manipulate it.

Given the recommendation that Sir Mark is a man of truth and free speech, I can only accept the fact that he agrees with me and my colleagues that there are, among the owners of the means of production, greedy entrepreneurs who manipulate things.

Mr Lewis: The same as there is in unions.

Mr O'NEILL: There is an interesting comment that fits right into the category of arrogant and abysmal ignorance. I will deal with the honourable member later on; he opened his mouth last night rather stupidly, too. The problem that I want to highlight is that: these greedy manipulators who use the people in the Federal Capital to do their deeds are bringing about a situation that cannot be for the benefit of South Australians or Australians. Sir Mark referred to this, too, and he pointed to the fact that we have often raised. He said:

Gradually, the resources of the earth are falling into the hands of multi-national corporations, themselves more powerful than most of the nations in which they operate, including Australia. Manufacturing industry is now suffering the same fate, as are the airlines of the world, the retail industry, the hotels and even the private hospitals.

So, Sir Mark, a man who speaks the truth can see this. He then went on to say:

Strangely, in Australia as elsewhere, this process is actively encouraged by Governments, especially State Governments, because they believe that the injection of capital from the outside could increase economic activity and hence employment.

I do not know upon what such State Governments base their premise, because it certainly does not come true. Nevertheless, that is what Sir Mark said that State Governments do. As a result of these activities, Sir Mark said:

Relentlessly, apparently, our civilization is collapsing about us, the process accelerated by human greed for money and power.

Well may the member for Morphett be concerned. However, he should realise that he is part of this process. If he wants to do something to stop it, he should give some consideration to the advice that comes from members on this side of the House.

As a result of attempts to get all this money in, we have already heard, as I pointed out earlier, that one of the problems is the influx of money into this country. That is creating problems in the industrial area and in the area of interest rates, and so on. However, it is part of the Prime Minister's great plan for us. I refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of Friday 3 July, when Mr Fraser was in America. Incidentally, I see from some other source that the trip cost us only about \$100 000, plus the \$3 000 an hour that it costs to keep the 707 aircraft, which costs \$40 000, in the air. The article states:

The Australian Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, yesterday was hailed as a world economic leader by big business of middle America, because of the tight monetary policy applied by his Government in Australia.

That tight money policy is what is screwing us in South Australia.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr O'NEILL: I think that Mrs Thatcher has probably recovered a little more than he has, and I will refer to that in a moment. A certain Mr Clayton Yeutter of Chicago said, 'That was a mouthful, Mr Prime Minister. We like it.' He then went on to say: 'That was the kind of international philosophy everyone in this room shares.' Further, he said: 'After meeting the Prime Minister, I believe our investments are safe. Not only that, I think you could double them.' These hard-headed businessmen in America do not put their money into anything unless they are going to get plenty out and, with the current rate of interest in America (they are now talking in terms of more than 20 per cent now), these people would be looking for greater than 20 per cent, probably 30 per cent or 40 per cent. That, of course, is the great financial benefit that the Fraser Government is bringing us!

The article in the *Advertiser* reported from America states that the meeting at which the Prime Minister was dining comprised people representing 90 big United States Illinois-based corporations which have major investments in Australia—and that is only one State. Goodness knows how many more groups of 90 corporations there are which are benefiting from our labours and ready to pump in billions of dollars, because they know that they will take billions of dollars out. The article further states:

Unlike all others on economic policy delivered by the Australian Government in recent years there was no reference to the urgent need to keep wages and salaries down. This reflected the bad timing and Mr Fraser's acute embarrassment at the peak of his North American tour—of the decision by Federal Cabinet in Canberra—

We all know what that was. On the question of inflation, the article states:

In addition, the American businessmen were under the impression that inflation in Australia is now running at an annual rate of 8 per cent, when the latest consumer price index figures put it at about 10.5 per cent.

So, Mr Fraser was misleading his guests, and, if they find out, they may reappraise their assessment of him. Returning to the remarks about the Americans' liking of Mr Fraser and his financial attitude being in line with what the Americans want (and I assume that they are personal supporters of President Reagan), we now find that, at a meeting in Ottawa yesterday, Mr Reagan did not do so well with his European counterparts. The report in the *Advertiser* of 23 July stated:

With his economic policies more or less derided by the European powers, Mr Reagan had an unhappy time in Ottawa.

The European Governments, including Mrs Thatcher's Government, are beginning to concede that the Reagan recipe is a recipe for disaster.

I wish to make only a few more comments in the couple of minutes available to me. I promised to reply to the member for Mallee who last night had a few things to say by way of interjection about the 35-hour week. My colleague, the member for Price, has already shown that the member for Todd did not know what he was talking about when he purportedly quoted parts of the A.L.P. conference document. I am assured (and I think this shows the double standards of members opposite and the people with whom they associate) from an unimpeachable source, that the Chamber of Commerce and Industry and the South Australian Employers Federation have since approximately 1972 had an agreement with their staff for a 35-hour week,

involving no loss of pay. Further, I have found (whilst my source is not absolutely sure about this and does not have absolute proof) that the Metal Industries Association of Australia has a similar agreement. What a disgraceful state of affairs.

I refer again to *Rydge's* and to the posturing in the industrial field of this outrage at workers requesting or struggling to retain their purchasing power. Yet, the very people who are leading the fight against the 35-hour week have had an agreement with their own staff for years to give them a 35-hour week with no loss of pay. South Australian Government workers are working 37½ hours a week, yet Government members have the cheek to argue.

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

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): In addressing myself to the motion, I join with those members who have expressed condolences to the family of the late Sir Thomas Playford. On a slightly happier note, I want also to record a retrospective promotion that has been given to the Speaker. He is not here, and I do not want to suggest that I am disappointed that he is not in his seat, because I am glad to see you, Sir, there. However, it is worth recording that the member for Light, the Speaker, has been given a retrospective promotion by certain of his constituents. I would like to quote from a small pamphlet which has been given out in the Mid-North of the State, headed 'Come see Kapunda, the oldest mining town in Australia', and which proceeds to list various things that can be seen in the Mid-North. One of the things mentioned is an establishment known as Plaza De Caballo, which, as the pamphlet says, was officially opened by Dr Bruce Eastick, former Premier of South Australia, on 26 January 1980. I had thought that we just sneaked in on the 1975 election, but, obviously, some of the people in the Mid-North of the State thought otherwise. However, I rejoice in the retrospective promotion that the Speaker has been given. I never mind that sort of promotion being given to members of the Liberal Party.

The basis of any speech made in this debate should be the Speech that was delivered by His Excellency only a week ago and I have searched the Speech diligently to find some reference to the area that is my particular concern, as the member for Salisbury did in relation to education. I have had a hard job indeed: in fact, I got to page 5 before I found the following statement:

In May 1981, two Government Departments, the Department for the Environment and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs, were amalgamated to form the Department of Environment and Planning.

The Speech says a little about the role of the new department, and then states:

In the last Session of Parliament, a new Planning Bill was introduced. This Bill, which integrates environmental and planning decision making, will lie on the table to enable public comment before being debated.

