

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 18 August 1981

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

## SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended that the House of Assembly make provision by Bill to defray the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the South Australian Government during the year ending 30 June 1982.

## PETITION: RANGER PATROL

A petition signed by 81 residents of the electorate of Chaffey praying that the House urge the Minister of Environment and Planning to appoint a resident ranger to patrol the environs of Waikerie, especially Toolunka Flat, was presented by the Hon. P. B. Arnold.

Petition received.

## PETITION: PRE-SCHOOL

A petition signed by 289 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide the necessary staff, teachers and accommodation to ensure that children are able to have a full year of pre-school was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 84 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to tighten restrictions on pornography and establish clear classification standards under the Classification of Publications Act were presented by the Hon. P. B. Arnold and Mr Langley.

Petitions received.

## PETITION: SWIMMING POOL

A petition signed by 381 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide adequate funding for a heated therapeutic swimming pool at the headquarters of the Western Rehabilitation Centre, at Royal Park, was presented by Mr Hamilton.

Petition received.

## PETITIONS: BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

Petitions signed by 275 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to restore the Beverage Container Act to provide that PET bottles be subject to a deposit were presented by the Hon. M. M. Wilson and Messrs Gunn and Lewis.

Petitions received.

## QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to

questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 2, 11, 26, 31, 33 to 35, 37, 40, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 54, 57, 63 and 72.

## AIRPORT RUNWAY

In reply to **Mr PLUNKETT** (21 July).

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: No investigation relating to the safety of children attending schools on the flight path of Adelaide Airport has taken place. The length of the existing runway is 2 438 metres (a few feet less than 8 000 feet). At the moment approximately 30 metres is being added to this length which will increase the line-up distance available for aircraft now operating in and out of Adelaide. There are no proposals as far as I am aware to extend the runway by approximately 500 feet as suggested in the questions.

The landing and take-off distances for aircraft are a function of many variables. It is quite erroneous to state 'the airbus needs a runway of 9 845 feet to take off or land'. The distance required is a function of aircraft load, airport altitude, ambient temperature, wind conditions, runway slope and safety regulations. The question has been addressed by both the intending operators of new aircraft to Adelaide Airport and by the Department of Transport Australia who will be responsible for enforcing the safety regulations. Although it is known there will be some weight restrictions applied to aircraft, particularly international aircraft operating from Adelaide Airport because of the runway length available, both domestic and international operators have indicated a willingness to use Adelaide Airport as a commercially viable proposition under the restrictions which will apply. The honourable member would also do well to check his facts before reflecting adversely upon the well established safety records of British Caledonian and other international airline operators.

## THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

In reply to **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (22 July).

The **Hon. H. ALLISON**: Following the member for Salisbury's inquiry, I initiated a review of *The Struggle for Power* by the School Libraries Branch of the Education Department. The reviewer has stated that the book 'tends to be highly emotional and sensational, and the author makes some highly contentious statements'. However, if students are encouraged to read the book in a critical manner it should provoke discussion and encourage students to read other material on this subject, both opposing and supporting nuclear energy. School libraries have a responsibility to present a range of viewpoints.

## ETSA LINE

In reply to **Mr OLSEN** (21 July).

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: It is the Electricity Trust's normal practice to consult with property owners and take into account as far as practicable individual wishes when establishing the centreline of a transmission route and again later when determining the location of the towers. Property owners can be assured that, as stated in the Environmental Impact Statement, this procedure will be followed in the case of the proposed 275 kV transmission line from Port Augusta to Adelaide.

## VETERANS

In reply to **Mr ABBOTT** (22 July).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** I understand that an announcement concerning the possible repeal of section 49 of the Commonwealth Repatriation Act has been made by the Prime Minister. However, details of possible alternative arrangements in relation to the maintenance costs of repatriation patients accommodated in psychiatric hospitals have not yet been advised to the State. Until formal negotiations are initiated between the Commonwealth and the State I am not in a position to answer the specific questions. May I suggest that the honourable member direct his inquiries on this matter to the Commonwealth Government at this stage.

#### OVERSEAS CONFERENCES

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (22 July).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** As I anticipated, no Government funds will be used to cover air fares for any employee of the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science who attends the XIth International Congress of Clinical Chemistry. Special leave with pay involving a continuation of salary has only been recommended for one officer of the Division of Clinical Chemistry and one other I.M.V.S. staff member. The expenditure for this period, if the leave is approved, would be \$1 934.84. Other members of the I.M.V.S. staff attending the congress will do so in their recreation leave or long service leave at no cost to the Government. No temporary staff are required to replace these officers while they are absent.

#### MICROWAVE OVENS

In reply to **Mr OSWALD** (22 July).

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** The use of microwave ovens in delicatessens and other public places does not pose a hazard to people who have heart pacemakers. Based on many thousands of measurements made in South Australia and elsewhere, it is known that the leakage of microwave radiation from microwave ovens is insignificant. In addition, most pacemakers are very well shielded against interference from other equipment. In theory, strong microwave radiation fields may affect some pacemakers and this may have led to some warnings to people who have pacemakers. However, such strong fields do not exist outside microwave ovens. Thus, there is no justification for warning signs to be displayed in places using microwave ovens.

#### PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORT

**The SPEAKER** laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Adelaide Trunk Sewer—War Memorial Drive to Torrens Road (Relocation and Replacement).

Ordered that report be printed.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: HINDMARSH DEVELOPMENT

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** During the Address in Reply debate on Wednesday 5 August 1981 the member for Spence referred to an article appearing in the *Advertiser* on 6 May 1981 headed 'new jobs, housing—Tonkin'. In his

comment on the article the member for Spence described it as 'a first-class con job' and stated that the whole story was about 'expansion of industry and not of housing and jobs in that area'. The honourable member further criticised the Government for its lack of consultation with the Hindmarsh City Council in respect of the matter.

The first point I would make is that the member for Spence has himself been 'conned', as the expansion of Gerard Industries Pty Ltd and C.P. Detmold Pty Ltd in the Hindmarsh City Council area will create some 300 new jobs, and the South Australian Housing Trust is actively engaged in the necessary action to develop and refurbish homes in the area.

With respect to the discussions which have been held between the Government and the Hindmarsh City Council, council members were informed as early as 4 May 1981 that the properties under discussion would be sold by the Highways Department to Gerard Industries and Detmold Packaging. On 4 May 1981 at the Planning and Development Committee of the corporation, which includes all council members, they were specifically informed of this proposed action, which they endorsed. They were also informed of the proposed press release and involvement of the South Australian Housing Trust in housing for the area. Furthermore, at the meeting they were told of the urgency with which the transactions had to proceed and informed that, despite the transfer of the premises, council would still be free to consider controls on development through zoning regulations.

At a further full meeting of council on 11 May 1981 it was resolved, *inter alia*, that council support the transfer of the properties to Gerards and that, before council gave its views on Detmold Packaging's proposed development, a council/Government committee be established at an early date. It was the responsibility of council to set the date for that meeting. Despite representations to the council's planning officer by Government officers concerned, the first meeting of this committee was not held until 9 July 1981, over two months later.

In view of the fact that council had been informed of the details and nature of the properties to be disposed of to Detmold and Gerards and that the transactions would take place before the end of the financial year, that transaction proceeded. Furthermore, the meeting proposed by council related to development issues, not whether the sale of the land should proceed. With regard to the Government's commitment to assist in the relocation of those tenants whose properties are required for industrial expansion, I would be pleased if some evidence could be produced concerning those tenants seeking such assistance. I have with me a letter sent to Detmold Packaging from a resident in East Street which compliments Detmold on the manner in which it has helped with his relocation. For the information of members, particularly the member for Spence, I quote that letter in full:

As Detmold (Pty) Ltd have now taken over the above property from the Highways Department for extension to your factory, we as tenants of the house, recognise that your company is now the landlord.

As this position has arisen, we feel we must write and thank you for your respect and co-operation in this matter; above all, in your consideration to help re-house we as tenants.

Having made our own alternative to your offer of other accommodation which I am now sure would have been conveniently situated, also in good condition and within our financial situation, we feel we must convey our thanks for placing no pressure for us to vacate the house, or to fall in with your plans.

In our estimation it will be of great benefit for the extension of your industry, by making jobs available, thus helping the unemployment situation for young and old who are genuine in their plea for work.

*Mr Abbott interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. C. BROWN:** Perhaps the member for Spence might like to carefully study the contents of that letter. Finally, regarding notices served on existing tenants, it is clear that they and councillors are aware of the offer of assistance made by the Government to seek alternative suitable accommodation in the area, and I suggest they contact the South Australian Housing Trust in this regard. Furthermore, I am advised that action taken regarding notices to relinquish the properties has been proper and in accordance with the Residential Tenancies Act.

#### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Education (Hon. H. Allison)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Education Act, 1972-1981—Regulations—Teachers Registration Fees.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. W. A. Rodda)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Rock Lobster Pots.

By the Minister of Forests (Hon. W. E. Chapman)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Forestry Act, 1950-1974—Proclamation—Forest Reserve Resumed.

By the Minister of Environment and Planning (Hon. D. C. Wotton)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

National Parks and Wildlife Service—

- i. Report, 1978-79.
- ii. Report, 1979-80.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. M. M. Wilson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Traffic Prohibition—Salisbury.
- ii. State Transport Authority—Schedule of Land Disposed, 1980-81.

By the Minister of Health (Hon. Jennifer Adamson)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Alcohol and Drug Addicts Treatment Board—Report, 1979-80.
- ii. Credit Union Stabilization Board—Report, 1980-81.
- iii. Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1981—Regulations—Fees.
- iv. Glazed Pottery and Methapyrilene.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Sewerage Act, 1929-1977—Regulations—Plumbing Advisory Board.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. P. B. Arnold)—

*Pursuant to Statute—*

- i. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980—Section 5 (f)—Statement of land resumed.

#### INTEREST RATES

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith, such suspension to remain in force no later than 4.30 p.m.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** The Opposition will support this suspension so that the issue of interest rates can be debated by the House, but in doing so I think it is vital that we put on record why we are supporting this suspension in these circumstances as moved by the Premier.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I indicate to the honourable Leader that at this juncture no indication has been given of the nature of the motion: it is purely and simply a request that Standing Orders be suspended. That being the case, the honourable Leader can speak only to the suspension of Standing Orders, not to the substantive reason as to why Standing Orders may subsequently be suspended.

**Mr BANNON:** I can, however, speculate as to the reason why this suspension has been moved. If, in fact, it was moved for a purpose other than to introduce a motion on interest rates, then it would not have Opposition support. I wish to indicate that the Premier is moving for a suspension of Standing Orders—

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I take the point of order that the Leader of the Opposition, so called, is patently trying to get around your ruling.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I am taking Peter Duncan's part when I put it that way.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The Premier did not say why he is asking for a suspension. Indeed, I think he left out a line of the motion he was supposed to read out and we do not know what he is going to talk about, or what is the reason for his suspension. It may be for any purpose at all.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member for Mitcham is now going far beyond a point of order. I uphold the point of order raised by the honourable member for Mitcham, as I had already indicated to the honourable Leader of the Opposition the very narrow parameters within which he may address the subject, which is the suspension of Standing Orders. I ask the honourable Leader not to presume what may be debated when Standing Orders are suspended, if in fact they are suspended. There will be ample opportunity to address that matter if they are suspended. The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr BANNON:** It was the publicly announced intention of the Opposition to move a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders at the beginning of today's sitting in order to have the matter of interest rates thoroughly debated by this House. That was announced to the public at large, and it was communicated in writing to the Premier. In response to that communication, the Premier claimed that he himself would be moving a motion to suspend Standing Orders.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I make the point to the honourable Leader of the Opposition for the last time that I have allowed him to set the scene of the reason why he and his colleagues are supporting the suspension of Standing Orders, but I ask him to give no further background than that which he has already given. Otherwise, it will be necessary to withdraw the leave that he has.

**Mr BANNON:** Thank you. I would think that you, Sir, other members of the House, and members of the general public would find it curious indeed that the Opposition should support this motion to allow the suspension of Standing Orders, when the Opposition had publicly announced that it wished to do exactly that in order to discuss the specific point.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I know he's under a lot of pressure, and he's had a bad couple of weeks.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** I don't think he's going very well at the moment.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mitcham has risen on a point of order, and I ask him to come quickly to that point of order.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** The point of order is that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to get around the ruling that you have very properly given, if I may say so with respect, that the compass of this debate is narrow. I have often suffered under it myself, and at your hands.

**The SPEAKER:** And are about to do so again.

**Mr MILLHOUSE:** Yes, Sir. As long as you make the Leader stick to the strict letter of the Standing Order, I have no complaint about that, but he is deliberately getting away from it as far as he can to try to get in some jolly prepared speech he has already, without looking up the Standing Orders.

**The SPEAKER:** The honourable member for Mitcham has again risen on a point of order. I am not going to uphold the point of order, in that I question whether in fact it was a point of order, but I make the comment to all members that the debate currently being conducted is a very narrow one, and the Leader of the Opposition has a last opportunity to remain within the limits of that suspension order.

**Mr BANNON:** I hope the Government is grateful for the assistance given to it by the member for Mitcham.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BANNON:** Let me say that we are confronted with a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders, the subject matter of which we are to pretend we do not know. I respect your ruling, Sir, that we must maintain this pretence and that I must make no reference to the known subject matter of this motion, but I find it absolutely necessary, and I do not believe that you, Sir, or the House should deny me the opportunity to say, on behalf of the Opposition, that this support of the Premier's motion to suspend Standing Orders in no way compromises our intention to do that; in fact, we are pleased to see him doing so, because, if the subject matter is as we anticipate, we support its being debated fully in this House. The form in which it will be debated will be known in due course, but we maintain that, if the Government had not taken this action, we would be doing so ourselves.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I rise on a point of order, Sir, and I did not wish to interrupt my Leader earlier, or I would have taken the opportunity then. I seek your ruling as to whether the motion as put forward by the Premier may be out of order. In support of my request for such a ruling, I refer you, Sir, to Standing Order 464, which states:

The suspension of the Standing Orders is limited in its operation to the particular purpose for which such suspension has been sought and, unless it be otherwise ordered, to that day's sitting of the House.

