

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 August 1981

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

PETITION: EMPLOYMENT

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to implement policies that will increase the number of citizens in employment in South Australia was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SEX EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

The **Hon. H. ALLISON (Minister of Education)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: Members will be aware that the honourable member for Brighton last evening drew the attention of the House to material dealing with sex education matters available in some schools. Some members complained that the language used by the honourable member to illustrate his concern should not have been used in Parliament. I remind members that this material was allegedly available to schoolchildren, and I would ask how much more offensive it would be to them and their parents. I sought an immediate report on the general allegations made by the honourable member and I now wish to respond.

First, I thank the honourable member for drawing these matters to the attention of the House. I also acknowledge and endorse his statement that most schools and teachers do act in a totally responsible manner. I would like to explain very briefly to the House the content and intent of the officially approved Education Department health education course. This course has been developed over the past nine years and has involved extensive co-operation between parent groups, health agencies and the Education Department. Currently the departmental health education course is used in 73 high schools and 400 primary schools. At the secondary level there is a section of the course entitled 'Sex and Family Life'; that is one of 10 sections within the course.

I should point out that none of the books from which the honourable member quoted yesterday are in any way suggested as text or student reference books for the health education course. In fact, suggested reference books in the departmental course have been chosen with extreme care and subjected to the closest scrutiny.

Throughout the past nine years, members of the health education team have worked very closely with schools and parent groups (particularly school councils) to ensure that the total school community is aware of the content and orientation of the health education course before that course is introduced into a school.

An honourable member: I think you will be giving Peter Rabbit next.

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: Not quite. Members will be aware that schools receive materials—both solicited and unsolicited—from a variety of sources other than the Education Department. The member for Brighton mentioned one such group in his speech, namely, the Womens Studies Resource Centre. This particular centre was established during the 1970s to meet some of the expressed and perceived needs of various groups of women in our community.

This centre is not officially involved in the Education Department health education project. Material of the kind quoted by the honourable member is held by that centre and is available for community use, but is not part of the resources recommended for use in schools. Undoubtedly some of this material—whether from the Womens Studies Resource Centre or from other sources—does find its way into schools.

Members interjecting:

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: Where schools have been identified as using the offensive material, I shall instruct the Director-General to advise the principals and chairpersons of the schools concerned of that fact. We do not consider it appropriate that such material should continue to be used. I cannot condone the use of the material which is so far removed from the clinical and biological as to verge on the pornographic. This material is exempt from censorship in the name of education. It deserves closer scrutiny. Meanwhile, schools are given clear guidance in the Education Department's instructions and guidelines, which deal with contentious issues in schools.

The policy statement *Into the 80s* and Education Department legislation and regulations all clearly reflect the department's commitment to consult with and involve parents in school programmes. There is a general acceptance of the health education course in South Australian schools. That acceptance extends across Australia, where other education systems are using the course. At the same time, there is provision for individual students to opt out of the course should their parents wish. The member for Brighton referred to specific incidents. I will examine these and report back to Parliament.

Mr Trainer: The whole profession—

The **SPEAKER**: Order!

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: I thank him for drawing this matter to the attention of the House and reaffirm the department's commitment to ensure that the programmes in schools are operating in the students' best interests. Meanwhile, I suggest that all school principals and councils take steps to see whether sex education material of an offensive nature is being used in their schools, and to exercise professional and parental discretion as to whether such material should continue to be used. It is very much a matter for parents themselves and for school staffs to ensure that material which they find offensive is not introduced into classrooms to the detriment of their children.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I seek leave to make a brief personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OSWALD: Last evening I gave a personal explanation in relation to an interjection that I made during the speech of the member for Gilles. So that charges of partiality cannot be directed towards the *Hansard* staff, I would like to clarify one small point in that explanation. In my response I referred to my interjection as saying that I made the interjection during the ringing of the bells. In fact, that interjection was made immediately before the ringing of the bells, and the ringing of the bells then prevented any further business in the House. The text of my explanation remains unchanged.

QUESTION TIME

BUDGET ALLOCATION

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier state how does the Government reconcile its support for the International Year

of the Disabled Person with the fact that hardly any of the 1980-81 allocation of \$43 000 for the Government's handicapped persons training scheme is spent? Were the funds allocated to that scheme syphoned off by the Government to help prop up the State Budget for the last financial year?

On 6 January, the Attorney-General launched the Year of the Disabled Person from a wheelchair and announced a series of Government initiatives in this matter. The objective of this scheme was to provide vocational training for disabled people in selected job environments to better fit the participants for employment. Top level Government documents reveal that nothing has happened. Minutes from the Attorney-General to the Premier and from the Chairman of the Public Service Board (Mr Mercer) to the Under Treasurer (Mr Barnes) disclose that the scheme envisaged two intakes of disabled trainees, the first of eight to span 1981, and the second of four to commence on 1 April 1981. It is estimated that \$43 000 would be required in 1980-81 for the initial phase of the first intake, and approval was given by the Acting Premier on 1 April. The documents indicate that possibly only one-fifth of the allocation was spent on purposes unspecified. I am informed that to date no person has commenced training under the scheme. The documents further state that the schemes should not be perceived as mere tokenism and should continue beyond the end of 1981. However, there is no indication that this has been approved. I have been informed that disabled people in South Australia feel let down by the Government, as the scheme has not commenced, although two-thirds of the international year is now over.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader of the Opposition will have to contain himself in patience until the Budget comes in. He is in error in a number of the things he said. We have no difficulty in reconciling our attitude and, no, we have not channelled off the funds.

GROWERS MARKET

Mr RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Agriculture say what progress has been made in the establishment of a growers market in relation to the area of Virginia, Salisbury, on the Adelaide Plains? It is an accepted and wellknown fact that the Adelaide Plains area is unique in Australia, and a very prolific producer of vegetables and market garden produce. I understand that there have been difficulties in recent months in being able to dispose of some high quality produce that is grown in the area. Efforts have been made on behalf of the growers for the establishment of a growers market. Will the Minister say what progress has been made to overcome the difficulties in the establishment of such a market?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: It is true that the growers on the plains north of Adelaide have had some difficulty, first, in securing a site and then in securing locally agreement to establish a growers market in the region. In relation to the site, I have had the greatest support from my colleague, the Minister of Transport, in recent weeks, in that he has agreed to make land available on the corner of York Terrace and Guerin Street, Salisbury, for such a growers market to be established on a trial basis. He has made the appropriate amount of State Transport Authority land available to the community for a period of 12 months for the project to be tried. The growers have formed themselves into the United Gardeners Organisation and have lodged a consent use application with the Salisbury council. I understand that the application will be considered by the full council on 17 August. Assuming that the council votes in favour of the proposal, some practical difficulties will have

to be solved to satisfactorily establish the market on that site. The acquisition at a reasonable price of some 400 tonnes of quarry rubble to bring the surface of the area to an acceptable standard is the first of the problems faced by the organisation. At present, the group has no great financial backing, and it is hoped that low-price fill can be obtained. The installation of a temporary sewer line for connection to the appropriate toilet facilities under conditions mutually acceptable to the growers and the State Transport Authority is yet another condition.

The possible assignment to the growers of an additional 20 metres of land beyond the line of the demarcation previously agreed to by the State Transport Authority combines to be about the sum total of their mechanical and establishment problems at this stage. I believe that those items are to be aired between the appropriate Government officers, grower representatives and staff of Salisbury council leading up to the full council meeting on 17 August. Once those difficulties are resolved and the council's decision is known, a further report will be furnished to this House.

It is important, now that this subject has been raised by the local member, that we should demonstrate that it is desirable for these growers to have access to a site in order to try their venture. It is desirable that they be given every co-operation at the local level. On that note, I hope that the council does agree, finally, to support the group in its efforts to market its own products. In mentioning their own products, I think it is of paramount importance that everyone recognises that the purpose of this grower market is precisely for that to occur: that they sell their own products and do not become backyard or roadside dealers and retailers of someone else's fruit and vegetables. The group has given the clear undertaking that that is the course it proposes to take. It is on that precise basis that they have the support of my department.

The SPEAKER: I advise honourable members that any questions to the Minister of Industrial Affairs or to the Minister of Transport will be taken this afternoon by the Deputy Premier.

S.G.I.C.

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say whether the State Government Insurance Commission was informed when the special committee to examine the future functions and activities of S.G.I.C. was appointed by the Government in 1979-80, who were the members of the committee, and has it made recommendations to the Government? Did the Premier mislead the House on 13 August last year when he said that the review of the future operation of S.G.I.C. was part of a total review of the no-fault accident insurance scheme?

Last Thursday, the *Nationwide* television programme leaked a Cabinet submission dated April 1980 from the Minister of Transport. In the submission, the Minister referred to the special committee that had already been established to examine the future functions and activities of S.G.I.C. The Cabinet submission led to the establishment of an inquiry into no-fault insurance. It seems clear, then, that the inquiry into the future of S.G.I.C. was well under way before the inquiry into no-fault insurance, contrary to the Premier's reply of 13 August.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Once again the Opposition has demonstrated quite clearly what a dangerous thing it is to take too many assumptions from documents about which they know very little and without the background of those documents.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Just give me a satisfactory answer.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am giving a very satisfactory answer and, if the Deputy Leader is not satisfied to the extent that he must interject, I suggest that he be quiet and listen to the facts.

An honourable member: Not too happy today?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I find it very difficult to suffer the fools in the Opposition.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: We are getting under your skin, aren't we.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think that it would take a great deal more than the efforts of the Opposition to get under my skin. The Deputy Leader, like his Leader, is also quite wrong and inaccurate in what he has said. No special committee has been set up to examine the functions of the S.G.I.C. The Deputy Leader is quite wrong in making that assumption and giving it the support of his question in this House. The only committee that has been set up is that to look at the third party insurance scheme. That committee has not looked at the general operation of S.G.I.C., nor is it going to do so. Really, the Deputy Leader has been talking an awful lot of rubbish.

PRAWN FISHERIES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister say when it is expected that a decision will be announced on the future management of the Investigator Strait prawn fishery? If the decision has been made, will there be any effect on the management of other prawn fisheries in South Australia? Many months ago, negotiations were commenced between the Commonwealth Government and the South Australian Government concerning the long-term management of the Investigator Strait prawn fishery. The fishing industry is most concerned that a decision has not been announced. During my initial inquiries, I was told that the problem rested with the Federal Government. Subsequently, I contacted the Federal Minister (Hon. Peter Nixon) and was informed that this was not the case and that, in fact, the Federal Minister was still awaiting a decision by the South Australian Cabinet. I further understand that there is some concern concerning the validity or otherwise of permits, as distinct from the managed fisheries authorities. I would be grateful for an explanation from the Minister.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I should have thought that the honourable member was aware of the difference between the validity of a permit and an authority.

Mr Keneally: You explain it to us, Allan.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: An authority is what it implies: it is an authority to take fish for time immemorial, or until the resource runs down. There is some trouble with the resource. The permit, of course, is on a year-to-year basis, and it can be terminated when the resource runs down.

This is the problem in the Investigator Strait fishery, and that matter is not unfamiliar to my friends opposite or to the member for Flinders. I have had discussions with the Federal Minister, subject to there being an agreement between the people fishing in St Vincent Gulf and in Investigator Strait to make it into one fishery and to place it under State management. This has caused some problems. We have had, and still are having, discussions with the industry on this matter. We are dealing with Commonwealth waters and State waters, and I should hope that before the week is out a decision will be made.

Mr Keneally: How do you keep them apart?

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: I would like to know. I am keeping them apart; the honourable member should make

no error about that. Let me inform members opposite that I am just the man to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come to order.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: These fishermen are brave men when they are facing the briny, but collectively they can be extremely difficult to deal with.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: When you get out there and part the water, they will fall over the edge.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: There is no parting of the waters with the fishermen; I can tell the honourable member that. The member for Flinders asked whether the management of Investigator Strait or St Vincent Gulf waters was going to have any effect on other prawn fisheries. I can assure the honourable member, despite some of the malicious rumours floating about today, that it will not have any effect on other prawn fisheries. The matter will be resolved by the Government, and I hope that it will be done this week. I assure the honourable member that it will have no effect on other prawn fisheries.

MURRAY RIVER BRIDGE

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I direct my question to the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Transport. When does the Government anticipate providing concrete evidence in support of its pledge, now almost two years old, that it would make the construction of a further riverland bridge across the Murray River a highest priority? Members on this side of the House visited the Riverland for a regional meeting of the shadow Cabinet on Monday and Tuesday. Wherever we went in the Riverland we found that people were asking questions about the proposed new bridge over the Murray River. There was some dispute about the best site for a bridge, and I hope the Minister can say something about that too. Much of the talk was about the Government's pledge of action given in 1979. The Minister should know that his colleague the Minister for Water Resources and member for Chaffey went on public record in September 1979 promising that a bridge over the Murray River at Berri would be given high priority and that planning would proceed immediately.

I join the people of the Riverland in seeking a firm assurance from the Minister responsible for such matters that money will be firmly committed to this project. I also ask when the project is to be commenced.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member's interest in this matter is refreshing. He has kept what one calls a low profile, despite his election to represent his Party elsewhere. However, the honourable member will simply have to contain himself until the Budget papers are available. He may be able to glean some information from them. The Opposition certainly knows a lot about making promises.

I do not recall the exact words to which the honourable member referred, anyway. We are so used to misrepresentation that the quote may well be in error. But, in any case, the Opposition when in Government was well practised at announcing and reannouncing projects. The Redcliff project, for one, was first announced in 1974, and announced and reannounced *ad nauseam* at every election thereafter. It was even announced by the Leader when we were in Government. He knew better than we did. When the Minister of Transport is available, I am quite sure that he will be happy to furnish the honourable member with any relevant information.

PLANNING LEGISLATION

Mr MATHWIN: I ask the Minister of Environment and Planning what is the closing date for submissions—

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Did the honourable member have a pain again?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: What is the closing date for submissions from local councils and other interested parties on the new planning legislation? Yesterday, in his statement to the House, the Minister said that since the introduction of the Bill in June there has been a consultation period which will conclude this coming Friday 7 August. In this morning's press it was reported that this period concluded yesterday. I believe that some councils have already expressed concern that not enough time was allowed for submissions to be prepared. Will the Minister explain the situation regarding the closing date for submissions on the proposed legislation?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I welcome the opportunity to clarify this matter because, this morning's paper stated that the consultation period closed yesterday, which is not the case. As I said yesterday in my Ministerial statement, I am aware that some councils have expressed concern about the closing date for submissions on the proposed legislation. I have said on numerous occasions that 7 August, next Friday, should be the intended closing date. However, I appreciate that there are some cases where that period needs to be extended. We are most anxious that all submissions or advice of intended late submissions be received by my department as soon as possible. We intend that this legislation be debated this session. Although I want to take on board all councils' comments, and those of interested groups and councils, members would appreciate that, once submissions are received, considerable work is involved in assessing them, making any necessary changes to legislation, taking the matter back to Cabinet, and reintroducing it; that will take some time. As we are anxious that the legislation be debated this session, it is obviously important that submissions be received as soon as possible. Certainly, the closing date was not yesterday. It has been indicated that it would have been next Friday 7 August. However, we are prepared to extend it to take on board any late submissions that may come from councils or other interested organisations.

BIRD SMUGGLING

Mr MILLHOUSE: I, too, should like to ask a question of the Minister of Environment.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: If he does not know about it, he ought to; we will see.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to the question.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The question is as follows: What action, if any, does the Government propose to take in relation to the matters I raised in my speech last evening concerning the irregular and scandalous actions in which officers of the Department of Environment and Conservation and officers of the Federal Department of Customs and others were involved, apparently from 1972 at least until 1978? With your permission and the concurrence of the House, I desire to explain my question.

The Hon. H. Allison: A robin is a protected species.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham has the call.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I wish that the Minister of Education would speak up. I did not hear what was apparently a gem to members on his own side.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister of Education was out of order.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Of course he was, and it probably was not worth answering, anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will come to the explanation.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He wanted to know whether robin red breasts were included.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Oh, I see. I have not quite got that personal interest in it.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr MILLHOUSE: If it is not, it ought to be, and my electors seem to think I am anyway.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Hon. Deputy Premier will assist the business of the House by desisting from interjecting.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. The explanation that I desire to give, with your leave and the concurrence of the House, is as follows: the Minister did not find it convenient to be in the Chamber last evening when I was speaking. I suppose he was outside watching the television or reading a book.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked leave to explain the question and not to make any reference to the appearance or non-appearance of members of the House at any given time.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Yes, Sir. However, I was a bit disappointed that he was not here; that is all. The Minister already knows something of the matters that I raised, but, if he does not, I will tell him. I recounted events in which Mr Bert Field was involved and for which he is now being paid \$60 000 by the Government plus costs. I also reflected on the actions of a number of quite senior public servants, including a former Director of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, a number of Customs officers and another man who is apparently a Commonwealth public servant.

Under Standing Orders it was the first opportunity I had had to canvass these very complex and grave matters. I am not the only one who has been perturbed about these things, and I remind the Hon. Minister, and others, that last year when the prosecution against the four officers for conspiracy collapsed Dr Andrew Black wrote a letter to the *Advertiser* on 22 April 1980 in which he said, in part:

It is unsatisfactory that the bird smuggling charges against four Government officers have been dismissed after a resume of presecution allegations but without further evidence having been offered. The men have faced criminal charges but have been found neither guilty nor innocent.

Mr BECKER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to Question on Notice 11, asked by the member for Mitcham of the Minister of Environment and Planning, and I ask whether the question that he is asking the Minister—

Mr Millhouse: It has absolutely nothing to do with it at all.

Mr BECKER: I am not asking for the ruling of the member for Mitcham, but for your ruling, Mr Speaker. I believe some of the explanation cuts across the question.

Mr Millhouse: Nonsense, that is about the settlement of the case.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order; it is not the same question. This relates to events in the House last evening and the likely response. The Question on Notice is more specific in relation to events some months ago.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I greatly appreciate your ruling, Mr Speaker, and thank you for it. It is obvious that there are

plenty of members on the other side who want all this swept under the carpet.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the honourable member not to defy the Chair by entering into discussion other than that which is a simple explanation of the question.

Mr MILLHOUSE: With respect, Sir. I go on with the quotation from the letter, as follows:

Concerned conservationists who began making inquiries more than two years ago about bird trapping by N.P.W.S. officers—

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Sir, I understood that it was not in accordance with Standing Orders to refer to previous debates in this Chamber.

The SPEAKER: It is common to refer to previous debates in this Chamber. It is not possible, under Standing Orders, for previous debates of the same session to be read. The honourable member for Mitcham is reading from a letter to the *Advertiser* by a Dr Black.

Mr MILLHOUSE: By gum, they are sensitive about it, Mr Speaker, are they not?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Becker: You tell us how much—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Mitcham to come quickly to the conclusion of his explanation.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am doing my best, Sir, but I am being interrupted.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: Let me go on—and I am nearly at the end of it, anyway. The letter states:

Concerned conservationists who began making inquiries more than two years ago about bird trapping by N.P.W.S. officers have withheld those inquiries because of the supposedly intense and thorough police investigations.

As you may know, Sir, there were investigations by police officers, not only State but also Federal. Dr Black concluded his letter in this way (and he was asking a bit much of the very talented *Advertiser* reporters):

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment, but to remain within the explanation.

Mr MILLHOUSE: Right. I will just read it, Sir. The letter continues:

Perhaps your inquiring reporters—

speaking to the Editor of the *Advertiser*—

can present to the public an explanation of why an apparently scandalous revelation of conspiracy has come to nought. How much has the community paid for this Gilbertian farce?

We will leave aside the last question. That will do for another day. I have read those extracts from the letter to show the concern which others besides myself have felt about this matter but which could not be aired in here until this time. I know that the Minister inherited all this, but so far he has done nothing to clear up the situation, giving rise to the growth of suspicions of wrongdoing by public servants and others, to give any public explanation as to what went on, or to punish those guilty who were involved in it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I appreciate the opportunity to clarify a couple of points raised by the member for Mitcham. I am getting a little bit fed up, in the first place, at being referred to as the Minister for Environment and Conservation. If the honourable member does not already know, I inform him now that I am the Minister responsible for the Department of Environment and Planning. I can appreciate the honourable member's concern about my not being in the House last night. It is so seldom that the member for Mitcham is in the House at night, in any case, that I can understand his concern. Last night was one of the rare occasions when I was not in the House, and my absence resulted from the fact that I had deputations.

A number of the matters raised by the member for Mitcham are as a result of a number of activities that took place during the time of the previous Government. This Government has taken action. We have appointed a senior officer, Mr Steve Tobin, as a law enforcement officer, and we have taken other action regarding the matter. We have taken positive action. There has been police action, too. The honourable member has raised a number of serious allegations in the speech that he made last night. I do not intend answering them, but I can tell him that we will investigate those allegations. I am well aware of the honourable member's involvement in the Field case, as I think all of us are, and quite a bit could be said about that, but I will not say it at this stage.

Mr Millhouse: Come on, you say it.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I will investigate the series of allegations made and bring down a report when appropriate.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order. The Minister has by implication reflected very seriously on me. The implication behind his remark was that I was in this matter guilty of some wrongdoing. It is well known (and I make no apology for it, nor need I) that I was involved professionally as well as politically in the matter. There is nothing wrong with that.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order. The Minister was acknowledging the honourable member's interest in this matter. Unless the honourable member is able to specify certain words which went beyond that general inference, I do not uphold the point of order.

FREE SERVICES

Mr RANDALL: Can the Minister of Health advise the House whether any services in South Australia will be exempt from charges following the introduction of new hospital finance arrangements after 1 September? It has been pointed out to me that in New South Wales and Victoria exemptions from certain public health service charges are being made. Therefore, it is of interest to this House to know what we in South Australia will be doing.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, there are certain services that will be exempt from charges when new charges are introduced after 1 September. They relate primarily to public health services. I can advise the House that the free service provision will be made in respect to sexually transmitted diseases, victims of sexual assault, victims of domestic violence or child abuse where a charge could adversely affect the patient's domestic situation, ante-natal physiotherapy if the expectant mother is booked for confinement as a hospital patient, and family planning and counselling services.

In addition, hospital boards of management will have authority to waive charges in respect of the chronically ill and in respect of public health services to persons of limited means. The hospital boards will exercise their discretion in these cases, and that authority, given to them by me as Minister and by the Government, is evidence, I believe, of the Government's concern for those who may not be able to meet charges in situations where they require continuing care. For those categories which I have announced, I believe there will be wide general support in the community for the provision of free service and the exemption from charge.

SPEECH AND HEARING CENTRE

Mr HAMILTON: In light of the fact that 1981 is the International Year of the Disabled Person, will the Minister

indicate when a start will be made on the restoration of the Speech and Hearing Centre at Woodville Primary School, and say what is the anticipated completion date for that project? As the Minister would be aware, this centre was gutted by fire late last year. Since then I have written to the Minister on this matter requesting that this project be completed as quickly as possible. As yet, I have not received a reply from the Minister. On 25 July I received the following correspondence from the Welfare Club at the Woodville Primary School, as follows:

Dear Sir, We are writing to you to express our concern over the Speech and Hearing Centre at Woodville Primary School. When the centre's premises were destroyed by fire last year, the school offered temporary accommodation in the building that was being developed as an expressive arts centre. We understood that this situation was to apply to the end of the 1980 school year. Work on the new buildings has been at a standstill since the beginning of this year and it now seems that the centre will not be able to transfer back to its own area until the beginning of next year.

As the situation now stands, everyone is disadvantaged:

1. The speech and hearing teachers are working under very difficult conditions; the area is cramped, the facilities are inadequate and one of the rooms in which they teach is an acoustic disaster area. The teachers can cope, but the effect on the children cannot be assessed. Surely these children are sufficiently disadvantaged; they deserve the best environment that we can provide.

2. The pupils of the primary school are deprived of the use of their expressive arts centre. Both schools have had their programmes set back for one full year.

3. The Welfare Club was designated its own room in this area. We are trying to carry on activities within the school, to take a more active part in the school's programme and to create better liaison between parents and staff, and yet we have nowhere to go!

We understand only too well the difficulties of lack of funds, but we feel the facilitation of this project deserves consideration, particularly in this International Year of Disabled Persons. We would greatly appreciate any consideration you could give to this matter and we look forward to hearing from you.

The letter was signed by 94 constituents whose children, I understand, attend the school. Therefore, I ask the Minister when this project will be commenced and what will be its completion date?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I sought a departmental report on the replacement of that unit, partly at the request of the honourable member. That report is not yet to hand. As a matter of urgency, I shall see that I get it, and I will make it available in writing to the honourable member.

STORMWATER DRAINAGE

Mr SCHMIDT: My question is directed to the Minister of Environment, representing the Minister of Local Government. Has the Government given any consideration to making alterations to the Local Government Act to give local councils the power to force people to provide adequate stormwater piping to get rid of stormwater from their properties on to street level? This year, being a particularly wet year, a number of cases have come to my attention where people have found themselves in a rather awkward position because their neighbours had not made adequate provision to have stormwater diverted from their properties, and consequently the water has run on to other properties causing structural damage to retaining walls or undermining foundations, causing homeowners excessive costs in having to provide underpinning. When these people have made representations to the local council to have something done about stormwater, local councils have found they are powerless to do anything about it because there is no provision in the regulations for councils to force these people to make provision to remove stormwater from their blocks to street level. That is the reason for there being a necessity for some sort of action to be taken to assist people, particularly those in residential areas, where the land no longer has the

ability to absorb the amount of water it catches because of great roof densities in the area.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I shall ask my colleague to bring down a full report. I know that this matter is under active consideration and that it is the intention of the responsible Minister to institute positive action in the very near future. I shall seek a full report from the Minister responsible and have it brought down for the honourable member.

SEX EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: In the light of the Ministerial statement earlier this afternoon, does the Minister of Education repudiate any imputations made by the member for Brighton regarding the work of authorised sex education programmes in schools, particularly with regard to the work of the health education project team and its pilot scheme? I hope, again, that I have the attention of the Minister, and not the Deputy Premier. In the Ministerial statement (and I am pleased that the Minister gave one—I called on him to do so and he responded to that call), the Minister thanked the member for Brighton for drawing this matter to the attention of the House.

In listening to the speech last night, there were a number of areas where the member for Brighton referred more particularly to programmes rather than to the particular behaviour of any aberrant teacher in those programmes. With your leave, Mr Speaker, I want briefly to describe some of these areas so that members will be more fully informed of the matters I am raising. I am not debating the matter, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will make that decision when it hears what is being led.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: With regard to the matter last night, the member for Brighton made the point that in his opinion '99 per cent of them, I guess' (teachers) 'Do an excellent and worthwhile job.' He said that he wanted to explore the impact of the two subjects (that is, health and personal development) of the eight areas of the curriculum in South Australia. He also referred to questionable sex educators saying:

It is necessary to explore certain information about sex education programmes in schools.

Furthermore, he said:

Yet, suddenly in the late—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will recognise that this matter is already a part of the record. Therefore, it does not require a great deal of requeuing, other than possible simple identification.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: My point is that the Minister made a statement and gave an interpretation of the member for Brighton's speech. I am raising certain matters in the member for Brighton's speech which, in my opinion, do not tally with that statement.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member proceeds along those lines he will be debating the issue raised by the honourable member last evening. He is simply seeking to explain the question which he has now put to the Minister of Education. I ask him to stick to the guidelines, which are well known, relative to explanation and not to proceed to reidentify passages within last night's contribution, other than simply.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I want to bring a couple of those examples to explain my question to the House. Last night one of the points made was:

... in the late 1960s, educational intermeddlers set up classrooms for sex instruction through this nation.

That was in the United States. He then said:

I wonder whether this could be a description of our developing sex education in Australia.

He also highlighted the following:

... problems, particularly in the area of sex education and the curricula, where it has afforded the opportunity to select and use, without any outside control, a variety of resource material...

The question was directly posed:

One of the questions... posed by this question of sex education is whether or not the Education Department in this State has abdicated responsibility for some of the sex education that goes on in schools.

Another question was:

Why is it necessary to put this cloak of secrecy around these subjects, or is it to hide the real subject under a cloak of respect that will hide the truth from parents?

Inasmuch as these matters pertain to the programme, we need a Ministerial response and to know whether the Minister rejects any imputations made by the member for Brighton.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Really, this question divides itself into two parts: one relates to the relevance of the material introduced last night by the member for Brighton to the health education programme in South Australia, which I think I said in my statement quite clearly was generally acceptable, not only within South Australia but across Australia, too. The material was carefully selected and is used, but does not contain material which can be abused. The other issue that the honourable member raised, which he did say was relevant to only a very small percentage of staffs in South Australian schools, was the question of what supportive material is being used within the education system. For anyone to assume that this is available and usable only as part of a sex education programme would be quite wrong.

For example, there are social science courses which involve the use of sexual instructional material, the M.A.C.O.S. and S.E.M.P. courses, which are part of the family programme but which are not part of South Australia's officially approved health education programme.

Mr Lynn Arnold: That is integrated into schools with the endorsement of the health—

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I appreciate that, but I was addressing myself quite specifically to the approved health education curriculum which has been devised within South Australia, which is integrated with social science, yes, but which is not necessarily integrated with S.E.M.P. and M.A.C.O.S. or other materials produced by the Curriculum Development Centre in Canberra, and by private commercial organisations in the United States, which unquestionably dumped a rejected programme. By 'rejected' I mean rejected in the United States as a result of a Senate Committee of Inquiry which refused to fund any more than the \$53 000 000 which had already gone into that programme. That material was dumped in New Zealand and Australia.