There is just a little more about that. My concern is also land resource management as well as planning and environment, so I also looked for some sort of statement from the Minister of Lands. In paragraph 23 I found the following:

The Department of Lands is successfully pursuing its policy of regionalisation with the recent opening of the new office complex at Berri, and is further extending the policy by stationing valuers at Kadina and Murray Bridge.

That involves a purely Public Service arrangement and one that could well have been listed under the aegis of the Premier rather than that of the Minister of Lands. There is not too much in this document that could help me by way of some sort of starting off point. I can simply say, from what is in the document, that it would appear that the priorities of this Government are elsewhere than partic-

ularly in the environmental and land resource management fields.

That would seem to be underlined by the relative silence that has occurred from the Minister of Environment and Planning in relation to some of the great issues that have come up in recent times in regard to the natural environment. Earlier in this session, I addressed a question to the Minister of Agriculture in relation to Kangaroo Island land, the so-called Gosse scrub, and I was very interested to hear the Minister's reply. In particular, I was interested to hear him say the following:

By implication, if not directly, the member for Baudin said today that I have a personal interest in that land. I take exception to that implication.

He then expanded on that point for about five minutes, which behaviour seemed to be purely occupying the crease. In fact, I did not make that statement at any stage. All I said was:

There has been considerable delay and the Minister's virtual recall of the considered opinion of his own experts seems to be the cause. If he could take us into his confidence about this matter, which is apparently very close to him personally, many people would be very grateful.

Anyone who knows the history of this matter, as all honourable members in this place should, would understand the point that I was making. The Nature Conservation Society some time ago sponsored a visit to Kangaroo Island by people who were concerned about the possibility that Crown lands in the hundred of Gosse and two other adjacent hundreds would be cleared for agricultural development. When they arrived there, they were virtually ambushed by a posse which had been arranged by the local member (who, of course, happens to be the Minister of Agriculture) and which consisted of some local farmers who were very interested in the clearing of that land for additional agricultural development on the island. There was no doubt that the Minister of Agriculture had soiled them on.

That was the extent to which I indicated that we were aware of the concern of the Minister of Agriculture. He has an ideological commitment and a strong emotional commitment to the clearance of that land, because he is the local member and is subject to pressures from certain of his constituents. As a lifelong resident of the island, he accepts, I believe, as part of his value system that clearance is the name of the game. That was the point to which I was referring. I suppose I could have made a personal explanation, but I did not think it was worth while because this time would be available to me.

However, I want to canvass further the matter that was the burden of my question, because by going on with this irrelevant circumlocution, the Minister of Agriculture was able neatly to sidestep the point I had been making. I have a document that, as I then said, seems to have had a very wide circulation. The Nature Conservation Society seemed to be aware of it. The Society did not give me the document, but when I received it, I telephoned the society and asked whether it was aware of the document. The society said that it was aware of the document and, indeed, had been so concerned about it and what had been said about it that it had taken up the matter with the Premier. As confirmed by the Minister of Agriculture the other day, the document was prepared by the Department of Agriculture for consideration by the interdepartmental committee that is advising or is to advise the Government on the ultimate fate of the Gosse Crown lands.

When one reads the document, it becomes clear that the departmental experts are very much opposed, on environmental and economic grounds, to the clearing of that scrub. In writing this report without fear or favour as good public servants, these people have run foul of the ideological and

emotional commitment that their Minister feels to the clearing of this area. The position, as has been explained to me, is that, when the Minister received this document, he went right off, sent it back to the department for a rewrite, and the departmental officers refused to rewrite it and said they had done their best and had drawn their conclusions on the basis of the best evidence they could obtain. In fact, it has been left to the Director of the Department of Agriculture to do the rewriting.

The document is very interesting, because it bears out all I have said. The handwriting of the Minister of Agriculture appears in the column. He seems to be acting like a schoolteacher with an essay or a script that is to be marked, or like a university lecturer marking a dissertation or an end of year examination. I will quote some of the Minister's comments as we go along.

First, let us look at the conclusions drawn by these Department of Agriculture people. Before I do that, for the benefit of members and of people who will later read the record, perhaps I should sketch in in a little detail the area of Kangaroo Island to which we are referring. The Crown lands in the hundreds of Gosse, Ritchie and McDonald lie to the immediate east of Flinders Chase. The Playford Highway runs along the spine of the island from east to west and is a watershed, with the rivers running to the north coast to the north of the Playford Highway and to the south coast to the south of the highway. There is a further watershed which divides Flinders Chase at the western end of the island from the Gosse scrub, and there is another minor watershed which divides the South-West River catchment from the catchment of both the North-West and North-East Rivers, which finally join in what is called Stun'sail Boom River, which runs to the ocean.

The area which is our particular concern is for the most part that area immediately to the east of Flinders Chase and immediately south of the Playford Highway, which therefore forms predominantly the catchment of the North-East and North-West Rivers, although a portion of it is also the catchment of the South-West River. That is the area to which we are referring. There is a small area, also in the hundred of Gosse, to the northern side of the Playford Highway, which therefore forms part of the catchment of the Western River. As I read some of these conclusions, either in whole or in part, I hope members will see that that little geography lesson is not irrelevant to the points being made. The first conclusion of the report is as follows:

1.1 Of over-riding importance in any decision-making relating to the future use of the subject land is the potential significance of the salinity problem associated with the clearing of all or a substantial area of the virgin scrub. In view of the predicted intensified salinity problems which established land owners on the south-eastern corner of the area will experience and the option of using the North-West River as a future source of water for the island in the light of worsening salinity status in the Middle River Dam system, clearing of vegetation in the catchment area for the North-West River cannot be supported.

I repeat portion of the last sentence:

... clearing of vegetation in the catchment area for the North-West River cannot be supported.

What is the Gosse scrub? It is the catchment area of the North-West River. I can find no significant tributary of the North-West River which rises outside the Gosse scrub. The report continues:

1.2 While the northern sector of the area, roughly coinciding with sections 41, 42, 43, 44 and 45 hundred of Gosse, is of a topography and vegetation which would pose few problems for land clearing, the soils are infertile sands which would be slow to come to full development. Furthermore, because of the sector's potential contribution to the salinity problem in the North-West River if cleared, it can be concluded that only section 41, hundred of Gosse being outside that catchment area, could be safely cleared.

The area to which the officers are referring is that portion of the hundred of Gosse which is within the Gosse scrub. In fact, section 40 is to the north of the Playford Highway and forms part of the catchment of the Western River. The report continues:

1.3 The dissected plateau constituting the southern sector of the subject area is deeply dissected with many steep slopes which could create erosion hazards if cleared and deep valleys effectively isolating areas of productive land, so that physical access to the better areas becomes a major problem for would-be primary producers. Some soils are shallow and stony, but topography combined with a potential contribution to salinity is the main reason for advising that the bulk of the dissected plateau area be left in its virgin state. The western end of section 43 hundred of Ritchie and section 21, hundred of McDonald are outside the catchment of the North-West River, and therefore much of that area could be safely cleared.