It seems to me that the motion as put forward may be out of order, as it does not appear to have attached to it any reason for the suspension.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order. The motion as put forward by the honourable Premier is in the normal form of putting such a motion to the House, and the precedent is one which is normal for the House.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I accept your ruling, naturally, Sir, but I put forward a further point of order relating to Standing Order 463 which, in referring to the limitation of the debate on this matter, states:

463. The mover shall in every case be limited to ten minutes in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension and one other Member may be permitted to speak . . .

Surely, implicit in Standing Order 463 is that the reason for the suspension must be given to the House.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Standing Order 463 simply gives a person who moves a motion of suspension the opportunity to speak to it if he so desires for a period of time no greater than 10 minutes. It does not require that a person use the period of 10 minutes that the Standing Order makes available to him. Likewise, a person who replies, if in fact one does reply, may address himself to the subject matter for a period no longer than 10 minutes.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** With respect—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** May I draw your attention to the wording of Standing Order 463 once again? The person who moves the motion is not given licence necessarily to speak for 10 minutes. In the terms of the order as I read it, the mover shall in every case be limited to 10 minutes (so far you and I are on the same course) in stating his reasons. The Standing Order does not say 'in order to speak'. It definitely and clearly states, to my understanding, 'in stating his reasons for seeking such suspension', and I ask your further consideration.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It is quite obvious the honourable member for Mitchell and I read the Standing Order in a different form. I have given my ruling on the matter. Unless the honourable member for Mitchell desires to test my ruling, the matter rests and I intend to put the motion.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I am most grateful to the House for agreeing to the suspension of Standing Orders. Accordingly, I move:

That this House expresses its grave concern at the effects of continuing increases in interest rates, recognises that in particular these increases are causing hardship for home buyers, small businesses and rural industries, and calls on the Federal Government both to contain further increases, and to take immediate action to minimise hardship caused to so many members of the community by present rates of interest.

Initially, may I say I moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to remain in force no later than 4.30 p.m., which was approximately half an hour longer than we usually do. I think formerly it was until 4 o'clock or sometimes 5 o'clock that we suspended Standing Orders for discussion of a motion such as this, and I did what I have done because I anticipated there would be some attempt on the part of the Leader of the Opposition to waste a little time by trying to justify the rather peculiar situation in which he now finds himself. I was not referring entirely to the reshuffle although I see the reshuffled member for Elizabeth sitting on the back-bench. It seemed to me the Leader of the Opposition was in some way trying to find a cause and that was the reason for the rather large advertisement in the paper this morning. I must say I find it appalling that anyone should make political capital, or try to make political capital, out of the misfortunes of so many members of our community.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** They have been doing it for years, I agree. I think it was totally and absolutely unjustified. If this is the new look Opposition that is coming out fighting, all I can say is heaven help the Australian Labor Party. Let me tell members of the Opposition generally the whole matter of interest rates has been concerning us very much indeed.

Yesterday, I reported to Cabinet on the Loan Council proceedings. It was a matter of record that the arrangement that we would bring forward this motion had already been made, by suspension of Standing Orders, long before I received the letter from the Leader of the Opposition. He may well place upon himself a level of importance that would suggest we should bow to his every wish. That is his

prerogative, but it is not the Government's summing up of his importance.

The Government believes that the whole interest rates question is important enough for it to bring forward, hopefully in a bipartisan fashion, so that the Federal Government can be told yet again of our concern at what interest rates are doing to people in our community, notably the small businessman, the person on the land, and, particularly, the young person buying a house. All I can say is that I am doubly pleased that I allowed until 4.30 p.m. for this debate, not only because the explanations have taken up this time, but also because the footling attempts by the member for Mitchell to delay debate on an issue which the Leader of the Opposition says is vitally important absolutely astound me.

If this is the come-out-fighting attempt and the best that the Leader of the Opposition can do, the member for Elizabeth can have very little to worry about in the long term. There will not be one member of this House who does not share the Government's grave concern at the effect of spiralling interest rates on all South Australians. Never before has there been such widespread fear that interest rates have reached a level that will force some people to sell out and risk losing their entire life savings that they have put into purchasing their home. The position is particularly serious for those people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I trust that honourable members on my left will accord the Premier the same degree of courtesy that I know they will accord their own Leader soon.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The position is particularly serious for those people who have taken out loans in the past two or three years to buy a new home, establish a business or upgrade rural properties. There are many of them. The problem extends to people who want to borrow funds to buy new homes. Whilst lending institutions may have finance available, interest rates that they are being forced to charge make it impossible for many people to achieve what has become peculiarly and properly an Australian dream of owning their home.

The building industry in South Australia is already in serious difficulties because of the vast over-building in years gone by in the latter years of the Dunstan Government. This is a further blow now to the future prospects of the building industry right across Australia. I have already registered my strongest possible concern with the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser. I wrote to the Prime Minister on 16 July, which was the most recent time I brought the matter up by letter, and stated:

The recent rises in interest rates have caused increasing hardship in the community particularly in the rural industry, and for home buyers and small business. The prospect of further increases is daunting.

I went on to say:

I would ask you to consider as a matter of urgency implementing a scheme to allow tax concessions for certain home loans. Such a scheme could be aimed particularly at assisting people in lower income areas.

If I remember correctly, the Leader of the Opposition, on that same afternoon, supported the general thrust of my argument. Although I undertook to write on his behalf to join his support to representations I had made, I did not ever hear from him. Therefore, I left it to him to take whatever action he thought necessary.

At the recent Loan Council meeting in Canberra I repeated my call for action from the Federal Government. Last Friday, after the Loan Council meeting, I again wrote to the Prime Minister, renewing my concern and my appeal for urgent Federal Government action to relieve the hard-

ship facing many people in the community because of the high rates of interest. I have also written to major lending institutions in South Australia asking them to make concessions and to show compassion in cases where people are having difficulty in meeting loan repayments.

I may say that without exception (and I have had answers now from perhaps a score) while they were sympathetic to my request, few of the banks, building societies, credit unions or finance companies would give guarantees that they would not be forced to take action against people who could not manage their repayments.

There is a potential difficulty which is presented by any lending institution which grants extensions to repayment periods and that is something that has to be borne in mind. Lending rates are rising as a direct result of deposit rates having risen sharply in the competition for funds and it follows, therefore, that those same financial institutions must ensure that their cash flow is adequate to meet increased interest commitments on deposits. By extending the period of home loans and thereby not adjusting their cash flow to meet the extra requirement, obviously financial institutions will find themselves in difficulty in the long term.

That does not in any way mean that institutions should not give consideration to helping people who are in serious difficulties and I repeat that all those who answered me acknowledged their concern and their desire to be compassionate as far as possible but it is not possible to give absolute guarantees in this matter.

The position facing many people in the community is becoming desperate. I repeat that I was absolutely appalled to see the Opposition Leader trying to make cheap political capital from this issue by virtually implying in a commercial advertisement in the *Advertiser* today (and this is basically what that message was) that lower interest rates could be achieved by people joining the Labor Party.

What a load of rubbish; how dishonest; how hypocritical! This is not an issue which has its roots in political philosophy. This motion is concerned about people, not political point scoring. As I and numerous Treasurers before me have said, State Governments have little influence, direct or indirect, over interest rate movements.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Did you vote against it or for it?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The matter will come forward in just a moment and I will take a great deal of pleasure in putting the Deputy Leader right, because he certainly needs it. The present upward pressures have resulted from a number of causes, such as the substantial increase in private capital inflow to Australia, the Commonwealth's tight monetary policy, which has resulted in attractive bond issues to soak up excessive liquidity, and the increased competition in the capital markets both for public and private sector developments, and the funds that are involved are massive funds.

Additionally, with the removal of the restricting regulations on the interest rates offered by trading and savings banks, the competition for household savings has intensified, as most banks are offering higher interest rates on short-term or call deposit. Interest rate policy is inextricably bound up with monetary and banking policy, with fiscal policy and with international finance. In other words, it is part of national economic policy and the responsibility for that policy rests with the Commonwealth.

However, national economic management policies must recognise the effect on people of the decisions that are taken. Apart from concessional home loans approved by the State Government, I must emphasise that the State Government has no control or influence over the interest rates being applied by major lending institutions across Australia. These are largely set in Canberra and only last week we

saw what I believe was a most cynical attempt by the Federal Government to implicate the States in its decision (and I emphasise, the Commonwealth Government's decision) on key interest rates.

The Premiers were called together to discuss the general problems associated with interest rates, but it became obvious soon enough that the Federal Government had already made up its mind about increasing interest rates by 1 per cent and that it wanted the State Premiers to be implicated. Let me assure members that the Premiers had nothing to do with that decision, which is something that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition needs to understand quite clearly.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Was there a vote?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** There was no vote taken at all on the tap issue, housing, or small overdraft rates, and that is the point that members of the Opposition must get through their heads. That decision was taken by the Federal Government before we arrived in Canberra. That is the long and short of it.

We were called upon to vote on two other issues which were relatively unimportant given the Commonwealth's earlier unilateral decision, but the key interest rate decisions were taken by the Federal Government alone. As I said at the time, and I do not resile from that position, it could all have been done by telex. I urged the Federal Treasurer at that conference (because it did give us the opportunity to put the point of view very strongly indeed at Loan Council) to consider the difficulties facing thousands of Australians because of rising interest rates. The Treasurer gave no indication, and I accept that it is proper that he gave no indication on the eve of the Federal Budget, that the Federal Government had any plan of action to ease the pressures facing those people.

I must say that I was encouraged to hear Mr Howard say on the A.B.C. news this afternoon that tonight's Federal Budget would take some of the pressure off interest rates. From what he said, obviously it is not clear whether he is talking in general terms (in other words, that the policies that are to be adopted will reduce the pressure for funds and therefore reduce the pressure on interest rates) or whether he is talking about a tax concession scheme of some kind similar to the one that I suggested to him and to the Prime Minister some weeks ago. Whatever happens, if tonight's Budget provides some relief from interest rates, then I, for one, will be very pleased indeed, and I am quite sure that all members of the House will be, too. If that happens, the efforts made by this Government in recent weeks will not have been in vain.

I understand also from the news services today that the Queensland and Western Australian Governments are seeking to withdraw the Commonwealth Government's unilateral power to increase yields on Commonwealth bonds. This would apparently have the effect of returning the control of interest rates directly to the States. While I have not received any official notice of a possible meeting on this issue, my Government would certainly be most interested to participate in the discussions.

As I have said already, the State Government has control over only one small part of the interest market, and that is the concessional home loans approved by the State Bank. I point out that many thousands of South Australians are already enjoying these concessional rates. I can give an assurance to members of this House that this current round of interest rate rises will not presently affect the concessional State Bank loans. The bank will continue to approve something like 55 loans a week to people who qualify for these concessional interest loans. I would also remind the House of the many other initiatives this Government has taken to assist people in buying and maintaining their own

homes. I recapitulate again, particularly for members opposite, whose memories are very short, that in the past two years this Government has abolished land tax on the family home—a direct cash saving for tens of thousands of South Australians. The Government has provided a rebate on stamp duty on the first \$30 000 of a first home purchase; it has introduced a new rental-purchase scheme for people wishing to acquire Housing Trust properties; and, by the abolition of State gift and death duties, it has removed the threat of a break up of family assets.

As a Government we have consistently demonstrated our support for small businesses, the rural community and home purchasers, and our actions since coming to office speak for themselves. We will not accede to the repeated demands made by the Opposition that we should increase State taxation. We will not remove concessions on stamp duty, land tax and pay-roll tax, and we will not reimpose succession and gift duties, because those measures would impinge directly on those very people who are in so much difficulty now. We will continue to give support to all members of the community, and will examine further ways in which they can be helped as finances permit. The Government is watching the interest rate situation with a very grave concern, and it is currently considering a range of options designed to ameliorate the effect of increased costs on those least able to afford them. Obviously, in the light of the forthcoming Federal Budget tonight, it would be unwise to ventilate any of those matters further, but the Government is very anxious indeed that something should be done.

The main direct implications for South Australia are also evident in the effect on the State Budget and on charges. The effects of higher interest rates on State Government loans will have an effect on the State Budget. Increasing interest rates have been and remain a most significant factor, adding to pressures on the State Budget. This latest decision will add to what is already a difficult Budget task. Higher interest rates for semi-government borrowings will inevitably impact sooner or later on the charges of State authorities, especially the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which is our biggest borrower. The trust is engaged, as honourable members well know, in a heavy capital works programme and it is essential that its borrowings be maintained so that it can provide the energy which is the key to this State's development. There is no alternative but for it and, indeed, all other authorities to pay the higher rates to which Loan Council has agreed.

Also, the Commonwealth Government's decision to increase interest rates on smaller bank overdrafts will obviously make it that much more difficult for business, especially small business. It is therefore clear that the added pressures caused by rising interest rates are entirely in the hands of the Federal Government. One thing is clear—unless action is taken in the Federal Budget tonight, or very soon thereafter, many people in the community are faced with an intolerable situation. Some, indeed, stand to lose their life's savings, as the members for Todd, Newland, Mawson, Henley Beach and the various young growth areas have attested.

The effects, for instance, of interest rates in northern suburbs, is as follows. In Tea Tree Gully, real estate agents say that there is a lot of downgrading going on, which is demoralising in its effect and socially not good. There are not yet significant mortgagee sales. In Salisbury there are increasing numbers of mortgagee sales. In Tea Tree Gully, developers say that new home buyers have almost completely dropped out of the market. Building approvals in Tea Tree Gully dropped heavily early this year when there was the first interest rate scare. They have dropped again in the last few months. That information, which was brought to me by the members for those districts, who are very

properly concerned about what is happening, is the reason for this motion. It is a responsible and realistic motion expressing our grave concern and calling on the Federal Government to do something positive about the problems which have been created. I repeat again, for the benefit of the newly reshuffled member for Florey, that it was the Federal Government's decision on the tap rate, on housing and on small overdrafts that put interest rates up, and that the State Premiers had no chance at all to vote on that.