South Australian schools have accepted some of that material through the M.A.C.O.S. or S.E.M.P. course, but certainly not all schools would have done so—just a very small proportion. I think that, in relation a lot of the material to which the honourable member referred last night, he specifically referred to the courses that I have just mentioned, and that is where a big question mark comes in. Are teachers or any people involved in education in South Australia bringing in supportive material which does not have the authority of the Director-General or, indeed, of school councils? That is what I believe school councils and principals, and parent organisations, should be addressing themselves to. That really is the question.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Dr BILLARD: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate what significance recent reports of changes in the French attitude to international safeguards on nuclear energy have for the future of the uranium industry in South Australia?

Recently there have been media reports indicating that the French Government has changed its attitude towards international controls on nuclear fuels and was now prepared to accept controls which might be demanded by the exporters of uranium, such as Australia. These reports also suggested that this change would have particular significance to Australia. For this reason, I ask the Minister to outline the impact that this decision might have on the development of uranium mining in this State.

Mr Keneally: Tell us about the bomb.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would very much like to tell the honourable member. If that were relevant and pertinent to the question I would, but I do not think it is. I will confine my remarks to answering the question. I did see the report, and I trust that the honourable member who has interjected saw it, and I hope his Leader also saw it, because that statement was made since their comrade Mitterand was elected the new socialist President of France. This attitude of the French Government has come about since that event in France. If the Leader of the Opposition has indeed seen that statement, it should cause him, if he was free to do so, to do yet another backflip in relation to his statements on uranium sales and likely sales and the future of Roxby Downs.

While we are talking about the French nuclear attitude, it was also particularly interesting to hear on the air in the last day or so and to hear the news reports that the French Government has let off an atomic device in the Pacific. Since we have had the comrade socialist brother-in-arms of the Opposition elected in France, I have also heard that the French Government intends to test a neutron bomb. Where are the strident left wing of the Labor Party and, indeed, the Leader of the Opposition and the Urens of this world condemning the President and the Government of France for what everyone agrees is quite outrageous behaviour? It is left to the Liberal Government to condemn these actions. When things are different, as has been said in this place many times, they are not quite the same. We did not hear a peep out of the Labor Party because its socialist brother in charge of France is letting off bombs in the Pacific, but we hear the Leader of the Opposition in full flight when—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, someone got him up to the barrier at last, but I bet it took some pushing. I have not heard Mr Uren get on the airwaves, but you could bet your bottom dollar if it was anything to do with nuclear electricity generation he would have been on *A.M.*, *P.M. Nationwide* and any other programme he had access to. Under the present regime in France, it looks as though there is a strong possibility that Australia will be able to write contracts for the supply of uranium to France.

It is also interesting to note, when we are talking about the international scene, that the Japanese, who I have said here before is the nation which should most fear the effects of radiation, believe that Australia's safeguards are too stringent.

Mr Hamilton: The Government does, but not all the people.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: The people elect the Government, and that is the way democracy works, or at least that is the way it is supposed to work. I wonder sometimes, with the activities of some of the more strident

of the trade union leaders in this country and in Britain, whether democracy is at work and the Government is allowed to govern, but that is another question. A Government is elected democratically to govern, and that is the official attitude of the Japanese.

This should cause the Leader to again change his attitude and his ideas in relation to the development of Roxby Downs. When he was in France, the Leader did not take time to look at the programme. We got the doom, the no-boom, in full bloom. When he was in France, he said it looked as though we had no future at Roxby Downs. I have his words here. Before he went to France, on 21 February the Leader said:

We still see it as a major and possibly vital project for South Australia.

When he went to France, he said it looked as though it was not a goer. He said that the French nuclear programme would have been scaled down by then, and we might find that there will be no market for uranium from Roxby Downs. I would have thought that would be a commercial decision on the part of the mining companies operating the project, but the Leader said that this would virtually leave Japan as the only market for uranium, and that the implications for Roxby Downs were enormous.

Because his brother socialist is now in command in France and it looks as though we might write some contracts with France, the time is appropriate for the Leader to make a third statement and to revert to his more optimistic statements earlier in the year.

I believe that is a very significant statement by the French Government. If the Leader and members of his Party had looked at what was happening in relation to nuclear energy in France, they would know that 900 megawatts of new capacity is being commissioned in France every two months. Let us get this in perspective. We in South Australia are building the new Northern Power Station where, in 1984, we will commission a 250-megawatt unit. Thereafter we will commission another 250-megawatt unit, and thereafter possibly a third. In France, they are commissioning a nuclear generating capacity of 900 megawatts, more than is envisaged for the Northern Power Station in South Australia, of new capacity every two months.

Of course, the new socialist Premier had to make noises to satisfy the environmentalists and others who helped elect him, but I will be more than surprised if there is a significant curtailment of the nuclear programme in France. I think the new socialist Premier might be successful in doing what the State branch here wants to do, to socialise selected industries. That is what the South Australian branch wants to do to an extent more than any of their colleagues around Australia want to do. He will be successful in that, but I doubt if ever he will be successful in cutting back to any marked degree on that enormous nuclear programme being undertaken in France. I think that the movement in relation to the purchase of uranium indicates that fact.

MOORING FEES

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Marine say whether improved and expanded facilities will be provided when the increased mooring fees are applied to small vessels moored in the Port River? The Minister recently foreshadowed what were described in some circles as staggering increases in mooring fees.

An honourable member: Horrendous, even.

Mr PETERSON: Horrendous, even. It is suggested that some fees will go up by \$300 a year. No-one denies that it is fair that some fees should be charged on boats, but most

craft in the Department of Marine controlled areas receive nothing for the money except a hole in the water in which to keep their boat. They are moored on facilities in areas that serve no useful purpose, obsolete in most cases—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member not to comment.

Mr PETERSON: I am sorry, Sir. Theft and damage to many of these craft have been terrific, and many craft have been totally destroyed. For the money at this stage, those who pay receive no coverage. Even the watchman in the area does not cover them. There is a strong feeling among many boat owners that this is the first step in forcing boats out of the river and into the moorings at North Haven, where there is a very substantial Government investment. Mooring fees start at just over \$1 000, and that would force many people to give up their boats, because many people with small boats cannot afford that sort of money.

The Hon. W. A. RODDA: It is nice to know that there are some holes left in the water in the Port River and at Outer Harbor. Holes are very useful. I once knew a con man who was marketing postholes. I indicated the other day that the matter was being looked at. There has been nothing about meteoric rises in boat mooring fees. The matter is being looked at. I would not have thought that we were so hard hearted that we would put on fees that would not be acceptable to people. The matter has not been looked at for about 30 years, or some similar long period. I am aware of the moorings that are without surveillance, and they are in backwaters. I am sure that all of those matters will be considered. It is only very early days for looking at these issues, and I will obtain a considered report. The matter must be looked at, and there is a great deal of interest in it. However, rather than make a statement off the top of my head I will get a considered report.

DENTAL TECHNICIANS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Health inform the House of the reasons why the Government did not proceed to the granting of chairside status to dental technicians? In explanation, I refer to a report in the *Adelaide News* on Friday 31 July, in which there is a reference to a review by the Minister. The report states:

The Health Minister, Mrs Adamson, said last week the scheme was not justified and legislation to register dental technicians would not go ahead.

A 'victim' of the decision, Clarence Park pensioner Mrs Ida Hourihan, today called on Mrs Adamson to reverse the ban.

Mrs Hourihan, 72, broke down as she told *The News* she faced a three-year wait for free dentures from a public hospital.

A diabetic who has suffered four strokes, Mrs Hourihan said she suffered extreme discomfort with her existing dentures.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I can inform the House of the reasons why the Government accepted the recommendation of the Committee of Inquiry into Dental Services in South Australia to defer legislation. I would like to comment on the situation of Mrs Hourihan, because it is indeed relevant to this matter. When I read the article about the difficulty Mrs Hourihan was having with ill-fitting dentures that were unsatisfactory and about the long wait to which she was subjected, I contacted the Royal Adelaide Hospital to find out the details of her case. I was informed that Mrs Hourihan had been fitted with dentures, three weeks prior to her visit to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, in Victoria, by a dental technician operating directly with the public. I give that information to the House because it throws some light, I think, on the reasons why dentists themselves have opposed the giving of chairside status to technicians who, of course, whilst they may be—

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Why did she have to go to Victoria?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have no reason to know why she was in Victoria. For all I know, she may have been a Victorian citizen who has just come to South Australia. The fact is that she obtained her dentures in Victoria from a technician who had chairside status. Those dentures were not satisfactory. She then came to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and I understand that since that story appeared in the paper a South Australian dentist has made arrangement with Mrs Hourihan to provide her with satisfactory dentures at a price she can afford. So, in that circumstance that single person has been cared for and her needs attended to. I should point out to the House that the reasons were as given by the Committee of Inquiry into Dentistry: concern over the cost of training these technicians to bring them to a level of competence that would enable them to deal directly with the public could not be justified on the basis of the advantages to the public as a result of that expenditure. In other words, there would have been a very significant cost to the taxpayer that could not be justified on the grounds of benefit to the consumer.

I point out to all those who are urging this chairside status for dental technicians that thought needs to be given to standards of professional expertise which are required to make clinical judgments about the condition of a person's teeth and gums. It is, perhaps, not realistic to expect that someone without the professional training of a dentist is fully equipped to make those judgments. Leaving that aside, another one of the reasons put forward by the committee of inquiry was a reluctance to introduce and train yet another category of dental personnel when there is already an impending over-supply of dental personnel in South Australia.

In addition, the committee of inquiry took into account evidence from other States which suggests that the difference between the cost of dentures provided by dental technicians and those of dentists reduces to the level of perhaps 15 per cent or so once chairside status is granted. In other words, once technicians are able to operate legally their charges rise and, of course, their overheads rise, and it is only natural that they should. I want to stress to the House that the Government is very concerned about the plight of pensioners who need dentures and is making every effort to ascertain whether the backlog, which it inherited from the previous Government, of 3 000 people on a waiting list for dentures at the Royal Adelaide Hospital can somehow be overcome. I remind the House that in 1974—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Has it been reduced?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It has been reduced at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, but additional waiting lists have been created at the three peripheral clinics that this Government established early last year. I believe that I have satisfactorily answered the questions put to me by the member for Mitcham. The waiting time at the Parks has been reduced because an additional dental technician has been employed there. I make the point that in 1974 the dental profession offered the previous Government, in an effort to reduce what was a public scandal in terms of a waiting list for dentures for pensioners, to provide those dentures free. The offer, I am advised, was refused.

I think that all those things should be borne in mind by Opposition members when they criticise a situation that this Government inherited from them. I stress that I regard the situation as serious. I am trying to ensure that resources are reallocated and priorities ordered at the dental hospital so that the waiting list can be reduced. I emphasise that the Government gave the matter of amending legislation very careful consideration. It has always been, and still is,

illegal for dental technicians to deal directly with the public in South Australia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: BIRD SMUGGLING

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr MILLHOUSE: The innuendo in the last part of the answer given by the Minister of Environment and Planning to me about bird smuggling was that in some way my connection with the matter was discreditable. The Minister said words to the effect—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It was a clear indication.

Mr MILLHOUSE: I am fortified by the interjections from members of the Labor Party. The Minister said, 'I know about the member's involvement in this and I could say a good deal about it.' The clear implication of that was that in some way it was discreditable, and certainly the tone of voice that the Minister used, which, of course, poor *Hansard* cannot reproduce, reinforced that. That is not so. My connection with the matter is not discreditable, and I will give the reasons why.

The facts, briefly, are that Mr Field came to see me in January 1979 in my capacity as a member of Parliament. He visited me at my holiday house at Moana. He said that he came to me because he was a lifelong Labor supporter but that they were the Government and had shown him no sympathy. Therefore, he could not go to any of them. He said that he did not like the Liberals, and he came, as so many people do, to me. I realised straight away that the matter was at that time a legal one and therefore advised him to see a solicitor straight away.

Mr Field had already been to one solicitor who said that it was too hot for him to handle. I therefore gave him the names of several other solicitors and suggested that he take his pick. That is what he did, and subsequently, the solicitor to whom Mr Field went instructed me to act as counsel. That is a normal sequence of events, and, as far as I am concerned, entirely proper. I very greatly regret, too, the Minister's innuendo. He obviously made it—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MILLHOUSE: —because he had no other excuse for his supine inactivity up to the present time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Salisbury.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: INTERJECTION

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: In the granting of leave, I advise all members of the House that the House has given the member leave to make a personal explanation and that the member can anticipate that it will be made in silence.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Last night during the speech made by the member for Brighton a point of order was taken by the member for Mitchell objecting to certain features of the speech by the member for Brighton, who, in response, said:

I find the point of order surprising. The member for Salisbury asked me to give some examples.

I did interject last night and am recorded in *Hansard* as saying:

Will you read some of it to the House?

When I said that I was referring to the paragraph before that, which was as follows:

Under the headings of enrichment, human relations, health, social education, and so on, some children (again I stress that it is a small minority, but it is happening) are being subjected to the sex education of a nature which cannot but help to change the values on the moral issues. I have been told that some of the so-called educational material being circulated comes from the Women's Educational Resource Centre in Adelaide.

The point of my interjection was at that time to focus on the phrase 'but help to change the values on the moral issues'. I was seeking information on that aspect: the value and changing of moral issues. I did not in any way seek to invite, or want to listen to, the torrent of pornographic obscenity that followed after that. I merely wanted an analysis of the values and clarification of the work allegedly being undertaken in relation to that material.

At 3.8 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier): I move:

That Standing Orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable Government business to be considered as required and to have precedence over other business, except questions, before the Address in Reply is adopted.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Mr EVANS (Fisher): Yes, Sir.

Mr MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Even though I was standing quite close to the Minister, he mumbled so that I could hardly hear what he said. I take it that the suspension is simply to allow the introduction of the two items of Government business which are on the Notice Paper. If that is so (that may have been the explanation that the Minister gave in so cavalier a fashion), I am prepared to accept the suspension, but, if it is for the purpose of putting off for any long time the proper consideration of the Address in Reply, I will oppose it. So, when the Minister, or whoever is articulate enough on the Government side to speak next does speak, I hope that we will get some explanation as to why this is necessary. I am sorry that I have to ask the question; the Minister should have given the explanation audibly, if he gave it at all in the first place.

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the Deputy Premier resume his seat? The Standing Orders provide that there may be two addresses on such a motion, one for and one either for or against—normally against. The two speeches having been made, I now put the motion.

Mr Millhouse: Well, I—

The SPEAKER: Order! If it assists members in the House at all, I can assure the member for Mitcham that the conclusion he reached was the one which was stated.

Mr Millhouse: What, that it is just to bring in these two things?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I want to make a slight correction if I may. The suspension is to bring in Bills, not to debate Bills. There may be Bills other than these two, but it is simply to get them on to the Notice Paper.

Mr Millhouse: Why didn't you say so in the first place?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Becker: Why don't you listen?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hanson will assist the business of the House if he does not interject, as will the member for Mitcham.

Motion carried.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Mining Act, 1971-1978. Read a first time.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I am certainly prepared to give that leave, but may I remind the Minister that in seeking leave—

The SPEAKER: Order! Either leave is granted or it is not granted.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If I may again speak on the point of order, Sir. What is the House coming to when we cannot get clarification on a point without resorting to artifice? If the Minister is prepared to assure me that copies of the speech are available, there is no problem.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell will know that he is not speaking on a point of order; he is seeking a clarification. I recognise the difficulty that he is having and the point that he has made. I am sure that it is one that will be considered by the Standing Orders Committee in due course. The simple question before the House at this juncture is that leave be granted for the second reading to be inserted in *Hansard* without its being read.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

This Bill makes a number of miscellaneous amendments to the Mining Act. Perhaps the most important of the proposed amendments are those relating to the creation of strata titles in respect of mineral lands. Western Mining Corporation presently holds an exploration licence in respect of the Olympic Dam area. An application for a licence to cover the Andamooka opal field has been lodged, but it is not presently possible for the company to explore for minerals beneath the precious stones field. It is essential that Western Mining Corporation be allowed to drill in this area in order to determine whether the mineralisation similar to that existing at Olympic Dam extends under the field. The Bill accordingly introduces strata-title provisions which will allow such exploration to take place. The proposed amendment has been discussed with the various opal miner associations and has received their approval. It should be noted that the amendments permit only exploration at this stage, and that before a production tenement could be granted in respect of the subsurface stratum a further resolution of both Houses of Parliament is required. Thus, the interests of the opal miners will receive proper consideration at the appropriate time if in fact the exploration work does reveal mineral deposits below the existing precious stones field which are commercially exploitable.

The maximum term of an exploration licence is currently two years. It is proposed to increase this maximum term to five years. However, after an initial period of two years the Minister may require a reduction in the area comprised in the licence. This provision is somewhat analogous to the system that operates in relation to petroleum exploration.

The principal Act at present provides for mining operators to enter into bonds ensuring satisfaction of civil liabilities that they may incur in the course of carrying on those operations. The Bill proposes to expand the existing provisions to make them more flexible and to make it possible for a bond to relate also to rehabilitation work that the mining operator is required to carry out either in pursuance of provisions of his tenement or in pursuance of provisions of the principal Act.

The Bill also proposes that notice of entry should be given by mining operators to the owner or occupier of all land except where the land is comprised in a precious stones field. At present, notice of entry is required only where the land is freehold land or is held under a perpetual lease or an agreement to purchase from the Crown.

The Bill amends the principal Act in regard to royalty. The amendments provide for flexibility in fixing rates of royalty, which will in future be prescribed by regulation rather than by the principal Act. In addition, those rates may be prescribed in relation to particular classes of minerals so that appropriate differential rates can be worked out. The Bill also alters the point at which minerals are valued for the purpose of determining the value in respect of which royalty is calculated. The Bill provides that the Minister shall fix a value based on the saleable value of the minerals, assuming that any processing that would normally be carried out by the holder of the production tenement were in fact carried out by him.

The Bill makes several modifications to the principal Act of a more minor nature. These include the following:

- (a) Companies will not be allowed to hold precious stones prospecting permits under the provisions of the Bill. Many companies have been formed by opal miners in order to circumvent the principle that only one claim may be held by one person.
- (b) A new provision requiring notice of intention to use declared equipment on an opal field is inserted by the Bill. This new provision is considered necessary in the interests of safety because large tracts of ground have been worked underground with no visible signs of surface disturbance.
- (c) Provision for notice of pegging of a precious stones claim is inserted by the Bill. Such a provision presently exists in the regulations but it is felt that the regulation may possibly be *ultra vires*.
- (d) A provision is made for the surrender of a precious stones prospecting permit. Problems have arisen where people have applied for social security benefits but have been refused because they hold a permit. This provision will permit surrender of the permit.

Clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clause 4 makes amendments to the definitions contained in the principal Act. A new definition of 'exploring' is inserted making it clear that this term includes both exploratory operations as such and operations for the purpose of proving the extent of a mineral deposit. A new definition of 'fossicking' is inserted to exclude any operations that involve a disturbance of land or water by machinery or explosives. The definition of 'minerals' is amended to make it clear that the term includes oil shale. A new definition of 'precious stones field' is included to make it clear that, where the lands constituting the field have been divided into strata, the field consists only of the surface stratum. A new definition of 'prospecting' is inserted in order to exclude from the meaning of that term operations that involve disturbance of land or water by machinery or explosives. New definitions of

'subsurface stratum' and 'surface stratum' are inserted. These definitions relate to the strata-title provisions.

Clause 5 amends section 7 of the principal Act. This amendment makes it clear that the principal Act does not regulate quarrying operations carried on in pursuance of the Highways Act or the Local Government Act. Clause 6 amends section 8 of the principal Act to make it possible for the Governor to divide mineral lands into strata.

Clause 7 deals with the provision of the principal Act relating to exempt lands. The amendment relates to the cesser of exemption. At present, the exemption ceases on payment of compensation determined between the mining operator and the landowner or fixed in default of agreement by the Land and Valuation Court. The new provision gives the parties and the court greater scope to determine terms and conditions on which the exemption shall cease to operate. It also provides that the exemption shall revive on completion of the mining operations in respect of which it was granted or on the expiration of such other period as may be determined by the parties or by the Land and Valuation Court.

Clause 8 makes amendments to section 10a of the principal Act which deals with mining for radioactive minerals. These amendments are consequential on changes in the definition of 'prospecting'. They also provide that the Minister may authorise mining operations in respect of radioactive minerals where the relevant mining tenement is a retention lease rather than a mining lease. This amendment is consequential on the recent introduction of this class of mining tenement.

Clause 9 amends the provisions of the principal Act relating to royalty. The proposed new subsection (2) enables the Governor, by regulation, to fix differential rates of royalty in relation to classes of minerals. The amendments to subsection (4) vary the point at which the value of minerals is assessed for the purpose of calculating royalty.

Clause 10 amends section 20 of the principal Act by permitting surrender of a miner's right. Clause 11 amends section 22 of the principal Act. The amendments permit pegging of a claim in respect of a subsurface stratum.

Clause 12 amends section 24 of the principal Act. At present, a mining Registrar may refuse to register a claim where the lands to which the claim relate are subject to an application for an exploration licence. The amendment provides that, where the claim relates only to extractive minerals, the mining Registrar is not to exercise the discretion to refuse to register the claim.

Clause 13 amends section 25 of the principal Act which sets out the rights conferred by a mineral claim. The new subsection (1) is largely consequential on alterations to the definitions of 'prospecting' and 'exploring'. Clause 14 amends section 26 of the principal Act. The amendment permits surrender of a mineral claim in a prescribed manner. Clause 15 is a consequential amendment to section 27.

Clause 16 amends section 28. The purpose of the amendment is to permit the grant of an exploration licence in respect of a subsurface stratum. Clauses 17 and 18 make consequential amendments to sections 29 and 30 respectively. Clause 19 extends the maximum term of an exploration licence from two to five years, providing at the same time for possible reduction, on renewal, of the area to which the licence relates. Clause 20 amends section 33 of the principal Act. The amendments are consequential on other provisions of the Bill.

Clause 21 makes it possible to grant a mining lease in respect of lands within a subsurface stratum. However, it should be noticed that such a lease can be granted only if authorised by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament. Thus, Parliament will have an opportunity to assess, and provide against, any adverse effects that might result from

the granting of the lease before mining production is commenced.

Clause 22 deals with the information to be furnished by an applicant for a mining lease and provides that a lease is not to be granted unless commercially exploitable deposits have been found to exist. Clause 23 provides for notice to be given to the landowner and also to the council for the relevant area before a mining lease is granted. In deciding whether to grant the lease, or in framing the conditions on which it is to be granted, the Minister is obliged to have regard to submissions made to him by the landowner or the council.

Clause 24 provides for the grant of a mining lease for a non-renewable term. Clause 25 makes a consequential amendment. Clause 26 repeals section 41. This section provides for the granting of a mining lease, in special circumstances, over an area greater than that fixed by the regulations as the maximum permissible area in respect of which a mining lease may be granted. The provision is no longer considered necessary.

Clause 27 amends section 41a, which deals with retention leases. The amendments are consequential on the proposed introduction of strata titles. Clause 28 extends the term of a retention lease from one year to five years. Clause 29 redefines the rights conferred by a retention lease. Clause 30 prevents the grant of a precious stones prospecting permit to a body corporate and provides for the surrender of a precious stones claim. Clause 31 is a consequential amendment. Clause 32 provides for notice of the pegging of a precious stones claim to be given.

Clause 33 reduces the period within which an application for registration of a precious stones claim must be made from 30 days to 14 days and provides that provision may be made by the regulations specifying the office at which the application for registration must be made. Clause 34 is a consequential amendment. Clause 35 removes the requirement that prospecting for precious stones can only be carried out on a precious stones field on a precious stones claim that has been duly pegged out. Clauses 36, 37 and 38 make consequential amendments.

Clause 39 reduces the period within objection to entry of land for mining purposes may be made by a mining operator from six months to three months from service of notice of entry. A copy of any objection must be sent by the court to the mining operator. Clause 40 provides that notice of entry must be given by a mining operator to the owner or occupier of land notwithstanding that the owner or occupier has no right to object (that is, notwithstanding that the land is not freehold land and is not held under a perpetual lease or agreement to purchase). Clause 41 provides for notice of intention to use declared equipment on a precious stones field to be given.

Clause 42 allows for the case where detailed provisions relating to the rehabilitation of land disturbed by mining operations are inserted in the relevant mining tenement. These provisions may exclude the discretionary powers of inspectors under section 60. Clause 43 expands the provisions relating to bonds in order to enable terms relating to the rehabilitation of lands disturbed by mining operations to be included. Clause 44 enacts new Part IXA of the principal Act. This new Part enables the pegging of access claims to permit access to subsurface strata. Clause 45 enables the Director or a mining Registrar to appeal against a decision of the warden's court, whether or not he was a party to the relevant proceedings. It also deals with the time for institution of an appeal.

Clause 46 provides for the making of rules of the warden's court prescribing fees payable on lodging documents with, or the issuing of documents by, the warden's court. Clause 47 corrects a typographical error. Clauses 48 and

49 prevent surrender of a mining tenement pending the determination of an application for its forfeiture. Clause 50 amends a heading in the principal Act. Clause 51 provides for the lodging of caveats to protect interests that might have been acquired in mining tenements. Clause 52 expands to some extent the grounds on which an order may be made excluding a person from a precious stones field but provides that applications may be made to the Minister for revocation of such an order on or after the expiration of 12 months from the date on which the order takes effect.

Clause 53 makes a consequential amendment to section 76. Clause 54 corrects a typographical error. Clause 55 provides for exemptions to be granted in appropriate circumstances either from the provisions of a mining tenement or the principal Act. Clauses 56 and 57 make consequential amendments. Clause 58 makes a typographical amendment. Clause 59 makes a consequential amendment.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD (Minister of Irrigation) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Irrigation Act, 1930-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The amendments made by this Bill will facilitate changes proposed to the method of charging the lessees of non-ratable land in irrigation areas for water supplied to them. In the past, individual agreements have been made with each lessee for water supplied. This is unnecessarily cumbersome and time consuming, especially since it requires the making of a new agreement with each new lessee of the land concerned when the land changes hands. It is proposed that the Minister will, in future, simply charge lessees for water used under the proposed new section 78. The new provision will also allow the Minister to charge lessees of ratable land that is not connected to a town supply for water supplied for domestic use. In the past, water has been supplied for this purpose under agreements that required renewal on each change of ownership.

Clauses 1 and 2 are formal. Clause 3 replaces subsection (3) of section 75 of the principal Act. The new provision requires notice to be given to ratepayers before the rates become due, and is in similar terms to the new section 78 (4). Clause 4 makes a consequential change to section 77 of the principal Act. Clause 5 replaces section 78 of the principal Act with two new sections. New section 78 is an expanded provision that will allow the Minister to fix charges for water supplied to land referred to in the section. Subsection (2) allows for variation in the charges that are made for the supply of water to different land. Subsections (3) and (4) provide for liability for and recovery of charges, and subsection (5) provides that unpaid charges will be a charge on the land and will carry interest at the same rate as that of unpaid rates. Section 78a empowers the Minister to remit interest on rates and charges in cases of hardship.

Mr KENEALLY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 4 August. Page 255.)

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): Prior to the adjournment of the House last night, I spoke briefly about the Adelaide Airport. I indicated my surprise about the views of some of the members opposite and I mentioned their names—the member for Hanson, the member for Glenelg, the member for Morphett, and the member for Henley Beach. I agree that the member for Hanson has done a lot to make certain that the curfew is upheld or adhered to at the Adelaide Airport. However, I was still very surprised about interjections made by members opposite about the member for Gilles's speech concerning the airport. I suggest that it is very possible that members opposite have been told to drop off as long as the curfew is kept as it is. However, as far as the Airbuses are concerned, the 727's and the 737's, apparently they are not to say much about them.

Mr Becker: You are talking out of the back of your neck.

Mr PLUNKETT: I have heard the member for Hanson do that every time he speaks. I have listened to the rubbish that he and his colleagues have put forward to this House.

Mr Becker: Is all this down in a little script for you?

Mr PLUNKETT: I bet I have spoken off the cuff more often than the member for Hanson has done, and I am using copious notes, which none of the honourable member's colleagues use—all the honourable member's colleagues read their speeches.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: The Minister of Transport has said that there have been talks about the State taking over the airport. That was reported in the press. What rubbish! He added that this would not happen until the airport became a fully international airport. The Minister of Tourism has spoken out in support of Adelaide Airport becoming an international airport, as the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and our Premier have done. I want to make my views clear. I do not oppose Adelaide having an international airport, but I oppose the upgrading of the present airport with the eventual intention of making it an international airport.

Mr Mathwin: Where would you put it?

Mr PLUNKETT: I will tell the member for Glenelg if he will have some patience. An international airport for Adelaide should be on the Adelaide Plains, to the north of the city, in the vicinity of the Two Wells and Virginia area. In case the member for Glenelg does not know, the Federal Minister, Mr Hunt, has also suggested that area. Maybe the honourable member should do a little bit of research in *Hansard* concerning what his Federal colleagues have said. There has been a lot of talk about the advantage of an international airport in the city, within 15 minutes of the G.P.O. Adelaide would be the only city in Australia to have an airport smack in the middle of a residential area.

Mr Ashenden: What about Sydney?

Mr PLUNKETT: I will come to that in a minute. In doing my research into this, and I have done plenty, I found an *Advertiser* press cutting which was dated 20 September 1979 and which referred to Mrs Jennifer Adamson, the incoming Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism. She said in that that one of her first intentions as a Minister was to have her office windows open and adjusted so that she would have a breath of fresh air. She went on to say:

I have ambitions. I would like to become known as the Minister for good health and a good Minister of Health.

I wonder what Mrs Adamson's advice would be to the people living in the western suburbs, in the flight path of Adelaide Airport, who get the full noise impact of scream-

ing jet engines and the taste of the afterburn of the turbulence created when the planes throttle back to land. The member for Henley Beach might be a little off the flight path.

Mr Randall: Where do you live?