Here, I am in some trouble. I have before me the map which forms part of the end papers of the book *Soldier Settlers—War Service Land Settlement, Kangaroo Island*, by Jean Nunn. I have checked this map alongside the detailed maps of the hundreds which are held in the library, and I can find neither section 43 hundred of Ritchie, nor section 21 hundred of McDonald. Needless to say, it would appear from the reference to their being outside the catchment area that they must form a very small portion indeed of the Crown lands to which I am directing my remarks. To continue, the report states:

The eastern portion of section 44 and the whole of section 45, hundred of Ritchie, are likewise outside the catchment of the North-West River and therefore if cleared would not contribute to salinity in that river. However, topography places severe limitations on any agricultural development of this area.

Here, the Minister begins his schoolmaster act, because he has written in the margin, 'How?'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Minister, for the most part, is temperate in his remarks, although he tends to become more exasperated as the report goes on. Paragraph 1.4 goes on to look at the other aspect of the whole business, the economics of it, and states:

The economics of clearing the area or parts of the area as far as the individual developer is concerned are not encouraging. Estimated returns on capital from land development are low and less than the returns expected from investment in an already developed property.

The Minister says, 'What is considered to be happening now?' The report continues:

The developer would be dependent on capital gains for the investment to realise anywhere near commercial rates of return. The main impediments to the developer are the heavy capital expenditures required with a calculated accumulated deficit before interest and capital repayments on a 1 000 hectare farming unit of \$600 000 as late as eight years after development starts and with the first annual operating surplus not being obtained until year seven.

It goes on to state:

The size of the anticipated cash surplus militates—and the Minister does not like that word, because he has changed it to 'mitigates'—against servicing any substantial loan leaving the developer with a minimum capital input from his own resources of between \$500 000 and \$600 000.

The Minister there departs from the purist line that he had taken in his grammatical corrections by saying, 'Site the cases analysed for the purposes of this exercise'—'cite' being spelt with an 's', and 'analyse' without a 'y', although 'exercise' is correctly spelt. The report continues:

1.5 Any land clearing for farming would have minimal economic benefits to the community.

And the Minister says, 'Expand on this statement.'

The report goes on to argue more closely the case for the conclusions to which it has come, and the House will be pleased to know that I do not intend to go right through

the whole story, as laid down by the report, but there are some other matters in the report to which I think I should refer. It gives a very thorough coverage of the topography and the climate of the area and it says, about four pages on:

Likewise, there are no impediments to development created by topography—

talking about the northern section of the Gosse land—

but any development of this area south of the Playford Highway would materially increase the salinity problem associated with stream flow in the North-West River.

The Minister has changed 'would' to 'could'. I would think that that was a matter of fact, something on which one could draw a conclusion. I am told by experts that any clearing automatically increases salinity in the area. At the bottom of the page, the report states:

Dissected land east and west of the catchment of the North-West River, as delineated on aerial photographs 187 and 189, if cleared would not affect salinity levels in the North-West River. However, topography would impose severe limitations on the clearing of the eastern side of the North-West River catchment.

The report, after a good deal of close argument about the salinity problem, goes on to look at the economics of the matter. But, there is one matter that I should raise, which is another three or four pages on in the report, where it talks about the area already affected by a rise in saline groundwater. It states that salt affected land accounts for about 2 per cent to 5 per cent of the developed plateau of the island. It states:

It can be accepted that a similar proportion of plateau land form of the Crown land sections 41, 42, 43 and 44 will become salt affected after clearing.

It goes on to argue a little further, and the Minister has written here:

Has consideration been given to selective clearing of a given area to avoid clearing of the vulnerable areas, the 2 to 5 per cent?

I think the Minister has misunderstood what his officers are saying at this point. We are talking about saline seeps, gross examples of salinity: that is the 2 per cent to 5 per cent area. It is probably not possible at this stage to predict exactly what proportions of the newly cleared area, if that occurs, would be grossly affected. We know that it would all be affected, and certainly the river systems would be. However, I think what the Minister is trying to conclude from this is that, if perhaps only a small portion is cleared, it would not matter. I do not think that is what his officers are arguing. They argue that they will all be affected, but there is 2 per cent to 5 per cent that will be grossly affected to the point of being characterised by saline seeps. On the next page, the Minister is really starting to do his block, and is saying:

Where are the cited examples of where this theory does not stand up, or can one assume this report is totally negative from cover to cover?

This time 'cited' is spelled correctly. He is certainly getting his dander up by the time he has reached this part of the report. A little further over there are a couple of blank pages, on which there are interesting comments by the Minister, which I think we should share with the House. While I locate those pages, I will go on to the matter of economic feasibility, because this seems to be very important indeed. The report studies the cost of land development in the hundred of Gosse, Kangaroo Island. It states:

For the purpose of the study it was assumed the developer took possession of a 1 000 ha block of undeveloped land devoid of any improvements; 800 hectares of the block were subsequently developed to carry a maximum of 10 DSE's/ha four years after initial development took place.

Then, the economics of such an operation are very clearly spelt out. Without boring members with the tables, I turn to the conclusion No. 7, right near the back of the report

regarding the general economic impact on the community, especially at the local level, where the report states:

It is concluded that it is unlikely that more than two or three new properties could be considered. The number of additional livestock to be carried would be less than the normal seasonal fluctuations in numbers on the island as a whole and the number of sheep turned off of no economic significance. The additional costs in providing infra-structure to so few new properties in a relatively isolated area could result in a nett economic loss rather than a community economic benefit.

The Minister has some comments that suggest that there is a good deal of infrastructure in that area. On the two blank pages of the report the Minister makes these comments:

Farmers sons need land on Kangaroo Island, too. Has the writer considered utilising existing plant?

On the next page he says:

On this basis no South Australian would have ever set out to develop this virgin land of this region—he simply would have bought developed land in Queensland or maybe even Victoria.

There may be some pertinence in what the Minister has to say, because there is no doubt that development of a good deal of marginal land in this State has been quite disastrous, not only in terms of its impact on the environment but also in terms of the material well being of those people who were induced one way or another to take up development of this land.

In fact, what we know is this: if this land is cleared, environmental degradation will occur. As to the return to the people involved, the Minister's experts are fairly clear that it will be very meagre indeed. There is not the economic development to offset against the environmental degradation which will occur. Even if there were, I would be arguing just as strongly for the retention of this sensitive environmental area as scrub and its eventual incorporation in the Flinders Chase National Park. This State does not have so much virgin scrub left that we can afford to be clearing what remains.

A good deal was done in the late 1960s and early 1970s. My colleague, the member for Hartley, as Minister of Lands, was very much involved in the acquisition of a good deal of scrub, but South Australia got into the act very late and much was cleared before Governments could take aggressive action to acquire much of what was left. The Minister of Environment and Planning, who has been almost silent on this matter, managed to get a Dorothy Dixier from one of his own side yesterday about the new scheme, vegetation retention. That is a laudable scheme, which was already being worked on before the Minister and his Government came to office. Indeed, it appears that it has so far been very successful. I am glad about that, but let us remember what is happening here.