It is a motion about people, their aims, and their aspirations. It is a motion which again calls the attention of the Federal Government to the present difficulties of those people. There is no lack of concern in the community, and numerous suggestions and proposals have been put forward by politicians and members of the public, and I have no doubt that we will hear a few more, too. I was impressed by the obvious concern shown by Senator Haines, when she put forward a suggestion, I think by way of a private member's Bill that she intends to introduce, that interest rates be pegged. Certainly, her concern is very real; whether or not such a move would work is another matter, and I think most honourable members would agree that it would be impracticable.

We must examine all the suggestions put forward in the light of financial and economic reality, in terms of what can be achieved, and I repeat that, as a State Government, we will continue to examine very carefully indeed the situation and the possible solutions to it. We cannot afford to overlook any possibility, but the responsibility and the opportunity for urgent and positive action lie fairly and squarely with the Federal Government. This is the clear message that we, as a House, must therefore send to the Federal Government this afternoon on behalf of all South Australians.

**Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition):** We have just witnessed one of those dreadful performances of the Premier, in which he attempts to address his mind to a problem that is concerning the whole community, begins by attempting to make cheap political points about it and accusing his opponents of doing just that, and then offers absolutely nothing to anyone in this State to try to solve their problems. He says the Opposition is capitalising on people's woes, and then he weeps crocodile tears over the way in which interest rates are going up. Let us not forget that it is a Government supported and endorsed vigorously by him, even to the extent of paid advertisements, less than 12 months ago, that has been promoting those policies, and he has aided and abetted it at every point. Let him tell that to his members on the other side in the marginal seats whose constituents are suffering so badly at the moment.

These crocodile tears, this lack of solutions, will not do any more. The situation is very grave, and he has done nothing. Is this something new that we have invented or developed in the past few days? On the contrary, let us go back to 30 March, four and a half months ago, when I issued a press statement on behalf of the Opposition, stating that the prospect of further rises in interest rates for housing loans had brought floods of letters to State members of Parliament. There was enormous concern over the matter in the community. Some families were even going without adequate food to meet the repayments.

I said that a crisis point was rapidly approaching and that any further increase in interest rates would simply push people over the top. I outlined a number of specific examples of households where the food bill was being reduced, of family decisions to defer having children because of the impact of the interest rates, of unacceptably large slices of family income being drawn on to maintain the family home. I reminded people that Prime Minister

Fraser had promised in 1977 to reduce interest rates by 2 per cent—and look what has happened to them since that time.

I mentioned in the press release in March that next would come higher water rates, sewer rates, electricity and other State charges, and every one of those things has come true, and true with a vengeance. I proposed at that time that home mortgage interest repayments should be made deductible from income tax, and suggested that Treasurer Howard should recognise the hardship by incorporating that in his Budget—in March. I also called on the Government to reveal the extent and depth of the serious social problems by undertaking one of its family impact statements and releasing its results to the public.

Absolutely nothing happened: there was absolute silence from the Government, no word from the Premier of concern, and no positive proposals. Now, 4½ months later, he stands up after the fiasco of last week's events in Canberra, weeping crocodile tears over the plight of these people. Their plight has been acute now for months and months. It has been drawn to his attention, and he says that the purpose of and the reason for the motion are the representations made to him by the members for Newland, Todd and Henley Beach (he picked out those in the marginal seats on his side). Why does he not listen to what the community is saying? Why did he not listen to some of the points being made and articulated by the Opposition months ago, on which there was a deafening silence?

Let the Premier raise his hands in protest. The fact is that there was absolute silence from him until the last week or so. He has now produced this pitiful motion to the House, only after he knew that he was going to be called to account by the Opposition. He knew yesterday, from the press statements I had made, that we would be moving to debate this issue today, and he hastily cobbled together a motion and an excuse, and produced it in the Parliament. What a pitiful effort it is. He suggested that we should not be political about this matter. This is a political problem. It can be solved only by political means, and those political means are to put pressure on the State Government, and through the State Government on the Federal Government, to do something and not just mouth pious phrases about it.

We have a motion which purports to express concern, which calls on the Federal Government to contain further increases and gives no indication how it might do so, and which asks the Federal Government to take immediate action to minimise hardship caused to so many members of the community, yet remains silent about how that hardship shall be minimised. Is it to be done the way the Premier does it, by letters to building societies and banks, asking them to treat hardship cases with some assistance and compassion? He has already outlined the sort of answers he has got on that—a totally futile case and, as my colleague the member for Stuart makes clear, it is probably because they just do not take his representations seriously. Indeed, it is hard to do so in the light of his lack of interest on this matter until recently, and then his no solution statements, his passive acquiescence in what the Prime Minister is doing since that time.

Under the policies of the Liberal Government, interest rates have risen to their highest level ever of 12½ per cent for loans from savings banks. That is unprecedented in the history of interest rates post war. Remember what was being said about the Whitlam Government and the outrageous increases in rates it was accused of presiding over. Certainly, interest rates went up, but that Government acted very swiftly to do something about it. The tax deductibility scheme that the Premier has picked up from the Opposition today is the one that was instituted by that Federal Labor Government. Presently interests are even

higher, and there is absolutely no sign of any relief from the Federal Government.

During the 1977 Federal election the promise was made that interest rates would be reduced. In the election last year, when it was clear that interest rates were again under pressure, the Prime Minister denied that they were about to rise. Let us remember that. In that pre-election period, the Prime Minister said that there would be no increase, despite mounting speculation that there would be rises. Well, it did not take very long at all (in fact, December) before those increases took place.

On this issue, the Premier is absolutely compromised. Last year he exhorted South Australians to vote for his Federal Liberal colleagues. He appeared in numerous advertisements urging the people to 'vote Liberal for South Australia's sake'. I recall those advertisements. 'Under Malcolm Fraser's strong leadership', the Premier told us, 'Australia is on a firm course of growth, security and prosperity.' Well, we have certainly seen growth in the interest rates area. As to security, the very symbol of security to average Australians, a home of their own, is increasingly slipping from their grasp.

As to prosperity, to whom does this accrue—home buyers, or ordinary wage and salary earners? No. Their real income has deteriorated, their interest rate burden has risen, and their standard of living has fallen. It was only a few months after this advertisement, sponsored by the Premier, that the interest rates spiral commenced, and it has continued ever since.

The Premier has been absolutely incapable of representing South Australia's views at the Premiers' Conference, incapable of joining other Premiers, like Wran and Bjelke-Petersen, and, even in this latest effort, the new Premier in Victoria—Premiers who come from different political persuasions and backgrounds. He has been absolutely incapable of standing up with them jointly to put a strong case against what the Federal Government is doing. He has been the running dog of the Fraser Government. One can understand how he would do this, in light of his heavily compromised position, but it is high time that he stood up for us and for our interest at these national levels, instead of simply lying down and accepting whatever Mr Fraser chooses to deal out to him.

These interest rate increases are having particular impact in South Australia. Look at the financial facts: since December last year the repayment on a loan of \$30 000 over 25 years has increased from \$283 a month to \$327 a month. That means that, on average, South Australians are paying \$44 a month (\$11 a week) more on their interest bill. This is, of course, one result of the free market forces that the Premier so loudly supports and trumpets. It also represents disposable income which cannot be spent on other goods and services and which, therefore, is not going to generate extra production and economic activity.

Who can afford housing loans today? If we take the average wage of a male breadwinner on the median or middle income in South Australia which, adjusted for inflation over the indexation rises, comes out to about \$255 a week, before tax, such a person able to use about 25 per cent of his income to repay a loan could repay a maximum of \$276 monthly. At 12½ per cent over 25 years the maximum which could be borrowed and repaid is \$25 360. If an average dwelling costs \$40 000, that means that over \$14 000 has to be put down as a deposit. That is the sort of deposit gap and the sort of money people are being required to find in cash before they start, if they hope to maintain their payments and pay off their loans.

Is it any wonder that the building industry is in the parlous state it has reached in South Australia? Not only are people already owning their homes in trouble but,

because this deposit gap has increased, it means that people are just simply not borrowing for housing. We have analysed the gap. Look at the impact on housing. In the year to May 1980, 9 568 houses were financed in South Australia. In the year to May 1981, the most recent 12 months, only 8 292 houses were financed, a drop of 13.3 per cent. Nationally, there has been a decline as well. The effect of interest rates is certainly Australia wide. A national decline of 7.4 per cent has occurred, but it is almost double that in South Australia. It is hitting us very much harder than anywhere else.

Of course, that is accompanied by a cost escalation. Just today the Bureau of Statistics released house building costs which showed an average increase of 9.6 per cent in six State capitals to July 1981. In Adelaide the rise was 10.7 per cent, the second highest in Australia. So, it is not just that the deposit gap is widening and repayments are increasing but that the costs themselves are going up much higher than the national average. The Premier is totally unconcerned about that. He is probably concerned, but certainly, publicly, he dare not say anything.

He claimed last year that we were below the national average, and he took great credit for that. Is he going to take any credit for this situation when we are well above it? Look at the key areas of increase: concrete mix, cement and sand is up 18.7 per cent; cement products are up 20.6 per cent; and clay brick and tiles are up 18 per cent. What is significant about those items? They are supposed to be subject to price control, which has been abandoned by this Government.

So, the market forces are being let to rip, even in those areas where the State Government has control and can do something about it. It is little wonder that our housing industry is the most depressed in Australia, and it has been going down. It is certainly not bottoming out; we have not reached the pit at the moment, in light of the financial consequences of this interest rate increase and other policies. Why are interest rates rising? Inflation is not falling, as promised by the Liberals. After six years of a depressed economy we are still facing double digit inflation. The *Financial Review's Indecs*, tips 10.5 per cent for this financial year. Of course, interest rates are rising to respond to it.

Budget deficits, for one reason or another, are blamed by the Liberal dogma for this situation at State and Federal level. In 1980-1981 the Federal Budget was in surplus, yet inflation is still rising. Apparently, we are to have another Budget surplus this year, but inflation will be going even higher. At the State level, the impact of State Government charges imposed by this Government, unprecedentedly high, will, of course, increase our rate of inflation and the cost of living in South Australia. So, by deliberate act of Government policy the c.p.i. is rising and costs which have impact throughout our economy are being increased.

We need public machinery to fight inflation. We need a Prices Justification Tribunal at the national level, and we need refurbished price control here in South Australia. Deregulation of the banks was referred to by the Premier as a second reason for those rises in interest rates. Who is involved in that—the Federal Government through free market policies so enthusiastically endorsed by the Premier, those policies which are certainly making the market free and ensuring that it slips right out of this State, thus threatening our complete economy and our prosperity?

What about capital inflow for the much-vaunted resource development? If it was genuine resource capital we would have no complaints about that; if it was being put into wealth-generating projects (and some of it is), we would have no complaints, but what about all the fast money that is being parked to take advantage of changing exchange



rates, money that is put in and pulled out of the economy in vast sums under the totally unregulated system allowed by the present Government? In order to save that causing economic problems internally in Australia and pushing up the inflation rate, we find the Government restricting domestic credit. Where does that squeeze most severely and quickly? It does so on home loans and hire purchase for household goods and motor vehicles, the very things on which the South Australian regional economy depends. That speculation should be stopped. A resource rental tax should be imposed to do something about it.

I have already said that in the Premier's motion there is not one suggested remedy, not one idea as to what may or may not be done about this situation. Just as at the Premiers' Conferences he remains passively acquiescent in what the Prime Minister does, so here in the State he offers no solution or remedies whatsoever. We believe that something can and should be done; we believe that any motion moved in this House should reflect that. Therefore, I intend to move an amendment which not only embodies some of the concern expressed in the Government motion but also adds to it remedies, and lodges home precisely where and in what way something should be done about it. We have suggested a number of aspects. First, in the short term the home loan interest rate tax deductibility has worked. It can be implemented quickly and it can afford immediate relief to many thousands of people.

Secondly, there should be a scheme to assist new home purchases. Labor's 1980 family ownership plan provided for grants to lower and middle-income families to enable them to borrow more on a first mortgage basis. That would certainly provide a boost to the building industry.

Then we suggest there should be some economic planning to divert capital from inner city blocks and into the housing area. We have suggested in the longer term an orderly planning of resource development in Australia, involving State and Federal responsibilities, joint talks on a basis of equality, and looking at national as well as State priorities. Many things can be done and they ought to be advocated vigorously and loudly but instead we have heard absolutely nothing from this Government. In conclusion, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out all words after 'That this House' and insert in lieu thereof:

- (a) deplores the recent series of increases in interest rates which are causing distress not only to people attempting to buy their own home but also putting pressure on small business and South Australia's vital job creating manufacturing sector;
- (b) condemns the policies of the Federal Liberal Government which have led to interest rates now being at record high levels;
- (c) directs the Premier to convey to the Prime Minister that these policies are unacceptable to the people of South Australia;
- (d) calls on the Federal Government to provide immediate relief to home buyers by allowing interest paid on home loans as a tax deduction; and
- (e) calls on the Federal Government to pursue a policy of reducing interest rates which includes stricter control over capital inflow from overseas, a resources rent tax, and control of price rises which are fuelling inflation.

These points are positive. They demand action from the Government and action on specific both short-term and long-term ameliorating methods. It is vital that action be taken and that we do not just simply pass this mealy-mouthed pious motion of the Premier. Let us get something done on behalf of South Australians. If the Premier is not willing to do it and is not willing to go to bat for us, do not worry: the Opposition will be joined by vast numbers in this community. Whether they join the Labor Party or not is immaterial to the fact that we share with them a common

concern, and do not just talk about it, but advocate specific and precise plans to do something about it.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Premier):** This is the latest excursion by the Leader of the Opposition into the realms of high finance. We have been 'privileged' to hear him expounding his views on the finances of this State on many occasions previously. It is always an interesting exercise to try to find out just what the hell he is talking about.