Mr PLUNKETT: I live right on the border of the airport. Research that if you like. Would Mrs Adamson recommend that the first thing these people do in the morning is throw their window up and allow fresh air to come in, or has Mrs Adamson changed her view since 20 September 1979? Does she now put the money from tourism before the good health of people? I think many of her colleagues have shown over the past few days that they do this. This could also be said of the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, along with the Minister of Tourism's colleagues, who believe that the Adelaide Airport should be extended and upgraded to cater for international flights.

If any honourable members opposite disbelieve this, they have not been reading their papers. I also have an article from the *News* dated 28 May in which the Tourism Minister says that she fully supports the *News* campaign for an international airport, and that those facilities be at Adelaide Airport. Anyone who doubts that those words were used has not read the *News* or the *Advertiser*.

We are continually reminded that there are no firm plans to introduce international air services to Adelaide Airport; we are told that the plans to upgrade and extend Adelaide Airport are aimed at increasing its capacity to handle domestic operations. Even with those extensions, facilities to cater for increased passenger load would still be insufficient.

Mr Becker: I told you that months ago.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am telling the honourable member now. You can speak on it when you have your turn. The runway is expected to be increased to 8 500 feet, but it will still be 1 300 feet shorter than the safety requirements for the A300 Airbus. An 8 500 feet runway will not allow the Airbus to leave Adelaide with 100 per cent capacity; rather, it will have a 70 per cent capacity. This was researched in Canberra and was shown in tests last week in New South Wales in relation to safety regulations. It has been stated that safety of both passengers and residents in the vicinity of the airport is of crucial importance. I think that is very important, from the point of view not only of a possible air accident but also of noise pollution and living standards. Tests conducted by the National Acoustics Laboratory on noise and noise levels show that Adelaide has the second highest level of airport noise in the country.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It is not as high as the level in here at times.

Mr PLUNKETT: You are back from the casino; I missed you. That was the Minister of Agriculture, who inspected the casino in Alice Springs. In my research on aircraft noise, I found that noise on landing and take-off at the existing Adelaide Airport for a 737 is 94.4 decibels. This is for the new Ansett planes; the level for the 727 is 100 decibels; and for the A300 Airbus it is 88 decibels. Further, it is said in the report that the A300 should increase the speed of air freight deliveries throughout Australia with greater payload, and it is easier to move about the cabin due to two aisles and there is less congestion with trolleys. The next area is Ansett versus T.A.A. The Government has agreed to Ansett purchasing 737s, which are equivalent in noise decibels in landing or take-off. Ansett has approval for four more 727s, which are noisier again than both the Airbus and the 732. The Government's decision before the major recommendations in relation to the needs for a major airport for Sydney referred also to Adelaide.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: Just because you are in the Mallee most of your time, do not be so ignorant, Peter. Because of the higher flight frequencies by Ansett with 727s and 737s to counter the greater carrying capacity of T.A.A.'s Airbus, excessive noise levels will be recorded over flight paths more frequently and with greater intensity. I do not think that the member for Hanson would argue about that, because all his constituents have been asking him to make certain that there is no more noise at the airport.

These things are all true. One Ansett plane landed in Adelaide two Sundays ago; I saw it, and I can say that there will be excessive noise from it. It is no good us telling our constituents that there will not be noise.

Members interjecting:

Mr PLUNKETT: If you would listen for a while you would learn about it. The health aspect in relation to excessive noise should be of great importance to our State Government. A fortnight ago I asked the Minister of Education what investigations he had ordered in relation to the safety of children attending schools on the flight path to Adelaide Airport, in light of the larger planes being introduced. He gave a truly apathetic answer which indicated that nothing had been done. He said:

Residents in the vicinity of the airport, especially on the flight path, have the right to the most stringent safety regulations.

Nothing has been done up to date; neither the Federal Government nor the State Government has said anything about this.

Mr Becker: What did your mob do?

Mr PLUNKETT: We did not have the Airbus, the 727 and the 737. Wake up to yourself. Noise monitoring equipment should be installed. We are told that this equipment is not justified: that has been printed in Federal *Hansard*.

I receive a constant stream of complaints from my constituents about noise and concern for safety. Ministerial statements on the subject are contradictory and confusing. We are told that the introduction of the Ansett 737 and 727 planes will permit increased frequency of flights, which is an ideal situation for passengers but which will increase pressure on the residents under the flight path.

Much discussion has taken place recently about Adelaide Airport being made into an international airport, but within the last few days it has been stated that the airport will not become an international airport. However, a recent article in the *News* stated:

Commonwealth Government decides: Adelaide Airport upgrading for 'early attention'.

The Commonwealth Government has decided that Adelaide Airport will be upgraded. The Premier, Mr Tonkin, yesterday issued a copy of a telex from the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr Hunt, in which he says Adelaide Airport upgrading will be given 'early attention'.

Many Liberal members have been saying that this will not happen. Why then is the Federal Minister (Mr Hunt) making these statements? He may have changed his mind since then but he did make that statement. I can supply my source of information to any member who would like to see it.

The T.A.A. Airbus, which is expected to use Adelaide Airport in 1982, will be less frequent and consequently less noisy. Will the curfew hours be altered to suit flight patterns in conjunction with other States? What does concern me is that apparently, when tests were made in New South Wales last week, the Airbus was considered to be less noisy than some of the other planes, but when it carries a full load of passengers it requires a runway 1 300 feet longer than the runway at Adelaide Airport. With the present runway at Adelaide Airport, the Airbus will be able to take off with only 70 per cent of its passenger load. This would mean that the airport would be used as a stopgap for the other airports in Australia. Anyone can argue that, if the Airbus

cannot take off from Adelaide with a full passenger load, it will have to leave Adelaide Airport more frequently. I believe the airline will then ask for the curfew to be lifted.

Although I have been referring to the Ansett 727 and 737 planes which will be used on domestic routes, I believe that Qantas has also spoken to the State and Federal Governments—

Mr Becker: That's not right!

Mr PLUNKETT: According to the paper they have. I would like some of the Liberal backbenchers to get up and speak about the airport. I would like to hear from members who live in the areas that are under the flight path. I would also like to know what this State Government intends to do regarding safety devices at the airport. I dread to think what would happen if a crash occurred at or near the airport. I live right on the boundary of the airport—

Mr Becker: You don't live under a flight path.

Mr PLUNKETT: I live under a flight path.

Mr Becker: You don't; tell the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! I would indicate that the gallery is no place for in-depth conversations, particularly by persons who are not members of the House.

Mr PLUNKETT: I will talk about the airport in the future, because I am greatly concerned about what will be happening to it. I will be attending all the meetings that will be held about the future of the airport, and I know that the member for Hanson will be there. I agree that he has done much work in that area. I would also like to see at those meetings his other colleagues who have constituencies in the areas affected.

Yesterday I indicated that I would speak on four different subjects. I will endeavour to speak on the subject of tourism on which so much money is being spent. I would like to start by reading a letter I received from the organiser of the Australian Workers Union, Mr John Dunnery. The letter states:

I promised to outline the position of A.W.U. members employed by Australian National on the Indian Pacific and Trans-Australian trains. Our members were approached by the Railways with the proposition that they introduce a fourth sitting for meals on these trains, i.e., four breakfasts, four lunches and four dinners.

At present our members do three sittings. Approximately 10 years ago, four sittings was the norm, and our members were convinced that the workload was killing our members. The matter was taken before a Commissioner, who was unable to make a decision, and he ordered the parties to confer. This took place and the fourth sitting was done away with, and our members were told it would never be reintroduced.

When the matter was raised again, the Railways told us that it was to make the system viable as they could place 19⁺ passengers instead of the present 144 maximum, and if we did not accept they would be forced to curtail trains. We find this hard to believe, as the Railways make no real attempt to fill the trains at present. We have plenty of evidence that passengers are constantly turned away by the Railways and told the trains are full (see letter from Bill Alborough in *Senate Hansard* 11 June 1981, page 3087).

The union, in an attempt to consult all the members involved, held a secret ballot open for one week to ensure all members were in Pirie over that period.

Ballot-papers issued	113
Ballot-papers in favour of 4th sitting	4
Ballot-papers against 4th sitting	108
Informal	1

I also mention that if the 4th sitting was implemented it would increase the workload of our members by 33 per cent, and the Railways offered nothing in return. No consideration was given to our members during daylight saving when crossing to Western Australia when they would lose 2½ hours. This meant they would work an 18-hour day, then only get four hours sleep, then return to duty.

Our suggestion to the Railways is to put their own booking system in order before trying to blackmail our members into intolerable working conditions by threatening to cancel trains.

That letter was dated 22 June 1981. On 11 June 1981 Senator Geoff McLaren of South Australia brought up a letter he had received from organiser John Dunnery con-

cerning A.N.R. and the way it was being run. Senator McLaren had told John Dunnery that he had run into some difficulty in getting accommodation on the train from Perth and that on his way back from Perth he had spoken to people who had run the train and was informed that, because the Railways were not taking steps to see that the train was full on every trip, 'dead' cars were running on the train and some of the staff had to be paid 60 per cent of their wages to travel back as passengers.

Why cannot these cars be full? People cannot get seats on the Indian-Pacific or on the Transcontinental; they are told that no seats are available. Senator McLaren went on to say that he had received a letter from Organiser John Dunnery, of Port Pirie, South Australia, where most of the personnel who service the passenger train live. The letter states:

Attached please find a copy of a letter to the A.N.R. from Bill Alborough concerning bookings on the Indian-Pacific.

The address on the top of the letter is: 22 Paddock Close, Quorn, England. It is dated 4 May 1981, and it states:

Operational Management,
Australian National Railways,
Port Augusta, South Australia.

Dear sir,

I write to acquaint you with an alarming state of affairs in respect to our booking for 21 persons on the Indian-Pacific on Sunday 23 May. Our original application was declined by your G.S.A. Thomas Cook, having been advised by yourself that the train was 'full'.

Our tour, being constructed around the Indian-Pacific—I was involved in the B.B.C. T.V. series *Great Railway Journeys of the World*, which included *The Long Straight*, the Indian-Pacific, I obviously could not accept your answer so long in advance of the date of travel.

A participant of the English tour working in Rockhampton, Queensland, contacted the Brisbane office of the Western Australian Tourist Development Corporation, whose Mr Ray Stenhouse contacted various States asking for their help in obtaining seats on the train.

I regret to tell you that the reply was always 'full'. Eventually an impassioned telex to Westrail obtained the seats—imagine our astonishment to discover this departure—

he was referring to the train on which they travelled—has 113 passengers aboard, whilst 144 is the maximum complement.

Would you please investigate this matter thoroughly and advise me why we were so misled. Our B.B.C. T.V. film has been seen on its initial launch by 60 000 000 viewers with further viewings scheduled, including your own State of South Australia. We may need to add a warning: It is impossible to book on this train because its operators mistakenly believe it is full. Should you wish to contact me, my group is c/o Quorn 13—

I take it that is a telephone number at Quorn, South Australia—

until Friday 8 May, when we join the Indian-Pacific again, at Port Augusta. Perhaps you might care to meet me and discuss the matter?

Yours sincerely,

Bill Alborough,

Tour Director, T.E.A. B.B.C. T.V.

I have travelled on the Indian-Pacific from Perth to Port Pirie, and I think it is a magnificent train trip, probably one of the few in the world of such a length. It is a great tourist attraction, as it crosses the Nullarbor Plain, and people from all over Australia and the world would most certainly come to take this trip. It is a great pity that it is so difficult to obtain bookings on the train, and perhaps our Minister of Tourism will be able to have the matter rectified. She may be able to speak to some of her Federal colleagues. Recently, I spoke to John Dunnery, who informed me that he had received a further letter from Bill Alborough. Dated 4 May 1981, the letter states:

Dear John,

Thank you for your letter of 2 July and the enclosed copy of the *Hansard*. I am pleased that our group's problems have perhaps had a happy ending. A better system of organising passenger

bookings on the Indian-Pacific and the trans-Australian train which we thoroughly enjoyed.

While nothing was received in writing from the Operations Manager, I was asked on our return to Port Pirie later that same week to accompany the fellow on the platform to the office of the railways just across the bridge from the station where I met the local Operations Manager and was invited to put some more detail into my problem.

This I did at some length, explaining how the bookings arose and the whole saga of trying from so many sources to get the bookings we sought, and the final success only a few days before we were due to travel.

The final note was, of course, my group's annoyance when seeing the train far from full whilst they were scattered across the great length of the train.

The Operations Manager acknowledged that there was indeed a problem, but said that a full investigation of booking procedures was under way and that hopefully by the time we return to Australia all matters will have been resolved. I gently reminded him that our next planned visit was 1983 and that, unless the matter was resolved somewhat sooner, there might not be any trains to travel on in 1983.

Finally, I enclose a copy of an illustrated report which we published only a few days ago, and which has gone to over 4 000 people to date.

I shall be back in Australia personally by the time this reaches you. From 15 July to 20 August I shall be researching tours for a number of organisations, including those intending using the Indian-Pacific and Transcontinental as part of their itinerary. Eventually, I'll be relaxing in Quorn in South Australia on Saturday night 15 August.

Should you need further information please do not hesitate to contact me that evening. Best wishes,

Bill Alborough,

Tour Director TEFS/Railway Advisory B.B.C. T.V. Features.

Sir, I have a copy of the magazine sent by Bill Alborough, entitled *By Rail Across Australia*. The first heading reads 'So began the long straight, the journey on the Indian-Pacific across Australia in the B.B.C. T.V. series *Great Train Journeys of the World*.'

I have brought this matter to the attention of members in this House for one important reason. There has been much talk about the money that South Australia misses out on in connection with tourism. I agree that large sums are available to the State from tourism, but I do not accept that that should be at the cost of any of our constituents, whether in health or in injury.

In the past couple of days, much has been said about the Adelaide Airport, with the Minister of Tourism, the Lord Mayor, the Premier, and the Minister of Transport all indicating how much money South Australia is missing out on. I say that we have an opportunity, at no expense whatever to the South Australian Government, to make sure that the Indian-Pacific train is fully booked, so that no-one misses out. It is a terrible shame for such a train to leave Perth not booked to capacity. I hope that the Minister of Tourism will take up this matter.

I am amazed that the few Opposition members who took time to sit and listen to my speech have interjected only to the extent that they have. I do not know whether they agree that these trains should not be full; nor do I know whether they agree that people living in the close vicinity of the airport should have protection from this noise. I have had constituents come into my office repeatedly and complain of extremely bad headaches, saying that the scream from the planes are causing them. They would not know what sorts of planes are passing over their houses. I have asked these people, most of whom are pensioners, whether they have been to see a specialist or a doctor. They say they have been to doctors and taken pills, and things like that. Government members should be looking seriously at this matter.

Mr Lewis: What came first, the house or the airport?

Mr PLUNKETT: The honourable member would not know, because he would be too busy dodging kangaroos in the Mallee. I am talking about tourism, so it does not

compare at all. I see tourism as being of benefit to the State.

Mr Lewis: We've got to get rid of penalty rates; that's where costs go up.

Mr PLUNKETT: The honourable member is blind. I will take my colleague's advice and not answer further. I had another matter to which I wanted to refer, but I will not ruin it now by trying to do so in only two minutes.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): First, I would like to pay my respects to the late Sir Thomas Playford and express my regrets to his family. South Australia was much richer for having him as a son who worked single-mindedly for the benefit of us all. It seems to me at times that we need another Tom Playford, who could, and did, work across political and other boundaries to achieve the very best for this State of South Australia, which he represented so very ably.

It is my belief that, unless we in this Parliament can approach many of the problems facing us on a bipartisan basis, the State will suffer, the people of the State will be the losers, and the whole basis of our political and Parliamentary system will lose the respect of the voters. There are many people in our community who are heartily sick of the continual petty bickering that has become the practice in our politics and who want to see some indication of where our future lies and how we are to achieve the best possible opportunities for them and their children.

Mr Lewis: Very true.

Mr PETERSON: I must be careful if the honourable member is supporting me. The reductions in spending and the consequent effects upon employment and education, coupled with rapidly escalating costs, has placed many people in a position where they do not know where the future will take them. All of us in South Australia need to be confident of the future and to trust the people guiding the State. Without the commitment of all South Australians to some achievable goal set by a realistic assessment of our situation by politicians, the standing of Parliament and the politicians can only be eroded further. Recently, a comment was made in a newspaper by Max Harris, who is not the most famous of columnists. However, he did make a comment—

Mr Millhouse: He's pretty well known.

Mr PETERSON: Perhaps 'famous' is not the word. I stand corrected. He made a comment upon the honesty of respective Governments. He qualified 'honesty' in that article in the following words:

By honesty, I mean honesty of mind, candour, responsible communication of the facts, palatable or unpalatable, to the community about the social health of the State.

He goes on, as follows:

My theory is that the people are not afraid of the truth.

That is my opinion, too—

If they know the facts and the future prospects they will adjust to it psychologically and realistically, and it is cruel to sell them spurious dreams of affluence. Most of us live in South Australia because we like living in the place. If there is a price, then we should know about it and be able to make informed decisions for ourselves and our families.

I agree with these statements. He continues:

The people of this State have the right to know the facts, and, as it becomes harder and harder to see where the State is headed, I am sure they will demand more accurate information from the Government instead of the selected statistics and not quite accurate statements that they are fed on occasions.

It is interesting that in tonight's *News* there is an article by Tony Baker, as follows:

When it actually gets down to it, politicians do not believe in the right to know. They believe in the right to know what they want you to know.

Mr Millhouse: That's some politicians.

Mr PETERSON: The majority of them.

Mr Millhouse: Not me.

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member is a minority, the same as I am. In speaking of realistic goals and honesty and what is achievable in the State, I would like to refer to a project that has been mentioned previously in this House today. It has been mooted for many years and is still being used as a political football by the Government of this State, although all evidence indicates that it is a lost cause. I refer to the establishment of a petro-chemical industry in this State. As with most South Australians, I have read of the possible construction of such a plant on many occasions over the past decade. The present Government has not been adverse to grabbing a portion or two of publicity, as the Premier's recent dash to Dow Chemical's boardroom and the Ministerial statement he made on his return showed. In part, the Minister said:

Although the Redcliff project is still a long way off and still in no way certain of being built, I believe that we now have the best chance ever of an eventual start. The Dow situation is at last clear; we know where they stand; they know where we stand. Now we not only have Dow still interested and still working but also we have two other world chemical giants, multi-nationals Ashai and Mitsui Tuhatsu investigating the project.

It is interesting to me that the Japanese industries should still be interested, because a report on a survey of Japanese industry in the *Economist* magazine of 18 July this year stated:

Petro-chemicals, paper and aluminium are heading for the dustbin of industrial development with stagnant investment and output. It continues later:

To Japanese science officials, catching up with the West has meant looking for new industrial processes. These have now become more ambitious, and include projects for bio-mass energy, and for the use of carbon instead of fossil-based carbon compounds in the petro-chemical industry.

In a newspaper article published at about the time of the Premier's return, several other interested parties were mentioned; there was one European, two Americans and, of course, the Japanese. So it would appear that at that stage there was no shortage of interested parties.

I think that in the time allowed to me I can clearly illustrate that the world petro-chemical industry is in such a situation where the possibility of such a plant being established in this State has been fading fairly dramatically since 1973. I believe that it is highly unlikely that it will ever be built. My interest in this topic was stimulated by articles in a magazine entitled 'Overseas trading'. It is the journal of the Australian Department of Trade and Resources, and is freely available in Parliament House. As I have referred to the magazine from time to time, I have kept noticing recurring articles, to which I will refer, concerning petro-chemical development. In volume 31, No. 4 of 1980, the following appeared under the heading 'Petro-chemical output':

The Inter-American Development Bank awarded US\$105 000 000 credit lines to Argentina to finance the construction of several petro-chemical plants in Bahia Blanca. The total cost of the project is estimated to be about US\$338 000 000.

In Volume 31, No. 7, under the heading 'Petro-chemical complex', the following appeared:

The Philippines has approved plans for the establishment of an integrated petro-chemical complex in Limay, Bataan.

It is also said in the bulletin at that time that the supplies there would be from Taiwan and South Korea. In Vol. 31, No. 5, under the heading 'Petro-chemical aid', the following appeared:

The Privredna Banka Zagreb has concluded a financial agreement with the Tokai Bank of Japan which will give Yugoslavia about US\$50 000 000. The credit will be used for the development of the petro-chemical industry in Croatia.

In volume 30, No. 20, under the heading 'Joint Venture' it states:

Shell International Chemical will join a Mitsubishi-led consortium of four Japanese petro-chemical companies to set up a plant in Singapore. The proposed plant is expected to have production capacity of 80 000 tonnes a year and is to go into production in 1982.

There was also another report which stated:

Construction of the Sumitomo petro-chemical complex and new down stream plant in Singapore coupled with substantial public utility expenditures are likely to increase the industrial process controls market in Singapore by about 60 per cent in the next four years.

In volume 31, No. 23, it states:

Palembang's development may be limited by the depth of the Musi River, but it is certain that a major petro-chemical industry will find a home somewhere in Sumatra. Mexico's Alfa Industries petro-chemical sector will invest \$81 200 000 in four projects.

In volume 32, No. 11, it states:

The Bahrain and Kuwait Governments have agreed to establish a joint venture petro-chemical company in Bahrain.

In the same issue it is stated:

C.T.I.P. of Italy has signed a series of agreements with Peking's Yan Shan Petro-chemical General Corporation according to which C.T.I.P. is to aid the Chinese group.

In volume 32, No. 16, it states:

\$1 805 000 000 agreement: The final agreement for construction of a \$1 805 000 000 petro-chemical complex at Yanbu Industrial City Saudi Arabia was signed between the Saudi Basic Industries Corporation and Mobil Oil Corporation Inc.

In volume 32, No. 21, it states:

Natural gas boost: The Petroleum Authority of Thailand will invest \$283 000 000 a year between 1982-86 for the increased production of natural gas. One of the main projects will be to produce ethylene.

In volume 33, No. 4, 1981, it states:

A Japanese company C. Itoh & Co. has received an \$85 000 000 contract for equipment for the proposed Qilu petro-chemical centre in Shandong Province, China.

In volume 33, No. 7 it states in an article headed 'Growth market for petroleum equipment in oil rich Alberta', it states:

With a 544 300 000 kg a year supply of feedstock from the Alberta gas ethylene facility (already undergoing expansion) petro-chemical growth in the Province has been dramatic.

Alberta now has 16 petro-chemical plants in operation—six major plants have been established during the past five years—and others are in the planning and construction stage.

Further, it is stated:

Esso Chemical Canada intends to invest \$304 000 000 on a petro-chemical fertilizer plant near Redwater Shell Canada Ltd and Nova have announced plans to build a \$456 000 000 plant to integrate ethylene and benzene production to make a new line of petro-chemical products. Dow Chemical (a name that we all know) of Canada Ltd has just completed a \$325 000 000 expansion of its facilities near Fort Saskatchewan and recently announced that it wants to build a polyethylene plant.

The report continues:

More growth is planned for the industry. It is estimated that there will be investments of \$1 521 000 000 in new petro-chemical developments during the next five years. This will double the present value of plant and equipment in the industry and establish Alberta as a world-scale producer of virtually all primary petro-chemical products.

Volume 33 of the magazine, No. 9, states:

Three British companies have won contracts to build the first major Greenfield petro-chemical complex in Greece.

While this is going on overseas, the Chairman of the I.C.I., in his address at the 1981 Annual General Meeting, stated:

Two years ago the company (I.C.I.) announced plans for major expansion of its petro-chemicals and plastics operations at Botany in New South Wales and for a new plant at Point Wilson, Victoria, to increase production of caustic soda, chlorine and chlorine derivatives.

The Botany expansion project is proceeding on schedule and the new 250 000 tonne per annum ethylene plant is expected to come

on stream in 1983. Associated projects for expansion of polythene and ethylene oxide capacity are also proceeding as planned.

Another report in the *Petroleum Gazette* of September 1979, headed 'Six million Ethylene Tank', reported a \$6 000 000 ethylene storage tank being built at the Altona Petro-chemical Company Limited plant near Melbourne.

These investments are taking place all around the world, but, also I have noticed reports which have indicated serious fears for the future of such plants. For instance, in *Time* of 24 October 1980, I.C.I. of Britain had this to say:

I.C.I. blames recession for the first loss of 10 000 000 pounds, exacerbated by excess capacity in petro-chemicals and fibres.

A report in the *Economist* of November 1980, headed 'Flow the Gas Southerly?' states:

The battle for North Sea gas to make chemicals hotted up this week. On Wednesday afternoon a top level group from Imperial Chemical Industries, Shell, Esso and British Petroleum went to lobby the energy, industry and Scottish Secretaries of State to try to ensure that they, not one of the flamboyant foreign projects—one of which is Dow Chemical—

corner the lucrative gas feedstocks due to be piped ashore once the planned 1.1 billion gas-gathering pipeline is laid.

As members will realise Dow Chemical has been named on a few occasions. The company has been named in relation to Canadian development. It has also been named in relation to expanding the British operation. The report on the gas pipeline went on to say:

The Southern Four say there is no need for new ethylene plants because Europe has a chronic surplus that will last into the late 1980s.

Another decline in sales was recorded in the *Bulletin* of July 1981 when it was reported that Mitsui Petroleum Industries, petro-chemical section, reported an earnings drop of 60 per cent. This report is significant because of a report about Redcliff which appeared in the *Advertiser* of 26 September and which stated that it was understood that the giant Mitsui company of Japan was interested in becoming involved. At the same stage, Mitsui was reported to be involved in a Middle-East development. A report stated:

Mitsui has denied Japanese newspaper reports that because of the Gulf war it will withdraw from the \$3 200 000 000 petro-chemical complex being built with Iran.

Again, with all these things going on, in 1979 there was a petro-chemical seminar in Adelaide that the Minister of Mines and Energy attended, according to the transcript.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr PETERSEN: Indeed, the Minister addressed the seminar. At that seminar, Mr G. S. Morris, who is the Business Development Manager of Dow Chemical, was asked, in relation to the world situation of petro-chemicals:

You showed very clearly there is over production in a number of those commodities, caustic soda etc. Do your predictions go far into the future? In other words are there many other such undertakings planned or on stream likely to change the situation very much in the future?

That is in 1979, I might mention. On page 41 of the report, Mr Morris replied:

The future: in total, we expect that the petro-chemical market will experience growth. We expect that this growth will be significantly less than it was traditionally in the late 50s and through the whole decade of the 60s. We would not expect the gap, certainly as a percentage would widen. So the amount of over-capacity will become less. That is primarily because we expect demand to grow; there aren't a great number—

and this is significant—

in fact, very few, projects with the facilities being built today. There are quite a few under study, but, in terms of total capacity, not a great deal.

The details of the magazine reports that I have put before the House earlier indicate that there is a great deal. Mr Morris, in reply to a further question at the same seminar, concerning possible markets for products said:

We believe our chances are greatest in Japan.

Again, this report seems to be at odds with the facts. A report, presented by the O.E.C.D. in 1979, refers specifically to Japan, as follows:

With a much lower growth now being experienced in the export of petro-chemical derivatives, the new capacity being built for ethylene in Japan is relatively small.

Surely, with Japanese industry slowing down and the Japanese investment in such plants in other countries, the possibility of our exporting to Japan must have been extremely remote. I repeat that all these reports show that some considerable millions of dollars are being invested, although down-turns are mentioned. I refer also to a magazine called *Business Week* published in 1978, the year before that report was presented. This is significant, as it contains reports from some of the major petro-chemical developers in the world, including the American market. It is headed:

The oil companies are sloshing in ethylene.

It states:

Billions of dollars in new plants keep coming on line, far ahead of demand.

The reports reads:

For the past 20 years, steel, wood, paper, and cotton have given way to plastics and synthetic fibres in a host of consumer and industrial products. And producers of the basic petro-chemicals that are used to make these new materials have had to hustle to add capacity fast enough to meet demand. But in the fever pitch of their most recent round of expansion, U.S. petro-chemical producers seem finally to have overdone it.

Since 1974, led by the big oil companies, they have built some \$2 billion worth of new facilities to make ethylene, propylene, butadiene, and other major petro-chemicals. And another \$3 billion to \$4 billion worth of new olefin plants are under construction.

Even before this added output becomes available, however, a sharp downturn in the growth in demand for ethylene, kingpin of petro-chemicals, is darkening the industry outlook. Plastics and fibres have been selling at discounts for the past year, and the construction of some new plastics plants that would enlarge the markets for petro-chemicals is being delayed. The resultant slowing of demand has weakened ethylene prices; and U.S. ethylene producers, who last year operated at 80 per cent of their 31 billion lb. of capacity, are talking about an average of only 76 per cent—of 34 billion lb.—for 1978.

This is at a time also when Dow was still expressing great interest in a petro-chemical plant here. The article continues:

Already, plans for several new ethylene plants have been shelved. But even if no new plants are started, nearly 8 billion lb. of additional ethylene capacity will be available by 1982, and industry executives fear that it could be 1985 before the demand for ethylene catches up.

I do not know how it will catch up with all that new development going on. The article continues:

By that time, some say, the industry could be facing new competition from such oil-producing countries as Mexico, which hope to expand downstream into petro-chemicals and sell part of their output in the U.S.

'We got a couple of years ahead of ourselves,' ruefully concedes Alfred R. Flora, manager of Shell Company's olefin business. 'There's no question,' he adds, 'that this will make it more difficult to turn the kind of profit we want.'

I suggest that this is very important for these plants: the profit. The article continues:

... normally 10 per cent to 15 per cent after taxes. Shell is adding more new olefin capacity than anyone else, and its most recent project, a 1.5 billion-lb.-per-year plant at Norco, La., should start up by early 1982.

Oil companies will bear the brunt of excess U.S. ethylene capacity because they, not the chemical companies, now dominate the merchant market for this basic petro-chemical. Though Union Carbide Corporation and Dow Chemical Company—

There is that name again, Dow Chemical, which keeps popping up anywhere where there are petro-chemicals. It continues:

—for instance, are still among the largest ethylene producers, both have internal uses for all the ethylene they can make, and both expect to be net purchasers of ethylene during the next few years.