When we say that about 20 000 hectares of natural vegetation have now been preserved as a result of that scheme, what are we really saying? How much natural scrub is added to our stock of natural scrub as a result of this scheme? None at all: all it does is maintain the *status quo*. This is the pass in which we find ourselves. We are reduced to the situation in which we can cheer because something like the *status quo* might be retained if enough people take advantage of this scheme that has been put up. That is realistic, but surely we can do better than this. In any event, if the Minister by his inaction or because he lacks clout in Cabinet allows the Minister of Agriculture and other people in Cabinet to have these 14 000 hectares cleared, what is the situation? He has saved 20 000 hectares, but this does not add one hectare of scrub—it simply retains what we have—and then he loses 14 000. I doubt whether he would then be provoking a Dorothy Dixier from his own side in relation to that matter.

There is still a good deal of threat to what remains of our native vegetation. I was told only today that a directive is to be issued in the South East of the State that 10-metre wide firebreaks are to be cleared around every national park and conservation reserve. In some of the smaller reserves that will mean a considerable carnage. In any event, I invite members to do a bit of maths here. Let us remember that, if you clear a one kilometre length of land 10 metres wide, you have cleared a hectare of scrub. It does not take too long before you are eating up a fair few hectares when you make this clearance around each of the conservation reserves in that area.

This is not something being done by people who want to farm that land; it is actually already conservation land. Yet I am told that the Minister's department is giving instructions that these breaks have to be cleared. That will achieve very little. If the wind is strong enough, the flames will jump a 10-metre gap without any trouble at all. There are other means whereby fire control can be instituted and be properly monitored. I may talk about that at some other stage when I have more time available.

If I am not right, if my information is incorrect, let the Minister say so at an appropriate time. I will be the first to give thanks that that is so and that this carnage is not to occur. I have it on good authority that the people in the South-East who work in the department will soon be told that they are to clear these 10-metre fire breaks around the reserves.

I think it is reasonable in raising these questions that I should address myself to the question whether, in asking for the retention of native vegetation and in raising these various environmental issues, we in the Labor Party are backed by public opinion; whether in opposing these actions which we fear and which I am trying to stop by making the remarks I am making today, we have general community backing. There is little doubt that we do have that support.

The other document, the contents of which in part I want to share with members, is the famous report on the Survey of Community Environmental Awareness in South Australia 1980, which was prepared by the Centre for Applied Social and Survey Research, C.A.S.S.R., School of Social Sciences, Flinders University.

Dr Billard: Is that leaked, too?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: This is nothing new. This report has been around the community for months. When I first asked the Minister to release the whole of the report because I thought its contents were of some considerable moment in the ongoing environmental debate in this community, and indeed that its contents would give him some ammunition in dealing with the heavies in his own Cabinet (the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Agriculture and people like them who apparently want to clear all the scrub away), the Minister said it was not appropriate to release the results of the report, because it was purely a preliminary report, a lot more work had to be done on it, and so on.

The report is comprehensive, indeed. Households were interviewed and people asked to fill in the questionnaire as follows: In metropolitan area: the Stirling-Bridgewater local government area; 60 in the City of Brighton area; 60 in Campbelltown; 60 in Thebarton; 60 in Noarlunga; and 60 in Elizabeth. In the country, the following number of households were interviewed: 30 in the district council area of Pinnaroo; 30 in Lameroo; 30 in Loxton; 30 in Berri; 60 in Whyalla; and 60 in Port Lincoln. That makes 600 households in the survey all told, which is a pretty good sample. I will not go into the whole methodology which is spelled out in great detail in the first paper by E. A. Cleland and A. J. Goldsworthy, but it is clear that it was a thoroughly

worked out survey indeed, and the results must bear largely on overall public opinion on these matters in this State.

An honourable member: Has the report been submitted to Cabinet?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am not aware that the report has been put to Cabinet. I believe it is still regarded as being a departmental report. Question 13 of the report asked:

Would you like to see the South Australian Government doing more, the same, or less with regard to the issues listed in table 7 below?

The first issue was: more parks in towns and cities? The answer was as follows: 63 per cent said 'more'; 33 per cent said 'some'; 2 per cent said 'less'; and 2 per cent said 'don't know'. The next issue was: increase the size of national parks and 40 per cent said 'more'; 50 per cent said 'same'; 5 per cent said 'less'; and 5 per cent said 'don't know'. The next issue was: increase the number of national parks, and 54 per cent said 'more'; 38 per cent said 'same'; 4 per cent said 'less'; and 4 per cent said 'don't know'. The next issue was: retain native vegetation, and 71 per cent said 'yes'; 24 per cent said 'same'; 2 per cent said 'less'; and 3 per cent said 'don't know'.

I think the Minister of Agriculture should know the sort of company that he keeps. He keeps company with 2 per cent, apparently, of a representative sample of the South Australian population. Seventy-one per cent say that they would like more native vegetation than we have now; 24 per cent say we should retain the same amount; and 3 per cent say that they do not know. Let us be generous to the Minister and let us add them to the people who say that we should have less native vegetation. That means that 5 per cent of a representative sample of the South Australian people agree with the Minister that we should clear more of these areas, including by implication, the Gosse land.

There are other interesting figures, some of which perhaps I should share with the House, although they do not bear on the specific matter I have been raising this afternoon, which is the clearing of the Crown lands on Kangaroo Island, but they are all environmental issues.

Another issue was: control salt in the River Murray. The result was 84 per cent more; 6 per cent the same; 1 per cent less; 9 per cent don't know. On the issue whether the Government should reduce traffic noise, the result was 65 per cent yes, 30 per cent the same, 2 per cent less, and 3 per cent don't know. Should the Government reduce car fumes? The result was 72 per cent more, 22 per cent the same, 4 per cent less, 2 per cent don't know. Should the Government reduce lead in petrol? The answer was 64 per cent said the Government should be doing more, 16 per cent said about the same, 4 per cent said less and 16 per cent don't know.

Should the Government control off-road vehicles? That is something about which we have heard nothing since this Government came into office. The result was 52 per cent more, 32 per cent the same, 6 per cent less, 10 per cent don't know. Should the Government improve public transport? The result was 73 per cent more, 23 per cent the same, 1 per cent less, 3 per cent don't know. Should the Government stop the sale of non-returnable bottles? I think maybe this had a bearing on the announcement made in this place this afternoon. The result was that 65 per cent said the Government should be doing more, 20 per cent the same, 10 per cent less, and 5 per cent don't know. In fact, the Government has not stopped the sale of non-returnable bottles, which was the request which was made by the environment lobby. All it has done is put a 5 cent deposit on the PET containers.

I would suggest that probably in a sense that is not a bad decision to have arrived at because what it preserves

is the integrity of the legislation. What people were particularly concerned about was not so much the PET bottle *per se* but the integrity of the legislation. The Labor Party introduced legislation which had the effect of putting a deposit on non-returnable soft drink containers. The returnables were already covered in a system which had been in force for a long time but the non-returnables, the cans, had to be treated in some way and so it was done by way of a deposit. There is no doubt that that has been successful and it can be seen as having been successful because elsewhere in this survey that is what people say.