I remember his Budget strategy for the State which he has expounded to us and to the world at large. I would like for a moment to dwell on that, because that is pertinent to his strategy on how in this State and nationally we should come to terms with the question of interest rates. Members will remember the economic strategy expounded by the Leader and also supported by his Deputy Leader. That economic strategy had basic tenets which underpin the economic policies of the Labor Party. These basic tenets are, first, to increase the number of people on the public pay-roll, and secondly, do not increase any State charges.

We have just had a dose of that again today. That, of course, flies entirely in the face of the Labor Party's track record when in Government for the last decade or so. In the past two years, of course, things have taken a turn for the better.

The third tenet is to institute immediately (on assuming office) a 35-hour week for Government employees. That was the advice given by the Leader of the Opposition which he has supported in recent public statements. He advocates that the Government should increase the level of Government spending. He has castigated the Premier and the Government—

**Mr Keneally:** What has this to do with the motion?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We will show the connection between inflation and Labor Party policies on interest rates if the honourable member will be patient. The fact is we have heard from the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon a particularly shallow speech and an amendment with which I will deal in due course. To support that economic strategy that he has outlined to the public at large and to this House on one or two occasions, he has made some statements quite recently in the public media. A report in the *Advertiser* on 8 August 1981 states:

The Tonkin Government should be forced to have second thoughts about its plans to cut an extra \$22 000 000 from the State Budget, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, said yesterday. Mr Bannon said he could not imagine how another \$22 000 000 could be lopped off Government services already shorn to the limit without severe disadvantage to all South Australians. We are all about to pay dearly for Mr Tonkin's serious financial miscalculations. Mr Bannon called on community groups to ask Ministers for assurances that vital community services would not fall victim of the cuts.

Part of the strategy is to spend more Government money, put more on the pay-roll, pay them more money, and give them fewer working hours. We will link this up later. The article continues:

There may yet be time for pressure to be applied to force the Tonkin Government into having second thoughts about the havoc in public services they are about to wreak.

Following the Premier's statement that as a result of last week's Loan Council meeting certain State charges may have to be increased, the Leader again made a statement indicating that he would not increase charges. He said that there must come a point where he finally understands that the public cannot stand any more such increases. There was one interesting sideline, however, in the comments made to the press by the now demoted member for Elizabeth about which the Leader of the Opposition did balk

behind the scenes. The member for Elizabeth, in his explanation of the incredible (not incredible: interesting) events—

**Mr Hemmings:** Let's talk about interest rates.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Well, this is relevant to the economic strategy of the Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I have been listening for seven or eight minutes to the Deputy Premier and I have not heard him at any stage talking to the motion. I thought we were talking about interest rates but the Deputy Premier seems to be talking about the member for Elizabeth, the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and so on. Nowhere in his summation so far has he bothered to talk to the motion. Could you please return him to that motion?

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold the point of order made by the Deputy Leader, because it is an exaggeration of the fact. It is necessary, however, that members addressing themselves to the motion do just that and I ask the honourable Deputy Premier and any other speaker to deal with the matter before the House.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I can understand the sensitivity of the Deputy Leader but I am pointing out the inconsistency in economic matters and in turn this will be related to the connection between inflation and Labor's track record in relation to inflation, charges and interest rates. To illustrate the inconsistency of the Leader of the Opposition in this matter, in his statement last week the member for Elizabeth indicated that he had sought an assurance from the Leader that an A.L.P. Government would not put up public transport charges but the Leader would not give him such an assurance.

**Mr Hemmings:** Is that true?

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am quoting from the public record of these interesting events. In an article on 14 August Mr Duncan was quoted as follows:

I spoke to Mr Bannon about this and sought an assurance from him before I criticised the Liberals that we would not put up fares in Government.

That statement led to some of the events which followed in relation to the happenings that led the member for Elizabeth to publicly accuse his Leader of treachery. The quotation states:

He would not give me that assurance and that is why I did not make any comment on the matter.

So much for the credibility of the Leader of the Opposition when he exhorts the Premier to put more people on the public pay-roll, to resist the absolute necessity of coming to terms with our Revenue Budget and in our attempts to reduce that revenue deficit by \$22 000 000, and not to put up State charges and taxes. How can any right thinking citizen of this State give any credibility at all to the posturing of the Leader of the Opposition in economic matters? He cloaks his sham attempt in order to whip up some public support with this charade of nonsense. When one analyses it in its essentials, it is seen that it is patent nonsense. That is patently clear to the people of this State. Last week we were subjected to the Leader's five-point plan.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Now you've got—

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I did not think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition really set this Chamber alight with his contribution to the debate, so when referring to his comments I do not think I have a tremendously convincing act to follow. The Leader of the Opposition had a five-point plan for fixing up the State. Besides the remedy which was given to us some months ago that more people be put on the public pay-roll, that they should work fewer hours, and we would balance the Budget (an impossibility, of course), we were subjected last week to further pearls of wisdom, further economic pearls from the Leader.

The first point in his five-point plan was to lower interest rates. He did not tell us how, or if he did it was so cloaked as not to be obvious to me or to anyone to whom I have spoken. The second was personal tax reform. He is saying that we must reduce taxes, so not only must the Government not raise State charges but it must reduce taxes, put more people on the pay-roll, let them work longer hours—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Balance the Budget.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I see. So, this is gratuitous advice to the Federal Government. Let us cast our minds back to Labor's record in Government in relation to taxation. Taxation leaped to record levels and now the Opposition is advocating a return to Medibank. How on earth the Opposition intends to finance the revised Medibank scheme without resorting to grossly increased levels of income tax, I do not know, and the Leader of the Opposition does not give us the benefit of his thoughts on that.

Then the Leader talks about foreign capital control. That certainly is in line with his 'No resources boom' philosophy. We can remember the 'No boom—Bannon' headline which was generated some time ago. Fair enough, his comments about foreign capital control are consistent with his earlier statements that we will not be having any resources boom, but it is not consistent with his latest statement in relation to the development of the resources of this State.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is far too much audible chatter.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Then, the Leader of the Opposition has had second thoughts. The trouble is that he just does not know where to jump. He, personally, and the group of enlightened people within his Party, would very much like to see the Roxby Downs development go ahead, but apparently we are not going to have a resources boom, according to the Leader. Then he said that we must have a controlled boom, so, he has modified his 'no boom' stance, and we will now have a 'controlled boom'. How the Leader thinks he is going to finance that has not been made quite clear.

It is a fact of life that due to the levels of exploration in this country generated by the efforts of the Federal Liberal Government and the Liberal Government of this State we now have a record level of expenditure for exploration on all fronts. If the Leader thinks that that is going to be done by local capital, he has another think coming.

**The Hon. M. M. Wilson:** It is a 'lower the boom' philosophy.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** We do not quite know where the boom is. I think it fell on the Leader's neck last week when the member for Elizabeth ran true to form. Now the Leader is hiding behind members of his staff. Some time ago I was invited to respond to comments in relation to the uranium issue by one of his staff who went public. Today I have been invited to comment on the statements of one member of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition who said that we will get nothing out of Roxby Downs development because in fact all the royalties will be taken into account—

**Mr Keneally:** The Stuart Highway.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I think the member for Stuart might be interested to know what his Leader's staff was up to, because he is making a monkey out of the Leader of the Opposition, quite frankly. This member of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition said last week that we will get nothing out of Roxby Downs, because if we give royalties they will be taken into account by the Grants Commission, because that will be deducted from moneys that flow to the State, so there is nothing in it. Now the Leader is anti-boom again!

I was invited to respond, not to a statement by the Leader, but to a statement made by one of the Leader's staff, behind whom he is currently sheltering. I can well understand the Leader's need for shelter. The fact is that such statements are patent nonsense and absurd. The fact is that the Grants Commission report is to be reviewed. No decisions have been made, and, in fact, there are all sorts of benefits which flow to the State besides the direct benefits of royalties.

If we follow that argument, which is back to the 'no boom, no action' argument, we would curl up in a corner and die. So much for the economic sanity (or should I say 'insanity?') of the Leader of the Opposition. What has he put forward today in relation to interest rates? It is interesting to note (obviously memories are short) what happened to inflation and unemployment during the years of the Whitlam debacle.

**Mr Keneally:** That was seven years ago.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** They are the inevitable consequences. I am glad that members of the Opposition are interested in what I am saying. I can always gauge the effect I am having, if they laugh they are embarrassed, if they interject they are worried, and this afternoon they have done both. The result of the Labor Party's economic policies would be a return to the Whitlam years, because the economic strategy of the Leader of the Opposition for South Australia is precisely what happened federally, to the dire cost of the Australian public.

After an irrelevant speech, the Leader came up with an amendment which is another five-point plan in relation to this matter. Let me remind members opposite of just what did happen during the Whitlam years. Interest rates were about 7¼ per cent in 1973. Then the figure jumped to 8¼ per cent. This was at the time when we had Whitlam and company running the affairs of the Commonwealth. We know what happened to unemployment—it soared. We know what happened to inflation—it rose to 17 and 18 per cent.

Interest rates then jumped in one hit to 11½ per cent. These are bank interest rates on home loans. Obviously, the Leader has not bothered to refresh his memory in relation to these figures, but this is what happened in one year under Whitlam with a Labor economic package, which has not changed one iota, as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition in his five or six-point plan which is embodied in his amendment. That is a rehash of the Whitlam Federal policy. Interest rates leapt in one year under the Whitlam Government from 8¼ per cent to 11½ per cent. Let us see the whole package together. This is the Labor economic package outlined by the Leader. Before I get off of his package of last week, I mention that he wants a return to the RED scheme, 'the positive job creation scheme', that is, the present Opposition's version of the RED scheme under which it frittered away \$50 000 000 in total over several years on its temporary employment schemes during which time real unemployment in this State grew to record levels. That was a ruse to pad the unemployment figures, which were alarming anyway. It cost \$50 000 000 of taxpayers' money while the then Government sat back and hoped that something would happen nationally which would turn the tide in relation to employment. The Leader wants to return to that situation again.

These are the points made by the Leader in his amendment. We have not had much time to study them, but, knowing his track record, I think that it should not take too long. He deplores the recent series of increases in interest rates. So do we all, and so does the motion. He condemns the policies of the Federal Liberal Government, which he always does anyway (we would think he was sick if he did not). There is nothing new, and he would be better

advised, in an issue which is as sensitive as this one is and which affects the entire community, not to keep carping on Party politics.

In point (c) the Leader directs the Premier to convey a message to the Prime Minister. This the Premier has already done. He calls on the Federal Government to provide tax relief on home loan interest. This has already been suggested by the Premier. Then he calls on the Federal Government to control interest rates and capital inflow and to impose a resources rent tax and price control, because, he says, this will reduce inflation. This is precisely the package which was advocated, as I have pointed out already, by the Whitlam Government when it was in office in Canberra. The fact is that the Leader does not know which way to jump. His economic remedies, as advocated for this State, are utter nonsense, and, when they are boiled down to a simple understanding of what he is on about, anybody can understand that they are absolute nonsense.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the member for Stuart agree with what his Leader said last week, that we must increase the number of people on the public pay-roll, that we must not increase any State charges, that we must bring in (according to the Labor Party council) a 35-hour week, and that, as soon as the Labor Party is in Government, it will do these things? Does the member for Stuart disagree with the contention that that is economic nonsense?

**Mr Keneally:** This is what we are talking about.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** The honourable member understands perfectly well that that is economic nonsense. One other matter to which I want to refer briefly is an area which adds some pressure to interest rates. I refer to the level of Government and semi-government borrowing. This is one area which affects interest rates. Of course, we realise that, much as the Labor Party might think we can live on an island, we cannot, as there are international pressures involving interest rates. We are in a competitive market for money and we cannot, despite the fact—

**Mr Trainer:** Try going for a drive overseas, Roger!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I do not know what the honourable member is saying, although he said something about 'overseas'. It would do him the world of good to go overseas. I hope the honourable member avails himself of the first opportunity to do so. If he gets a study tour, or uses whatever means is available to him to go overseas, he will see what is happening in the real world. He will then come back with his horizons greatly broadened and will understand that we live in the real world and that his attitude to the supply of energy and to uranium mining is completely phoney and blinkered. He might also learn something about the real world of finance. Despite the fact that Governments seek to insulate us from world influences, including interest rates, it is impossible to divorce ourselves entirely from them. I understand that the prime lending rate in America at the moment is about 22 per cent.

**Mr Trainer:** Whitlam had—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Ascot Park is totally out of order.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I agree; he is cranky. I firmly advise the honourable member to go overseas at the first opportunity with his eyes open, not like his Leader, who was looking at what he wanted to look at and not looking at what he did not want to look at. The Leader went to Saskatchewan, which is a socialist State that is well into the business of uranium mining, but he did not look at that matter. All I am asking is that, if the honourable member goes overseas, he has a good look and not a selective look, because he might learn something about interest rates and international finance. One of the influences that affects interest rates is the pressure of borrowings, including

the pressure of Government and semi-government borrowings.

This was made abundantly clear when I accompanied the Premier to Loan Council meetings and the Premier's Conferences earlier this year. I give the lie to the statement that the Premier did not fight for the State. That is absolute nonsense. I think that the Leader chooses either not to listen to what the Premier says publicly or not to read those bits in the paper where the Premier is quoted. The Premier has taken a strong line in making the views of this State known publicly and, indeed, the Minister of Health has done the same thing in the area of health. So for the Leader to get up here and try to suggest that the Government and the Premier are lying down is patently absurd. It is as absurd as is the Leader's economic package. It leads to the inevitable conclusion that has been reached by the member for Elizabeth, that he is an ineffective Leader. The public is not gullible enough to swallow this, because the people do read the papers, and they do not read them selectively.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** I am delighted that members of the Opposition are enjoying my speech. I always feel flattered when I generate a number of interjections, because if Opposition members laugh they are embarrassed and if they interject they are worried. The fact is that the level of Government and semi-government borrowings puts pressure on interest rates. The demands of this State have been relatively modest in that area. One of the reasons for that is that we are not into the resources boom to the degree that the other States are. Indeed, New South Wales and Victoria have gone into aluminium smelting, and the demand for infra-structure borrowing is high.