Again, with the huge increase in the market in Alberta across the border, I cannot see them producing it here and shipping it across the world. The article continues:

Flora explains Shell's decision to go ahead with its expansion by noting that Shell also has 'a significant internal requirement' for basic petro-chemicals. 'We have to be covered to support the downstream investments we were making to consume ethylene,' he says. However, several of those ethylene-consuming projects may be delayed, so that the amount of ethylene and propylene that Shell will have to sell outside could be larger than it had expected.

We are speaking here about the surplus. He continues about markets, as follows:

In selling its surplus, Shell will meet competition from a lot of other producers that are in the same fix, having delayed or cancelled plants to make polyethylene, polypropylene, styrene, and other derivatives. Exxon Chemical Company—

another huge company—

for instance, is building an ethylene plant in Baytown, Texas, and had expected that 100 million lb. or more of that plant's annual production would go as feedstock to a high-density polyethylene pipe mill reportedly planned by U.S. Steel Company Chemical Division. But the steelmaker has not moved on its project.

Calling such disappointments common, John S. Hartman, olefin marketing manager for Exxon Chemical U.S. notes that 'every forecast for ethylene demand since 1972 has been revamped downward.' Most of the big petro-chemical projects now under construction or planned in 1973 and 1974 when the industry was bumping the limits of capacity, and when demand was leaping ahead at 10 per cent to 12 per cent per year. Now, most industry analysts predict growth rates for ethylene consumption of 6 per cent to 7 per cent per year for the foreseeable future.

Several other companies are mentioned. Amoco Corporation has a surplus. Gulf Oil Company, Continental Oil Company, and Pullman (Kellogg Foundation) all have an excess demand. These are some of the largest producers in the world. So, we have an investment limit in some areas in the world and in other sections there is deep anxiety about the viability of the petro-chemical industry.

Earlier, I mentioned a report of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, of which Australia is a member. The report, entitled, 'The Petro-Chemical Industry: Trends in Production and Investment to 1985', was produced in 1979. Its introduction reads:

At its session in March 1977 the Industry Committee decided to prepare, with the help of an *ad hoc* group, a report covering the current problems of the petro-chemical industry and those foreseen during the next decade relating, *inter alia*, to trends in demand, availability of feed stock and investment in the industry.

The summary, relating to demand, states:

Firstly, competition from the new producing areas will probably result in pressure of imports, concentrated more on Europe from the COMECON countries and later, and perhaps more strongly, from the Middle East, and a reduction in export growth possibilities, in particular for exports from the U.S. to Latin America. Secondly, over the last two years the development of capacity outside the OECD area, particularly in the Middle East, has been slower than the forecasts until quite recently had indicated; the completion of a number of projects has been postponed or cancelled, which means at least that the full impact of this development upon member countries will not be felt before 1985.

Most important in relation to South Australia, the report goes on to analyse the position in relation to investment in petro-chemical plants. The O.E.C.D. is a huge organisation which represents most of the countries in the 'Free World'. The report continues:

In the field of investment in the coming period one major problem is likely to dominate: the financing of the new installations which will have to be constructed from 1980 to 1985 to satisfy the demand forecast up to the 1990 time horizon. The under-utilisation of production capacities which will probably be a feature of the period to the beginning of the nineties will mean increased competition and low cash flows caused by depressed prices, higher costs and, consequently, narrower profit margins.

Again, a significant factor. The report continues:

It is to be feared that it will be difficult to offset this erosion of firms' gross margins for self financing by turning to external providers of private capital in a situation in which the petro-

chemical industry will appear much less attractive to investors than in the past.

It has been reported in other documents about which I have spoken that there has been a serious down-turn, but the report goes on to say:

Beyond 1985, if demand prospects do not pick up in the meantime, this problem is likely to become worse because the industry will find that it must begin to plan the replacement of existing plant.

At the time of this report, the average plant in operation had been built in 1970. The report continues:

It is estimated that it will not be possible to finance more than one-third of such replacements out of depreciation reserve.

The O.E.C.D., of which this country is a member, has issued a report which states that there is plenty of feed stock. The report is supported by reports from America and around the world. Just about every country in the world is reporting supplies and saying that they will be able to provide ethylene, and many of them were thinking of their own plants. This is all to happen during the time scale in which this State is expecting huge developments. None of what I have said previously paints a rosy picture for investment in a plant in South Australia. Vast new production plants are planned for Argentina, the Philippines, Yugoslavia, Singapore, Mexico, China, Thailand, Canada and Greece, and huge developments are planned in the Middle East, while in the United Kingdom it is claimed that a surplus of petro-chemicals exist, and in the United States all of the large petro-chemical companies have expressed serious concern about the state of the industry and the surplus that exists there.

With that as a background, perhaps it may pay to have a look at the Redcliff situation. The possibility of the construction of a large petro-chemical plant in South Australia arose in the late 1960s, and that came about because of the discovery and utilisation of the Cooper Basin gas fields. Initially the South Australian Government, in conjunction with the Cooper Basin gas producers, pursued studies on the concept, and consultants were retained to investigate the project. Companies from Japan, the United States of America and Australia at that stage showed an interest in the project, and two possible sites were selected for the plant, at Port Adelaide and Redcliff. During the period 1971-73 the scale of the project was increased, and the site at Port Adelaide was discarded because of inadequate space.

To this point the South Australian Government had offered to provide the entire support in the form of the infra-structure. I can understand that; I can understand any Government offering to sponsor whatever it can in the way of development in this State. However, as the size of the proposed plant increased, the infra-structure costs were thought to exceed the capacity of the State Government to provide them, and at that stage assistance was sought from the Australian Government. In 1973 the future of the project was thrown into doubt because of the insistence of the Australian Government that 51 per cent Australian equity in the project be established. That is another concept with which I agree, but it is not insisted on to the same degree today.

A consortium which was held to meet this requirement was formed by Alcoa, I.C.I., Mitsubishi, Ampol and C.S.R. Later, Ampol and C.S.R. withdrew, but the remaining partners were allowed to continue with their feasibility studies. Dow Chemicals, which had also bid for the project, temporarily withdrew.

In 1975 the Alcoa, I.C.I.-Mitsubishi consortium announced that it was withdrawing from the project. The ostensible reason for this was that the high rate of inflation in Australia had made the project uneconomic. However, it is

fairly significant in view of later events that the 'other economic factors' which were also held to have contributed to the cancellation of the project were the over capacity in petro-chemical plants and a general slackening of demand around the world.

The Redcliff project was revived in 1976 when Dow Chemicals, which had been one of the companies first interested in the development, expressed renewed interest in the plant. Considering the state of the world petro-chemical industry at that stage and the reasons given by I.C.I. (a company making products similar to Dow) for pulling out of the venture, this was a strange decision. I cannot fathom that one at all. The reasons for it remain a matter of pure speculation. Perhaps Dow took a more optimistic view of the world economy than did I.C.I. Perhaps the decision was an attempt at empire building by Dow Australia, which may have been supplying rather optimistic reports to the parent company. On the other hand, Dow may merely have been attempting to pre-empt any likely competitors on the ground that, if the outlook for petro-chemicals improved, it would be the company best able to exploit the new situation. For whatever reason, Dow decided to go ahead with feasibility and environmental studies, which were to continue over a period of four years until Dow announced in 1980 that it was withdrawing from the project. I am not sure what sort of tax benefits there would have been to a company which involved itself in this sort of feasibility study—that may have been the reason as well. The questions that have to be asked are: was the Redcliff project ever really viable, and did Dow ever seriously intend to build the plant? Looking at the situation as it is, I think we have to look at the investment that would have been necessary and the products and the market for those products.

The latest published figures on investment indicate that the total cost of the project, including infra-structure development, was about \$900 000 000 at 1978 prices. Probably the cost would now be in excess of \$1 billion dollars. This cost places this development in world class. It was reported in the *Advertiser* on 12 November 1973 that Dow at that stage was building a Redcliff-size plant every nine months. Of course, 1973 was a boom time for petro-chemicals.

The products to be produced at Redcliff have varied from report to report. However, since 1978 predictions have remained fairly stable. To take three recent examples, in a paper prepared for the Department of Mines and Energy in 1978 it was stated that Redcliff would produce per annum caustic soda, 515 000 tonnes; E.D.C. (ethylene dichloride), 630 000 tonnes; L.D.P.E. (low-density polyethylene) 142 000 tonnes; pyrolysis gasoline, 25 000 tonnes; and alkylate, 135 000 tonnes.

In 1979, the Department of Economic Development stated that it would produce 505 000 tonnes of caustic soda, 313 000 tonnes of ethylene dichloride, 102 000 tonnes of low-density polyethylene, 272 000 tonnes of vinyl chloride monomer, 58 000 tonnes of propylene oxide, 35 000 tonnes of isolutane, and 3 000 000 tonnes of crude oil. Later in 1979, at the seminar to which I have referred previously, held by the Australian Petroleum Exploration Association, a representative from Dow said that Redcliff would produce 370 000 tonnes of caustic soda, 500 000 tonnes of E.D.C., 50 000 tonnes of polyethylene, and 200 000 tonnes of ethylene. Dow always intended that the main petro-chemicals produced at Redcliff would be exported, and this at a time of a reported glut in overseas production—but go ahead. The Australian market was small, and at that stage was more than catered for by the I.C.I. plant at Botany Bay, a plant that has been expanded and upgraded to produce the entire Australian market by 1982.

The world situation on petro-chemicals is such that the phases of petro-chemical production sales faded over the years, and it could be that, if we look at the market for the produce, that will probably do as well as anything. The sale of ethylene in the form of E.D.C. was vital to the success of the Redcliff project and yet, according to my figures, an over-supply of ethylene has been a characteristic in relation to this product since 1970. World production of ethylene in 1970 was 17 850 000 tonnes. The world production capacity was 20 500 000 tonnes, which meant that only 85 per cent of what could be made was being used. In 1975, the world was using only 68 per cent of what was made, in 1976 it was using 74 per cent of production, in 1980 it was using 75 per cent, and in 1985 it is predicted that the world will use 85 per cent of production. So, right up until 1985 there will be a surplus of production over demand.

It may be seen from those figures that, since 1970, the utilisation of ethylene has always been well below the maximum. In 1975, at a time when the Redcliff scheme was being actively promoted in South Australia, the utilisation of plant in the O.E.C.D. world was at its lowest ebb. At that stage it was reported that eight billion pounds of ethylene was surplus.

Turning to propylene, again, the figures do not indicate any market. The world production in 1975 was 10 490 000 tonnes, while world production capacity was 17 400 000 tonnes, giving a utilisation rate of 64 per cent. In 1976, world production was 12 620 000 tonnes and capacity was 17 700 000 tonnes, representing a 71 per cent utilisation. In 1980, there was a 75 per cent production capacity, and in 1985 it is predicted that the figure will be 85 per cent. Similar tables would indicate the same situation for all major petro-chemicals.

Caustic soda was always a major element in the petro-chemical field, and there are two major facets for the use of caustic soda in Australia. The main uses for this product are in industries such as soap manufacture and in the production of alumina from bauxite. The domestic production of caustic soda is carried out almost entirely by I.C.I., which produces about 130 000 tonnes annually. This amount meets the needs of domestic industry. The I.C.I. operation is protected by a tariff of 43 per cent on imported caustic soda.

It is significant that the needs of the aluminium producers are all met by overseas imports. These imports, which amounted to \$51 000 000 in 1978-79, are not subject to the 43 per cent tariff and are landed practically duty free. I think, from what I can find out, that a 2 per cent levy is paid. Therefore, the large aluminium producers are able to buy caustic soda at what might be termed the world price. The sources of supply for caustic soda imports are difficult to establish from the Australian records, because the Australian Bureau of Statistics does not publish figures on the country of origin. It appears that it is only a small number of countries importing caustic soda and, if they all published the figures, they would be able to identify who was supplying the needs.

Alcoa has said that its major sources of supply are the large British and American chemical conglomerates. In the case of Britain, this probably means that I.C.I. (U.K.) was the company concerned; it has a company in Australia. The United States source is more difficult to ascertain, but it would seem that Dow Chemicals would fit the description there. The importance of identifying these sources of supply of caustic soda to the aluminium producers in Australia is obvious when it is realised that the Redcliff project would be in direct competition with them. This competition would not be crucial if there were a world shortage of caustic soda, in which case Redcliff no doubt would easily gain the entire Australian market by overcoming the shortage. Far

from being a world shortage of caustic soda, however, there is a world glut, and that situation has existed for many years.

I am sure that the Government is well aware of the situation, because figures that are available to me are available to it, and the Government must be able to read the picture as well as I can. In 1977, the President of Dow gave an interview to the *Chemical Age* magazine, in which he stated that Dow had surplus caustic/chlorine capacity in the United States. That was reported in the *Chemical Age* of 23-30 December 1977.

At the A.P.E.A. seminar on Redcliff, Mr Morris, in the course of his address, quoted some interesting figures. This is the company that was looking at setting up a plant to produce caustic soda. The figures showed that the present world capacity of production of caustic soda was 40 000 000 tonnes, but the present world demand (in 1977) was 30 000 000 tonnes. Therefore, in 1979 there was a proven over-capacity in the world supply of caustic soda of 33½ per cent.

Looking at Redcliff in the light of what has gone before and the predictions of what it was to do, one of the basic products to be made at Redcliff was (or is, depending on one's line of thought) caustic soda, the sales of which, because of the volume of production, and obviously being a major factor of production, would be essential to guarantee the profitability of such a scheme. Also, there has been a proven world glut of caustic soda for many years. Dow, the company that has been pursuing this for some years, is a major producer of caustic soda in the United States, and I suggest that that indicates that it must be one of the producers of surplus caustic soda at this stage.

It is almost certain that Dow already supplies caustic soda to the Australian alumina market. It does it at the moment duty free. On today's figures, it would cost Dow or any other developer, Japanese, American or European, at least \$600 000 000 to establish the Redcliff plant. What would they get for this investment? If it was an American company, it would invest \$600 000 000 to compete against its own duty free imports of caustic soda; any supplier to the market in Australia would invest \$600 000 000 to compete against itself. It may eliminate other importers of caustic soda and become the sole supplier. Therefore, for any company to proceed with this project, it has to be able to show a financial balance, and that is very hard for me to see in this situation.

If any company did go ahead with the production of petro-chemicals in this country, it probably would not have a price difficulty on the Australian market. But, of course, what we have to consider, also, is that the alumina market usually is a part of a conglomerate and, if any part of their set-up also produces caustic soda, they are competing against themselves. One of the interesting side issues to the whole concept of the petro-chemical industry in this State is that it would be interesting to know whether anyone has considered what effect it would have on I.C.I., which is in my electorate and which is one of the largest caustic soda producers in the country. It seems to me that it might even put that company completely out of business, so I do not know whether there is much benefit in this for that industry.

Another interesting report on the aluminium industry which appeared in the *Advertiser* of Friday 31 July was a report from Comalco. As caustic soda production is dependent upon the aluminium industry, one would obviously expect that, if there was a booming aluminium industry, there would be a booming caustic soda market. It is interesting to read that report from C.R.A., under the heading 'Comalco hit by charges', as follows:

Net earnings of the 45 per cent C.R.A. owned Comalco fell from \$36.75m to \$12.49m in 1981's first half.

This is the significant thing. We are talking about petrochemicals again. We have to think of the market for caustic soda and, if the aluminium market is booming, we can expect sales. If the aluminium market is depressed, the market decreases. The article continues:

Directors said the lower result reflected the impact of lower depreciation charges, the continuing depressed world demand for primary aluminium and alumina.

That is expanded on a little later in the article as follows:

Activity in aluminium consuming industries remained generally depressed, particularly in the major economies—the United States.

Again, the United States has a depressed alumina market; it also has a depressed chemical market, so there is no market there for produce from here. Japan has a depressed market. It has been reported in several magazines as having had a very depressed petro-chemical market. We know its economy is slowing down because of fuel costs. It is moving aluminium smelting to Australia, but it will not do so if there is no market for it. Europe has a vast supply of petro-chemical products from Comicom countries and from Britain, and a plant is starting in Greece, so there is an increasing supply of petro-chemical products there. So there is the report that says the market in Australia is down for aluminium, and, in accordance with that, that market for caustic soda is down.

I suppose it is still remotely possible that somebody will go ahead with a petro-chemical plant. For instance, I notice in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Port and Terminal facilities at Stony Point, South Australia, a Santos project, that there are a few references to petro-chemicals—nothing definite, though. I notice that it is all 'if', 'what', and 'perhaps'. I think I will just read from that report, clause 424, which is about ethane, a petro-chemical feed stock, the following:

Current recoverable reserves of ethane in the Cooper Basin are estimated at 7 500 000 tonnes. Ethane can be left in the gas stream to be sold to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia or Australian Gaslight, or it can be extracted and used for petro-chemical production where it has application as a feed stock for ethylene-based products. The final use of Cooper Basin ethane will be heavily dependent on the development of an accessible petro-chemical complex within reasonable pipeline distance, as it is most easily transported by pipeline.

I understand that ethane/ethalene will be produced there. The report continues:

It is currently planned that all ethane gas produced as the top product from the first column will be completely consumed in the plant as fuel. The possible development of a local Spencer Gulf ethane market could result in a large de-ethaniser designed to recover significantly greater quantities of ethane for sale.

So there is nothing positive. It states—and this supports the other statements:

Ethane can in the future be accommodated at the site if a petro-chemical plant is built in the vicinity. Alternatively, ethane can be provided to a petro-chemical plant at Redcliff if one is built there.

I think that the petro-chemical plant has been a bit of a political football since 1973. The possibility of it has been decreased; I am sure that at the end of the previous Labor Government it was obvious to people that it was not a goer. However, that did not stop the Liberal Government, when it came to office, from grabbing it as a banner. I think this is deception. It should not be done. It should not put these stories over people. In the present economic climate of the world, I cannot see any possibility of a petro-chemical plant in this State.

We have heard about all the benefits it will give to the State and the people if it goes ahead, but they are pipe dreams (to use a pun) to put those thoughts forward. As was stated in the newspaper article to which I referred earlier, it is cruel and unfair to give people false expectations. I think it reflects the mushroom philosophy of Governments, to feed people information that is not true. I

suppose honourable members are all aware of mushrooms—keep them in the dark and feed them something. It is just not the principles of the Government. We need a Government which will work together, be honest and get the State moving again. I noticed in a document I was reading earlier today that the honesty of politicians was reflected on by a member in another place.

That honourable member said that the standing of politicians is in very low order, and that we make promises and do not keep them. I think that most people who look at politics at all would agree with that. Politics has now evolved into a situation where it is a matter of promise, promise, promise, with no real intent or capacity to deliver, because we are all around the place working against each other.

In this State we are facing what is probably another huge development that, on the face of it, will cause a massive disruption to the people of this State, namely, Roxby Downs. That is a problem which must be faced by all politicians and people of this State. I say here and now that in my opinion Roxby Downs must go ahead. I do not see how this State can survive without that development. I have no idea at this stage what we do with uranium.

Regarding the disposal of the waste products, I do not think anyone has the answer. Millions of words have been spoken on that subject from both sides. Some people say 'yes' and others say 'no'. I do not know what the answer is, and I am sure that no-one in this House knows either. However, I am sure that something will be found. However, Roxby Downs must go ahead.

Dr Billard interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: There are plenty of theories, and there are as many experts for it as there are those against it. This State needs Roxby Downs. We do not need promises but we need to attack the problem definitely with the idea of finding a solution for the purpose of getting Roxby Downs to go ahead for the benefit of this State. There is nothing else on the books to give us any hope at all. If we have two years drought in this State we are finished, because the economy is still based on wheat and wool. Our manufacturing industry is slipping away. So, let us get back to honesty in government and work together towards a common goal.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): The previous speaker mentioned a particular topic on which millions of words have been spoken to little avail. Before making some remarks on a subject that concerns me greatly, I should like to make a few remarks on something else that involves millions of words going nowhere, namely, the concept of the Address in Reply debate itself, which I believe is a massive waste of time. Several other members of this House have already expressed that opinion on this occasion and on previous occasions, and I did so myself this time last year.

You, Mr Speaker, plus the 10 Ministers on the front bench do not usually contribute to this particular ritual; it is reserved for the 36 other members of the House, the front-benchers and back-benchers of the Opposition and the back-benchers in the Government. As a result, if all 36 members speak, we have 36 hours of absolute verbiage, or, should I say, garbage in the case of the contribution last night from the member for Brighton, to which I will refer more fully later. His contribution consisted of nothing more than ribald silliness, masquerading as social analysis.

Each year this debate wastes weeks of Parliament's time; we have 36 boring speeches delivered to a near empty Chamber by 36 more or less bored politicians. The speeches are boring to give and are generally boring for people to listen to. They achieve very very little. I pointed out at this

stage last year that that amount of time would be far better used if it could be spread out during the Parliamentary session so that each member could have six 10-minute speeches at a time more suited to his requirements, so that he could speak on a topic or a subject that is topical at a time when it is topical. A member could raise a matter on behalf of a constituent within a matter of a few days of that constituent's asking him to raise a particular problem.

Instead, we have this ridiculous ritual of people trying to pad out an hour's speech, and waste time. The one hour contribution from the member for Brighton last night is a prime example—just a torrent of prurience from him—pornographic material just read with relish, which was masquerading as distaste. The honourable member's attitude reminded me of what we sometimes see in yellow press articles: persons going through a masquerade pretending that they are horrified with the subject material with which they are dealing. Yet for some reason or other they have to deal with it in great detail and apparent relish in order to prove how disgusted they are.

I regret that on this occasion only two members are on the Government benches, the member for Newland, busy on the back bench on some literary matter, and, on the front bench, the Chief Secretary, who could not exactly be described as 100 per cent alert. However, I will not make any other reference in that regard. Unfortunately, the member for Brighton is not present in the Chamber in order to hear the remarks that I wish to make regarding his contribution last night.

There were several tragedies evident in that contribution last night. There was a tragic slur on the Health Education team, and, by implication, on the member for Salisbury, because in a previous occupation he was closely involved with the writing of curricular materials for the Health Education team. There was a tragic slur on the teaching profession in general. No school or teacher was specified; instead, every school and teacher in this State, regardless of the very vague qualifications that the member made, is under a cloud as a result of the member's wild allegations.

Another tragedy was the fact that it was a lecherous waste of time of this House. It is absolutely pathetic that the public purse should contribute \$30 000 or so for the salary of a member if we are to conduct ourselves in that fashion. It is particularly tragic that any member should want to dwell on such a topic for an entire hour at a time when this State has 40 000 unemployed people, when we have 20 000 people on the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation, when the State's Budget is in disarray and a month late, and when the Government itself is in disarray. We have seen a leaked survey indicating that the Government's standing in the community is at a very, very low 28 per cent.

Perhaps that contribution last night was symptomatic of the Government's need to find some sort of distraction from its performance, in particular from its education policy. Another tragedy, as I see it, connected with the contribution by the member for Brighton is that this House has such inadequate representation from that area. It is tragic that the Brighton area has lost a member of Parliament of the stature of Hugh Hudson and has ended up with the representation that it has now.

Members on this side were as disgusted with the speech as I was and I believe that one or two decent honourable people from the Government benches also were disgusted at the performance we saw last night. The member for Brighton has ruined his reputation forever within the forums of this Parliament. The way in which the member for Brighton played to the gallery, which was packed full of Festival of Light people, was quite blatant. He played to the press, he made a sensation of delivering his speech,

expecting sensational coverage, and, as anticipated, he has his picture in the paper this afternoon, and an article appeared in this morning's *Advertiser* as well. He made sure that the speech got sufficient coverage. I shall deal with some of the techniques to get such coverage that the honourable member used—techniques normally reserved only for people of Ministerial status.

Members on this side expressed our disgust and our mirth. We were in two minds as to which was the most appropriate reaction to provide to a contribution such as that. We did not know whether to laugh or to cry. We were torn between disgust at what could well be the cynicism of the member concerned, or, if the member concerned actually meant what he said last night, Opposition members found it very hard to resist mirth at his silliness and at the way in which he has destroyed his reputation in this Parliament more or less for all time.

Originally I did not intend to speak on this matter, but I am doing so, first, because the behaviour of the member concerned is absolutely beyond the pale and, secondly, because I can anticipate the interpretation, or should I say, distortion that will appear in Festival of Light circles with regard to the Opposition's reaction.

A lady by the name of Gwen Tapp, I understand, spoke with one of our members after the speech. This particular lady is famous for her personal collection of pornography. If, as is claimed, pornography has a debauching influence on people then she must be one of the most debauched people in Adelaide. She is always willing, I understand, to provide examples of it when anyone requires a bit of evidence to use in debate on that subject. One could say that she supplies pornography on tap.

Mr Keneally: I understand it's always up to date as well.

Mr TRAINER: So I believe. Apparently she was very concerned about the Opposition's reaction. I will try to show why our reaction was one of disgust combined with mirth. Earlier today the Minister made a statement which I do not think in any way adequately defended the work of the health education team. All teachers and all schools, as a result of the actions of the member for Brighton and the inaction of the Minister, are still under a cloud. Last night, shortly after the disgraceful prurience displayed by the member for Brighton, the shadow Minister of Education put out a press release. I quote from one paragraph of that:

'Lurid examples,' Mr Arnold, said, 'were read into *Hansard* by the member for Brighton'. No-one would support the distribution of such disgusting material as part of sex education.

No-one on this side had indicated that we support any distribution of such material in schools. The quotation continues:

And I know the health education project team does not; indeed, they have in the past had certain teachers removed from teaching the course for bad teaching methods much less serious than those quoted.

Mr Arnold continued:

Yet, not once did the member for Brighton make any mention of the valuable work of the health education project team.

One question that arises from the Minister's inaction is whether the Minister had any prior knowledge of the member for Brighton's contribution. When the shadow Minister was a member of the Opposition he quite regularly criticised one of the subjects that came under fire last night, namely, the Social Education Materials Project, known as SEMP. That was rather curious because that was one of the particular targets of the member for Brighton last night. But, much more significant than that, the Minister was seen by a member of this House perusing that speech before the member for Brighton delivered it.

That is the worst speech that I had heard in the two years that I have been here, and I have been a regular

reader of *Hansard* for well over a decade before entering Parliament and it is the worst speech that I have read in *Hansard*.

There have been occasions when a member perhaps straight after the dinner break has come out with a few words which were a bit rash and which perhaps might have been best left unspoken. But, we have never had a scatological hour similar to the one to which we were subjected last night. I have never heard anything so prurient in this Chamber as the delivery by the member for Brighton, who made an absolute spectacle of himself in the process in doing so.

Indeed, he could well have a new profession when he leaves the House. Instead of going back to the tourist business where he could organise lost weekends in the fleshpots of Bangkok, he could instead, since he can make such a spectacle of himself, get a job with O.P.S.M. or Laubman and Pank. He certainly made his mark last night. Since entering this House the member has been fairly inconspicuous, after arriving on the scene at the expense of the Hon. Hugh Hudson. Many of us thought him the least likely person to make a contribution of the nature made last night. I was not one of those who held him in quite that high an esteem. I had a couple of doubts, which I will explain later.

There are a couple of things I have learnt about him early in my two years here. Nevertheless, I must agree with members on this side: he seemed an amiable chap, the sort of junior Chamber of Commerce 'hail fellow, well met' type of person. He would greet you with a pleasant word and a sheepish grin. (He certainly had a sheepish grin on last night as he made that disgusting contribution.) He was rather startled to have won in 1979. He did not expect to win, nor did he live in the area at the time. I understand that he still does not do so.

After the election this astonished person was racing around like Blinky Bill asking what he had to do next. In a state of pleasant smiling confusion, he entered here like something that was a cross between a Cheshire cat and a startled Koala. Indeed, he reminded me of Fred Daly's comment regarding a member in the Federal House: he seemed rather like an artificially inseminated cow—something wonderful had happened but he could not work out quite what. It was, indeed, a tragedy that the House should lose someone of the stature of Hugh Hudson and be replaced by someone of the stature of the current member for Brighton. Hugh Hudson was a very good economics lecturer. He was, in many respects, a national figure. He was Deputy Premier of this State, a brilliant debater, one of the very few in here who could, by their ability, upstage people of the calibre of Virgo and Dunstan. He could hold the House in awe with his skill. Admittedly, like other people, Hugh Hudson had his faults; prolixity was one.

But, nevertheless, it is tragic that he should be replaced by this miserable member, obsessed, as he is, with carnal matters. There is something very strange about that. When I told my wife on arriving home last night about the sordid speech we had heard in here, she suggested that perhaps what he delivered was symptomatic of someone who had frustrated ambitions as a gynaecologist.

The first time that my wife and I met this member on a social occasion he was rather an amiable, polite person. My wife summed him up as being 'a nice man'. She said, 'Mr Glazbrook is a nice man. Please do not attack him in the House.' I said, 'I think you are being conned. I think he is just a typical Liberal.' She was wrong. I think the despicable sort of speech he made last night proved that. It was despicable on either or both of two grounds: his despicable ignorance or his despicable cynicism.

He has not been a particularly conspicuous member in the time that he has been here. As proof, I will give some details of what, at the time, was to me an embarrassing incident. It relates to an occasion at the Marion council where we had a naturalisation ceremony. Like other members present at that time, I had to give a little speech and start with the usual formula, 'Your Worship the Mayor, Lady Mayoress, my Federal Parliamentary colleague, Mr Ralph Jacobi, my State Parliamentary colleague,' and so on. As I turned towards the member for Brighton, I could not for the life of me remember his name. But, he has certainly made his name now. It is all over the *Advertiser*; it is all over the *News*. He is stuck with the name now forever: the name that I have heard in the corridors here, 'Dirty Dick'. 'It was a grubby performance,' the Leader of the Opposition said on *5DN* this morning.