People were asked their response to the following statement which appears on table 9, as follows:

Disposable or throwaway containers (bottles, cans) are a better idea than returnable containers.

Four per cent of the people surveyed strongly agreed with that; 9 per cent agreed; 6 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed; 44 per cent disagreed; 33 per cent strongly disagreed; and 4 per cent did not know. So 77 per cent of people involved in that survey either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the contention that the throwaway containers are a better idea than are returnable containers. Again, I have no doubt that loomed very large in the decision that the Minister made. The Minister was under a good deal of pressure from all sides. He had various options open to him.

I seem to recall that in this House a little while ago I suggested that probably what the Minister would do would be to extend the trial period for another 12 months. I really did not think he would bite the bullet. I was wrong. I am extremely glad that I was wrong, because although I am not too sure that this decision will be met with a great deal of enthusiasm, either from the soft drink manufacturers or the environmentalists, nonetheless it is a better decision and it puts them in a better position than if he had decided to extend the trial period for another 12 months. That would have pleased nobody at all. As it is, we are left in a situation where the legislation has been retained intact.

For all the criticism I have of this Government in the environmental field, I have to say this: despite the hints given by some of its harder headed people before the election that dreadful things would happen to the legislation, that has not occurred, and I am glad that has not occurred and I put on record my appreciation of the fact that the legislation has remained intact, and long may it be retained in that position. The Minister was prepared to dismiss this as a preliminary survey, one we were not allowed to see despite the great amount of public money that went into a survey of this scope, magnitude and sophistication.

Just to complete this matter, people were asked whether they thought the Government should be doing more, the same, or less about the following matters: stop the killing of kangaroos: 44 per cent said more, 37 per cent the same, 13 per cent less and 6 per cent don't know; protect native birds and animals: 79 per cent said more, 19 per cent the same, 1 per cent less, and 1 per cent don't know; protect historic and aesthetic buildings: 64 per cent said more, 30 per cent said the same, 3 per cent said less, and 3 per cent don't know; protect Aboriginal relics and sacred sites: 57 per cent said more, 28 per cent the same, 11 per cent less, and 4 per cent don't know; and control industrial effluent: 83 per cent said more, 10 per cent said the same, 1 per cent less, and 6 per cent don't know.

On all of those issues, the only one in which there was less than a 50 per cent majority for the Government doing more was in relation to stopping the killing of kangaroos, and 37 per cent of people said about the same should occur. As to the matter of those people who said that less should be done, representing less of an environmental commitment, the highest was the 13 per cent who said less should be

done by the Government to stop the killing of kangaroos. There were also 10 per cent of people who said that less should be done about stopping the sale of non-returnable bottles.

There is no doubt that this survey must have been something of a bombshell for at least some of the members of this Government. I hope that the Minister of Environment and Planning sees it as a Godsend. I hope he sees it as a weapon with which he will be able to beat his fellows in Cabinet whenever discussions on these issues arise. I hope he will be prepared to use it in that form, because there is little doubt that that is what it represents.

I referred a little while ago to question 17 in the survey and one aspect of that question: disposable or throwaway containers are a better idea than returnable containers. Another interesting issue was as follows:

The beverage container legislation has been effective in reducing litter.

The response to that was that 16 per cent said that they strongly agreed, 56 per cent said they agreed, 8 per cent said they neither agreed nor disagreed, 10 per cent disagreed, 3 per cent strongly disagreed, and 7 per cent did not know. Only 13 per cent of those polled in this survey were prepared to disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that the beverage container legislation had been effective in reducing litter. No doubt, that also loomed large in the thinking of the Minister.

There are one or two problems for the Minister in the survey. Another issue that was rather interesting was as follows:

The South Australian Government's Department for the Environment is doing a good job as far as the State's environment is concerned.

Three per cent of people strongly agreed with that question, 38 per cent agreed, 24 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed, 12 per cent disagreed, 3 per cent strongly disagreed, and 20 per cent did not know. It seems to me that there may be a bit of an image problem that the department needs to pick up. The departmental officers I have met seem to be excellent people who seem to be highly dedicated to their task, but it must concern us all that, if we add to the 'neither agree nor disagree' the 'don't knows', there are 34 per cent of the people in the survey who were really not prepared to commit themselves either way, and another 15 per cent either agreed or strongly disagreed with the statement.

Of course, from time to time people confuse in their own minds the record of a Government and the record of a Government department. As every schoolboy and schoolgirl knows, that is not the same thing. It may well be that the somewhat shaky record that is perceived by some people in relation to the environmental record of this Government has washed over on to the department, and quite unfairly, may I say. That is something, certainly, that the Minister needs to look at.

Along with that problem goes the response to the issue: the public should be educated more about aspects of the environment. I have no doubt that that is seen as being in part a departmental function. Twenty-six per cent of people strongly agreed and 62 per cent agreed, so 88 per cent of people agree that the public needs more education about aspects of the environment. Only 5 per cent sat on the fence, 4 per cent disagreed, no person strongly disagreed, and 3 per cent did not know.

There are other matters which I think I should perhaps canvass while I have this survey in front of me. Another issue was: further subdivision and housing should not be allowed in the Adelaide hills face zone. Nineteen per cent of people strongly agreed, 38 per cent agreed, 13 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed, 13 per cent disagreed, 2 per

cent strongly disagreed, and 15 per cent did not know. I think we can draw two inferences from that: first, 57 per cent of people agreed or strongly agreed that further subdivision should not be allowed on the hills face zone. A further 28 per cent either sat on the fence or simply did not know.

Dr Billard: That was a double question.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Yes, 'subdivision' and 'housing', I agree, but I think the response indicates the complex nature of many planning questions and the way in which they are perceived by the general public. People are prepared to commit themselves more strongly on issues concerning the natural environment than they are on issues concerning the human environment, because the human environment is a so much more complex problem, or is perceived as so being by people at large.

It is interesting to look at the statement that the environment was a fad which had had its day; 2 per cent strongly agreed with that, 5 per cent agreed, 6 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed, 49 per cent disagreed, 26 per cent strongly disagreed, and 12 per cent did not know. Only 7 per cent of the survey agreed or strongly agreed that the environment was a fad which has had its day.

With regard to the question of whether mining should not go ahead if it would severely damage the environment (something that would be of concern to the Deputy Premier, who is sadly away today—on his sick bed, no doubt; our best wishes go to him), 24 per cent strongly agreed that mining should not go ahead if it would severely damage the environment, 46 per cent agreed, and so 70 per cent of the survey agreed or strongly agreed with that contention, 11 per cent sat on the fence, 10 per cent disagreed, 4 per cent strongly disagreed and 5 per cent did not know. That is a very high percentage of people committed to environmental protection in that area, especially in view of the propaganda and the statements that we have had about mining resource development in recent years, particularly from spokesmen for the present Government.