All of this has put pressures on interest rates, because there is competition for money. However, the Labor Party was not too concerned, when in Government in this State, about the level of spending of Loan funds; in fact, it spent them prodigiously and prodigally in relation to a number of matters of which the public is well aware. We have only to think of the Labor Government's excursion into town planning and the Monarto fiasco, and its excursion into cheap housing allotments and the Land Commission fiasco, which entailed enormous borrowings. These are the policies of members opposite. They want to put further pressure. They would be the big spenders in Government. This is factual. They would be the big borrowers in Government. What effect would this have on interest rates?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Members opposite were so prodigal that they built the Modbury Hospital to win a seat in Tea Tree Gully. It took a long time to build it, and it was so big that it is now underoccupied.

**An honourable member:** And they lost the seat.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** And they lost the seat. The demands of the Wran Government for Loan funds and borrowings far exceeded anything that this State has been able to secure and, in our negotiations with companies, we are expecting them to raise the funds; indeed, we are reducing the demand for Government borrowings at present.

**Mr Langley:** But not unemployment.

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Unemployment reached record levels in this State when Labor was in Government, and the signs now are quite encouraging. Levels of unemployment in this State were lower in five months than for the corresponding periods last year. What is the Labor Party's cure for unemployment? Members opposite suggest that what I am saying is irrelevant. They want to talk about unemployment. What is the cure? Is it to spend another \$50 000 000 we have not got on a RED

scheme which does not create one permanent job and not to go in for resource development because there is nothing in it? That is garbage. The amendment of the Leader of the Opposition is patently absurd, as are all of his economic pronouncements made in recent days. The Premier has taken a responsible attitude to approaches to the Federal Government. They are embodied in the resolution, and we reject utterly the nonsense in the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY:**—amendment, and support the resolution.

**Mr HEMMINGS (Napier):** If ever there was an example of the uncaring attitude of this Government to those people who are suffering over high interest rates, we have had it here today. The Deputy Premier said a little while ago that he was pleased that honourable members were enjoying his speech. Many thousands of people outside have been forced to leave their homes because of the high interest rates, and they would not find it funny at all. I find it rather ironical and rather hypocritical that our worthy Premier has at last found himself in a position to go to bat for the people of South Australia, but that is only because of prompting by the Leader of the Opposition and the work that the Opposition has been doing in this area. He said, in what I suppose we must call his speech, that he met with Cabinet late last night. If he were sincere in wanting the matter debated, why did he wait until late yesterday afternoon to discuss with his Cabinet the matter of interest rates? It was because he had heard on the radio that the Opposition intended to move in this House today a motion along these lines.

Yesterday, the thing uppermost in the Premier's mind was the subject of the State flag. We all received a letter yesterday afternoon stating who could get it and who could not. He told us, when he came back from the Loan Council meeting, that the matter of interest rates was a *fait accompli*. Now we have heard him shed his crocodile tears this afternoon in an attempt to bolster his flagging credibility, and he spent at least 10 minutes justifying that. One thing I can say in his favour is that at last he is getting his priorities in the correct order. It was due to our Leader and our advertisement in today's paper that he got his act off the ground.

When I came to this country in the early 1960s, hundreds of families in Elizabeth were being forced to leave their homes because of the credit squeeze and the high rate of unemployment. People, in the main young couples, could no longer keep up their mortgage repayments. Today, the same thing is happening again. Young couples are being forced to leave their homes, and they are losing everything. The speeches of the Premier and the Deputy Premier show that they have no idea of the misery being inflicted on the community. In my contribution I intend to outline to the House what that misery is.

It is an established fact that rising interest rates are forcing many families into extreme hardship and, in some cases, poverty. This year, the electorate offices of Labor members in this House have been deluged with letters and telephone calls giving details of hardships already endured in homes where families are locked into mortgages and are having to meet higher and higher repayments. Some families are being forced to go without adequate food to meet their repayments. I have been told that cases of vitamin deficiency and scurvy have occurred in Adelaide because some families can no longer afford fresh fruit and vegetables if they are to meet their repayments—and this is supposed to be the lucky country!

My Leader received a signed letter from a constituent who said that her family had been reduced to depending

on a diet of rice, chips and pancakes. Yesterday, the Opposition received a similar call from a heartbroken couple about to abandon their home because of Mr Howard's latest interest rate rise. That family had been forced to cut back on decent food in order to retain the home for which it had scrimped and scraped, and now the family was being forced to put the house on the market. The tragedy is that the latest rise has meant that the potential buyers could not afford to borrow enough money and have decided not to proceed with the purchase of the house. Yesterday, that family decided to quit the home and lose everything, because it could not cope with the extra \$12 or so a week repayments, with the prospect of another rise imminent.

I represent an electorate consisting basically of Housing Trust homes, and in no way does it comprise palatial homes. Since January, there has been a stream of people coming to see me, no longer able to juggle their finances. Mortgagee sales are on the increase, and one thing that the Fraser and Tonkin Governments have achieved in my electorate is equality: we are all out of work, and none of us can provide a decent standard of living for our kids.

I have evidence showing that a typical home owner in my electorate has to work for more than one week just to keep up the home loan repayments, and on top of that are council and water rates, electricity charges, and all the things that go with home ownership. We have evidence of families having to put off having children because they cannot afford them. My colleagues have given me countless examples of young married couples who had originally intended that the wife would work for a couple of years and then start a family and who now find themselves in a situation where they dare not start a family, because two incomes are vital for them to keep up the mortgage repayments.

These are the heartbreaking stories that come into our offices. All we get from the Premier and the Deputy Premier is buffoonery and talk about the member for Elizabeth. If they thought the matter was serious, they would have addressed themselves to the problems facing thousands of young married couples.

Of course, working class families in this State have been dealt a triple blow. Apart from increased mortgage repayments, they have been hit by many steep increases in State charges. Bus, rail and tram fares have increased, electricity tariffs have gone up and there have been new hospital charges and sewerage and water levies. The Premier has now served notice that further increases in State charges are to come. At least, we know whom he is going to blame this time. He is going to blame the Federal Government.

This Premier, who in 1979 promised to slash taxes, has been deliberately using a backdoor taxation that hits the working people rather than the wealthy. In his speech the Premier mentioned approaches that might be made for returning the responsibility and power to the Loan Council, as far as interest rates are concerned. He said he heard this through the media. If other State Premiers felt he was worthy of being consulted, surely it would be done by telex; but no, he hears it over the radio, or he reads it in the newspaper. As reported in the *Australian* today, the Queensland Government, a Government that is not well known for humanitarianism, has said that it would seek the support of other States to have control of interest rates removed from the Federal Government and returned exclusively to the Loan Council.

What was the Premier's reaction to this report that he saw in the media? Surely, one would have thought that after the Loan Council meeting, the Premiers would get together and try to put on a united front against the Federal Government. He tells us he hopes the Federal Government, in tonight's Budget speech, will make some moves to alle-

viate the interest rates. There should have been telexes going from the Premier on Friday morning urging that this be done, but we have a mealy-mouthed resolution which has been put by the Premier and which says, 'We call on the Federal Government both to contain further increases and to take immediate action to minimise hardship'. That is not worth the paper it is printed on.

We have the Deputy Premier playing his usual dirty Party politics, attempting to denigrate the Leader of the Opposition in moving the amendment. At least what the Leader of the Opposition has moved is a positive way that we can overcome the situation, not a matter of going to the Treasurer and the Prime Minister cap in hand and saying, 'Please do what you can to help us'. There are positive moves that the Premier could make with the Federal Government, but as the Leader said, he is the running dog of Fraser and Howard.

On 1 September the working people of this State will be dealt another blow. They will be hit again by being forced into costly health insurance, which they cannot afford, despite South Australia's legally binding hospital agreement, which our Minister of Health ditched and threw out the window. I will read the last paragraph from a letter I received from a constituent, because this is pertinent to the motion and the amendment we have before us today. The lady says:

Our home is becoming a financial burden that we may not be able to support if payments continue to rise. The transition from Housing Trust tenant to home owner has created many additional expenses. To help cover these expenses I have had to take on casual work. We have not been able to afford medical benefit cover and do not know how we will be able to cope after 1 September. We have lived from pay to pay since June 1979.

We have a situation where that constituent has taken a risk and has not taken out medical or hospital cover. As from 1 September, due to the magnificent efforts of our Health Minister and the Fraser Government, that couple will be forced to take out hospital and medical cover! There is every indication that this couple will join the many others who are going to be forced to leave their homes because they can no longer afford them.

The tragedy currently facing working class families is compounded by the fact that Federal and State Liberal Governments have cut back savagely on funds for public rental housing at a time when people cannot afford to buy homes. As a result, we have a two-way squeeze: rents for the private sector housing are already rocketing and meanwhile the waiting list for Housing Trust homes is growing larger and larger. As at 31 December 1980 we had 19 296 on the Housing Trust waiting list. That is the second largest of all States after New South Wales. I am informed that the Housing Trust is bracing itself for a massive increase in applications from people who find themselves priced out of home ownership, and the tragedy is that there is no way that the trust can accommodate them.

We were told by the Minister of Housing recently that the low deposit purchase scheme would help the low income groups in this State. My colleague, the member for Ascot Park, has given me information that gives lie to that particular proposal the Minister was advocating. The member has received correspondence from a deserted wife who has a small child and who is currently paying \$40 per week in rent. When the Minister announced his proposal, she sought a \$25 000 loan under the \$500 deposit scheme for persons on low incomes.

She receives \$108 per week, which includes a pension, maintenance and child endowment. When she went to the State Bank in Pirie Street she was told that she could not afford the \$31.26 mortgage payments on such a loan. We have there the paradox of a person who is paying \$40 per week rent in the private sector, who attempts to gain a loan

under the low deposit purchase scheme that would result in some \$8 less per week, and who is told the bank cannot accommodate her. Budgeting for council rates, water rates, and insurance, the total would have been \$36, which is less than she now pays in rent for a flat. This is not an isolated case, so that much vaunted scheme for providing low cost purchase homes is doomed to failure from the start.

Interest rates in this country are at record high levels. The present levels are far higher than they were when the Whitlam Government was in office. This is a fact, and I dispute what the Deputy Premier said in his miserable contribution.

I am sure that people in the community will remember Fraser's 1977 election promise that interest rates would be cut by 2 per cent during 1978. Those who believed that are now bitterly regretting their dependence on his word. Indeed, there has been a rise of 2 per cent in home loan interest rates since the Federal election last year, which was when the Premier was urging South Australians to vote for Malcolm Fraser for South Australia's sake.

**Mr Keneally:** It is a sick joke.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** It is a sick joke. It has been calculated that there are 1 600 000 home buyers in Australia today. Perhaps they now feel sacrificed, owing to the gross incompetence and confusion of the Fraser Government's economic policy. Those 1 600 000 people have found that the great Australian dream of home ownership has turned out to be a nightmare. The tragic case reported in the *Sunday Mail* this week about a young married couple being forced to leave their home is not isolated.

I remind the members for Todd, Newland, Mawson and Morphett that they will feel that electoral backlash in 1983 from those young couples who put their faith in a State and a Federal Government and now find themselves being sold down the river. The Premier has played ducks and drakes over home loans. After the Leader of the Opposition proposed in March that interest on home loans should be made tax deductible, the Premier was advised that he had to change course and agree with the Opposition for political reasons.

Yet, the statements the Premier made in South Australia for local consumption were quite different from what he said in Canberra. Despite his typical grandstanding at home, he went quietly at successive Premiers' Conferences. His role, according to the press, was low key and most co-operative with the Commonwealth. Unfortunately, he consistently refuses to stand up for South Australia as previous Premiers have. If interest rates rise again (and it has been tipped that they will in six months time), that will be a tragedy for many families seeking their own home for the first time; it will be another blow for an already flattened building and construction industry.

The Housing Industry Association has calculated that 4 000 potential home buyers are put out of the national housing market by every 0.5 per cent rise in interest rates. That means that the 2 per cent rise in the bank mortgage rate that has occurred since December has put another 16 000 potential buyers out of the market. On my calculations, each 0.5 per cent rise in interest rates adds more than \$11 to the monthly repayments on a typical \$30 000 loan over 25 years, so during the past year monthly repayments on such a loan have increased by a steep \$44 with this 2 per cent rise in interest rates.

Since April 1980 interest rates have gone up 3 per cent, which results in an extra \$65 per month to be paid. For many families on lower incomes the level of repayments they are forced to make has become too high for them to handle, yet it would seem obvious from what the Premier and Deputy Premier said, and by the raucous laughter by members of their backbench that greeted their every

remark, that there are in their districts people who are in trouble. They all come to Labor members of Parliament. We hear the tale of misery day in and day out. We have to reluctantly advise people that the best avenue open to them is to cut their losses and get out. However, it seems from the way members opposite have treated this debate that they have no such people in their districts.

It is quite clear that any further round of mortgage rate rises will do a great deal of damage to the building industry, and to the prospect of the average Australian ever being able to buy a home. It is not only the home buyer who is hurt by the interest rates hike. Small business, already suffering under Fraserism, is in the firing line.

If interest rates do rise later this year, a large number of small businesses will be forced out of business or at least prevented from expanding. After all, any interest rate rise, apart from increasing the repayments level, will also increase the cost of capital and, therefore, the price of investment, making new investment far less likely. I would like to quote from today's *News*, on page 6, where Mr Michael Wilkinson is reported as asking this question of Mr Howard:

You campaigned, promised in 1977, that interest rates would come down. The Deputy Prime Minister even promised he would eat his hat if rates didn't drop. When will rates come down?