The member for Brighton said that he dislikes the spread of pornography, but he propagates the most explicit material by having it put into *Hansard* so that it will end up in school libraries and homes.

An honourable member: Disgusting!

Mr TRAINER: It is disgusting indeed! He has gone down very sadly in my estimation for his Marquis de Sade-type performance last night. I find it very difficult ever to consider that I will look on him again as a decent person. He does have a district near mine, so it is necessary that I will meet him on various occasions as Parliamentary representatives for our districts. My position as member for Ascot Park requires that I will have to do so, and I will have to be courteous under duress. I will continue to provide that courtesy because it is a requirement. But, let there be no mistake on how the member stands in my estimation for his disgraceful performance last night when he read page after page of salacious material with apparent relish, playing it all up to the Festival of Light who were up there in the Strangers Gallery, and oblivious to what I noticed in the Speaker's Gallery, which was a mother with her two young children. To be honest, I do not want to be unfair to the member concerned. I cannot verify whether the two children were present in the gallery in the earlier part of his contribution when the member was delivering most of that smutty material. But, I certainly noticed them there towards the conclusion.

It is significant which Government members stayed in here last night for the contribution. I notice some of them are in here again now. Very few were here then, although, of the few who were here, it is significant that most were people who at one time or another have indicated some sort of support for the policies and prattlings of the Festival of Light or the League of Rights in this Parliament, particularly when we were debating the Prostitution Bill of the member for Mitcham a few months ago.

For example, the member for Henley Beach went to ground. He was one of the people who was going to support the Bill or produce an amendment that would ensure its carriage. But he went to ground; he hid. The Festival of Light had got to him. I cannot work out why the member for Henley Beach would be so terrified of the Festival of Light. I certainly cannot understand any of their supporters in his district voting for an Opposition Party like ourselves. They seem to have a lot of distaste for us. Of what was he afraid?

The only conclusion I can come to, as have other people who have concurred with me in this analysis, is that he was terrified of his preselection. Apparently, the Festival of Light has a great deal of say in Liberal Party local preselection. The member for Mawson is another person who indicated Festival of Light-type stances.

Mr SCHMIDT: I rise on a point of order. I take exception to the member for Ascot Park naming me personally as

being a supporter of the Festival of Light and I ask that he retract those comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mawson has taken offence at the words expressed by the member for Ascot Park and asks that he withdraw them.

Mr TRAINER: I withdraw those words if the honourable member is offended and considers it disreputable to support the Festival of Light or the League of Rights. However, I did on a previous occasion make mention of a speech that the member for Mawson had delivered wherein he prattled on from a list from a Mr W. Cleon Skousen, allegedly a former F.B.I. agent, of the communist secret plans, their lists of rules for taking over the world. I drew attention to the sort of sources from which material like that had come. Of course, the member for Brighton was one of those present last night and we have seen one or two strange comments about morals from him on earlier occasions. Another person who was present was the Deputy Premier. We may recall that during the Prostitution Bill he said that he felt the Festival of Light was a marvellous group of people and he supported basically many of their policies.

There we have the member for Henley Beach, the member for Mawson, the member for Brighton and the Deputy Premier, our own Gang of Four, although in this case we have the member for Brighton in the place of the usual Madame Mao, the Minister of Health, referred to by Tony Barker in the *News* as the 'Minister for Morals'. The role of the staff of the Deputy Premier in the context of last night's contribution is rather interesting, and I will be referring to that later on. The whole operation last evening was cynically orchestrated to get the maximum prurient sensational results. Many members may not be aware of this, but yesterday morning radio 5DN carried a news report in which it was announced that the member for Brighton would be delivering a speech with a great deal of impact later in the day. Copies were supplied to the press gallery beforehand and, I presume, to the Festival of Light members who were present in the gallery.

An honourable member: Was that a copy of a speech, or just copious notes?

Mr TRAINER: The member concerned, when a point of order was taken, claimed that they were copious notes, but we have our suspicions otherwise. The Acting Speaker at the time—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member is not going to reflect upon a decision of the Chair on an earlier occasion.

Mr TRAINER: No, I was merely going to say that the Acting Speaker concerned has made his ruling and we will have to abide by that ruling in future. We will have to adhere to it quite closely.

Mr Mathwin: And not allow you to read from notes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: I am sorry, Sir. I resumed my seat. I was not sure whether you were ruling on a point of order or merely quietening the member for Glenelg.

Mr Max Brown: That would be hard to do.

Mr TRAINER: Which is fairly difficult, as the member for Whyalla has said.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Ascot Park not to make assertions that could be an allusion to action taken by the Chair on this occasion or on any other occasion. The Chair will always take action relative to any member, whether it be the member for Glenelg, the member for Ascot Park or anyone else.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed, Sir. I was merely indicating my support for you in your very difficult and invidious task when some of the members are so stropic.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that the honourable member get on with his speech.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Glenelg to cease interjecting.

Mr TRAINER: The sort of distribution beforehand of a speech that the member for Brighton had last night is the sort of treatment that is normally reserved for speeches of an important nature from Ministers or Opposition front-benchers. It was rather strange that someone from the Deputy Premier's staff (a Mr Yeeles, I understand) distributed this to the press gallery on behalf of the member for Brighton. As I mentioned earlier, a member in this House saw the Minister of Education apparently vet the speech and then pass it over to the member for Brighton. I will attempt very carefully not in any way to reflect on the Chair, but he read from those copious notes verbatim, like a clockwork orange.

Mr Mathwin: Like you are reading from yours.

Mr TRAINER: It happens that I have in my possession a copy of that speech that was circulated, and it even contains (this is how verbatim it gave the appearance of being) the initial 'Mr Speaker' bit at the beginning of the first page. It was the sort of speech that one could almost imagine having written into it 'halfway through, check the time' or '45 minutes, check the time' and so on. It was blatantly obvious it was not his own wording in the main. Large sections of it were plagiarised.

It was tempting to repeat the old line that parts of the member's speech were good and parts of it were original, but the parts that were original were not good and the parts that were good were not original. To be honest, I must say that there was not much in it that was original and all of it was dreadful, including the sections that were plagiarised. There were great slabs from the sort of right-wing publications that we see in League of Rights bookshops, and yet, for some reason or other, the member for Brighton or the author of the speech, if the two are not synonymous, did not see fit to indicate that those great slabs had been taken from other publications.

I am curious as to who exactly helped to write it. Who is the unfortunate girl (I say girl in this content because secretaries in our sex-oriented employment arrangements are normally girls or young women) who had to type out that particular material, all 83 pages of it, and who was responsible for having to photocopy it for distribution to the press?

An honourable member: What about the unfortunate students who have got to listen to it?

Mr TRAINER: Could there be some connection with the Minister of Education's office, because the Minister certainly with some issues seems to adopt a 'running with the hare and hunting with the hounds' attitude. He adopts the policy that, as the head of his department, he will call for reports and all the rest of it and yet, at the same time, one can suspect that he may be pushing a barrow on the side. This is not the first time that I have noticed some curious connection between the member for Brighton and the Minister of Education.

I refer now to an article that appeared in the *Australian* on 22 December 1979 entitled 'Warm beer and Party promises'. That refers not to an orgy but to the Liberal Party Christmas party that year, and to the interesting experiences of two of the journalists concerned, one of whom was Peter Ward of the *Australian*, from whence I am reading this article. The two journalists had a particularly interesting experience. The article states:

In the course of the afternoon, two senior journalists were harangued by one of the backbenchers who, to his amazement, had won a strong Labor seat.

I am assured that the member concerned is the member for Brighton. The article continues:

No, he was not a politician, just a representative of his people, he said. Furthermore he saw his main new task was to help enforce strict moral and family values absolutely everywhere. He'd spoken to the Minister of Education, Mr Allison, who had suggested setting up a special committee of like-minded zealots. It would be done in the new year. A new moral force would stalk the land. Would he describe himself as a puritan, he was asked. Yes, I am very interested in sports and tourism, he answered, so that you didn't know if he'd understood. Signs of the times.

It was interesting to hear the reference to a special committee. In the version of the speech that was distributed to members of the press but not in the *Hansard* proof that I had a look at today, there is a reference to the member's calling for a Select Committee of the House. For some reason, he decided not to include that bit.

One of the many reasons why I took offence at the contribution of the member for Brighton was that he personally attacked me. Whether he realised he was attacking me, I am not sure. At one stage when he was reading from some gobbledegook about an international global conspiracy, I interjected and asked whether he was reading from the *Protocols of Zion* or, to give it its full title, the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. That is the most notorious forged document in history. It goes into great detail describing the international Jewish plot to take over the world, and it is continually rewritten. This document was originally put together in Russia in the early years of the nineteenth century.

It was responsible for the death of thousands of Jewish Russian people in the pogroms of the period of the Black Hundreds. It went from there with White Russian emigres after the Revolution into places such as Nazi Germany, where raving anti-Semites accepted it as absolute fact, and indirectly it led to the 6 000 000 dead in the concentration camps and to the persecution in some areas of the world that still goes on by people who believe this weird international conspiracy. It is still being peddled around, the most nauseating forged document in history. I asked the member for Brighton whether he was reading from the *Protocols of Zion*, and he said:

No, I do not need to. If you have a guilty conscience you might like to do it later.

It would seem to me to be a fairly clear inference that he accepted this weird conspiracy theory that led so tragically to the consequences that the *Protocols of the elders of Zion* led to. He went on to say—and this is where I took personal offence:

If you are not concerned about your children, I am concerned about mine.

I think he picked the wrong person to have a go at as someone not concerned about his children. I would probably be one of the most boring stereotypes of a family man who has been seen in here for some time, as a teetotaller, now a non-smoker, with three children whom I love very, very dearly, and I took deep resentment at that sort of remark coming from the member for Brighton. I would like at a later date to see a retraction.

His speech was a miserable one, full of lasciviousness. He seemed to relish all those disgusting four-letter words that he used quite unnecessarily. If he really wanted to make a point—and there are certain valid points in what he put forward, rather minimal, but nevertheless one or two that must be considered—

Mr Lewis: All of them.

Mr TRAINER: I will deal with that later. But the way in which he approached it! I see no necessity to quote at such length and with such relish, rolling those words around his tongue. But they certainly got the impact that he desired.

Mr Lynn Arnold: There is no evidence that he followed it through the appropriate channels, either.

Mr TRAINER: There is no evidence that he followed it through the appropriate channels, as the member for Salisbury has pointed out. The member for Brighton said in his contribution that last year he was told this and nine months ago he started to follow something up, but there is no indication that he attempted to follow it through the appropriate channels. The only indication that exists is that he deliberately set out to make a big splash. I noticed him upstairs this morning, in a press conference, displaying his smut for the Channel 10 camera. He got the headline that he wanted in the *Advertiser* today, and his picture is in the *News* tonight; he is even responsible for the cartoon that appears in tonight's *News*.

The speech that he delivered, regardless of what excuses the Minister might make, was a general smear on education. The member for Brighton did not deal in specifics. He was as vague as possible, trying to avoid any indication of where and when something had happened or who was involved. I checked with my local high school, and none of the publications he mentioned are in the library. The only connection with anything of the sort of material that he listed is that they have certain parts of the SEMP package, and there is nothing particularly wrong with the Social Education Materials Project. It has a few faults here and there, but basically it is a good, well-meaning attempt to provide the sort of curriculum materials that were lacking up until the time it was developed.

The member for Brighton sees conspiracies everywhere. He talks about 'carefully laid plans' that led to the things that he says are happening in the schools. He talks about 'secular humanism' and people trying to achieve 'Utopian dreams' that will destroy the 'Judeo-Christian theistic, the God-centred way of life'. He smeared the Women's Education Resource Centre, except that that is not the title of the body. It is called the Women's Studies Resource Centre. I rang there this afternoon to seek their point of view on what the member for Brighton had had to say about this, because last night, in the course of his speech, he said:

I have been told that some of the material being circulated comes from the Women's Education Resource Centre in Adelaide.

An honourable member: He should have checked it out before he made the statement.

Mr TRAINER: He should have, but he did not say who told him. It is just vague generality: 'I have been told.' He could not quote the name of the organisation correctly. That organisation is based at North Terrace, immediately upstairs from the Women's Information Switchboard. I contacted them today to inquire further into their role. They have books available to the public on women's subjects, available for display to the public to show what is available on the market, and some are for sale while some are available on loan. They are for general loan to any members of the public; they are not lent specifically to schools *per se*. Only a tiny minority of their publications are concerned with sex. They are generally women's subjects, and about 4 per cent or 5 per cent of the total are of a sexual nature.

I asked about the first publication mentioned by the member for Brighton, the book entitled *Make it Happy*, written by Jane Cousins, from which he read some lurid extracts. That publication happens to be a Penguin book, available in just about any bookstore in the State. He referred to a sex kit called *Empire Times Man on Man*, and I am advised that that is not a kit but an edition of *Empire Times*, the not very high quality (at times) journal of the Flinders University. The copy referred to is six years old, and the Women's Study Centre has one or two copies not on display at the moment but in the archival file, according to the information I was given this afternoon.

Mr Glazbrook: Tell us about the resource kit given to all the schools.

Mr TRAINER: If the honourable member can produce some evidence on that, I will retract that part of my argument. The third was a book entitled *Sexuality*, allegedly produced by the Victorian A.U.S. Women's Studies Resource Centre. Further on in the course of his contribution the member for Brighton misinterpreted completely the well-known 'freedom and authority' directive from the Education Department.

An honourable member: Freud would have had a ball with you blokes.

Mr TRAINER: That is an unfortunate choice of phrase.

Mr Keneally: That was covered last night.

Mr TRAINER: It was?

Mr Keneally: Yes—another unfortunate phrase.

Mr TRAINER: Most unfortunate. He asked some interesting questions as to parents' right to decide:

Do parents have the right to decide whether or not they wish their child to be subjected to material of the type I have referred to, or must they have the decision made for them by teachers who must make a blanket overall decision covering the whole class?

Mr MATHWIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I seek your ruling on the fact that the honourable member is reading the speech directly from *Hansard* of a member of this House, and I ask whether that is permissible under Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold the point of order. It is the same debate, and honourable members may refer to the same debate although they may not refer directly to the *Hansard* record. I did not hear the honourable member for Ascot Park identify it as the *Hansard* record; therefore, I do not uphold the point of order.

Mr TRAINER: On a point of further explanation—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MATHWIN: On a point of order, Sir, the honourable member said that he was quoting from the speech of the member for Brighton in this place, and he quoted directly from the *Hansard* of last night.

Mr TRAINER: Point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I will deal with one point of order before I take another. It is most unusual to receive a point of order from the person who has the call of the Chair. I suggest to the honourable member for Glenelg that reading from the speech of the honourable member for Brighton is not necessarily synonymous with reading from *Hansard*. The honourable member for Ascot Park earlier indicated that he had read and was reading from the distributed record of the member for Brighton—

Mr Trainer: A copy of them.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is conceivable that that is the source of the quotations now being given, but I would indicate to the honourable member for Ascot Park that it is necessary, if he is going to record any comment made by the member for Brighton, that it be the actual statement made by the honourable member, and not necessarily one that he had distributed, unless he is saying that it is the distributed word as opposed to the stated word. I do not want to get into a discussion about semantics, but the point is not able to be upheld, as the honourable member for Glenelg would ask. The honourable member for Ascot Park.

Mr TRAINER: With your leave, Sir, I will adopt the second of those two alternatives. Parents do quite clearly have a right to decide what is taught to their children. In references I will make later to the syllabus of the health education group I will make that quite clear.

There are some other strange things that appear in the honourable member's copious notes. For example, there was reference (and I could not quite work out what he was getting at here) to a mother who complained of her child

being asked to write an essay on 'How would you kill your father?'. It was not made clear whether this was something recently brought to the attention of the member for Brighton by a constituent or some other elector in South Australia, or whether it was something that took place some years ago, or whether it took place in this State at all. It would have been most helpful in analysing the speech of the member for Brighton if he or his note writer (the one who contributed his copious notes) could have been more specific about where these various incidents were supposed to have taken place. It is hard to sort out what is secondhand and what is thirdhand, or what consists of wild stories of the type the member for Hanson once contributed regarding a forceful injection of drugs that allegedly occurred in a toilet at the Marion shopping centre, the investigation into which cost countless man hours of police time.

The member for Brighton refers to many of these incidents taking place in Victoria, although it is not explained where in Victoria, or in what circumstances. We do not get any dates or places. We do not know whether it is recent, or in the 1970s or the 1960s. He certainly has a strange approach in adopting as complete fact a publication entitled 'They've got your kids'. That is a nice title for a pamphlet to appeal to people's paranoid fantasies. Some of the references he makes to overseas organisations are rather strange. He referred to a group called SIECUS, which stands for the Sex Information and Education Council of the United States. He prefaces that with the adjective 'notorious', and the whole general description that the honourable member gave reads very much as though it was lifted verbatim from a publication by the John Birch Society in the United States, or a similar organisation. He quotes approvingly from an article in *American Opinion*, 1969, which is the major journal of the John Birch Society of the United States. He quotes approvingly from someone called Garry Allen. I have a publication from this Garry Allen here. It is a marvellous potboiler called *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, which deals with the same sort of international conspiracy I mentioned earlier. At page 35 it states:

We can only theorize on the manner in which Moscow is controlled from New York, London and Paris.

You see, Sir, in Garry Allen's fevered brain there is, presumably, the international Jewish conspiracy, although the word 'Jewish' is often dropped and reference is made merely to the international conspiracy of the 'money men'. In his fevered brain the Soviet Union is controlled by rich financiers in New York, London and Paris. We find references in his text to United States Jewish millionaires subsidising the Russian revolution. In the section from which I am quoting, he states:

Undoubtedly much of the control is economic, but certainly the international bankers have an enforcer arm within Russia to keep Soviet leaders in line. The organization may be SMERSH, the international Communist murder organization described in testimony before Congressional Committees and by Ian Fleming in his James Bond books.

The whole book is just an incredibly sick product from a sick mind. I am surprised that anyone would want to use that sort of an author as an authority on anything. Further on, in what is obviously plagiarised material, the copious notes state, with respect to Dr Lester Kirkendall, Professor of Family Life at Oregon State University:

This particular person can never be accused of being an old fuddy-duddy by even the hippiest of the porno politicians.

That is just the sort of phrase I have read so many times. I am sure that that sequence of words did not originate in the mind of the member for Brighton. I am sure that that was lifted straight from a right wing publication. Also, the notes refer to Isadore Rubin, as follows:

He, too, shares Dr Kirkendall's rejection of patriotism. Rubin was, on 3 May 1955, identified in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a member of the Communist Party.

I point out to those who are not aware of it that the House Un-American Activities Committee, H.U.A.C., in 1955 was the playground of the famous Senator Joe McCarthy.

Mr Keneally: And Richard Nixon.

Mr TRAINER: And Richard Nixon, too. I mentioned earlier how it is hard to pin down the actual dates of the incidents to which the honourable member is referring. In one particular section, in what I can only presume is a quotation, although it does not have quotation marks around it, he states:

Examples of features in recent issues include 'Can humans breed with Animals' and 'Witchcraft and Sex 1968'.

It is most peculiar, if he has read a recent publication, that one of the titles in that publication should be 'Witchcraft and Sex, 1968'.

It goes on further with all sorts of cute Americanisms masquerading as member for Brighton originals. 'Now get this', it says in one place, and there is a reference also, to folderal, a word I have not seen for a long time, but it is exactly the sort of word one sees popping up from time to time in right-wing American journals such as *United States News and World Report*. He quotes from an article written in 1966—15 years ago! There is the very weird and sick story he gives of 20 male students who allegedly got carried away with their sex lesson and raped their teacher on the spot. There is no indication of where or when that happened, nothing to give us any reason for thinking it was a story of 100 per cent veracity. Like these right-wing American publications, he gave a big serve to that *bete noir* of the right wing, the famous educationist John Dewey, the sort of person the Australian Lilac League, centred in Queensland, has often referred to.

In case members are wondering what 'Lilac' stands for, it is 'Ladies in Line Against Communism', I understand the patron is Flo Bjelke-Petersen. He also has what seems to be a side-swipe at the famous behavioural psychologist, B. F. Skinner. Then he gets stuck into the MACOS course and the SEMP course and goes on and on about secular humanism, and the conspiracy theory comes up again and he refers to the predictions of Nostradamus. Then I completely lost my cool when he referred to Nostradamus. That is the last thing I expected to be cited as an authority in this Chamber.

Mr Randall: He never said it in the House.

Mr TRAINER: If he did not say it last night, then I apologise, but it is listed in the copious notes and it would appear that even the member for Brighton was too ashamed to bring Nostradamus in here, which must be a redeeming feature and something that can be said on his behalf, and there is not much I can find to say on his behalf today. He also cited the wonderful W. Cleon Skousen, author of the same sort of book that indirectly led to the quotations used by the member for Mawson some months ago. There are examples in there of the effect of the international communist conspiracy. For example, it is affecting the quality of sculpture in our society. One of the rules for communist revolution, apparently, is to 'eliminate all good sculpture from parks and buildings and substitute shapeless, awkward and meaningless forms'. Also Skousen refers to 'infiltrating and gaining control of more unions and big business'. There again, rearing its ugly head we see the famous international conspiracy of the poor old middle class squeezed in between the dangerous unions and big business, with the evil Jewish people, as they are described in the *Protocols of Zion*, combining both roles.

I want now to refer to part of the health education curriculum, and I will quote at some length, so that it will be clearly recorded in *Hansard* exactly what sort of curriculum was so viciously attacked by the member for Brighton last night. I refer to a section titled 'Sex and the Family Life', as follows:

Adolescents need to understand their sexual growth and development and to be given opportunities to discuss and clarify their feelings about matters related to sexuality, relationships and family life.

Using a basic understanding of human reproduction, this unit seeks to develop awareness of the emotional and social changes which take place during and following adolescence.

Opportunities to discuss the implications of sexual behaviour and the individual's responsibilities to others are provided in a classroom atmosphere in which the students are encouraged to share their concerns and feelings, and to seek answers to questions of concern and interest. An understanding and acceptance of such things as differing maturation rates and points of view, and respect for varying religious, cultural and family attitudes are important aspects of sex and family life education. The values of the individual, the family and society, and a knowledge of laws related to sexual matters, are other areas which receive consideration.

The last point listed on that page is highly significant in view of the member for Brighton's remarks about whether or not parents have any right to have a say in what is happening with their children, and whether individuals are catered for. The last sentence on that page says:

In fostering classroom discussions there is a need for sensitivity to the differing experiences and backgrounds of the students.

It is clearly laid down in the curriculum that individual differences and the family backgrounds of the children are to be catered for. Among some of the aims listed, there is, for example, for years 1-3 the aim 'To realise the need for family grouping'. For years 4-7 there are aims such as 'To appreciate that families in present-day society display a wide range of characteristics', and 'To understand the contribution we can make to family life'. For years 8-10, the aims include the same thing, that is, 'To understand the contribution that family members can make to the quality of family life', but it would be gone into in a little more detail, and 'To understand variations in family structure', although variations in family structure, particularly in connection with MACOS and SEMP courses, apparently, have infuriated certain more backward sections of the community. Another aim for years 8-10 children is 'To be aware of the role for various agencies which may contribute to the quality of family life in our community'.

This very well put together document lists a great deal more of the objectives and teaching techniques of the health education course. Some of the references, the resource material, listed at the back of the curriculum are of interest, because such a list makes it quite clear that many of the publications that are part of the course are intended for teacher use only. Many of the publications are listed purely as background information and titles such as 'Lesbian/Woman' by Martin & Lyon are clearly intended only as a teacher reference, as additional background material.

Mr Randall: Have you looked at that book?

Mr Keneally: No, we rely on you people to read books.

Mr TRAINER: That is correct; that is your thing.

Mr O'Neill: He is more into the brown-cover stuff.

Mr TRAINER: That is correct. Denis Altman's book *Homosexual Oppression and Liberation*, written by someone who is a homosexual, is purely intended as a reference book for teachers. The material listed for students is quite different. If the member for Brighton has any specific instances of those guidelines being deviated from, why could he not be more specific? Why did he have to go for the sensationalist approach? Why did he have to go through the prurient business of reading out that material? Why did he have to slander the teaching profession? Who was he trying to please? In view of the garbage from the member

for Brighton last night and the nonsensical, inane interjections from the temporary member for Henley Beach, it seems to me that what is going on here in this State is partly due to desperation of the Liberal Party in seeing its popularity sink so low. The Liberal Party is trying to throw up a public smokescreen to detract attention from all the things that I mentioned earlier. The Party's standing is almost as low as its morals. Also, it is wittingly, or unwittingly, co-operating with the extreme right—with some of the odd people we have in the community—with their obsession with education matters. I refer to an article in the *National Times* of 6 March 1978 entitled 'Another crusader sets out to save Queensland', which describes in detail the vicious campaign organised against the MACOS course and the SEMP course. I do not pretend that such courses are perfect, that they do not have particular faults, but certainly they would be no way bad enough to justify the sort of campaign waged, in particular by a lady by the name of Rona Joyner, who objects to the whole concept of a pluralistic society, namely, of live and let live, of tolerating our differences. Says Mrs Joyner:

My opponents argue that this is a pluralistic society in which we live, and our schools must reflect this.

Mrs Joyner rejects that. The article states further:

Mrs Joyner is organiser of STOP (Society To Outlaw Pornography) and CARE (Campaign Against Regressive Education).

I should translate that in the same way that 'Liberal' in South Australia actually means 'conservative', what she means by 'regressive education' is what most educationists would call 'progressive education'. The journalist describes the visit—

... which Mrs Joyner organised, promoted and raised finances for the right-wing United States educationist, Mrs Norma Gabler, last August. She arrived with views and pamphlets worthy of the John Birch Society, describing MACOS as the equivalent of 'cultural heroin'. But she did get to meet Education Minister Bird and put the following truncated case against MACOS.

One of her objections was this:

Part of MACOS studies the life of a little-known tribe of Canadian Eskimos, the Netsilik.

This was referred to last night, although, in this particular respect, the member for Brighton did not go into any detail of the unsavoury culture that that particular group of people practise. The article continues:

Mrs Gabler found a receptive audience for banning that sort of education in Queensland's countryside. Her second argument, rather lost on lay Aussies, was that MACOS gave rebirth to the progressive, permissive philosophies of John Dewey, a humanist American philosopher-educator of the 1930s who opposed the traditional method of teaching by rote. Dewey was influenced by evolutionist Charles Darwin, and thus was seen by the Christian educators as dangerous. A theme of MACOS, in studying the Eskimos, was that judgments of all men are shaped by their culture.

What a shameful thing to say! The article continues:

... by culture, note, not God or the bible.

The result? Thanks to Bjelke-Petersen, MACOS was banned in January 1978. The article continues:

Mrs Joyner turned her attention to SEMP, and within a month it was banned, too.

But Bjelke-Petersen made a mistake with SEMP. The article continues:

Flushed with the banning of MACOS, Cabinet took Mrs Joyner virtually at her word that SEMP contained objectionable material.

The article further states:

To his credit, Val Bird (Education Minister) counselled by distraught departmental advisers, sought to save part of SEMP. But he was overruled by the Premier who, good farmer he is, applied the bag-egg analogy to education.

'If it's bad, you throw the egg out, you don't eat part of it.'

The article continues:

The section on families, which contained references to pre-marital sex and homosexuality, was devised by the headmasters of the

Sydney schools the Scots College, St Ignatius College (Jesuit), Knox College, Barker College and Canberra Grammar School.

The article also states:

It was one thing for the Premier to blast away at rank-and-file teachers, but these SEMP supporters were a trifle too establishment to be nailed as socialists or subversives.

The member for Brighton, as I mentioned earlier, has damned himself as despicable in one or both of two ways: either he means the garbage he came out with last night, in which case he is despicable for his ignorance, or he did not mean it, in which case he is despicable for his cynicism in headline hunting in that way. It may be that perhaps these are the opening shots of a Liberal Party campaign to repeat what it did in 1979 with their filth. They are desperate. Perhaps at the recent conference, perhaps at the instigation of their party workers, they decided to smear the education profession, to smear teachers and to smear schools to distract attention from their bankrupt policies. Members opposite should be as angry as I am, and as members on this side are, but I am afraid they probably are not.

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

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I understand from other members who have spoken in this debate that this Address in Reply presented to His Excellency will be the last address presented to him in that position. I am not aware whether that statement is accurate, but, if it is, I should like to extend my appreciation to His Excellency and Mrs Seaman for the work that they have done in their respective roles and to commend Mr Seaman for his forthright approach to his position. More important, if His Excellency is to retire, I wish him and his wife the very best of health and happiness in their retirement.

The most noteworthy and predominant part of His Excellency's Speech was that relating to the late Sir Thomas Playford. I, with all other honourable members, wish to express sympathy at the passing of Sir Thomas. I first met him in 1962 when he came to Cummins with his wife to receive debutantes. I was relatively young then and perhaps I was unfortunate to have to propose a toast to him on that occasion because I was a partner to one of the debutantes. That was many years ago. I did not see Sir Thomas to speak to personally until a few weeks after I entered this House in 1973. Sir Thomas remembered me, although I am not sure for what reason. However, he knew where I came from and quite a bit about me. One can only assume that his ability to recall names and, more particularly, faces, is beyond reason. That is probably one of the smaller attributes that Sir Thomas had: his fine ability to recall names, places and people and relate them in their correct perspective.

From 1973 until a couple of months ago, I met Sir Thomas on numerous occasions. We often had meals together at Parliament House, sometimes just he and I and on other occasions with other members, and at all times every comment that Sir Thomas made to me was very helpful and of assistance. I could look to him and his advice with some confidence. It is with a great deal of sympathy and regret that I note his passing.