This is a survey which certainly should have been made available to the general public when its existence was identified. Indeed, people should not have had to ferret out the existence of such a survey. It should have been freely available to the people of this State so that they could get some idea of the basis upon which decisions were made and upon which they continue to be made by the Government. I am delighted that the survey has been carried out. I am delighted that it is now generally available. All I ask is that the Minister use the survey as strongly as he possibly can in the interests that he should be pushing within Cabinet. If he does that, and if the Government, around the Cabinet table during what seem to be the interminable sessions that it has, is prepared to listen to reason, then it would seem to me that many of the people concerned about matters relating to the future of the environment in this State will be somewhat reassured. We will wait and see.

Of course, it would be of some use if the Government left the running of environmental matters largely to the Minister. The Minister is in a position to get good advice from his department on many of these things. Often where these environmental matters have arisen it has been because somebody else has hopped into the act, somebody else has jumped in and said something that he should not have said, and too often the Minister has been silent publicly. Of course, we do not know what happens behind Cabinet walls, but it is to be hoped that the Minister has ticked off such persons severely. We just do not know. We are not aware of that.

Some time ago in this House (and it appears that I do not have this reference with me, but I will produce it at some other time) the Premier, in defending the record of

the Government in the national parks area, said that his Government's attitude to the acquisition of land for conservation purposes was that such land should be held in trust with its former owners. He used words to that effect. I do not have the *Hansard* pull with me here, but I committed that statement to memory. It has concerned many people in the conservation movement. Nobody really knows what that statement means. Some people have speculated on the possibility that the Premier is talking about the U.K. system of landholding for conservation purposes—one which it would appear is not at all relevant to the South Australian scene. However, we just do not know.

I think it is important that the Minister spell out just what that statement meant, if indeed it meant anything. Maybe the Premier got his words mixed up and did not bother to reread his statements afterwards; it has gone into *Hansard* and it is nonsense, not meaning anything at all. The Government at this stage has not moved to institute such a policy—whatever such a policy could possibly mean. There it is, it leaves people up in the air. It reminds me very much of the famous statement made in February 1980, when, having been pressured by journalists about where the Government was going to save money, the Premier said that there was a good deal of waste in the education and hospitals area which would have to be brought into line.

That gave everyone the heebie-jeebies; people were running around, thinking that the knife was going to go in very quickly indeed. When asked to spell out in greater detail what he meant, the Premier was not prepared to do so. That was one of the things which led to the falling from grace of this Government in the eyes of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. It frightened the wits out of everyone; when there was an opportunity to offer reassurance, it was not forthcoming. If the Premier was not prepared to spell out the exact meaning of such a comment, he should not have said it. He should not have made the general statement.

I think the same position applies in relation to the matter I have raised. The whole question of the form of tenure of our national parks system is a very important one indeed. I see the Heritage Act as a useful ancillary to the acquisition of national parks. That is all I see; I do not see it as the cornerstone of public policy. The cornerstone of public policy must be the acquisition of those representative samples of habitat which remain to public ownership in such a way that they cannot be lost.

Of course, I regret that when my Party was in Government it did not add the Gosse Crown lands to the Flinders Chase National Park. There seemed no great hurry to do so. As a Government, we were not in any way committed to the clearing of that land. We saw no reason why anyone in the future should raise the possibility of such land being cleared. It was seen as something that could be safely left for some time. There is a great deal of native vegetation in this State not represented in the national parks and conservation reserve system. A good deal of it is under public ownership in Crown land or in some other form, such as forest reserves, and a good deal of it is left on private property. Those are the areas that the Minister of Environment and Planning hopes to be able to preserve through this voluntary system that he has begun.

It has had a promising start. That is great, but do not let the Minister fool himself into thinking that such a scheme is some sort of substitute for a proper national parks system and a proper continuation of the acquisition of representative habitat where it seems appropriate that that should happen. Where the habitat is already in Government hands, where it is already public property, the concept that such land should be sold off to private development, that it should be cleared for public profits, seems to me to be almost obscene.

I hope that this whole thing will have a happy ending, and that what I have said today will be a chapter in a successful conclusion, which will be a firm statement from the Minister that the Gosse scrub will not be cleared, and that in time it will be added to the Flinders Chase National Park.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I have been informed that I do not have much time to speak this afternoon, so members will have to bide their time and wait for the pearls of wisdom that I will give on Tuesday week.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Does the honourable member intend to speak?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, I am speaking.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Does the honourable member intend to speak now?

Mr HEMMINGS: I want to get into the swing of things. Over the past three months, I had the pleasure of undertaking a study tour. I was disappointed that, halfway through that study tour when I arrived in the United Kingdom, I found that, within the Australian community in London, there was a degree of frustration about what was going on in this State and in Australia as a whole. I found out that the 'razor gang' had recommended that the Government sell off all airports, that 250 staff members from Australia House were to be retrenched, and this was at a time of increasing interest by the United Kingdom business community in becoming involved in Australia.

When I visited Australia House I was disappointed to see the staff wandering around aimlessly, not knowing what would happen to them. The same thing was happening in South Australia House. The news was not good. There were reports of teacher unrest, mass meetings in Victoria Square of 7 000 teachers and ancillary staff, unrest within the Public Service, and a complete disenchantment with the Tonkin Government. On Tuesday week I will enlarge on this subject, but in the meantime I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I intend to devote my time to an item of importance to my district, but before doing so I feel obliged to refer, at least briefly, to the very important problem that is facing this country at present. I refer not to the Tonkin Government, which is a fairly important problem, but to the present industrial confrontation. We must pay attention to the policy of the Federal Government, and the Fraser regime in particular, in regard to unions and the confrontation with which we are faced. During some five years, the Fraser regime in the main has pursued a very strong line of wage restraint. It has continually and purposely put to the working-class people of this nation that those people should accept wage restraint.

By implementing that extreme policy, the Fraser regime has done two other things to strengthen the policy of wage restraint: it has invariably called upon the question of union confrontation and by doing that it has endeavoured to manipulate or control a union that is protecting and looking after the interests of its members.

The second effect regarding wage restraint is that during five years the Fraser regime has continually interfered with the major machinery for settling industrial disputes. I say quite seriously that, when there has been a dispute of any

magnitude in this country, we have seen a continuous and very purposeful interference by the Fraser regime in the machinery of the arbitration system. That regime has tried to molest and hamper the arbitration system and today, when we have a major confrontation on our hands, it is still hell bent on pursuing that policy.

Mr Ashenden: Of course, it is not the unions' fault, is it!

Mr MAX BROWN: That is the usual kind of interjection made by the member for Todd. All I can say is that, to my knowledge, no trade union movement accepts the line of confrontation to which the member for Todd has been trying to allude. It is just ludicrous for him to say that: in fact, it is not only ludicrous but it quite glaringly shows that people such as the member for Todd do not understand the industrial relationship. Not only does the honourable member not understand it but also he does not want to understand it. I do not understand farming, so I would not comment on it. I do not tell the farmers what to do, because I do not understand farming, and I do not apologise for that. I am not a farmer. For goodness sake, the honourable member should not interfere with something he does not understand. It is as simple as that. He is playing with fire.