**The Hon. R. G. Payne:** When will he eat his hat?

**Mr HEMMINGS:** Yes. The answer was:

I am not going to make any forward promises about variations up or down. It is fair when talking about interest rates to refer to the election that put the present Government in. That's the 1980 election. I expressly refrained from making any commitments about interest rates in that election.

What they could say in 1977 is not valid in 1980. Unfortunately, the recent Premiers' Conference has shown that the Fraser Government, despite the message it received at the last election and in successive opinion polls, is hell bent on pursuing its monetarism policies, even though they do not work. It is being fully aided and abetted by this State Government in its policies.

It has been repeatedly demonstrated, not just in Australia, that high interest rates go with Malcolm Fraser's callous brand of monetarism for two reasons: first, inflation tends to remain high and tends to bid interest rates up; secondly, Mr Fraser's policy on contracting the money supply creates a shortage, and so the price of money (and that is interest rates) is again forced up. They are the economics of the interest rates problem and the economics that this Government, in its blind allegiance to the Federal Government, follows.

Let us look at the matter in human terms. The damage done by rising interest rates was starkly revealed to me by one constituent who said in a letter that during the past 15 months her housing interest rates had gone up five times, yet in the same period her husband's pay had increased only once. That is another example of how the working people in this State are suffering under the Fraser Government's policies. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, steps must be taken to lessen the impact of interest rate rises. The first step should be that home mortgage interest repayments be made deductible from income tax on a means tested basis. Surely, no-one on the Government side would disagree with that. We had such a scheme once, but that was abolished by Mr Fraser.

If the Federal Government was concerned about the tremendous hardship being caused by the interest burden the Treasurer (Mr Howard) should readily agree to such a tax deduction in tonight's Budget. I can just imagine that if, by chance, mortgage interest rates are made tax deductible, or if there is some way that Mr Howard attempts to

alleviate the suffering, our worthy Premier will be jumping up and down tomorrow taking the credit for it.

The A.L.P. is currently waging a campaign to give the Liberal Party a message about interest rates. We make no apologies for that. We feel that at least we are taking a positive step to let people know exactly what is the cause of the rising interest rates and how the community is suffering, yet the Premier tells us that if we do that we are playing Party politics. Does he expect us to go along blindly with this mealy-mouthed motion? We intend to tell the community exactly who is responsible for the mess we are in today and we will tell it that our policies can alleviate the present suffering.

The Premier and his Canberra colleagues should be made aware of the 135 000 households paying off mortgages in Adelaide alone, 90 per cent of which would be suffering severely. Also, we all know that many of these people live in areas which are held narrowly by the Liberal Party. I just hope that these people will remember that in subsequent State and Federal elections. I am sure they will.

At the State level the Tonkin Government could reveal the extent and depth of the social misery being caused by higher mortgage repayments by undertaking one of its highly publicised family impact statements into the effect on families of higher interest rates. Perhaps while it is doing that it can undertake family impact statements on the Premier's increased charges for water, electricity and train, bus and tram fares, and other State charges which are only serving to worsen the problem we have today. Unlike all the other family impact statements which have never been made public, this one should be.

**Mr BLACKER (Flinders):** I support the motion not because I totally agree with it but because it is the better of the two propositions put before us today. I would like to go through the aspects of the motion and the amendment to explain where I agree and where I disagree with them but before doing that I would like to say that this morning I did receive a letter from the Leader of the Opposition advising me that he intended to call for a suspension of Standing Orders. On reading that letter and the letter he sent to the Premier, I was prepared to accept that there was a case to be made for having this matter raised and I indicated to those who spoke to me that I was prepared to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders.

I was not, however, totally in agreement with what was proposed at that stage, even though no motion had been stated in the Leader's letter. I leave it at that point because I believe that the matter should have been spread further to include people in isolated areas and in rural communities. I accept the point from the Leader of the Opposition that that was probably at the back of his mind but I would like to see it specifically spelled out.

I think we all agree with the basic principle of the Premier's motion but it does not call on the Federal Government to take any action to reduce interest rates, and I think that is what we should be looking for. We should be going one step further and we should be calling on the Government to reduce interest rates rather than passing this particular motion.

All the motion is doing is saying that we have accepted the interest rates so far but we do not want them to rise any further and to please take some action to minimise the hardship on those members of the community who are so seriously affected at the moment. To that extent I believe the motion should have gone a lot further than it has done. The Leader of the Opposition, on the other hand, has introduced an amendment which does include some specific direction from this House to the Federal Government. I

would like to go through each point raised and indicate my support or otherwise. The first point was:

That this House deplores the recent series of increases in interest rates which are causing distress not only to people attempting to buy their own home but also putting pressure on small business and South Australia's vital job creating manufacturing sector;

As I have said, that could easily be broadened to include the producing sector of the community, namely, the rural area as well as the fishing sector. As a basic principle, I agree with that part of the amendment. Part (b) states:

That this House condemns the policies of the Federal Liberal Government which have led to interest rates now being at record high levels;

That is a debatable question, because we do not know what level these interest rates would be if the Federal Government had not carried out its present policies. I venture to suggest that, if it had not embarked on stringent financial policies, it may well be that interest rates would be considerably higher than they are at the moment. I could not support that part of the amendment. Part (c) states:

That this House directs the Premier to convey to the Prime Minister that these policies are unacceptable to the people of South Australia.

We all agree that interest rates are a considerable burden on all sections of the community. Part (d) states:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to provide immediate relief to home buyers by allowing interest paid on home loans as a tax deduction.

I think that is a positive recommendation from this House that some action be taken to help those who are embarking on buying what is for most people the greatest asset of their lifetime, their own home. Part (e) states:

That this House calls on the Federal Government to pursue a policy of reducing interest rates which includes stricter control over capital inflow from overseas . . .

That causes me great concern. We all agree that there should be stricter control but the implication is that there should be a reduction in overseas capital and I do not believe that is necessarily in the best interests, because it may well be that low interest money can be brought in from overseas, which would help our cash flow problem, and there could be considerable advantage in looking for additional funds from overseas, but under strict control.

Part (e) also refers to a resources rent tax. I take argument with that because it is obviously an attempt to slow down the development of the resources of our country and I can see a great deal of argument with that particular suggestion. Part (e) also refers to the control of price rises which are fuelling inflation. I think we would probably agree with that part.

What concerns me greatly is that in many cases these interest rates are affecting those people who have committed themselves to long-term financial agreements. In many cases they have just recently undertaken the purchase of a farming property, for example, where they sat down and were able to prove their ability to repay that loan at the interest rate and with the commitments as at that time. That was a commitment undertaken with the bank or financial institution by the individual concerned but in many cases these people, within two or three years, are finding that these repayment commitments are now far beyond the ability of them and of the property to service.

I could quote some examples of a commitment made as recently as two years ago on a perfectly viable proposition. It was a commitment acceptable to a bank, which is usually conservative in its financial dealings compared to other financial institutions, but the properties are now no longer viable because of the interest rates. This is a part of the operation which is beyond the control of the person who had negotiated the price of repayment.

It has been suggested to me that, with loans for a home or for a producing farming proposition, the avenue should be available for finance to be negotiated at a set interest rate for a period of time. I remember that the first loan I ever raised was at a minimal interest rate by today's standards but it was for a fixed five years before the interest rates were renegotiated, and that meant I was able to plan quite positively for five years.

Nowadays I do not think any financial institutions undertake such an arrangement. Increasing interest rates takes the ability of the individual to manage his own affairs completely out of his own hands. That is the unfortunate part of this situation.

This is the unfortunate part. I believe that unless interest rates are contained we will see many small businesses, farms and homes sold up because of the inability of the proprietors or owners to meet the increased payments. We could say, as a result of the present squeeze that is on, that in many cases the finance has been too easy to get in the past and that people have committed themselves to the very limit and have not allowed sufficient latitude at the upper end to cater for any increases in interest rates or any other eventuality. It points to the fact that many people who now find themselves in that position possibly lacked good legal or financial advice at the time that they undertook that commitment which has now placed them in that position.

I think we can look at all of our financial agreements and treat them in different ways, but the people who have been committed to a loan for, say, 15 years should be able to meet their requirements. Even though they negotiated the loan on a very low interest rate, with the rate of inflation, the price of commodities and wages so far received one should be able to keep ahead of the increased interest rate which, over a 15-year period, has gone from 5¼ per cent to 12½ per cent. However, those people who negotiated loans in the last two years, when the interest rates have jumped by 2½ per cent, face difficulties, and possibly they are sailing a little close to the wind.

The member for Napier made some comments about the difficulties being experienced by some of his constituents. I do not believe that there would be a member in this Chamber who would not be able to quote examples of such hardship. I for one have had an example of every case that the honourable member quoted come to my office. I do not know whether it has been the same number proportion-wise, but the examples are there. We would be naive if we did not accept that point. People come to me, and I wish that I could wave a magic wand to help them. It has been suggested in some instances that two incomes are necessary to keep up the home repayments. That reiterates the point I made that, if a financial commitment were made in the last two or three years and it is now necessary for two incomes to go into that household to keep up the financial repayments as a result of interest rates, surely they have been poorly advised when it comes to the planning of their financial arrangements.

I have home buyers come to me as well as owners of small businesses. Small businesses are probably the greatest concern, particularly in my electorate and in country areas—and I mean small businesses. I clarify the point, because in some avenues a small business consists of 50 employees, but in most country electorates a small business would refer to a family partnership employing two or three people, with a maximum of five. In my terms, a small business is one consisting of 10 employees or fewer. They are the people who are affected more by interest rates than are the larger concerns.

The Federal Government has been putting up interest rates with a purpose in mind, that is, to try to create a cash flow. I do not know the ins and outs of the matter enough

to be able to debate it. Maybe there are good reasons why higher interest rates are needed, but I hope that it is purely on a short-term basis. It has been suggested from some quarters that interest rates have peaked, and I hope that that is the case. If they have not, I can see grave consequences for Governments of the day if they are unable to control or contain interest rates, particularly to the stage where people are starting to lose their homes, their farming operations and business operations. That is when the real crunch will come, particularly in the ballot-box.

I support the Government's motion for the simple reason that we all agree in principle, although I do not believe that it goes far enough. However, I cannot accept the amendments in total. I accept three of the five points raised, but to give a blanket approval to the total amendment would, I believe, be wrong for this House to pass on to the Government. I support the motion.

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer):** I am very grateful to honourable members for the consideration that they have given to this motion, which is a very serious matter indeed. I thank the member for Flinders for joining into the debate in such a positive way. The member for Napier's concern about the matters that he outlined within his electorate does him great credit. I place on record that I believe he is sincere in what he has said. However, it would have been a little better, instead of criticising members on this side for levity and laughter, for him to recall that he was indulging in that before he started his speech.

I was disappointed that the Deputy did not join in the debate. There is very little at all that the Leader of the Opposition has put forward. The amendments that he has moved could have done with a considerable amount of redrafting once he realised he was not going to be moving any motion in this House.

I repeat that Cabinet considered this matter yesterday. It is sufficiently concerned about the entire interest rate situation to take the action that it has taken today and we are grateful for the support, albeit grudging, that the Opposition has given to the principle that we have outlined. As to the particular matters, we all deplore the recent increases in interests rates, and that is encompassed in the motion already moved. It is unfortunate that the Leader condemned the policies of the Federal Government, but he always will do so. I will certainly be conveying a message to the Prime Minister anyway, so there is no point in putting it in any amendment. When it comes to the Whitlam package that he put forward, which will undoubtedly lead to inflation of record levels, interest rates at record levels and all of those other matters that happened in the 1972-1975 period, the people of Australia had enough of that package then and they do not want to return to it now. It is no solution at all. I believe that this is a very important matter for the people of South Australia. I believe that we should make our point of view known to the Prime Minister forthwith, and I will undertake to do that as soon as this motion is passed.

*The House divided on the amendment:*

Ayes (21)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, O'Neill, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten and Wright.

Noes (24)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson and Wotton.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.



## ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 6 August. Page 368.)

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** In reply to the Governor's Speech, I want to raise a number of matters. In particular, the Governor said, in part:

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

Only time will tell as to the sincerity and commitment of this Government. As we have seen so many times since the Government has been in office, its promises really do not hold any water at all. Also, I am very much concerned about the statements made by the shadow Minister of Housing, the member for Napier, in a press release of 20 July 1981, as follows:

Labor's Shadow Housing Minister Mr Terry Hemmings said he had been shocked to discover that no housing had yet been allotted to any of Adelaide's estimated 4 000 homeless youths. This accusation was made today by the SHELTER organisation. Mr Hemmings said the State Government had been pressed into promising some relief for unemployed youths who had nowhere to go. The pledge of 50 houses—not extra houses but houses from the Housing Trust's stock—had been made in April. Now, in the Governor's Speech to Parliament last week, announcing future Government policy, there was a reference to plans being underway to establish the 50 dwellings to provide 'minimally supervised' housing. That confirmed that nothing had happened since April. It appeared that market rents were to be charged for this housing. If this was correct then the whole enterprise looked doomed to failure. People on the 'dole' could not pay such rents. It also appeared that the Government was not willing to allot funds for the 'minimal' supervision. Mr Hemmings said he fully supported the notion of a combined conference of concerned unemployed and welfare groups to organise pressure on the Housing Minister, Mr Hill, to fulfil the pledge made in April.