Reference was made in His Excellency's Speech to the rural scene, and, because I represent a rural district, I should comment on the way in which the Minister of Agriculture is organising the rain for us. I am sure that the Minister will appreciate my comments—I say that jocularly. Some of the producers in the wetter areas of the State are experiencing problems. Many farmers, particularly on lower Eyre Peninsula, are not facing good prospects for the grain season, while some of the producers in the northern part of Eyre Peninsula face good prospects. It is

the old story: it is an ill wind that does not blow someone some good. In this case, the grain production in some parts of lower Eyre Peninsula, and in some of the higher rainfall areas, will be devastated.

I know of one producer who commenced sowing his grain crop last Friday. Unfortunately, he had in only a day and a half of sowing when the rain came, and it will certainly be several weeks before he can get back on to the land again. This story is repeated time and time again, particularly in the lower 120 kms of the peninsula, taking a line from Karkoo across the peninsula. That is the sorry story for most people in that area.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That will be a reseeded job, would you say?

Mr BLACKER: It certainly will, if the farmers can get on to the ground in the first place. Some farmers have seeded twice already and will be facing up for a third time: others have not been able to get on to the land at all. So, considerable concern is felt by the grain growing component of that area. I mentioned that the northern part of the peninsula is in a better position: the farmers' crops, although late for a normal season, nevertheless look quite healthy and good at this stage. With the late follow-on rains, they may produce an above-average crop. So, there are good and bad patches, particularly in my district, and I believe that that situation probably applies State-wide.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What proportion of the total area of Eyre Peninsula does this cover?

Mr BLACKER: The Minister has asked what proportion of the peninsula is involved? It would be difficult to say, but I think that about one-third of the area would be involved. Certainly, more than half of the farmers are involved, bearing in mind that the farms on lower Eyre Peninsula are of a more intensive nature than those on the upper part of the peninsula. So, there are some problems in that regard.

Paragraph 7 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the Government's intention to introduce legislation to establish a Parliamentary committee to examine the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of statutory authorities. This could be taken as the first step in trying to implement some form of sunset legislation in regard to some statutory authorities. I know that that is not stated blatantly, but it does mean that every statutory authority will have to face up and justify its existence. I fully support this type of operation, because I believe that there are about 248 statutory authorities in South Australia alone and that an equal number, if not more, Federal authorities have some influence in South Australia.

Many of those authorities do not have to justify their existence on a continuing basis. In the endeavours of the Government to tidy up and achieve efficiency of government and some of its instrumentalities, this is a good move, because I do not believe that some of the authorities can justify their existence on a continuing basis.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I will not name them. I have already said that 248 have been listed. It would be quite wrong for me to name one or two authorities and let the others off the hook: I probably would not pick the authorities most deserving of criticism.

Funding for sport gets a brief mention in His Excellency's Speech, and I wish to compliment some of the young sports men and women who live in my area and who have shown significant note in the past few months and certainly in the past 12 months. Needless to say, the first to mention is John Fitzgerald. I am proud that John is a constituent of mine: more particularly, I am very proud of his family.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: He is 20 years old, and I appreciate the Minister's comment. John Fitzgerald has established himself in the world of tennis. He got to number 16 at Wimbledon this year, and for the third year in a row he has qualified for and played at Wimbledon. A fortnight ago he won the Austrian Grand Prix, beating Guillermo Vilas. In the very next tournament he won 6-0, 6-0, but I cannot remember the name of his opponent. John Fitzgerald has established himself well in the game of tennis, not only for South Australia but for Australia. More particularly, he has been able to achieve such standards with little or no support from Government instrumentalities. I think the same goes for a number of our other athletes.

Mr Slater: He's a professional tennis player.

Mr BLACKER: He is a professional tennis player now, but he did not get there with any assistance from anyone else. I refer also to Dean and David Lucan, both world ranking in the area of weight lifting. Dean is now the current Australian champion. He is no longer a junior as he has turned 21. He is ranked as No. 4 in the Western world and No. 9 in the world. I think that that is an incredible effort. Dean and David are brothers, and the 19-year-old brother is claiming equally as many records as he goes about his weight lifting pursuits.

There are also other youngsters coming along, and in this regard I refer to Robert Schultz. Recently I was asked by the Recreation and Sport Division to present to him a grant of \$300 to assist in specialist training in his weight lifting pursuits. In the championships held last weekend, a 67-kilos lad snatched 91 kilos. So, it is not a bad sort of approach. Much of the credit for the abilities of Robert, Dean and David comes from Mr Leon Holmes. I would be remiss if I did not refer to that fact. Leon used to be a former principal of the Further Education Centre in Port Lincoln and is now principal of, I think, the Port Adelaide Community College.

I could mention a number of other athletes who are showing a great deal of promise, such as young Garry Griffiths from Cummins in distance running and Caroline Byles in athletics, and so on. I mention this because these people are getting to the top without Government assistance and are showing that it can be done with a will and the desire to get through.

Mr Slater: They'd do better if they had a bit of assistance at the right time.

Mr BLACKER: I accept that point and certainly support it. If these youngsters were able to get specialist training in the prime of their youth when they are showing promise for their pursuits, surely they would be better athletes as a result. We would all support that approach.

Two of the issues that have concerned me greatly as well as my constituents involve fishing. I must make some comments on behalf of the industry and of the constituents that have contacted me about it. The first relates to the Government's decision in the first instance to close the Investigator Strait prawn fishery. I raise this point because it has some bearing on management programmes throughout the State. The House would no doubt recall that I raised the question today about the management of the Investigator Strait fishery and the likely impact that it may have on other prawn fisheries in the State. I refer, of course, to Spencer Gulf and the Far West Coast, and in this case also to the implications that it could have on Investigator Strait. All of the assurances in the world could not prove that any decision on any one fishery would not have repercussions on any other fishery. I must make that point on behalf of the many fishermen who have considerable capital invested in the industry.

On 1 April this year a joint statement was made by the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Hon. Peter Nixon)

and the South Australian Minister of Fishery (Hon. Allan Rodda) on the proposed closure of the Investigator Strait fishery. That statement was made after consultation with the fishing industry, and, more particularly, with AFIC. It was made after a recommendation by the South Australian Fisheries Department and subsequently endorsed by the Australian Fisheries Industry Council. After that decision an announcement had been made there seemed to be some procrastination as to what was going to happen next. As time went on it became quite apparent that the fishery was not going to be closed. A number of alternatives were put up as to what might happen. A number of options were presented as to whether those six permit holders in that fishery should lose their permits and be turned back to the fisheries from which they originated, whether they should be absorbed into other fishery areas, and whether Investigator Strait should be maintained as a separate identity and kept as such. These options have subsequently been aired by many people and have certainly been talked about within the industry.

On 9 March Mr Mick Puglesi, of the Western Waters Prawn Boat Owners Association, signed a telex to the Premier on behalf of a number of fishing organisations. I would like to read that telex, which was marked for the Premier's urgent attention. Copies were sent to the Hon. J. Porter, the Hon. P. Nixon, AFIC head office, to the Director of Fisheries, as well as to the State Minister of Fisheries (Hon. W. A. Rodda), and the Premier. The telex states:

The fishing industry of Port Lincoln ask you and the Federal Minister Mr Nixon to give your personal attention as a matter of urgency to the now far too long drawn-out Investigator Strait-St Vincent Gulf fiasco.

I reiterate that this telex was dated 9 March this year. It continues:

We trust your Cabinet gives full support to the responsible decision of South Australian Minister of Fisheries and South Australian Department of Fisheries joint Commonwealth policy on Investigator Strait. This policy has been fully endorsed by South Australian Branch of Australian Fishing Industry Council. AFIC management committee members of the undersigned associations who are all experienced fishermen have spent an enormous amount of time and expense on the matter over the past 18 months, and have been very close to the true facts of the matter.

The damage that has been done to the St Vincent Gulf prawn resource in this unnecessary long drawn-out problem can only be described as a disaster. This situation in the fishery must not be allowed to deteriorate any further.

The Department of Fisheries has made a recommendation which has been endorsed by AFIC (S.A.). There only remains for a political decision to be made. We urge that that decision be made as a matter of urgency.

South Australian AFIC management committee members (from Port Lincoln)

- Western Waters Prawn Boat Owners Association
- South Australian Prawn Fishermens Association
- West Coast Cray Fishermens Association
- Abalone Fishermens Association
- Southern Eyre Peninsula Scale Fishermens Association
- AFIC members (Port Lincoln)
- Australian Bight
- Tuna Processors
- South Australian Tuna Boat Owners Association
- West Coast Shark Fishermens Association
- Puglesi Fishing Company
- Santa Anna Deep Sea Fisheries
- Haldane Brothers
- Gemic

I read that into *Hansard* in order to point out that the action being taken by the present State President of AFIC has the full support of the industry. In the discussions that have taken place (I am referring to the President of AFIC, Mr Morris Corigliano) there has been much controversy regarding whether Mr Corigliano is representing the industry in his endeavours to have the matter of the Investigator Strait problem solved.

We all know that Mr Corigliano has an interest and a fishing vessel in St Vincent Gulf. It could therefore be assumed on the surface that he may have more than just the interests of the industry at heart and may have personal interests alone. Mr Corigliano offered to step down and resign from the position as President. He offered to step down on any negotiations in the case. However, he was asked not to do so by officers of the Premier's Department and by AFIC, which gave its full support. The telex to which I have referred fully justifies those comments.

I say that quite specifically, because the words and actions that Mr Corigliano has had to undertake as President would appear on the surface to conflict with his own personal interests. A couple of other points need to be made. The Investigator Strait fishery commenced when permits were issued by the Commonwealth for exploratory work to be done in investigating the industry to see whether it was a viable proposition.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:

Mr BLACKER: I appreciate the Minister's concern, and I am more than aware of his input into the discussions that have taken place in recent weeks and months. In Investigator Strait, the six permit holders are probably the most privileged fishermen in the State. They are the only fishermen that hold a permit to catch prawns for 12 months of the year and also an authority in another managed fishery, a situation that no other fisherman in this State can hold.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The six are not—

Mr BLACKER: The six are not in that position. Three hold a lobster authority, and three have taken the liberty of selling their licence. The point should be made that the three who have sold the licence did so of their own volition, and they have the same ability to repurchase a licence to go back into the industry. They have endeavoured to capitalise on the industry. That point must be made because, whatever the outcome of the Investigator Strait prawn industry, I do not believe that any fisherman has the right to hold licences, permits, authorities, or whatever in two totally managed fisheries. That position needs to be rectified.

I cannot answer the problem of the number of fishermen who should be allowed to remain in the industry. I understand that the highest catch within the fishery is about 185 tonnes, and I am told that the majority of it came from outside the Investigator Strait fishery, in the triangle between Commonwealth and State waters. I cannot verify that, but I believe it has been put in writing from one source that 90 per cent of the catch was made outside the State's waters in the triangle, and from another source the figure was 85 per cent. Let us disregard the percentages and say that at least it is not the whole industry. I believe that, in the last six or 12 months, the 185-tonne catch has reduced dramatically, to the point where it is now down to about 60 tonnes. Therefore, the viability of those operators must be seriously questioned. How long they can continue to remain in existence and still not affect other managed fishery resources must also be questioned.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You recognise that a number of the six are prepared to accept an authority and sacrifice all of the so-called privileges that go with the permits, as you suggest?

Mr BLACKER: I am not aware of the Minister's interjection.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You recognise—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: The problem is this: where does this put managed fisheries in South Australia? That is the real problem affecting my fishermen, as mentioned in the telex signed by 12 or 15 associations and industries. Where does

managed fishery stand in South Australia if it cannot be allowed to manage the fisheries in the area?

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: That's for the Commonwealth. What are you on about? That is outside of South Australia.

Mr BLACKER: If the Minister had been listening, he would have heard that a joint Ministerial statement was made by Commonwealth and State Ministers in relation to the future management of these programmes. I have here not only a copy of the *Advertiser* report of 1 April 1981, but also a copy of the telex as circulated by the Director of Fisheries, Mr Richard Stevens. I think that adequately covers that aspect.

The other matter I wish to bring up is that it was referred back to me by a number of fishermen that the reason for the failure to announce a decision on this rested with the Commonwealth Minister. That reflected on me, as a member of the National Country Party, and on the Commonwealth Minister, in his portfolio, let alone any Party affiliation. I took the liberty of ringing the Minister to ascertain the present position. He told me that he was awaiting a decision from the South Australian Cabinet, and I believe that to be the position as it stands. I was talking to the Federal Minister in Port Lincoln only last Wednesday, and he is still awaiting a decision from the South Australian Cabinet. That is verified, because the State Minister of Fisheries was present at the meeting. So, there is a long drawn-out affair which is not yet resolved and which is causing some consternation among those who believe in managed fisheries for South Australia. The other subject I want to raise in relation to fisheries refers to manning regulations, and, more specifically, certificates of competency.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Before you go on to that, would you like to tell me why the lesser number than the six should not have authorities and do away with the so-called privileges?

Mr BLACKER: I believe that the industry is supporting a proposal that there should be only two licence holders remaining in the area. I do not know whether or not that is good management practice. All I know is that there is not a sufficient catch in the area to justify the existence of five permits to remain in the area.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You are aware that the previous Government, from Minister to Premier, promised that five permit-holders would all be given authorities—in writing?

Mr BLACKER: That is contrary to the manner in which the permits were issued, because they were issued on the basis that the permit-holders could hang on to their existing managed fishery authorities in the lobster industry and revert to that and hold the position as a managed fishery holder at that time if industry resources were not sufficient.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Would you like to see a letter signed by my predecessor to that effect?

Mr BLACKER: I would like to see it. I would like to get back to the position in relation to manning regulations.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Would it surprise you that South Australia—

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Flinders to continue with his contribution, and not to engage in a personal discourse with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr BLACKER: The regulations on the certificates of competency for the fishing industry have caused a tremendous amount of publicity and consternation, particularly in the past two weeks. I believe we should take the issue a little further than that. The matter was raised by AFIC with the Minister long before it was necessary for anyone to take it to the media. Unfortunately, little or no action was taken to try to rectify the situation. I have copies of correspondence sent by AFIC to the Minister, dated 28

May, seeking a meeting with the Minister and his department in relation to the application of regulations under the certificates of competency and manning regulations. Many of the questions that have arisen in the press in the past 10 days were raised then, with little or no result forthcoming.

The letter dated 28 May is rather lengthy and sets out all the problems as they are seen—the insurance problems, the responsibility for the provision of training, which still is not answered, the type of courses, the level of competency required, why it should be necessary to have a level of competency which is equivalent to that required for coastal marine shipping for the fishing industry. In some cases, that applies to quite a high level. The letter from Des Gallary, Executive Officer, concluded as follows:

I hope I have demonstrated some of the problems that have resulted from the proclamation of new manning regulations which do not distinguish between the trading and fishing industries. Similarly, there is a need to clarify the confusion with regard to training responsibilities and I suggest a more formal Government/Industry advisory committee is justified.

I look forward to discussing these problems with you in the near future when we will be seeking your advice and assistance to resolve our common problems. A copy of the minutes of the last training committee meeting are attached for your information.

The next item of correspondence is dated 6 July and refers to the forthcoming meeting on 15 July. It states that, hopefully, a Ministerial reply to the A.F.I.C. submission dated 28 May 1981 will be available for consideration.

These manning codes, the course syllabus, and so on, are of considerable concern, because where does one stand now? We know that there was a meeting of Executive Council on Monday, which amended those regulations and gave Ministerial discretion about their implementation, but what is not said is that some clear guideline is provided as to how the industry can adapt to this particular problem.

I mentioned in the House yesterday that, if all available training resources presently in South Australia were applied full time, it would take 10 years to train those in the existing fishing fleet adequately, so it is a totally impracticable proposition even to talk about manning regulations if there is no possible way that those personnel can be trained. I know that larger vessels are being used and I know that it is desirable that highly skilled and competent people be manning them, but I do know now that every large vessel could be tied up on the basis that it is not adequately manned. I know that risks have been taken, and everyone agrees that there should be a code of ethics and a rule book for the operation of fishing vessels, but that should not apply to the extent of imposing marine navigation requirements and coastal shipping requirements on the fishing industry.

One could go through the entire regulations and pick holes in them, because most large vessels now have to have at least two men, one with a class four certificate and one with a class five certificate, and two ships engineers—four highly qualified people, of which there is no availability in Australia. If we like to throw the letter of the law at people, we could say that, if one of those persons could not turn up at the wharf, the vessel could not go to sea, and that means that there will be a gradual phasing in of union control and domination of the fishing industry. That concerns me greatly, because I do not believe that an industry that requires flexibility can operate under such conditions.

I know that statements have been made by fishermen that virtually say that they have fished for 30 years and now are not allowed to skipper their own vessel. That is how the regulations apply. The Minister has said that he will implement the regulations on a 12-month *ad hoc* basis, and therefore give a breathing space. I think the whole issue is adequately covered in an editorial in the *Advertiser* of 30 July, when it refers to the 'fishing fleet bungle'. The editorial states:

On the evidence so far available it seems clear that the Government and the bureaucracy has bungled the introduction of changes to the manning regulations of the Marine Act as they affect the State's fishing fleet. The result is confusion in an important industry and the dangerous probability that the insurance cover of many of the vessels in the 1 000-strong fleet is no longer effective. Despite the justifiable protest from fishermen and the obvious urgency about the situation, the reaction from the Minister of Marine, Mr Rodda, so far has been indecisive.

The Minister has implied that the industry is to blame for its predicament because it has failed to prepare for the changes despite five years warning. Fishermen claim that final decisions on the exact requirements and the date of their implementation have been made only recently and it was reasonable for them to expect a sensible subsequent timetable for them to comply. The complex regulations, which include the level of qualifications to be held by crew members of vessels, came into force on 1 July. Their aim is to improve marine safety—an objective which should command support. But, obviously, there are practical matters to be considered in relation to the fishing fleet and these have not been given the attention they deserve.

If they had, why are fishermen so confused? Why is it that the facilities for educating crews are insufficient? Why can't the new regulations be complied with? There seems little doubt that the communication between the bureaucracy preparing the new regulations, and the Government which directs it, and the South Australian fishermen has been lacking. The imposition of new regulations on any industry requires considerable care. In the case of one built on the skill and tenacity of a rugged and diverse group of individualists great tact is needed as well. It seems perfectly reasonable for fishermen to be given a reasonable time, after the final decision on the new regulations, to qualify to meet them. It also seems fair that years of practical experience and success in the industry should count towards the issue of certificates which, in many instances, will just be a ticket to do the job the man is doing already.

It is to be hoped that Mr Rodda takes a positive stance in his talks with fishermen today. The present situation where many of our fishermen are faced with the choice of operating illegally and without insurance cover or leaving their boats moored must not be allowed to continue. Mr Rodda and his Government must be practical.

I think that editorial really sums up in a nutshell exactly the position with the fishing industry, and so many people who are operating vessels of 20 metres and larger and have been doing so for many years are faced with the position of not being able to man their boat. That seems an incredible situation.

Another point that I should like to make arises out of this situation, namely, the endeavours made by the Government to provide facilities to train the prospective crew-people (we do have ladies fishing in our industry). The Department of Further Education has been given the responsibility of providing a new training scheme, and until about a month ago it envisaged running only one training programme for this current calendar year, which meant that the department could have trained 13 class 5 skippers, assuming that all 13 were able to pass the examination. With 1 000 vessels operating in South Australia, the magnitude of the training programme must be upgraded tremendously.

The first class will conclude this coming week, and an immediate start will be made on another course, which will cater for another 13, but that is still a total of only 26. Some criticism has been levelled at the Department of Further Education, and I think I should take up the department's stand in this case, because it can operate only within the bounds of finance and allocations made to it. The department is happy to upgrade and provide the courses if suitable funding arrangements can be organised, but at this stage that is not the case, so where do we stand?

The Government is operating on an annual basis, with little or no prospect of training the crew for 10 years, with the present training facilities. Therefore, it seems to be an indecisive and inconclusive arrangement. I can only suggest that, if the Government wished to pursue the manning regulations, it should do something positive about providing the training facilities that will enable those people in the

industry to upgrade their qualifications. The other aspect of the matter that has drawn some criticism is the level of training and the technical nature of the courses involved.

Some of the people operating within the industry are not highly qualified. They have learnt fishing the hard way. They probably left school at an early age, have been fishing with their father ever since, and have built up to the stage where they own and operate an extensive investment, in many cases running into hundreds of thousands of dollars (in some cases it is getting around the \$1 000 000 mark). While those people are operating a highly technical machine, they have been brought up with it; they have had the navigational aids attached to it and have learnt to use them. To sit down and complete a complex examination paper is difficult for them because many of them do not have the literacy skills that are so necessary in undertaking such an examination. I believe there is a real case for a grandfather type clause to be included in the regulations so that those fishermen who have been operating a vessel, for example, of 20 metres or more, for more than a certain period of time, can be given a certificate of competency which will enable them to continue to do so. Unless that can be provided, then where does the industry stand, because it seems quite ludicrous that many of the older long-time fishermen who have been operating these vessels (in some cases for 20 years or more) will be told to step down because they cannot operate their own vessel.

Another point which has come up is that these regulations had to be implemented because they were being done on an Australia-wide basis; it was a Federal and all States operation. I think I should say quite categorically that that is not the case. I understand that Western Australia is going along with these manning regulations for the very reason that it has been endeavouring to implement something similar for the past 16 years. On the other hand, New South Wales has thrown them out—it is not undertaking manning regulations. So the idea of a Commonwealth and all-State operation is just not on. Since many South Australian fishermen fish in New South Wales waters, we have a conflicting arrangement already occurring. I believe that in Queensland attempts have been made to implement similar regulations.

In Victoria certificates of competency and manning regulations are being implemented, but they are not identical to those being implemented in South Australia, so any statement being made that they are being introduced on a universal basis is unfounded and cannot be justified in that true sense. I think I have said enough about that particular problem in the industry, other than to say that we have younger fishermen who have considerable investments in the industry and who want to upgrade. How can they do that?

I had one skipper come to me on Monday who is part-owner of a million-dollar vessel. It is intended that he will be the skipper of that vessel and operate it at sea. He has a skipper's certificate. I cannot think of the actual name of it, but the implication of it is that he can operate any fishing vessel in the State. It does not, however, technically qualify as the class 5 skipper's certificate. I understand some arrangement has been made whereby he can do an engineer's course to upgrade his present certificate to class 5, which is a new adaptation of the regulations. More particularly, however, he needs a class 4 certificate. There is nowhere in this State where he can do that training. It does pose a considerable problem. He is only too happy to do it and to undertake all the training necessary, but he just cannot do it, because the facilities are not available. Where does he stand, being a part-owner and skipper of a million-dollar vessel? Even though he wants to, he cannot do the course because there are no facilities available. I

believe that the tutorial classes for a class 4 skipper's certificate will not be commenced until late next year; it may even be 1983. These very real problems have to be ironed out fairly soon.

I wish to raise now a couple of other issues which are of considerable concern to me. As the Minister of Agriculture is present, I would like to raise the issue of Samcor. The good news I would like to hear is that the Government will upgrade the Samcor works at Port Lincoln to United States Department of Agriculture meat export licence specification, because it is of considerable concern. When I asked a question in the House on 16 July about this matter, the Minister gave quite a lengthy explanation. I appreciate the sentiments he expressed in supporting the desirability of the upgrading to United States licence specifications. I gathered from his answer that what he was looking for was some tangible evidence that the local industry will support the works. I do not know how we can get that tangible evidence. We cannot go around and ask farmers whether they are going to sign all of their stock through that works. I received a letter the other day from Mr Graham Shepherd, the Secretary of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, Zone 3, together with a copy of a letter which he forwarded to the Minister on 3 April and which backed up the United Farmers and Stockowners Association—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: The support from that organisation is very much appreciated.

Mr BLACKER: I thank the Minister for that comment. I raise the matter in this House because I think the sentiments expressed in that letter do have the backing of the majority of people in that area. The Minister would be aware that there is a local lobby endeavouring to do that at the moment. I understand that the Hon. Martin Cameron from another place was in Port Lincoln only Wednesday and received a deputation.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: He got the message.

Mr BLACKER: I thank the Minister. I was making sure that he got the message because I am adding to that. The whole exercise is that we have a number of very dedicated people trying to do the right thing. We have, I believe, an excellent manager, who has done a tremendous job in reducing the considerable annual debt at the works to a figure that is as realistic as would appear to be possible to get. Perhaps he may be able to further reduce that deficit. I think that, in those circumstances, he is the one who needs encouragement as much as anyone else needs it. The whole problem is that we need that export licence. Various meat processors have said that they can and will use the works if an export licence is granted. I refer to Freezpak, and the Minister is aware of that. This is a long-standing operation on the peninsula, and I have ever reason to expect that that sort of an offer is genuine and would be undertaken and fulfilled if possible.

As with any works that has been established as a service works, there is the problem of guaranteed continuity of throughput. We all know that if a guaranteed continuity of maximum throughput could be guaranteed, the works could be operated in a practical and realistic manner.

Mr Keneally: Would you like a bit of socialist activity down there at Port Lincoln?

Mr BLACKER: I fail to see the relevance of the honourable member's comments. Surely it is good commercial practice that, if a business can be operated to maximum capacity, then obviously its efficiency will be at peak efficiency. A service works is designed—

Mr Keneally: A service works is a socialist works.

Mr BLACKER: A service works is designed to cater for the extreme capacity which is sometimes brought about through unseasonal conditions such as drought, flood, fire and so on. The member for Stuart is being pedantic when

he tries to say that a service works is a socialist works, as he put it. One only knows too well how he supports the establishment of the Gepps Cross abattoir, which was established in the first instance as a service works. All members would appreciate the necessity and the desirability of having some excess capacity over and above the normal throughput to cater for the extreme circumstances in the case of fire, flood or drought.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Given that Freezpak has exclusive access to works, do you consider it should contribute financially to—

Mr Keneally: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! I distinctly heard a member call a point of order, but I see no honourable member standing for that purpose.

Mr KENEALLY: Mr Speaker, I withdraw my call for a point of order, because you have taken the course of action that I required.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: You hypocrite! You interject and then have a crack at me. What's wrong with you?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLACKER: I did not catch the Minister's comments then, but I understand that other meat processors are interested in operating through the works. Another point which I believe should be followed up is the potential for sale by classification in the red meat trade. I think that point is something which not many producers, particularly producers on the peninsula, have explored. It would take considerable groundwork for that to come about. Sale by classification is becoming a common practice in the pig industry. My brother has been involved in selling pigs by classification, sight unseen.

That means of sale guarantees a greater throughput of the works, because the stock does not come under the watchful eye of an auction system, and it is sold on a weight and grade basis. Therefore, the stock can be killed at Port Lincoln and, in effect, sold in Adelaide on the basis of weight and grade.

That method of sale has been established and is growing rapidly within the pig industry. I believe that it can be further adapted and, in fact, I believe it is being adapted in the South-East to incorporate red meat—sheep and beef. There is an opportunity available to further expand the use of the works.

Another point I wish to make is that I received a reply today from the Minister of Industrial Affairs in relation to a question I asked about the Government's attitude to red meat sales during extended trading hours. I asked this question some 12 months ago in relation to the Government's attitude and brought to the Minister's attention the fact that, when the shopping hours legislation was debated in the House, 14 members spoke in support of red meat sales having the same trading hours as other items. In other words, red meat should be allowed to be sold during late night shopping hours. Of the 14 members who supported the legislation, 12 are present members of the Government, and many of them are now Ministers. They all supported red meat trading.

Since then, there has been little or no activity for the extension of those trading hours. When I asked this question some 12 months ago, the Minister said that a study was being undertaken and he expected that legislation would be introduced very soon. Such legislation has not been forthcoming, and I asked a further question only a couple of weeks ago. Unfortunately, the reply to that question is very similar, because the Government is not prepared to extend the trading hours. I raise this matter because I represent many hundreds of producers of red meat.

I have just been discussing the continued operation of the Samcor works and the necessity to have throughput

through those works. If the red meat resource of sheep and beef were given equal access to the consumer market, perhaps there would be greater throughput not only through the Samcor works at Port Lincoln but also the Gepps Cross works in Adelaide. Perhaps that would be of advantage to the Government by reducing some of the losses that it is presently incurring at those works. Surely those producers are entitled to have their commodity presented to the consumer competitively with access to the market equal to that available to white meats.

Mr Keneally: Can you remember the Ministers who voted for it when it was debated in the House?

Mr BLACKER: I cannot remember. I believe seven Ministers of the present Government voted for an extension of red meat sales.

Mr Keneally: And spoke in favour?

Mr BLACKER: And spoke in favour; they are all there in *Hansard*.

Mr Keneally: Was the Minister of Agriculture one of them?

Mr BLACKER: I cannot say.

Mr Max Brown: He never tells lies.

Mr BLACKER: The Minister has just indicated that he was not.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe I heard the member for Whyalla utter a word which is not Parliamentary.

Mr MAX BROWN: Mr Speaker, I do not know whether it was unparliamentary or not, but I just indicate—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whyalla has, I believe, uttered the word 'lies'. In the sense in which it was uttered it is unparliamentary and I ask him to withdraw it without any qualification.

Mr MAX BROWN: I withdraw it, Mr Speaker.

Mr BLACKER: The Minister of Agriculture has elaborated on comments that I was making about the operation of Samcor and he asked, given that Freezpak has exclusive access to the facilities at Port Lincoln (and I am not sure whether it does have exclusive access), whether I consider it fair to ask it to contribute financially to the costs of upgrading to U.S.D.A. licence standard. That is very difficult to answer and I would not like to answer the question at the present moment. I assume that Freezpak pays for the services that it receives on a per head cost basis. Therefore, if any arrangement were made that it should financially contribute to such upgrading, then surely that would be compensated by a lesser fee than would be charged any other user of the works. I am not in a position to enter into that sort of debate at the moment. I would like to investigate the matter further, because I believe—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It's unlikely that any other company would exercise it for the U.S.D.A. market.