In addition to pursuing its wage restraint policy, the Federal Government has also pursued an opposite policy in regard to prices. I believe it is quite correct to say that the Federal Government has allowed particularly big business an open right to increase prices. If one considers prices (and let me say that increased prices interfere with everyone's pocket), one will see that B.H.P. recently increased the price of its steel. The increase does not stop there, because it must be passed on to the motor car industry, the white metal industry and the housing industry. The increase in prices is passed on, and I accept that, but I do not accept such an exorbitant increase.

Mr Ashenden: How do you know it is exorbitant?

Mr MAX BROWN: Have a look at the balance sheet of B.H.P. What a stupid question. Let me continue a little further: let us consider an everyday commodity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whyalla has the call.

Mr MAX BROWN: Of course he has, Sir. Let us consider an everyday commodity in which I know the member for Mallee is interested—a glass of beer. Six times in the past 15 or 16 months the price of beer has increased. How on earth could the member for Mallee or any other member opposite convince the workers in the brewery that their wage structure has gone up six times in the past 15 months?

Mr Lewis: What is the percentage increase?

Mr MAX BROWN: I am not a mathematical genius. I have not worked it out, but it has gone up six times at least in 15 months. I refer to the increase in the price of Coca Cola products, that firm having a monopoly in all States. We have seen increases in the prices of bread, as well as pies and pasties and all the every-day commodities that the working class housewife has to deal with.

Not only has the Federal Government pursued that sort of policy but, more importantly for the poor old housewife or the future housewife, it has pursued a policy of high interest rates, a matter which is causing some strife. This has been done because the banks have approached the Commonwealth Government, since they are being squeezed out (although I find it difficult to understand that reasoning) by credit unions and building societies. If we look at television, as the member for Mallee does quite often, we see an advertisement telling the ordinary person to invest his money at 10¼ per cent or 11¼ per cent. That looks good, but the other side of the penny is that when we go

to a building society for a loan we are borrowing at about 20 per cent or more.

Mr Lewis: Go to the Savings Bank.

Mr MAX BROWN: That is the point. Now that the Federal Government has allowed the banks to get into this situation, that is what is happening.

Mr Lewis: If you want more you have to pay more.

Mr MAX BROWN: That is a brilliant philosophy. How does a person pay more when the Liberal Government is continually putting wage restraints on the workers. Where does he get the money? Does he have a magic wand? It is ludicrous for the member for Mallee, or any other member opposite—

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to use the short time I have available to me this afternoon to speak on behalf of a section of our community, both the young and the old, and particularly the younger generation, who are living in the hope that South Australia can be provided with an entertainment centre with indoor seating capacity of at least 10 000 people in which we can stage rock concerts.

We are moving into an age when young people will have more and more leisure time on their hands, and the question arises as to where they will spend that time. Not everyone likes rock concerts; on the other hand, not everyone likes symphony concerts or ballet, either, and yet the Government has built the Festival Theatre and subsidises it to cater for the latter body in the community.

I know that there is an argument that the Festival Theatre could be used for rock concerts, but I will point out shortly how impractical this venue is for that use. The problem we have to face is the provision of an indoor venue which can provide sufficient seating capacity, which can cut down the noise and shield it from those who look upon rock concerts as noise pollution, and which at the same time is acoustically suitable for the electronics of the modern rock concert.

I sympathise with people who are forced to listen to music they may not like. They have a right not to be subjected to this type of music. On the other hand, rock fans also have rights—a right to see and hear the rock bands of their choice.

Mr McRae: What do you think of the Hindley Street site?

Mr OSWALD: I will come to that. Tens of thousands of young people are worried at the prospect of rock concerts being cancelled because of noise pollution, and they are worried because the big name bands will start to by-pass Adelaide. There is no doubt that rock and roll concerts produce noise pollution. Decibel counts taken last February by the Department for the Environment at Memorial Drive during the AC/DC and the Police concerts registered levels far beyond those permitted in industry. A few metres from the stage, the noise level was just below that of a fully loaded 727 taking off from Adelaide Airport.

The Premier brought up the matter in Parliament early in March, and Lord Mayor, Mr Bowen, brought it up, when the possibility of banning outdoor concerts was first raised. It all comes back to the fact that Adelaide lacks a suitable large indoor venue in which rock fans can attend concerts. Unlike the situation in most capitals, when promoters come to Adelaide they have to put their superstar attraction outside. It just is not feasible to put Bob Dylan in for 12 nights at the Festival Theatre so that the 25 000 fans needed for the tour profit can see him.

Apart from the project being too costly, AC/DC, Elton John, and Rod Stewart have limited touring time, and

several nights in a city the size of Adelaide is not on. The vast majority of young people wishing to attend rock concerts are as well behaved as are those who have attended other types of concerts and pictures in days gone by. We are inclined to look upon the younger generation as perhaps having different expectations from those of our day. We are now moving towards the end of the twentieth century and, with the advent of electronics, the demands of the young people have changed.

Members interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: I would question the interjections from members opposite, and ask them perhaps to dwell for a while on the expectations of our young people. They will find, for all their mirth, that young people are not catered for in the area of rock concerts. There is a very strong demand amongst their constituents for the provision of this type of entertainment. Our growing younger generation want and need an indoor auditorium capable of staging world standard performances. It is appalling that members opposite should be collapsing in mirth at my suggesting that we should provide a rock stadium of some sort in Adelaide so that young people can benefit by that form of entertainment, rather than see it by-pass Adelaide, with the large bands now concentrating interstate. We have missed out in Adelaide on industries and on many aspects through the mirth of the Opposition.

In closing my remarks, I would like to quote from some letters to the *Advertiser* last March, as I believe they sum up the thoughts of a large section of our young people. One letter to the Editor states:

Over the past week, there has been considerable controversy involving the noise level at rock concerts. Violence and unruly behaviour were also said to be causing concern at these concerts.

On Tuesday night, I attended the Police concert along with 9 000 other fans. Several people were removed by security guards, but the vast majority were well behaved and there to enjoy the music and to have a good time.

Mr O'Neill: 'Yours sincerely, Jim Bowen, Lord Mayor.'

Mr OSWALD: I interrupt this speech to once again call attention to the mirth of members opposite, who obviously do not care about trying to provide a facility for young people of South Australia so that they can attend their rock concerts. The letter continues:

The noise level would be reduced considerably if concerts of this nature were held at an indoor venue. This is where promoters face their biggest problem. The Festival Theatre cannot accommodate the numbers commanded by most performers and Apollo Stadium is certainly not chosen by the promoters for its acoustics. The only other alternatives are places such as Memorial Drive, Adelaide Oval and Football Park.

If Mr Bowen and Mr Tonkin are so worried about the noise level, they will find a way to finance a much needed indoor concert venue. It may not stop the violence, but it will at least give performers the incentive to come to Adelaide and play at a decent venue for a change, instead of missing us entirely.

I know that members opposite have no interest in this subject, but it has been raised because I have been approached by countless young people, teenagers and those in their early 20's, who did not grow up in the era in which we grew up. The electronic rock concert is their form of entertainment.