What the Government is doing concerns me. Today we have heard expressions from members on both sides of the House concerning problems with interests rates, to which I will refer later. In my electorate I have seen many problems being experienced by my constituents, as have many of my colleagues. What concerns me is the increasing pressure being brought to bear on the South Australian Housing Trust and emergency housing. It was only some months ago that an Adelaide radio station talk-back programme contacted my office requesting that I take part in a talk-back programme concerning a woman who had telephoned the previous night and who had been crying to the interviewer on the telephone. That poor woman was living on just in excess of \$200 per fortnight with which she had to house, clothe and feed her two children, and she had bills in excess of \$2 000 for braces for the children's teeth. She may have over-committed herself, but it is only natural that she wanted to provide the best she could for her children. Also, she was paying excessive rent, namely, \$45 a week for private rental. After talking on the talk-back programme, the interviewer Jeremy Cordeaux, from 5DN, asked what could be done for that woman, and Mr Edwards said that he would have a look at that case again to see what could be done.

That woman was in a situation similar to that of many thousands of people in South Australia. It was only after I pointed out that this woman had only \$6.45 a week with which to feed her children that the matter was reconsidered, and I am now happy to report that she and her two children have now been provided not with a Housing Trust house but with emergency housing.

Many thousands of South Australians are in similar circumstances, and I understand that there are about 19 000 applications for Housing Trust rental houses in South Australia each year. This indicates that many people in the community cannot afford a deposit on a house, let alone the repayments. What will take place in regard to private rentals has already been demonstrated. As in other States, private rentals in this State are taking off through the roof, and the increases will result in additional pressures on the South Australian Housing Trust and on emergency housing.

I have clearly demonstrated in the House previously some of the problems that my constituents are experiencing. It seems rather strange and hypocritical that the Premier has come out in Parliament, in regard to this motion, with crocodile tears: where was he in March this year when our Leader called upon the Government to act? The Premier has been very tardy, to say the least. On 3 June this year, I stated (pages 3824 and 3825 of *Hansard*):

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

We heard so much from the Prime Minister in 1977 about how he was going to reduce interest rates in this country by 2 per cent. The situation of the woman I have mentioned is such that in 14 months interest rates went up by \$49 a month. She informed me that she could not keep up the repayments, that she would have to sell her home and, like many other people in South Australia, recoup as much as she could. She said that she could not afford health insurance and that she found it difficult to find money for clothing and to feed her children adequately.

I went on to point out the problems of increasing interest rates and the effect on the building industry in South Australia. I also quoted from an article in the *Advertiser* of 17 April 1980 under the heading 'Housing approvals tumble', which stated in part:

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

In the past 20 years, the only months when fewer approvals were granted were January 1967 . . . and May 1961 . . . The February figures represent a fall of 50 on January and a fall of 61 on February 1979. The value of private housing approved in February was \$13 900 000 compared with \$15 400 000 in January and \$14 200 000 a year ago.

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

A further report of 29 April stated, in part:

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

Another report in the *News* of 28 April stated:

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

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

There is no doubt that, because of the increased pressures of interest rates, many thousands of people not only in

South Australia but throughout the community have been affected. It is interesting to recall an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* of 5 August this year, under the heading 'Fifty thousand fewer seek homes', which stated:

Melbourne: 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 H.I.A. 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,' he said.

'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.'

Those statements have been clearly demonstrated by the examples that I and other members on this side have given. It was further stated:

Mr Kirkby-Jones said 'far too many' Australians had no choice between owning their own home or renting.

As part of the study, the H.I.A.'s deputy director, Mr Ron Silberberg, investigated claims that waiting lists for Government welfare housing had swelled in most States.

He found there were more than 280 000 Australian families 'in real housing need' who were not accommodated by public housing authorities.

Mr Kirkby-Jones said the Federal Government could try to alleviate the plight of many home buyers by revising the home savings grant scheme and eliminating the 'highly discriminatory, nine-month waiting period'.

The Government could make interest payments on housing finance tax deductible for moderate and low-income first-home buyers and existing home owners who could show real financial hardship, he said.

Once again, members on this side have provided illustrations of those people who are not only trying to buy their own homes and maintain the repayments but also who experience problems in renting homes. It does not finish there. Families are subject to considerable stress. While I was in Western Australia recently, I was interested to read an article in a Western Australian newspaper of 27 July, under the heading 'Cleric tells of stress in families', which stated:

The policies of State and Federal Governments in Australia were bringing increasing pressures on families, it was asserted yesterday.

The Reverend Ian Mackie, director of the Anglican marriage and counselling service in Perth, said: 'A 1 per cent rise in housing mortgage rates represents a crippling extra \$30 each month for the average suburban family.'

When this is added to the 'risk losing everything or pay up' health insurance predicament, education cuts, unemployment and increases in local government charges, there is an increasing burden on wage and salary earners.

This is typical of what is happening in this State. The article then continues:

Mr Mackie, who is a vice-president of the Australian Association of Marriage and Family Counsellors, said that counsellors across Australia expected a sharp rise in the number of people seeking help because of severe marriage and family problems.

As long as the consumer price index figures of which the Government is boasting do not include interest rates and other elements such as health-care costs, official figures on inflation will continue to appear to support socially disastrous Government policies, he said.

People were feeling tremendous frustration and a sense of helplessness leading to discordant relationships, he said.

This led to a general increase in depression and anxiety, both of which were in epidemic proportions already.

Those in government must recognise that their policies are having a profoundly negative effect on ordinary people, said Mr Mackie.

These stresses are likely to cost more in the long run in terms of reduced industrial productivity and escalating demands on already underfunded health-care agencies.

I have seen that demonstrated, as no doubt other members have. Members of this Parliament have had people come

into their offices, such as husbands and wives who have lost their jobs and as a result are losing their homes because of high interest rates. It will be of much interest to me to see what sort of commitment this Government makes in the next Budget towards Housing Trust accommodation and emergency housing, and also, in respect of the problems from high interest rates, I will also be interested to see how much extra money is allocated to the Department for Community Welfare, because I envisage increasing pressure on the people working in that department to try to help the increasing number of disadvantaged in the community.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Would you be satisfied if it was the same amount as your Party granted in Government?

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am talking not about my Party when it was in Government but about the Minister's Party, which has the responsibility of providing that money. Government members are the people who were going to look after South Australia and the people who said during the last Federal election campaign 'Support the Liberal Party for South Australia's sake'. We have seen quite clearly over the past 20 months how well the Government has looked after the people in South Australia. One thing which we have not heard about and which I have not seen in the press in South Australia is the number of loan defaulters. It is hard to find out how many loan defaulters there are with banks and building societies in South Australia. Those institutions are reluctant to provide those figures to people like myself. I came across an article that appeared in the *Age* of Thursday 9 July 1981 under the heading 'More loan defaulters as interest goes up', as follows:

High interest rates have caused a sharp increase in the number of people failing to meet mortgage payments, a study has shown.

The study, by the Committee for Economic Development of Australia, an association of businessmen, says that from 1973 to 1979 the chances of a home owner defaulting on mortgage payments rose by more than 13 times.

The committee said that nationally the rate for foreclosure of loans had risen from one in 950 in 1973 to one in 70 in 1979.

The article continues later:

Spokesmen for both the Government corporation and the privately owned Mortgage Guarantee Insurance Corporation of Australia said yesterday that there had been some improvement in mortgage defaults since 1979 and an upturn in the building industry in Victoria.

But the Federal Government's decision to raise interest rates on semi-government and Government savings investment and the decision by building societies to lift their rates to 15 per cent later this year, would have the effect of increasing mortgage insurance claims in the future, the spokesman said.

'It used to be a deposit gap that stopped people buying homes but now it appears to be the repayment gap,' the Government corporation's spokesman said.

The rise in interest rates will not only affect home owners and potential buyers but tenants on fixed or low incomes.

The article continues, later:

The report shows that rent for a three-bedroom home in Northcote is \$65 a week, Footscray \$55 a week, Caulfield \$75 and Essendon \$70 a week.

I can well imagine a similar situation occurring in South Australia in the near future. Mention was made during one of the contributions here today of those women who would like to have a family. I was interested to hear those remarks, because I have already put aside a letter to the Readers' Forum which appeared in the *News* on 27 July last. It is headed 'Career hit by policy' and states:

Sir, I feel that I am being manipulated by the Government.

First, I have been prevented from pursuing my career in which I received three years training at taxpayers' expense, due to massive job shortage.

Secondly, as a married woman in her mid-twenties, I have to face the dilemma of choosing between keeping my house or starting a family.

Housing interest rates have risen 3.5 per cent in 2½ years with the rumor of a further 3.5 per cent rise in the next two years.

I cannot afford to give up work and I'm sure there are thousands of other women in the same position.

Does the Government want to encourage a negative population growth?

Is this going to help 'Advance Australia'?

Would they be happier with a country of childless home-owners or a country of crammed caravan parks and high rise flats?

Whatever the choice, great social problems will follow.

When are the politicians going to open their eyes?

S. CRONIN,  
Daw Park

I think, in line with other contributions made here today, that the problems are clearly the policies of the Federal Government, supported by this State Government, and try as they may, they will not be able to escape the blame that should be levelled at them, because it was Liberal Party advertisements leading up to the latest Federal election that asked people in South Australia to vote for a Liberal Federal Government for their own sake. People are now only too well aware of what they let themselves in for.

I have distributed tens of thousands of leaflets throughout my district since I have been in office. Two of the biggest responses have been about pension and unemployment benefit entitlements, and housing interest rates. I will welcome the announcement of the name of the candidate for Albert Park in September this year, because I will be inviting that person to come and address a public meeting in the West Lakes area and to answer to the people in that area who are upset (to say the least) about the increasing interest rates that they have had to pay.

There is one other important issue to which I must direct my attention. An employee of the St John Ambulance Brigade came into my office this morning and made some serious allegations. I have had no time to check those allegations. I will do so, but I want to draw those allegations to the attention of the Minister of Health, because they are very serious. I have them on tape and my secretary has typed them for me straight from a tape recording made in my office at 10 o'clock this morning. In part, he states—

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** On a tape recorder?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes, he agreed to it. Talking about the ambulance system, he states:

It is getting to a stage now that the volunteer system is breaking down completely. There are more pressures on volunteers, more schooling, and there is no discipline in it at all as the bosses are scared to put too much discipline on volunteers as they are frightened that they may lose them if they do. Over the past three years they have had to do drives to recruit people into the ambulance service. The staff morale is extremely low, as nothing is going on. Funding from the Government has caused a lot of the problems, or should I say no funding from the Government. Currently we are trying to bring up-to-date resuscitation equipment.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** And all of these remarks are a recording of what the constituent conveyed to you?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Yes. The Minister is quite at liberty to listen to them. The transcript continues:

We have had only hand-me-backs for quite a long time now and we are trying to bring in new equipment that is hand operated. We do not have portable radios because of the non-funding from the Government, yet every other emergency service has all of this equipment. We do not have any of this equipment at all.

I think that the Government should provide portable radios as a prime necessity to allow for the speedy operation of the ambulance system. The transcript continues:

For the technical equipment that we do require we would need about \$200 000.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** What's wrong with the current radio link-up system?

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am just talking about the allegations; I want to get it all in. The transcript continues:

But we just do not have the money available from the Government to have this important equipment. We currently have vehicles on the road with over 250 000 kilometres on their speedometers.

I understand that some of these vehicles are well over the required speedometer reading and they should be replaced. In my opinion, if this is correct, it is an appalling situation.

What if there is a priority one red alert and the ambulance breaks down and a person dies or persons die because of it. Think of the consequences. The transcript continues:

The centres where crewing goes down used to knock off at 6 a.m. and start at 3 p.m. and another crewing centre comes on at 10 a.m. and finishes at 7 p.m. for the volunteers to take over. Union pressure brought it to a stage where they have two crews to do from midnight to 8 a.m. Monday to Friday and that brought the early crew in from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. At least the schoolchildren could be catered for during these hours.

This crew knocks off at 4 p.m. and are not replaced until 7 p.m., so out of 27 ambulances you are going to have to go down to 13 ambulances and every half hour until you have about 11 ambulances available for the last hour. You still have your turnover to cover. It is the highest accident rate, not the injury rate but you still have to attend, but the highest accident rate from Hindmarsh to Port Adelaide and the response time goes down. They have their computer that says that the response time is eight minutes for emergencies and all of the rest of the statistics, and it was reported by one doctor that if an ambulance cannot be at the scene within three to five minutes there is no point of having an emergency.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Is this an edited version or a transcript of the discussion that took place.

**Mr HAMILTON:** It is not the total discussion, because I deleted my comments. The transcript continues:

They collapse after three minutes, the brain cells start dying. What is the point when it has in one case taken an ambulance 17 minutes to arrive. The union have been doing a survey by itself and it can take up to 13 minutes for an ambulance to arrive in the metropolitan area. The average response time over cases is so much say, for example, that the one, two, three priorities that they give, but that does not account when they have a booking job to go to an out-patient hospital. They give the booking out as twice. But if that car is diverted and they give it to another car they give out a new set of figures; sometimes there is just no delay recorded on the statistics at all. Sometimes there are return patients that have received treatment at the hospital and are going back home. They should in this case be booked as time in and time out, but if it is too long it is out as twice.

The next example given by this employee is rather interesting. He states:

One booking may be from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, if the crew went in and said for the patient to just arrange for the orderly to collect you and they are given another job, that was forgotten about for four hours—this is a case that happened about two months ago.

**The Hon. W. E. Chapman:** Are you going to identify this employee?

**Mr HAMILTON:** No, I have no intention of identifying this employee at all, because he is fearful of the repercussions. Honourable members can listen to the tape and can then be sure. I do not intend standing up in this Parliament and making allegations.

**Mr Becker:** Then it hasn't got any credibility.

**Mr HAMILTON:** Members opposite can say that, but if they want to listen to the tape they are quite at liberty to do so.

*The Hon. W. E. Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr HAMILTON:** I am simply saying that these are the allegations that were made. If the employee can be assured of receiving protection from the Government, I will pass that message on to him. I will not say where he lives because he could be identified from the electoral roll, which I checked this morning. However, he certainly lives in my electorate. The transcript continues:

I can say that in the whole Woodville City Council area there is not one ambulance centre. In the whole of my electorate [presumably, the Albert Park electorate] there is not one ambulance centre. They have one at Port Adelaide that has been there for a while and they do not have one over in the North Haven area, and traffic there has increased dramatically.