Mr BLACKER: It is one of those problems that does come up. The Minister has also indicated that it is unlikely that any other operator would use it for U.S.D.A. licences. I would hope that was not the case, but it may well be. I would like to think that it would be possible for other exporters to be attracted to the area, even on a smaller basis, because quite often the export industry revolves around smaller packages. Whilst it is nice to get a guaranteed undertaking on a weekly or monthly basis, that is not always the case.

In the short time left to me, I would like to make a small comment completely outside the primary industry area. In Port Lincoln there is a small group of three young craftsmen who have excelled in building magnificent furniture. When I say 'magnificent' I mean magnificent. They are craftsmen in their own right. In fact, they are the only craftsmen manufacturers of furniture in Australia who have been invited to become members of the Guild of Master Craftsmen, based in England. They are the only craftsmen who

manufacture furniture who were invited to exhibit at the Sydney Craft Expo. They have shown an expertise which is unparalleled in this State or in Australia. A fortnight ago they returned from a craft exhibition in Sydney where they received outstanding reviews. One piece of their furniture, a chest of drawers with a bookcase, sold for \$16 000, and I believe that it was a bargain at that price. We have this expertise in this State, but unfortunately the Government is not trying to help them. At a later time, perhaps during a grievance debate, I will explain their plight and the difficulties they have had in gaining some recognition. They have just gained that recognition and through no great—

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

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I join with other members in tendering condolences to the family of the late Sir Thomas Playford. I do not think it is necessary for me to add anything further in relation to the late Sir Thomas. I feel that the member for Gilles has said everything that it has been necessary to say. I also wish to express regret that this was the last presentation by Mr Seaman of the Governor's Speech to Parliament. His Excellency has served the State with great distinction and dignity and he has been a great Governor for South Australia, and I wish him well for the future.

It is amusing that the Government should refer, by way of His Excellency's Speech, to its intention to continue to give highest priority to many important areas of concern. Those intentions and high priorities, without any action, are just not good enough. New Government development and initiatives are lacking and in many instances many of the projects and developments referred to were commenced by the former Labor Government. Paragraph 22 of His Excellency's Speech states that the Department for Community Welfare has continued its programme for the development of the local community welfare centres by the opening of the Enfield centre in October 1980 and the Mount Gambier centre in June 1981. It also refers to the approval given for building a centre at Port Pirie. However, all these centres were decided upon, commenced and approved by the former Labor Government.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It is a continuing programme—you just read it out yourself.

Mr ABBOTT: It might have said the intention is to continue those programmes, but to date there has been no announcement of any development in the community welfare area, and that is the very point I am making.

Mr Keneally: The Liberal Party criticised those programmes when it was in Opposition.

Mr ABBOTT: Correct. What has this Government done in that area of local community welfare centres? Absolutely nothing! Similarly, the Community Welfare Act Amendment Bill was commenced by the former Government. Paragraph 11 of His Excellency's Speech refers to the Government's continuing to place importance on Aboriginal affairs. It regards with great satisfaction the near completion of administrative details under the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act, leading to the handing over of title to the land to the Pitjantjatjara people. It seems that the Premier is continuing to grandstand about the achievement of this legislation. However, fortunately, of course, most people know that the person responsible for Aboriginal land rights in this State was Don Dunstan. It is also noted that a final decision has been taken to vest in the Aboriginal Lands Trust certain Crown land previously known as the Maralinga prohibited area. Again, this is a matter for which negotiations were conducted by the former Government prior to the last State election.

What concerns me is the Government's claim that it continues to place importance on Aboriginal affairs, yet it

did absolutely nothing to help solve the Point McLeay Community Council/Ralkon Agricultural Company dispute. That dispute threatened the whole future of the Aboriginal community at Point McLeay, yet the State and Federal Governments did absolutely nothing to assist that community. I was pleased to read in the *Advertiser* of Saturday 18 July that some move towards a settlement of the dispute appeared to be under way, although it was a pity that the Chairman of Directors of Ralkon, Mr Spencer Rigney, could not be contacted for comment, and the company's manager, Mr Ian Hillock, said that the directors would not be in a position to comment until they knew the full details of any agreement, although he said that in principle they were likely to seek to rent the land from the council. That press report states:

The Point McLeay Community Council has taken over the lease of 892 hectares of land formerly leased by the Ralkon Agricultural Company.

The land, about three kilometres east of Point McLeay on the eastern shore of Lake Alexandrina, is held in title by the Aboriginal Development Commission.

A 99-year lease at a peppercorn rental was signed in Adelaide yesterday by the council chairman, Mr Henry Rankine, and the ADC general manager, Mr Colin Bourke.

The land, known as Bartlett's Farm, has been the subject of controversy in recent years.

The ADC, a Federal statutory body consisting of 10 Aboriginal commissioners, inherited title to the land last year when the Aboriginal Land Fund Commission was disbanded.

The land represents one-quarter of the 3 600-hectare Ralkon station, with the remaining land being held under freehold title by the South Australian Aboriginal Lands Trust.

The ADC claimed in May that management of the land by Ralkon was extremely poor and that Ralkon's financial records had not been audited since 1977.

A company spokesman said then the company had been pre-empted from investing in the land because there had been no clear and proper definition of tenure.

The council's deputy chairman, Mr Noel Wilson, said yesterday the council had accepted the ADC lease offer, as it considered this would be in the best interests of the Point McLeay community.

Mr Wilson said that although it was too early to say how the land would be used, there would be 'many projects and a lot of use'.

Mr Bourke said the ADC was happy to reach agreement with the council.

'This promises to solve long-standing difficulties,' he said.

The State Government's decision to close the Oodnadatta office of the Department for Community Welfare was a major blow to the Aboriginal people of this Far North township. I was shocked to learn that the Minister of Community Welfare had made this abrupt decision, apparently without local consultation. I stand by the comment that I made in my press statement, namely, that there was no Aboriginal community in South Australia more deprived than that community at Oodnadatta. I have been there; I have seen it with my own eyes; and I came away feeling completely depressed. So much for the Government's intention to continue to place importance on Aboriginal affairs! I also support wholeheartedly the comments reported in the *Advertiser* on 15 July by Mr Rathman. He is the highest ranking Aboriginal in the Department for Community Welfare. Mr Rathman made the following comments in that article:

The State Government's decision to close the Oodnadatta office of the Department of Community Welfare is 'a slap in the face to the Aboriginal people of South Australia', according to a senior Aboriginal public servant.

The decision was typical of the 'tokenistic' approach the South Australian Government had adopted in Aboriginal affairs, Mr David Rathman said yesterday . . . Mr Rathman said the recent decision to close the Oodnadatta DCW office was the 'most recent and most serious' example of the Government's cheap approach to Aboriginal problems . . . Mr Rathman said the closure would seriously deprive Aboriginals in the region of essential welfare services.

'Aboriginal people in remote country areas have serious welfare problems, and there is a need for them to receive at least the same

level of services as enjoyed by other people in South Australia,' he said.

'Yet the DCW decision will mean they are being denied this level of service.'

Mr Rathman said the decision had been taken without consulting the Aboriginal people. An Aboriginal policy consultation group within DCW 'which might have been expected to be consulted' had been ignored.

He said this was typical of the approach to Aboriginal affairs being adopted by the State Government.

'Consultation with the Aboriginal people appears to just be so much window-dressing,' he said . . . 'If the Government refuses to consult them on a vital issue such as this, then what hope is there for the future?'

They are the words of a senior Aboriginal public servant working in the Minister's own department. It was also interesting to note that the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs declined to comment on Mr Rathman's comments, but a spokesman for the Minister later said that the Hon. Mr Allison supported the comments of the Hon. Mr Burdett.

However, the Secretary of the South Australian Office of Aboriginal Affairs, Mr Les Nader, said he fully supported Mr Rathman's comments, as his knowledge of what Aborigines need is far greater than the knowledge of anyone else in the Community Welfare Department. From all of this, it seems that both Ministers do not see eye to eye with their respective Aboriginal advisers, and surely that is proof that this Government's alleged support and its claim of continued importance for Aboriginal affairs are just so much window dressing. It is now obvious to everyone that areas of social need are going to be among the first to be cut by the State Government razor gang, and it is a great shame that the Aborigines were among the earliest victims.

Whilst talking about the razor gang, the Budget Review Committee, the Premier has made it clear in recent statements that there will be cuts in real terms in every area. The Premier is reported as saying:

It is fairer that everyone misses out rather than one section missing out on a lot. The difficulty is in balancing priorities.

He also said that, in the critical areas of health, community welfare, education and community protection, spending had to be maintained at reasonable levels. I only hope that the State razor gang and the Premier ignore some of those Liberal myths that are constantly aired in the media; for example, the statement that 'the proposals cost too much' when, in fact, in economic and social terms it may cost even more to do nothing. Another myth is, 'We should not spend more on welfare because they are bludgers, anyway.' That is an easy way to salve our consciences.

The great majority of unemployed do want to work, and this myth only serves to reinforce feelings of worthlessness, humiliation and rejection, and a loss of confidence. In fact, only a minority of people receiving welfare payments are unemployed: the majority are aged, war veterans, handicapped persons or widows, and the like. I was disgusted by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry and its recent suggestion that the Federal Government scrap some welfare programmes in 1981-82. The chamber claims that a number of existing welfare programmes should be cut out and that a range of benefit schemes removed from automatic indexing. The chamber called for containment or a reduction in the real level of Government spending, concentrating on welfare rather than public works.

That is being advocated at a time when up to 2 000 000 Australian families are living in poverty. The problem is that the public expenditure cuts have redistributed resources away from people in lower income groups who have no other options or choices. Erosion in the value of pensions and benefits affect in particular the children of pensioners and beneficiaries, the single, unemployed and lone parents and those requiring rental accommodation. The failure to meet the needs and consequences of poverty and unem-

ployment, and particularly the increasing number of homeless persons, especially youth, cause an enormous increase in the emergency bill of voluntary agencies. Resources are being redistributed away from the poor and the disadvantaged and, unless action is taken against increasing inequalities, in their final rejection of society's norms and standards, the growing number of poor and unemployed will be pushed further towards crime, delinquency and drug abuse.

In a recent speech by the Federal member for Port Adelaide to the Commonwealth Parliament, when talking about the substantial impact that the razor gang's report would have on immigration and ethnic affairs, the Federal member stated:

Basically, two main themes run through the review of Commonwealth functions or, as it is commonly known, the razor gang report. First, anything that is profitable is sold to private enterprise and, secondly, whatever is difficult to manage, like hospitals, is given to the States.

Perhaps this is what the State Budget Review Committee will finally recommend, although it will have great difficulty in giving away whatever is difficult to manage, because that is just about everything for this Government. I now turn to the vital health question, and I am pleased that the Minister of Health is taking her turn on the front bench at this moment. I refer to paragraph 12 of His Excellency's Speech, as follows:

... [the] Government believes that one of the great challenges facing health professionals in the 1980s is to create an awareness that individuals are responsible for their own health. To this end, the South Australian Health Commission will continue to pursue [the] Government's programme of expanding health promotion and preventive medicine. A State Plan for Health Promotion is being devised to co-ordinate and develop health promotion activities...

That is about the extent of the Government's health programme. Everyone will certainly require health promotion when the new health system gets under way. During the next few weeks all South Australians will be forced to think carefully about the question of insuring for the continued good health of themselves and their families. As most members know, this has been brought about by the Fraser Government's decision to make major changes to Australia's health system for the fifth time in 5½ years.

From 1 September health care throughout Australia will operate on a 'user pays' principle under which the availability of proper health care will be largely determined by one's ability to pay for it. If one is not amongst those people judged by the Commonwealth to be disadvantaged or amongst those people who can afford health insurance, one may run into considerable financial difficulties in the event of serious illness. Mr Fraser has managed in 5½ short years to completely undo Australia's first universal health system, despite his promises that Medibank would survive. We are back in the pre-Medibank days where our health system is designed principally for the benefit of private health insurance companies and the private medical profession rather than the patients it is supposed to serve.

Confusion, discrimination and stigma were among the hallmarks of the pre-Medibank health services. Poor people had to use public hospital services and undergo a rigid means test. Tax concessions for health insurance contributions meant that wealthy people paid less than those on lower incomes. Migrant families experienced great difficulty in understanding the health system. Aboriginal families seemed to be even worse off in the health stakes. Under the new scheme to operate from 1 September, poor people will have to apply to the Department of Social Security every six months for confirmation of their disadvantaged status. They will receive a card to show that they have been judged to be poor. Health services may then be secured at no cost from private practitioners or public

hospitals. The stigma of being poor will be restored to the disadvantaged.

One of the lesser publicised aspects of the new Fraser health scheme is that it does away entirely with section 34 beds, which are reserved for pensioner patients. They are of great importance and the dispensing with them is a further blow to the sick, destitute and aged people within our community. There will be no such thing as a free consultation for families, including single-parent families, with a gross weekly income of more than \$160 plus \$20 for each child or for a single person with a gross weekly income exceeding \$96.

Although the new health arrangements are likely to cause difficulties for most low-income and middle-income earners throughout the country, the problems will be magnified for people with a very high level of medical needs and a still inadequate level of medical services. Also, the means test limits are quite ridiculously low. People marginally over the limits, including a considerable number of pensioners and superannuants, will find themselves even closer to the breadline after paying out \$10 to \$12 a week in health insurance contributions. Of course, honourable members would have read the announcement in the media today that those charges are likely to increase by up to \$3 a week by 1 September.

Couples with young children, earning perhaps from \$200 to \$250 a week, and faced with high living costs, astronomical rent, and high food and clothing costs, will be hard hit by an additional commitment of this magnitude. Young single people, earning, say, about \$100 a week, will have to balance the risks of staying uninsured and taking \$5 or \$6 a week out of a meagre income to obtain health insurance cover. I believe that there is an excellent argument for setting the means test limits higher in recognition of the fact that the proposed limits are a very inaccurate reflection of the disadvantaged people to whom I have referred. Of course, all families just above the cut-off point will then be disadvantaged.

The fallacy in the Federal Government's 'user pays' philosophy on health care is that the user is already paying. Public hospitals are built with public funds, equipped with public funds and staffed with public funds. They do not just happen: every taxpayer in Australia helps bear the cost. Now the vast majority of Australians are being asked to pay substantially more, not through a taxation system or levy related to a person's ability to pay but through a multitude of unnecessary and costly private health insurance companies.

The Federal Government has made a virtue of the fact that it will introduce a taxation rebate of 32 cents in the dollar for basic contributions paid to health insurance funds, but at the same time it will more than recoup this loss by dropping half tax indexation. If sleight of hand tricks were all that was necessary to create an effective health care system, the Fraser Government would be on a winner.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Keneally): Order! There is too much audible conversation coming from the Government front bench.

Mr ABBOTT: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Anyone who believes that the fifth Fraser health plan will mean cheaper or more effective health care in Australia is labouring under a delusion. Every new health system introduced by the Fraser Government has been less successful and more confusing than the one before. From a simple straightforward scheme which guaranteed health care to everyone, regardless of means, we have returned to a 'sink or swim' system, with only the guarantee of either a medical bill or a degrading process to establish whether or not one is too poor to pay. There is nothing in the new scheme to control

costs, improve health care for Aborigines or overcome confusion among ethnic groups.

Mr Langley: The Minister couldn't care less.

Mr ABBOTT: The member for Unley is perfectly right. I do not think the Minister could care less. More pressure will be placed on the Department of Social Security, which will also have to cope with income testing unemployment beneficiaries on a fortnightly basis. What sort of society makes it difficult for the poor and the disadvantaged to obtain the health care they need, and stigmatises those in ill health? One day in the future we may be able to have a quality health service based on need, a service that promotes good health and no longer discriminates against ethnic groups or those who are poor. Dressing up the old system of 10 years ago will further compound the ills of our nation's health system. The only comfort that I can offer the public is the fact that Federal Labor Leader, Bill Hayden, has given an unequivocal promise that he will restore a universal health system after the 1983 Federal election.

I now turn to the major problem of welfare housing. According to paragraph 16 of His Excellency's opening Speech, the Government will continue once again to give high priority to its commitments through the Housing Trust to provide quality welfare housing, particularly on a rental basis, for low-income and moderate-income earners and pensioners. Additional support has been provided for the Emergency Housing Office, and plans are under way to establish 50 dwellings that will provide minimally supervised housing for homeless young people.

I am afraid that I must agree with the remarks made by the member for Playford. The Speech delivered by His Excellency was just a collection of words. The member said (and this was also quoted by the member for Goyder):

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

How many times do we hear the phrase, 'My Government will continue to give high priority to its commitments'? There is no point in continuing to give high priorities to issues if no meaningful action is undertaken, and that is exactly what is happening in the area of welfare housing and housing for homeless young people in South Australia.

There have been promises, surveys, conferences, forums, announcements, working party reports, departmental committees, Cabinet subcommittees and continuing high priority promises. But nothing worth while has been achieved, yet the need is continuing to grow. It is growing rapidly, and becoming worse day by day. According to the Housing Industry Association, more than 280 000 pensioners and single-parent families urgently need housing aid. Many of these families are being forced to live in substandard housing because they just cannot afford the rent for a decent home. It is estimated that in the past year the number of very needy families grew by well over 20 000.

Federal Government funds for welfare housing have been halved in real terms in the past few years, despite large increases in the number of needy families, and the Housing Industry Association says that the States are now faced with the unpalatable prospect that the Commonwealth's base commitment of \$200 000 000 for welfare housing in 1981-82 will only just be sufficient to cover loan repayments by the States on earlier Commonwealth advances.

The association claims that the proposed five-year Commonwealth-State welfare housing agreement no longer provides for special grants for innovative home ownership and rental housing projects. In the absence of such grants in the forthcoming Federal Budget, State housing authorities might be tempted to limit the amount of assistance going

to the most needy families to avoid adding further to the already large costs of their rent rebate bill. We read only today in the *Advertiser* of a further statement by the Housing Industry Association where 50 000 fewer people are seeking homes. The report states:

The rising cost of housing finance has stopped at least 50 000 Australians seeking home ownership, according to a Housing Industry Association study.

The study, prepared by the national office of the association, shows that in the two years to the end of 1980 the number of home owners in Australia fell by 70 000.

The HIA National Executive Director, Mr Bill Kirkby-Jones, said yesterday housing finance was the major reason for the fall. He said that if interest rates continued to rise, as predicted, some lending rates for housing would have to be increased by more than 30 per cent in less than 18 months.

This could well mean that a further 30 000 families will not be able to afford home ownership. It could also lead to a substantial number of Australians having to sell their homes because they can no longer keep up with mortgage repayments, he said.

In an official press release on 8 April on youth housing, the Housing Minister, Mr Murray Hill, stated that he would be seeking additional funds for South Australia through the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for housing homeless youth. However, in reply to a question by the Federal member for Hindmarsh, Mr John Scott, M.H.R., in the House of Representatives on 3 June 1981, as to whether the Federal Government had been approached by South Australia for increased funds under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act, Mr Hunt, representing the Minister for Social Security, replied:

There is no record of an approach by the South Australian Government for an increase in funding under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act.

This Liberal Government's apathy is causing widespread suffering among the increasing thousands of young people experiencing housing difficulties in South Australia each year. The Minister's tardiness in tackling the Federal Government for additional funds can only be construed as meaning that this Government is completely indifferent to the suffering of homeless youth in our community.

The Minister's sincerity must therefore be called into question when he attacks cuts in Federal welfare housing grants, as reported in the *Advertiser* on 27 May, yet fails to approach the Federal Government for increased funding for homeless youth as promised in his own press statement of 8 April. The situation is becoming so bad that even the use of warehouses for homes has been called for. A report in the media on 4 June on a youth housing forum organised by Shelter (S.A.) at the Y.W.C.A. revealed how alarming the youth housing crisis really is. The report stated:

Derelict warehouses at Port Adelaide should be converted to house homeless youth, a youth worker suggested at a forum yesterday.

Mr Nick Wagner, of the Port Unemployed Self Help group, said the area had many large, empty warehouses which, if converted for living accommodation, could house 50 to 100 people at a time . . . Mr Wagner said that to leave the warehouses vacant was an 'enormous waste', especially when there was such a dearth of suitable premises for homeless youth. Substantial space was just rotting.

The warehouses could be converted using voluntary labor and community support, he said. Similar projects had been successful in Europe and America, and there was a warehouse community in Sydney. Mr Wagner said that with private and Government dwellings in such short supply, it was necessary to look creatively at alternatives . . . Other speakers at the forum included Mr David Cunnew of the South Australian Housing Trust, Mr Brenton Wright of the Department for Community Welfare and representatives of the Emergency Housing Office and the Squatters Union.

Mr Cunnew said applications had been received from 18 welfare organisations for the State Government offer to provide 50 houses through the Housing Trust for homeless youth under 18. However, only two of these organisations were able to pay rent.

Until the others were able to raise funds to cover rent, they would not be able to take advantage of the Government's offer . . . The two organisations which had been approved to rent houses for homeless youth were the Red Cross and a church-

affiliated group from Edwardstown. Mr Cunnew said the trust this year had faced the heaviest demand for housing in its 40-year history. Already it had exceeded last year's figure of 10 000 new enquiries.

It is a disgraceful state of affairs when the homeless youth of this State must recommend that vacant warehouses within the metropolitan area have to be converted for use by our homeless youth. It is time that the Government implemented the recommendations of the working party report into the homeless youth in South Australia. I urge it immediately to commence implementing the recommendations of that working party's report.

I refer now to an announcement by the Premier, which in my opinion was a first-class con job. It affects a part of my electorate which is one of the most disadvantaged suburban areas in Adelaide. A report on the front page of the *Advertiser* of 6 May headed 'New jobs—housing—Tonkin' stated:

Land no longer required for proposed transport corridors would be used to revitalise Bowden and Brompton, the Premier, Mr Tonkin, said yesterday. He said 300 new jobs and new housing would be provided in the process.

Mr Tonkin said two companies, packaging manufacturer C. P. Detmold Pty Ltd and electrical accessories maker Gerard Industries Pty Ltd would spend a total of \$5 000 000 expanding their factories in the Hindmarsh council area. And the South Australian Housing Trust would renovate some of the old houses and build new dwellings.

Also, the Hindmarsh council had employed consultants to investigate whether industrially-zoned land at Brompton Park, which predominantly was residential could be re-zoned to protect its residential nature.

This will be a great boost for the Hindmarsh area in many ways, Mr Tonkin said yesterday. The projects involve using land no longer needed by the Highways Department since the Government decided to abandon some proposed transport corridors in the area.

We were determined to dispose of the surplus properties wisely and this project will assist both local industry and residents. It is a vital expansion for two major manufacturers in the important plastics industry.

That is what the whole story was about—the expansion of industry and not housing and jobs in that area. The report continued.

Mr Tonkin said that the South Australian Government was supporting the development through its establishment payments scheme administered by the Department of Trade and Industry. 'Not only are the companies creating valuable new jobs, but they are also introducing the latest technology,' he said. Within two years Gerard Industries will employ another 200 people and Detmolds another 100.

Within two years—so that aspect of the statement will be worth following up in two years time. The report continued:

He said the two companies would acquire land next to their present properties. The Housing Trust had guaranteed that any tenant who had to be rehoused as a direct result of the proposals would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area. The trust would use other land in the area to provide rental homes in a programme to build more housing in conjunction with the Hindmarsh council. It also would acquire and renovate surplus Highways Department housing and those not occupied would become available for renting.

The Premier said specifically that the Housing Trust guaranteed that any tenant who had to be rehoused would be assisted with alternative accommodation in the same area, with the trust providing rental homes in a programme in conjunction with the Hindmarsh council. A subcommittee was set up consisting of Hindmarsh councillors and the following Government officers: Mr D. Lambert, of the South Australian Housing Trust, Mr D. Crouch, of the Highways Department, Mr M. Macintosh of the Department of Environment and Planning, Mr I. Lovell, of the Department of Trade and Industry, and Ms V. Palmer, also of the Department of Trade and Industry. The committee was set up to consider and examine more closely the expansion needs of Detmolds and a wider programme for the development of housing in Hindmarsh.

The council members were amazed to learn that some 16 properties had already been sold to Detmolds, and many of the residents had been notified that they must quit those homes without any offer of assistance to be relocated in the same area, as had been guaranteed in the Premier's press announcement. The council felt completely let down by this action. The proceedings of the subcommittee were reported as follows:

Following endorsement of the Hindmarsh Steering Committee Report by State Cabinet in August 1980, council requested the formation of an *ad hoc* committee to recommend an appropriate strategy for the disposal of surplus Highways Department land. Recommendations were put to State agencies and council in December 1980.

Investigations into the expansion needs of Gerard Industries and Detmold Industries commenced by the *ad hoc* committee were continued by the Department of Trade and Industry which endeavoured to establish mechanisms by which the rightful and necessary expansion needs of these companies could be facilitated by the appropriate disposal of surplus Highways Department property.

The Department of Trade and Industry, assisted by other agencies, presented their recommendations on the expansion needs of Gerard Industries and Detmold Industries at a special meeting of the Planning and Development Committee on 4 May 1981.

At this meeting, proposals for the expansion needs of these industries were given together with a support programme by the Housing Trust to assist with the transfer of Highways Department tenanted houses to the needs of industry. At a subsequent meeting of council, some doubts were expressed as to the exact nature of the proposals and it was requested that further discussions be held to clarify the proposals, particularly the expansion programme for Detmold Industries.

Soon after council's consideration of the Department of Trade and Industry proposals, the Premier publicly announced a joint development package for Hindmarsh, including the expansion programmes of Gerards and Detmolds together with a general programme of Housing Trust involvement in housing matters.

That refers to the press statement that I mentioned, quoting the Premier, on 6 May, referred to at the joint meeting held by the Hindmarsh council and representatives of the Government departments I have mentioned. The minutes continued:

One of the main aims of the meeting was to discuss and establish an on-going committee to co-ordinate aims and objectives of council and State agencies to facilitate the orderly development of Hindmarsh. It was suggested that the committee establish a co-ordinated housing development programme in line with the Premier's announcement of trust involvement in Hindmarsh, recommend and define specific action programmes to council, trust and appropriate bodies. It was agreed that council's planner and the Housing Trust representatives prepare a charter for the operation and function of the committee.

The committee then resolved as follows:

That following discussion on the Detmold issue, the committee request that the following representatives examine closely the development programme for Detmold Industries, hold discussions with the company as necessary and report back to this committee for its consideration—council's planner, Department of Trade and Industry and South Australian Housing Trust representatives.

That this committee recommend and appoint members to a 'Hindmarsh Development Committee' whose first task would be to outline its formal working arrangements and terms of reference. The principal aims of the committee would be to report directly to council and appropriate Government agencies and recommend housing programmes, projects, funding priorities, etc.

The committee then considered the following letter received from the residents of East Street, Brompton:

We wish to bring the following issues to the attention of council. The residents of East Street would like to make clear that they are totally opposed to the further expansion of Detmolds. We are concerned about the quality of our housing and feel that council is bound to support us in our efforts to remain in East Street.

They made a number of points along these lines:

On 10 July, residents of East Street were instructed by Detmolds that they would have to leave their homes. Some residents were given seven days notice to leave and some three months. We therefore request that council formally ask Detmolds as to why they have ridiculously given some tenants only seven days notice while giving others three months notice.

According to the press release made by the Premier, Mr Tonkin, concerning the expansion of Gerards and Detmolds, we note that

residents who were to be affected by this expansion were to be rehoused in the area. We would like to point out that no serious attempt has been made to offer alternative accommodation and believe this promise to be a lie.

The meeting resolved that the residents of East Street be advised of the meeting held on 9 July concerning Detmolds, and that their concerns would be discussed by the committee appointed to hold discussions with Detmold Industries and report back to council through its subcommittee.

In all of that, following the Premier's announcement about the expansion of those two industries, about 16 properties were found to be no longer required by the Highways Department and surplus to its requirements, and it was decided to sell those properties to Detmolds. Detmolds then gave notice to all of the tenants to vacate those houses. That action was taken when the various Government departments and the Hindmarsh council were meeting to decide on the proper disposal of any surplus property, to assist with the housing development and requirements, and also to assist those people who were likely to be affected by the expansion of those properties.

The councillors I mentioned were absolutely amazed that that action was taken without their knowledge and without their having come to any final conclusion as to what assistance they, in conjunction with Government officers, could render to those people who were likely to be affected by the development of those two industries.

I will be following this matter up as soon as I possibly can to see whether the Government is serious about the assistance it offered in the statement made by the Premier. The council had felt completely let down, and it was a great shock to it to learn that those homes were sold and that those living in them had received eviction notices, some to vacate within seven days and some within three months. I have no idea of the reason for that discrepancy, but I hope to be able to direct questions to the Premier to obtain clarification in relation to this very serious matter affecting those residents to whom I have referred in the disadvantaged suburbs of Bowden and Brompton.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I rise at this time of the evening, when the House is chock full of interest in this debate, and I am sure that what I say will add to that interest. Having about 181 different points that I want to make in the short time at my disposal, I shall try to pursue them.

The first point I want to make is that, if ever a debate in a Parliament anywhere has developed into a boring and long-winded rabble of noise and words, this debate has. I believe that many people in this House, including some of my colleagues, over a period of some time have expressed the opinion that this debate is an uninteresting and even boring waste of time. I recall the member for Mitcham vividly, I think 12 months ago, expressing the same theory as I express tonight, namely, that the debate was boring and a continual waste of time.

I believe quite seriously that an in-depth study ought to be made by responsible people in this Parliament so that something can be done about the debate. I suggest that certainly the time that is being allowed for members to expound their various theories, and so on, ought to be reduced to a reasonable time. I suggest that the authorities should be looking into that particular part of our procedures as far as this Parliament is concerned. I also suggest that, perhaps by reducing the amount of time available to members in this debate, there may be some compulsory method of allowing members to have a longer time, and perhaps more opportunity, to do what we call the grizzle in the House.