I am appalled at members opposite if their interest is such that they cannot even contain their mirth and support the call for facilities of that type. Perth and the Eastern States have them, and South Australia should have them. I would have thought that they would listen and support my call for an indoor rock concert venue in South Australia. We have plenty of areas for that. There is no problem in finding the real estate. It is important to recognise that we must have this type of facility and then we will find somewhere to put it.

We cannot even get agreement from members opposite that we need this type of facility. I would like those mem-

bers to stand up in their electorates and tell young people that they do not need the facility for rock concerts in South Australia. They would be howled down and told they were wrong. Talk to your teenage children and ask them whether they need a rock concert facility. They will say, 'Yes, we do need such a facility.' I trust that the Government and people take this subject on board, realising that young people in South Australia need such a facility in which to stage world standard rock concerts.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I consider it somewhat coincidental that I should have the opportunity to follow the previous speaker, in view of what he said about rock concert venues. I have expressed a considerable amount of concern on that topic on previous occasions. That concern was not related to whether or not such a venue should be provided, because I believe that it should be. As the honourable member said, if one asks one's teenage children, they will say that there is a need for such a venue to be provided. My 16-year-old daughter has commented on that matter more than once. However, I am concerned about where this venue should be. I am sure that all constituents of Plympton Park and Morphettville in my electorate would not be at all pleased to think of its being located at the Morphettville Racecourse. I hope that that does not happen. I am sure that the member for Albert Park could express the opinion of his constituents that they would not like the location to be Football Park. However, I would like to hear the member for Morphett's opinion on where that venue should be. However, that is not the topic on which I intend to make a brief contribution now.

I would first like to make some brief remarks with respect to the slight alteration in procedures in this place, something to which the Speaker alluded earlier in the day. Finally, we have been able to break with tradition and accept a little reality along with our constitutional fiction. I refer to the way in which questions can now be addressed to Ministers, using the title of the portfolio with which the question was connected. One example today was when the Minister of Health received a question in her capacity as Minister of Tourism. The same process has been adopted on the Notice Paper with respect to Questions on Notice. We now also have, for example, a question from Mr Millhouse to the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General. We now specify the Minister who will end up answering the question, rather than the person to whom it is directed. In the past, that looked quite odd, seeing a particular Minister being asked a question that had nothing whatsoever to do with his portfolio. I am pleased that my suggestion in that regard has been taken up.

I made another suggestion a few months ago about putting a line across the page under the questions to indicate when the most recent batch of questions had been added, so that the day's questions were separated from those of previous days. I suggest also that the actual date the question first appeared on the Notice Paper be placed alongside the question so that it is evident how long that question has been on the Notice Paper and which Ministers are very slow in responding. That could be very embarrassing to some Ministers, particularly the Minister of Education.

The matter I now wish to raise relates to how easily accidents in school can leave students maimed and crippled. This problem came to my attention when a constituent came to me concerning her son, who received permanent injury about 18 months ago after slipping off a stool in a high school laboratory. It seems that the boy was leaning forward on the stool, a not uncommon practice (although as a teacher I tried to discourage it because of the dangers involved). The teacher was not directly supervising him in

one sense, because he was facing the blackboard, as a teacher frequently has to do, and another student kicked the stool out from underneath this student, causing damage to the base of the boy's spine.

The particular student has missed several month's schooling since then; he is unable to stand, sit, or lie down for more than a few minutes at a time. His hopes for employment on a farm have been dashed. Up until now this boy, who was 14 at the time of the accident, used to spend a month on his grandfather's farm every year gathering hay. He is no longer able to do that. He also wanted to go into the armed services, but that is now out of the question.

In the year when the accident took place, he missed all of the last three months of the school year. He returned to school at the beginning of last year but, of course, was unable to participate in sport. He often had to return home at lunch time. He had to be driven to school, because he could no longer ride a bicycle. This year, he has lost all of terms one and two. He is almost certain to have to repeat year 11. He has spent most of this year at home in bed or in a brace as a result of the damage to the two bottom discs of his spine.

The parents sought some sort of compensation from the Education Department. I made representations on their behalf, and I will read shortly from the correspondence involved. The Minister of Education, in a reply I received this morning, declined to accept any responsibility. I will allude to the matter of responsibility shortly. Parents have to be fully aware that the Education Department will decline any responsibility for accidents which occur to their children at school. It is possible to take out student insurance for one's child, but it is unlikely that such insurance would cover the sorts of sums needed to provide compensation for a ruined career.

Mr McRae: It's pretty expensive too.

Mr TRAINER: Yes. I think in this case it is about \$15 a year for 24-hour coverage to a maximum of about \$500, which would barely scratch the surface of the cost involved for the parents in this case.

As individuals, we have to be more aware of the terrible injuries that can result from actions such as pulling a chair out from underneath someone. This is part of comic folklore. The scene of someone being pulled off a chair may seem funny. The situation of someone having a chair pulled out from him and hitting the floor is often portrayed in cartoons and comedy films, but in real life the results can easily be tragic.

It is obvious that teachers have to make a special point of stressing to students the importance of being careful with chairs. Students need to be warned of the risk in tilting their chairs and strongly warned of the tragic consequences that could follow from forcing a seat out from under someone else.

Similar dangers exist in playgrounds. An article in the *Advertiser* on 18 June pointed out that about 30 000 Australian children were injured in playground accidents each year. The article stated:

Dr Murray Clarke, of the child Accident Prevention Foundation, said 1 per cent of all children between the age of two and 12 were being treated in hospitals for fractures and lacerations from playground accidents. He said doctors often were appalled by the types of injuries. They all recall very serious injuries to face, arms and legs from swings and monkey bars,' he said.

The main types of fractures were to elbows, forearms and wrists and some had resulted in permanent disability. Dr Clarke said such accidents were often caused when a child fell from play equipment on to surfaces which had been made hard and compacted with underlying stones and even cans and broken glass.

Earlier this afternoon the member for Florey commented on a playground where a hazard such as that exists.

An honourable member: A terrible state of affairs.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed. The article continued:

Nerve damage was frequent. Facial injuries were mainly caused by swing seats striking a child. 'Noses, the facial bones and the jaws are all frequently fractured in swing-seat accidents,' he said.

Concussion resulted from 80 per cent of the head injuries. Dr Clarke said children had been treated for spinal injuries resulting from incorrectly used see-saws. The accidents highlighted the need for guidance and instruction by supervisors, particularly in schools and by parents in public playgrounds.

I have insufficient time left to refer to the correspondence to which I alluded earlier, but in the next few weeks I hope I will have the opportunity to draw these problems to the attention of the House. I would particularly like to draw the attention of members to an article in the *Australian* on 19 July last year regarding an accident which was even more serious than the one I have described and which took place in Queensland, where a child fell from monkey bars, scratched his arm and an infection developed. The arm and right shoulder had to be removed. There was no way the parents could receive any compensation at all for the injuries.

Motion carried.

At 5.12 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 4 August at 2 p.m.