I only put those two points of view as, I hope, a constructive viewpoint to try to have something done about this absolute schemozzle (that is the only word I can think of) of a debate. Having dealt with that point, I will get on with another point I want to make in this 181-point saga. I recently raised the matter of a very important issue in this country at present. I refer to the wage restraint policies so ably carried out by the Fraser gang.

I want to take a few moments to go back into the history of this wage question in this country. Anyone who has been in the trade union movement or who has had anything to do with the industrial field, with employer or employee, would know that the history of this country on the wage question has been spelt out through the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, an Act that, from memory, came into fruition in this country in 1904. The concept of the arbitration and conciliation system as far as wage fixation was concerned was simply that an independent tribunal, if that is what we will call it, ought to be able to sit in judgment, on a fair basis on wage fixation.

I remember (and I am sure some of my colleagues remember) that the basis of wage fixation in those days was called the basic wage, and for many years in this country we had the concept that led to the basic wage increases on a yearly basis. The basic wage concept was simple. It was laid down on the basis of what it was considered it would cost a working man to keep himself, his wife and two children on a reasonable and proper standard of living.

From there the cost of living adjustments and the percentage increase decisions of the court came about, but over those years cost of living adjustments and the percentage increases brought about by the decisions of the court led to the fiasco that we have in this country today, because everyone who was associated with the cost of living adjustments would know full well that, without fail, every application that was made by a trade union to the Arbitration Court for a cost of living adjustment was based on what the differentials of that cost of living might be between one year and the other.

Invariably, the whole of the cost of living adjustment was not passed on to the worker. There was always some reason or other that the court would proceed with, on the basis not to grant, and on that point alone we have found the working class people of this country having some type of wage restraint. Then the court turned, on every occasion when it increased the wages of the workers of this country, to basing its decision on a percentage.

We do not need to be mathematicians to work out that the percentage decisions of the court also led to the problems that we are now experiencing in the arbitration system, because, if the workers of this country receive a 3 per cent increase in the decision, it would be simple to work out that 3 per cent of \$100 was \$3 and that 3 per cent of \$200 was \$6. What has happened over the years is that, with these increases on a percentage basis, the worker in a higher income bracket has invariably received more money in increases. I go a little further because another element then came into this system. I must say that this other element has been with us for some time, but it has never been manipulated as the present Prime Minister is manipulating it.

I want to point out the role of Governments, particularly the Federal Government, in the cost of living adjustments. Not only did they object to the full cost of living adjustments being passed on to the workers, but in their budgetary planning they created another increase in the cost of living. I only have to mention the tax on wine; the beer and cigarette tax; the lack of increase in the amount of money for housing; the increased electrical charges, water rates,

and so forth. Although they may be a revenue support, they are tax measures, and this leads to a situation in which the workers are asked to pay more out of their wages but have no right under the arbitration system to go into court and ask that allowance be made for these increased costs. That is the other point where the whole system breaks down.

History has shown that methods can be pursued within the arbitration system to curtail considerably the purchasing power of the worker. One of two things then follows, or possibly both occur. First, the workers' power to spend wanes, or disappears, causing a decline in the economy; or, secondly, the worker revolts sooner or later because he or she has no other alternative. I believe that at the present moment the worker is revolting about the decisions that have been brought down by the arbitration system in the past few years. Those decisions have been manipulated by the Fraser regime. The Prime Minister was shown arriving back in Australia on television tonight, and immediately he attacked an employer for going outside of his wage restraint system. I suggest, quite seriously, that the employers have gone out of this wage restraint system laid down by the Prime Minister simply because they know that the guidelines that have been laid down by the Government are not working—it is as simple as that.

I would suggest quite seriously—and I have suggested this for some time but no-one has seemed to take much notice—that the arbitration system has failed; it has failed for some years. Now, suddenly, once again we find that certain people in this community are asking what we should do about it. I say that, if we are going to interfere with the arbitration system in the way in which Governments interfere with it today, then get rid of it; it no longer plays the role for which it was instituted. It is a great pity that people did not look at the arbitration system more from the conciliatory angle than from the arbitration angle. I suggest that the fiasco of strikes and industrial turmoil that this country is currently going through is largely caused by the interference of the Federal Government and the frustration this has placed on the arbitration system.

I turn now to a matter which has something to do with wages and the arbitration system. I refer to a person I have known for nearly all of my industrial life. I will deal with this person only because it is a great example of a person being given a marvellous opportunity in this country by the working class people. I am appalled that, in the continuing struggle by workers for wage justice, this one-time prominent unionist turned against the workers in their struggles. I refer to an article that appeared in the *Adelaide News* on 22 October 1980, under the heading 'Unions blasted by former Labor chief', and the subheading 'Integrity "is lost"'. I ask: whose integrity? Is he suggesting for a moment that he has not lost any integrity with the remarks he made at that time? Sir John Egerton was an ex-boilermaker in Brisbane. He was a trade union official, a President of the Trades and Labor Council, and he was on the Federal council of the boilermakers. At all times he led us to believe that he was the great martyr of the working class people of this country. The article states:

Former trade union boss Sir John Egerton has labelled trade unions in Australia as 'the most greedy, grasping organisations in the community.' Sir John, a former president of the Queensland Trades and Labor Council, said unions had lost their social consciousness and their integrity.

I want to point out before I go any further that this particular gentleman, who has been elevated to the board of Qantas, said this at the Gold Coast: he did not say it down the mine or in the boilermakers' shop. The article continues:

Sir John said unions in Australia had lost their social consciousness, despite the 'reams of propaganda' they churned out to the contrary. 'They're no longer worried about the underprivileged in

the community, the people who are not capable of fighting their own battles', he said.

The man is saying this while lolling back on the sands of the Gold Coast. He is saying that the trade union movement has lost its concern for the workers. He would not know.

Mr Abbott: He said that when he was watching all the girls on the beach.

Mr MAX BROWN: That is right. The article continues:

They campaigned for shorter working weeks, which benefited only those employed and made it more difficult for the unemployed to get work. When they got such concessions, they often turned around and hit again for more.

The article continues, under the heading 'Socialists':

In the early days, if you reached an agreement, you stuck to it. But, an agreement made today can be abrogated tomorrow. We've lost our integrity. Sir John attributed much of the irresponsible activity of trade unions in the past five years to their socialist elements.

Let me say this, and I make no apology for saying it, that I can recall very vividly when this man, unfortunately, in my opinion, was branded a socialist. Any resemblance between this man and a socialist is purely bunkum.

Mr Oswald: A radical socialist.

Mr MAX BROWN: He is not a very radical socialist lying on the sands of the Gold Coast with the amount of money he gets for being on the Qantas board. I believe that those sorts of people ought to play a very important part in the current industrial turmoil that this country is going through, and not the type of role that I have just referred to. I believe they have a responsibility to let us know where they come from, who put them there and what put them there. It does him no credit at all, and I suggest that his integrity is shot to pieces.

Members opposite do not believe in the 35-hour week, so while I am on this topic I refer members to a recent *Nationwide* programme where I understand a Japanese professor (whose name I do not know) spoke on robots in industry. I was appalled, because he said that we had to accept—and this is rather interesting because it is nothing more than what members opposite have pursued for some time—high unemployment along with the promise that in the long term robots in industry would solve our economical problems. There was no guarantee of this, but we had to accept the provision of robots in industry. If members viewed that programme they would have seen that robots can do anything.

I honestly fail to see how on earth we can pursue the current programme in industry where we have to accept robots and technological change, which is depriving us of many jobs, yet as soon as someone talks about a 35-hour week, a shorter working life or early retirement they are called socialists. I think it is time that people in prominent positions in this nation began to understand that whether we like it or not we are heading for a situation in which there will be very little need for workers as we know them.

I believe we are facing a very grave problem at the moment and, unfortunately, it will intensify. Unless we turn to the real need of looking at a programme that will provide more leisure for our people, we will be in real trouble. Our unemployment situation will simply rise. The problem does not simply stop there, because I am convinced that the unemployment problem is also creating the vandalism, crime and so on that is in our society at the moment.

Although members opposite came into power with the policy of law and order, if they believe for one moment that they have achieved anything along those lines all I can say is that they are certainly living in a fantasy land, and there is no doubt in my mind about it.

Mr Oswald: In Whyalla, you should remember, we came in on industrial development as well.

Mr MAX BROWN: I do not know whether the member for Morphett is having a dizzy spell or whether he is just plain crazy. He does not understand the position and he does not want to understand. No doubt the member for Morphett would be an exponent of the theory that because someone is unemployed he is a dole bludger and he is no good.

Mr Oswald: That's rubbish.

Mr MAX BROWN: It is not rubbish. That is the theory that the member for Morphett expounds and supports. There is no question about that. It is nearly time that members opposite started looking at what is happening in our society today.

Mr Oswald: Your people in Whyalla can work themselves out of trouble if they try.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Whyalla has the floor.

Mr MAX BROWN: For the benefit of the member for Morphett I will refer to an example of what I have been discussing. Recently, B.H.P. built a second blast furnace at a cost of \$30 000 000. That blast furnace performs just about every modern function that one could think of in a blast furnace works anywhere in the world. When B.H.P. was asked how many more men would be employed at this blast furnace, the reply was 'None'. In fact, one employee would be lost. That means that \$30 000 000 has been invested without creating one more job. All that B.H.P. said at that particular time (and I think it was quite serious), was that there would be no retrenchments. The point is that there will be no more jobs. That is the very point that I am trying to make to members opposite, because that is how serious this matter is.

We do not have to look only at B.H.P. I support and have always supported the project that Santos wants to develop at Stony Point. However, I point out, and I did so publicly, that although \$750 000 000 will be spent, the project will create only 30 jobs. I am not opposed to this project; I have stated that quite openly, and I make no apology for doing so. I remind the House, and I have reminded my constituents and anyone else that I run into, that that sort of thing is not the solution to our unemployment problem. It cannot be.

Mr Oswald: It helps.

Mr MAX BROWN: Of course it helps—that is why I support it. I am trying to point out that this expenditure of millions of dollars will not solve the current unemployment problem. That is the calamity of this situation. I have 181 different points that I wish to make, but I have made only two so far. Before I go on to make my third point I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): The subject I want to speak about tonight concerns the use of pull combs in the pastoral industry. Unless the saner members of the Graziers Association condemn and take positive action to eliminate wide-gauge combs from the industry widespread industrial disputation is a certainty. Pastoral workers delegates meeting at Dubbo on 1 June called on the Graziers Association to give a clear and unequivocal undertaking condemning the use of wide comb shearing tools and a further undertaking to prosecute any members breaching clause 32 of the Federal Pastoral Industry Award.

Any increase in the width of a comb used for shearing poses a threat to the rates of pay and conditions of all pastoral workers, and must be rejected by those concerned if disruptions in the industry are to be avoided. The present shearing rates are based on the average number of sheep shorn per week of 480. Any upward movement of this number results in a lower rate per 100 for the shearer. Tests concluded in Western Australia show that the following increases in the average number of sheep shorn per week would result from the use of combs of differing widths: for a 73 millimetre comb (that is, a pulled standard comb) there would be a 6 per cent increase, which would result in an average of 510 sheep being shorn per week; for a 76 millimetre New Zealand pacer comb there would be a 7 per cent increase resulting in an average of 515 sheep being shorn per week; for an 86 millimetre comb there would be a 14 per cent increase, which would bring the average up to 550 per week. These increases were rounded off to a nearest multiple of five. I have a table which sets out the present formula for shearing rates based on 480 sheep per week. This information is statistical and I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

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

Leave granted.

SHEARING RATES

Present Formula		\$
Present total wage	192.90
Plus 20% piecework allowance	38.58
		<hr/> 231.48
		\$
20 weeks wages at 231.48 per week	4 629.60
20 weeks fares at \$7.96 per week	159.20
3 weeks travelling at \$72.46 per week	217.38
17 weeks mess at \$39.77 per week	676.09
17 weeks camping allowance at \$7.82 per week	132.94
1 week lost earning time at home at \$192.90 per week	192.90
Pro rata allowance in lieu of 4 weeks annual leave plus 1 1/2% loading	460.85
Pro rata allowance in lieu of 1.8 weeks sick leave	162.92
		<hr/> 6 631.88
Less 17 weeks contribution towards the cost of meals at \$25.07 per week	426.19
		<hr/> 6 205.69

Rate per 100		\$
$\frac{\$6\ 205.69}{17\ \text{weeks}} \times \frac{100}{480}$	76.05
Plus comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus allowance for occasional daggy and fly-blown sheep56
		<hr/> Present rate per 100
		\$79.78

Effects on shearing rates that would result if any of the increases indicated by the West Australian tests were approved by the Arbitration Court and the adjustment made to the average number of sheep shorn per week in the present formula:

Rate per 100 based on 6% increase in weekly average sheep shorn		\$
$\frac{\$6\ 205.69}{17\ \text{weeks}} \times \frac{100}{510}$	71.58
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Allowance for occasional daggy and fly-blown sheep56
		<hr/> \$75.31
Reduction in rate compared to present shearing rate per 100	\$4.47

SHEARING RATES

Rate per 100 based on 7% increase in weekly average sheep shorn

	\$
$\frac{\$6\ 205.69}{17\ \text{weeks}} \times \frac{100}{515}$	70.88
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus daggy and fly-blown sheep allowance56
	\$74.61

Reduction in shearing rate per 100

\$5.17

Rate per 100 based on 14% increase in weekly average sheep shorn

	\$
$\frac{\$6\ 205.69}{17\ \text{weeks}} \times \frac{100}{550}$	66.37
Comb and cutter allowance	3.17
Plus daggy and fly-blown sheep allowance56
	\$70.10

Reduction in shearing rate per 100

\$9.68

Mr PLUNKETT: When this loss to shearers is applied to 130 000 000 sheep over the period of five to six years, reasons why graziers are now looking around for methods by which they can increase the rip-off from shearers and weekly wage pastoral workers become abundantly clear. Resolute action by pastoral workers can defeat this insidious attack on wage rates and working conditions by graziers and scab shearers. Pastoral workers should take job action to see that no breaches of the Pastoral Award occur in South Australia. On 10 June 1926 the President, Mr Justice Power, delivered the following judgment:

Claim 14—The claim reads—that a new clause be inserted after clause 11 of the agreement with the shearer (and that a similar provision be made in the agreement with the crutcher) to read—

The shearer shall not without the consent of the employer use any comb wider than the standard size of 2½ inches, nor shall he use any double bent teeth comb.

As to the first part of the claim no objection has been made. As to the second, the union strongly objects to the claim and many shearers prefer the comb referred to. It is, speaking generally, a new comb, and the employers are almost unanimous in their objections—many of the objections are serious ones. The comb gathers more wool than the ordinary 2½ inch standard comb, and is therefore contrary to the first part of the claim agreed to.

The weight of the evidence is clearly against the double bent comb, but not against the comb bent on one side only, which is useful as a guide. Many shearers have already bought the double bent combs, and I think the position can be fairly met by prohibiting the use of the comb because of the injury to the sheep and the ridges left in the wool.

Regulation 11A states:

11A. The shearer shall not, without the consent of the employer, use any comb wider than the standard size of 2½ inches, nor shall he, after 31 December 1926, use any double bent comb.

Clause 32 provides:

USE OF CERTAIN COMBS PROHIBITED

(a) No shearer or crutcher shall use nor shall the employer permit him to use—

- (i) any comb wider than two-and-a-half inches between the points of the outside teeth; or
- (ii) any comb having the bottom teeth bent outwards; or
- (iii) any comb having the bottom teeth projecting beyond the centre teeth, except in the case of a convex or a concave comb where no tooth shall project more than one-sixteenth of an inch beyond the shortest tooth except the top tooth; or
- (iv) any comb on which the runners of the outside teeth protrude one-sixteenth of an inch or more below the runners of the to her teeth.

(b) For the purpose of measuring the combs as specified in paragraph (iv) of subclause (a) hereof, the comb shall be laid on its back on a flat surface.

The brief history of this prohibition is that it was first inserted into the award by consent in 1926. It should be noted, however, that the provision as it then operated was related to the 'consent of the employer'. I refer to the graziers' objection. This has its basis in the employers viewpoint that wide combs were detrimental to the sheep's welfare. In 1938, the provision was changed, as follows:

Provided that on and after 1 August 1939, the foregoing provisions shall cease to operate and the following provisions shall operate in its stead:

The shearer shall not use—

- (a) any comb wider than 2½ inches between the points of the outside teeth; nor
- (b) any comb having the bottom tooth bent outwards; nor
- (c) any comb having the bottom tooth projecting beyond the centre teeth, except in the case of a convex or a concave comb where no tooth shall project more than one-sixteenth of an inch beyond the shortest tooth except the top tooth; nor
- (d) any comb on which the runners of the outside teeth protrude one-sixteenth of an inch or more below the runners of the other teeth.

In 1948 a further clause was inserted by the graziers. The clause was remodelled placing an obligation on the employer to refuse a shearer permission to use unauthorised combs, and provides:

14. The shearer shall not use nor shall the employer permit a shearer to use—

- (a) any comb wider than 2½ inches between the points of the outside teeth; nor
- (b) any comb having the bottom tooth bent outwards; nor
- (c) any comb having the bottom tooth projecting beyond the centre teeth, except in the case of a convex or concave comb where no tooth shall project more than one-sixteenth of an inch beyond the shortest tooth except the top tooth; nor
- (d) any comb on which the runners of the outside teeth protrude one-sixteenth of an inch or more below the runners of the other teeth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PLUNKETT: An article was printed in the journal of the Livestock and Grain Producers (Industrial) Association of New South Wales headed, 'Warning on use of wide combs'—

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I want to use this occasion to respond to attacks that have been made upon me, particularly by the member for Napier in his Address in Reply speech. It was noticeable in his speech that the member for Napier unfortunately tended to concentrate more on the person than on what was said, which I believe is an unfortunate aspect of some of the debates from members opposite.

Obviously, if only the person, rather than what he has to say, is attacked, it usually indicates that the attacker cannot attack the points that have been made. The character assassination that was undertaken by the member for Ascot Park earlier this evening also stands to be condemned. The member for Napier, when he concentrated on what I said rather than on the person, misrepresented me on a number of occasions. I thought that, if I did not respond to those misrepresentations, some people might believe that some of the things he said have an element of truth. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth.

Let me consider some of the remarks made by the member for Napier. First, he accused me of criticising the trade union movement only and entering into a trade union bashing exercise. I challenge him to find anywhere in my speech a so-called bash of the trade union movement. I stated at

the beginning of my speech that trade unions are essential and that their members have the right to strike. The only two aspects on which I concentrated in my speech were demarcation disputes and political disputes, and no-one will convince me that any union has the right to enter into a demarcation or political dispute. If members opposite listened to what I had to say or read the comments that I made and if they can then find one comment that criticised the unions other than for their activities in demarcation or political disputes, I would invite them to quote the comments to me. They are just not there.

Unfortunately, at present far too many unions are costing this country dearly, because of disputes that have absolutely nothing to do with wages or work conditions. The trade union movement should work to protect its members if they are being unfairly treated in relation to those aspects, but for the trade union movement to bring this country to a halt in the way that it is doing at present is just not on. One example was seen on the Melbourne wharves. The dispute has been resolved, and what did the unions do today? There is now a demarcation dispute on those wharves. There is no way in the world that anyone can justify that type of action.

Mr Langley interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Once again, the member for Unley is saying that I am a union basher. I repeat once again for his benefit that unions are essential and the members of unions have the right to strike, but unions do not have the right to enter into demarcation or political disputes. If they do, they bring the country to a most unfair situation.

Mr Langley: Have you ever been a member of a union or organisation?

Mr ASHENDEN: I am sure the member for Unley will be delighted to know that I was a member of the South Australian Institute of Teachers when I was a high school teacher.

Mr Langley: What about when you were with the other company?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Todd has the call. He has invited comment, but not immediate comment.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will now refer to my most recent employment at the Chrysler company. The member for Napier got his little jollies by saying that I was an office boy. Once again, he could only attack the person and not what was being said. If he goes to the Chrysler company (or Mitsubishi as it is now called), I am sure that the personnel office would be delighted to show him that I was on the senior executive pay-roll. If the honourable member thinks that is an office boy, good luck to him. Even when the member for Napier concentrated on some of the points that I made, unfortunately he attempted to completely misrepresent what I said. He even referred to comments made by the British High Commissioner and quoted him as follows:

Poor industrial relations were the fault of management, not workers.

For goodness sake, surely the member for Napier and other members opposite are not saying that every dispute that arises is the fault of management. That is what the member for Napier said: he said demarcation and political disputes are the fault of management. Let us not be ridiculous. Of course they are not. Management has nothing to do with those disputes, and members opposite are only too well aware of that. The honourable member also stated:

The work force are not naturally bloody minded. They want to get on with earning their living.

I could not agree more. The majority of those in the work force want to do exactly that. I assure members opposite that during the last Australia Post dispute and the transport

workers dispute, a large number of the workers involved came to my office and said, 'For goodness sake, can't something be done about these disputes. We do not want to be on strike. We want to work. Why on earth can't we?'

That is a statement of fact. Of course the average worker wants to work. I could not agree more with that point made by the member for Napier. Some of the union hierarchy do not want them to work because they want to do everything they can to bring this nation to a halt for their own political advancement.

I would like now to concentrate on some points made by the member for Gilles. At least he brought forward intelligent arguments. Although I cannot agree with those points, at least the honourable member concentrated on the points that I made in my speech rather than the sort of person that I am. He asked about the 17 000 jobs that the Premier was going to create. Let us face facts. Since this Government came to power in 1979, the Bureau of Statistics shows categorically that over 15 000 more jobs are available in South Australia now than when we came to power. In other words, taking the jobs that we created and those that had been lost, the net gain is over 15 000 jobs in 20 months. We still have 18 months to go before the next election. We will have created far more than the 17 000 jobs of which the Premier spoke.

Mr O'Neill: Tell us the net gain.

Mr ASHENDEN: That is exactly what I am talking about. When one considers jobs gained and jobs lost, the net gain is over 15 000 jobs. The member for Gilles went on unfortunately to concentrate on the *bete noir* of the members opposite—the multinationals. They are all bad—there is nothing good about them whatsoever! For goodness sake! How many jobs and how much investment do they create in this country of ours? Why cannot members opposite appreciate the value of those companies in our society? The honourable member went on to speak about Raytheon, and I refer to what he said last night on computers, namely, 'They do not create jobs'. For goodness sake! The Raytheon company will have over 200 additional jobs for this State alone. Of course it creates jobs. I cannot understand why that member, who is a member of the Industries Development Committee and who supported this Government in its approach to Raytheon, is suddenly critical of it in his Address in Reply speech. The member went on to explain, stating:

Such companies are not interested in the general result for South Australia—they are interested only in the profit motive to shareholders located outside Australia.

He went on to say that we should not have competed against New South Wales to get that company working in South Australia. That company is just one of the many that show the resurgence of confidence in investment in this State. Regardless of what is said by members opposite, this Government is determined to go about attracting an industrial and mining base back to South Australia so that we have the investment of those companies, the jobs that those companies create, and, of course, the mineral royalties of the mining companies. We will then be in a position to have that invaluable money to spend in other areas that are so necessary if this State is to continue to progress. I conclude by saying once more that if members opposite would only concentrate on what we say rather than who on this side says it, it would be better for all concerned.

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

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): Tonight I wish to address the House on the matters raised by the member for Brighton last evening in regard to sex education in this State. I want particularly to emphasise the contribution

made by the Health Education Project Team in South Australia for the past eight years, because I believe that it is highly significant that at no stage did the member for Brighton even refer to that team. Yet, that team is the principal provider of sex education courses in South Australian schools.

I believe on the whole that the contribution by the member for Brighton was exceedingly poor and in very bad taste. I believe that it denied the real options that could have been followed if he were genuinely concerned about the cases he raised. The avenues would have been through the school councils, even through the Education Department, or through the Minister. From my personal experience, I know that there were occasions when teachers who were following bad teaching methods in sex education classes were removed from the classes on the advice of the Health Education Project Team as soon as the events were found out. They were removed for what were very much less serious events than the ones to which he referred. If they were genuine, he should have taken the avenues available within the department and the schools, without attempting to beat up the issue into one of political self-interest.

In his speech, he indicated that he was talking about only a minority of teachers, but I ask him to re-read the comments made, because they make five quite distinct imputations about the curriculum, not about the individuals, as it is followed. Those imputations cover the five following grounds: first, that the curriculum is not controlled; secondly, that it is secretive; thirdly, that it meddles in a child's development; fourthly, that it is an example of abdication of responsibility by those in authority; fifthly, that it is a curriculum subverted by those practising it to erode morals.

The Health Education Curriculum Project, in its work over the last eight years, in no way can produce evidence to support those five imputations. For example, the resources, the books mentioned by the member for Brighton, in no way are supported or endorsed or even mentioned in the curriculum materials provided by the health education unit. I have them here if any member would care to look at them.

None of the teaching strategies referred to by innuendo or by direct mention (some appallingly direct mention in this House last night) are recommended strategies in this book. Indeed, they would not be, because they could not be supported by anyone genuinely concerned for health education and sex education. I call on the member for Brighton to publicly state to this House and to the State of South Australia what his opinion is of the Health Education Curriculum Project and its work, because it is doing immensely valuable work in the majority of schools undertaking sex education in this State, and it deserves the support of this place and, in the light of his comments, his support also.

With regard to the five imputations about curriculum development which must reflect, unless he gives a denial of this, on the health education team, I want to touch on each one. The first is the matter of control. I would like to quote from a paper delivered to an Education Department Staff Conference on 14 April 1976, entitled 'Progress in Health Education Courses'. When the paper was delivered, it was in the context that some people were criticising the health education team for being too slow about introducing these courses into the schools and spreading them right throughout the school area, the fact that so few schools had a course at that time. The point was made that there were several factors which at that stage prohibited the rapid expansion of health education programmes into the schools. The paper stated:

There would appear to be inherent dangers in merely writing and distributing syllabus and support materials on a wide scale when there are too few teachers trained to provide a quality program.

That was the control. The programme would not expand until the trained teachers, able to teach it, expanded in their numbers. The paper continued:

While overall developments in the pilot programme would appear to some to be slow, it is considered by Standing Committee—that is, the Health Education Curriculum Standing Committee—

by Primary and Secondary Divisions and by the Project Team that such developments should be well prepared and researched before the subject becomes a core part of general school curriculum in this State.

One other point made is that inadequate subject leadership in many schools was considered a major problem, and that should be a constraint upon the course's expansion—and justly and wisely so. Rather than being a subject with no control, it was criticised for too much control. Its controlled growth was far too slow, in the opinion of many people, but I think that they followed the right course.

With regard to the allegation that the curriculum is a secretive one, under a cloak of secrecy, I will make the following points that were revealed by a Mr Sullivan, of the Research and Planning Division of the Education Department, in relation to Health Education in South Australian Primary Schools and the effects of the new course on teaching of health topics. He made this point:

In those schools where the topic is undertaken and parents informed of this, objections from parents seem to have been extremely few, and teachers who have had sufficient confidence in their relationships with their classes to deal with the subject reported no disappointments or uncomfortable moments. . . . Parents have almost always been supportive and few strong objections have been raised. . . . no parent wishes to have a teacher, indirectly through the child, criticise his or her lifestyle, but these types of problems have rarely occurred.

I, in my experience with the Health Education Project team, have addressed many meetings of parents throughout the State. Those meetings ranged from Salisbury North, in my own district, to Wudinna, on Eyre Peninsula. Parents were from many different backgrounds and had many different types of value beliefs but, in discussing these matters, I found that parents were able, willing and interested to discuss the matter on a rational and genuine basis rather than on a beat-up issue basis.

I also know from experience at those schools that they had parents who were concerned (and any parent must be concerned about the quality of education that his or her child receives) about the Sex Education Unit of health education. At one school, where I met the Principal, he indicated that six parents had come with objections, saying that they did not want their child to take part in this, but after interviews with the parents it was discovered that the main problem they were concerned about (and justifiably so, I suppose) was who was the teacher who was going to teach their child. Therefore, they felt that they wanted to meet the teacher, talk with the teacher about what was to be done, and discuss the matter. That was a just decision and, after that, only two remained adamant that they did not want their children to take part.

'Meddling in child's development' was another proposal put by the member for Brighton. Health education is not out to undermine the essential education provided by those homes that take up their responsibility in this area. It has never been out to challenge that. It does, however, take on the challenge of combating toilet wall education, the education of misperceptions, of incorrect data and facts to which so many children become exposed.

Also, it attempts to pick up the shortfall from those families who do abdicate their responsibility. There is evi-

dence to suggest that many families do not take on fairly and reasonably their responsibility to their own children in regard to matters like this. Are those children to be left in ignorance? Are they not to be assisted in their maturation process? The health education project feels that it has an obligation in this regard.

The other matter worthy of mention is 'curriculum designed to erode morals'. When outlining the qualities of an acceptable health education teacher at a conference of health education teachers in 1975, the following points were made, amongst others. First, a health education teacher should possess the following two qualities: he or she should be acceptable to parents, students and staff as a teacher of sensitive topics, and that person should be aware of possible parent community attitudes and antagonisms and be prepared to deal sensibly with the same, prepared to avoid creating or encouraging parent-child conflict.

How can that be to erode the family? How can that be to erode morals? Likewise, it has been stated constantly throughout (and I have the data for people to look at) that emphasis throughout the course is upon the individual and his relationships with the family and society. Regarding aspects of resources used, there was a rigorous analysis, review and preview of all resources used in the pilot programme by health education. Materials were reviewed by teachers who had established records and traditions in the department and whose opinions were highly held in the eyes of other people. They would have discussion meetings—

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

Motion carried.

At 10.19 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 6 August at 2 p.m.