There is a great hassle to get that new centre at Salisbury which is still being built. The people out there are doing a temporary centre for a year until they finish building one, spending \$20 000 on it. [I gather he means a temporary centre]. But they are not opening up to regular staff until they have their volunteers there. They are still waiting on their volunteers. Thirty to 40 volunteers would be needed and during the day they would require two

permanent officers per car. And if they do man it, they are going to take one car that started off at Hindmarsh and went to Elizabeth and that car stays at Elizabeth; in other words it is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

In the whole of the Woodville City Council area, there is no ambulance centre. There is one in Swan Street in Port Adelaide and the next one is on South Road near Grange Road and the other one is on Regency Road near Prospect Road. If an accident occurs on the corner of Port Road and Woodville Road and if you had a car available—most of the cars would be over at the Q.E.H.—then it would be a minute or two service with a car at the Q.E.H. and it would be five minutes from the Hindmarsh centre and about seven minutes from Prospect Road and Port Adelaide on a Friday evening.

He then goes on to state what the priorities are. The transcript continues:

Priority one is a red alert—life threat. Priority two means as soon as possible for fractures, etc. Priority 3 means it is a booking to the out-patient at the Q.E.H. or any other hospital and a return. Funding for this State last year—we received \$1 600 000 from the State Government to do the whole of the State. Victoria was given \$27 000 000, and Mildura received more for their ambulance service than the whole of the State of South Australia received. We received about \$1.70 per head of population for this State roughly to provide the whole ambulance service to all residents. To have all of the equipment here that we need we would need three times this amount.

Certainly, I am not well acquainted with the St John Ambulance area, but the lad goes on to provide information that he believes to be correct, and he states:

The Stirling Ambulance Centre has been absolved. The Government has stopped the building of the new one further down the road next to the bus depot. It was stopped a few months back, and they must be out by the end of May or June next year—and the thing is that they will be required to move to the Centre that they are no longer building. They really have nowhere to go.

Hindmarsh Centre want to do it up—they have the garage doors, the maintenance, the crews there, yet they do not know what is going to happen because the Government cannot make up their mind about the money. What is going to happen in plain terms?

The whole situation is a grave worry to the whole of the community. The union, as far as we can see it, is forced to not only do the industrial side of it but to try and enforce the operation side of it—because something has to be done somewhere. Ambulance men in the country are rostered their 40 hours normal work and are required to be on call for 80 hours. In the country services they only have volunteers who come in when they feel like it, and when the crew are rostered off they are required to take the ambulance home and be on call for the 80 hours.

Peterborough have all volunteers; they were really down at one stage but they have built up again. Naracoorte were currently in the process of getting a third officer—they were to have a service superintendent, one ambulance officer, and then they were to have another officer. The Health Commission froze this position about two months ago because of cut-backs and no funds being available. And another job was going at Angaston, in the Barossa Valley, and they froze that position altogether.

It has been proven that these positions are required, yet they still freeze these positions. By the time the volunteers do the community a service, the pressure is put on them too much and for someone to come and do it a couple of hours each night, you need skills there for the whole of the time, not just a couple of hours each night.

**Mr Randall:** You've got nothing against the volunteers, though, have you?

**Mr HAMILTON:** Nothing whatever. They do a great job. He continues:

Like this new advanced care project on its way at the moment. We have six ambulance officers working full-time on it, yet they have put through about 30 to 40 volunteers to do the same thing. They recognise that it is a specialist skill and the ranks are becoming thinner in the professional ambulance, but they let the volunteers do it. January will be the decision day as to if they will continue this project or not, as it is still under review. The decision will be made by our advisory committee which is the specialists from the various hospitals, e.g. Q.E.H., R.A.H., Flinders Medical Hospital.

The illustration I am about to give certainly concerns me, as no doubt it will concern the Government, because it could mean the difference between living and dying for someone. My constituent states:

A sister from the Q.E.H. has stated that it did in one case take a patient one half of an hour to be picked up from Crittenden Road and taken to the Q.E.H. arrival. One of the officers turned left on Findon Road as they did not know the area, and this fact was verified by our radio telephonist. This officer, who was a volunteer from Hindmarsh, was on volunteer duty and went there as a second car, and went to follow them, but when they turned left he was only on a priority green. By the time he got on air to tell them what they were doing they were near Grange Road—yet from Crittenden Road you can see the Q.E.H. The wastage of time in this case was 10 minutes so the actual time had doubled.

As you can see, the volunteers are under continued stress. We used to have volunteers who had been in the brigade for a period of 10 years and now we have them with as little as two years experience.

My constituent further states:

I was informed last week that the budget—

I gather that is the budget for the St John Ambulance—had been placed on the 'don't pad' and that it has been slashed.

I understand from talking to my constituent that 'Don't pad' means that some of the budgets are padded to make way for anticipated cuts by the Government from the budget provided. It is of grave concern to me that a constituent of mine, who works in that field, makes such allegations. I will be writing to the Minister, asking that the allegations be checked out, and I will be asking many questions about the funding of the St John facilities.

In the time I have left, I want to take up a number of issues affecting my electorate. As members will recall, in this House on 5 and 6 August I asked a question of the Minister of Education about the progress to be made at the speech and hearing centre at Woodville Primary School. The Minister's reply was somewhat amazing to me, because he said:

As a matter of urgency, I shall see that I get a report on this matter.

He did that, and a report came into the House on the following day, 6 August, when the Minister said that he was then in a position to announce, as a result of a question asked by the member for Albert Park, that progress would be commenced on the following Monday and would be completed within six to eight weeks. That is great, and I am glad to hear that news when I think of the disadvantaged children who use the centre. However, it seemed rather strange following what had happened on 2 December 1980, as a result of a Question on Notice, and following the criticism by the Premier of the number of questions I had put on the Notice Paper. It just proves what can be done by questioning the Government. The comment on 2 December 1980 was as follows:

The Education Minister said that a transportable unit will replace Government buildings after upgrading costing \$50 000. He said that the unit would be available for occupation in the first day of term one, 1981.

It was obvious to me that the Minister of Education did not know what he was talking about on 5 August, but was just trying to put me off.

**Mr Slater:** Or any other day.

**Mr HAMILTON:** That is true, but here was a situation in which the Minister of Education was caught out. He gave a positive reply to me in December 1980, yet on 5 August 1981 he said that he would call for a report as a matter of urgency. It is obvious to me and to many people from the school to whom I have spoken that the Minister was telling a blatant untruth. I would like a response from him. I doubt whether I will get it, but it is obvious to me that he was telling a blatant untruth, or had not done his homework, or both.

I come now to a matter on which I have spoken in this House many times and on which I will continue to speak until the Government is prepared to take action. I refer to the problems in Royal Park with Allied Engineering. I have

not got time to go through the whole saga of what is happening, but, briefly, the Minister of Environment and Planning had directed that the company involved must employ a team of consultants to see what could be done to assist not only the company but also those residents in the area who were suffering from the noise, dust and other problems emanating from the factory.

I refer now to an *Advertiser* report of 31 July concerning Mr Dowd, Chairman of the Royal Park Residents Action Group. He said in part:

'People have been under treatment for nervous disorders,' he said. 'A man in Maple Street would come home from work to find his pregnant wife crying her eyes out because of the noise. Since the baby was born they can't get it to sleep during the day. One resident has sought psychiatric help because of the situation. The site is simply not suitable for factory operations.'

The report further states:

A spokesman for the Department for the Environment said yesterday that Allied Engineering had been given a 12-month exemption from the Noise Control Act with one condition. This was that the company provide the department with a private consultant's report into technical and economic details of the noise situation at the factory by the end of the year. Until the department received this report nothing could be done. The manager of Allied Engineering, Mr L. T. Lugg, said last week that his company was sympathetic to residents but was not able to move without Government assistance. If the Government assisted the company to move it would be able to employ more staff.

I have related this matter to the House on many occasions. I refer to alleged threats quoted in the media concerning one distressed gentleman, who said that he was in such a state that he considered shooting the manager. That situation concerns me. I am further concerned by a statement made by the company's manager (and I understand that this is fact) that the company is not in a position to employ a team of consultants or a consultant to look at this problem. Therefore, I ask the Minister of Environment what is going to happen if this company cannot afford the consultant or consultants. Will the Government provide assistance for the company to employ consultants?

If the company does not employ consultants, will the Minister seek information about whether the company has employed a consultant at this stage? If it has not, what action will the Government take to enforce this request in accordance with the provisions of that exemption, because clearly the residents of the area are reaching the end of their tether? I was interested to read a pamphlet sent out by the Royal Park Action Group on 17 August, as follows:

Since our last newsletter our group has been continuing to exert pressure on the Minister of the Environment, the Hon. D. Wotton, to recognise the industrial pollution problems experienced by the residents of Royal Park.

The pamphlet goes on to quote me and my role in Parliament on behalf of the action group and states:

As stated in our last newsletter, Allied Engineering was granted a one year exemption from the Noise Pollution Act. Since that exemption, the factory has been working longer hours and there has not been any noticeable noise reduction. We ask the Minister what, if any, conditions did he place on the exemption, and Mr Wotton's reply (and I will quote) was: 'It would be impossible to determine if the level of activity has actually increased.' However, with a show of great compassion, he suggests that, if the stress and noise gets too much to bear, then the residents affected present themselves to the Beaufort Clinic for treatment. I am surprised that he did not suggest that we wear earplugs and gas masks in our own homes.

Several of our locals are already under doctor's care for nerve problems which have been caused or aggravated by this pollution. After the last newsletter, our group has received several letters of support from concerned residents, one of which we feel deserves special mention (and we quote):

I am deeply concerned about the things you have told us about in your newsletter. I am hoping you will be able to help us help you in making Royal Park a better place to live in.

That letter is signed by Helen Simpson, a lass of 12 years of age, and I thank her for her comment.

The action group goes on to indicate that it has received letters of support from many other groups in the community. Doubtless, many other members have experienced similar problems when constituents complain to them. I know from correspondence that I have received that there are other members in surrounding districts who are in similar situations, in regard not only to factories but also to hotels and other places of entertainment. Perhaps the Government should investigate the noise control system in operation at the Clarence Park R.S.L., which is opposite the Clarence Park railway station and which I attended some months ago. In that venue is set up a coloured decibel meter which is connected to musical instruments and, when the decibel reading reaches an excessive level, the system cuts off the electricity supply to the musical equipment.

That situation should be given much publicity in the community in order to ascertain the feelings of publicans and the owners of places of public entertainment, because I understand that no representations have been made to any hotels or places of public entertainment, including the football clubs in my district. That is perhaps one avenue that the Government should look at.

I would now like to return to the contribution made by the member for Henley Beach, who obviously delights in making comments about my district every time he speaks in a debate. I do not mind that, because it gives me the opportunity to feed that information out to my electorate and show that the member for Henley Beach is more interested in my district than he is in his own. The Labor Party candidate for Henley Beach is also having a good time with this material, and I believe that the member for Henley Beach, before he starts throwing stones, should look at his own district first. I refer to the comments of the member for Henley Beach on 21 July, when he was talking about the tetrapods and saying that I should make contact with people in my district concerning the need for them. The honourable member stated:

First, he should consult the West Lakes people to see whether they want that cemetery-type illusion created along the foreshore, and he also needs to find out from the West Lakes people why they developed and how they were allowed to develop properties on those sand dunes in the past five or six years.

That amazes me, because it is obvious that a couple of his own Party supporters had spoken to him. Clearly, the honourable member had not done much work at all on this matter. Before I comment on his statement, I refer to an *Advertiser* report of 21 July which referred to what I had said, as follows:

'I believe the use of tetrapods should be thoroughly investigated by the Government,' he said. 'I understand they can greatly reduce the forceful impact of waves. This could help arrest the erosion of our beaches.'

Mr Hamilton said he would write to the Minister of Environment and Planning, Mr Wotton, suggesting the use of tetrapods be investigated.

That is a report of what I said. It seems to me stupid that the member for Henley Beach should comment on that when all I was calling for was an investigation into the feasibility of the use of this equipment. If the honourable member had read the report carefully he would have seen what I was talking about.

In regard to researching the matter, I have not the time to go into all that information again, but I have certainly done that and I have spoken to people in my electorate on these matters. The member for Henley Beach should not waffle on about what is needed in my electorate, especially as the member for Peake has indicated that he received complaints from a number of constituents from the Henley Beach District complaining that they could not get satisfaction. I suggest that the member for Henley Beach gets his own house in order before he comes into this House and

mouths off about what I should or should not do. However, I do not have the time to get involved in an altercation with the member opposite.

Another issue that concerns me is in relation to a statement made by the Minister of Transport about the public transport system in South Australia. The statement, which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 7 August, under the heading 'No train lines will go, says Minister', states:

No lines will be closed because of cuts in train services, the Minister of Transport, Mr Wilson, said yesterday.

The article goes on to say how the Minister had met a representative group from the Public Transport Committee on the problems of these cuts, which I understand are somewhere between 101 and 151, on the Outer Harbor/Grange and Port Dock/Dry Creek services. It seems strange to me, after having spoken to this group, what exactly is taking place. I spoke to the members for Spence and Price, and we came to a conclusion which was set out in a public statement made in the *News* of 14 August, under the heading 'Labor voters "hit by rail cuts"', as follows:

The State Government was deliberately attacking Labor strongholds by reducing public transport in Labor-held electorates, it was claimed today. Labor M.P.s Roy Abbott, George Whitten and Kevin Hamilton said this appeared to be the reason for cuts proposed in suburban rail services on the Port Dock, Grange and Outer Harbor lines. In a joint statement, the M.P.s said they were receiving increased complaints about the changes. They said the number of services to be cut each week was between 101 and 151. Their comments followed a meeting with the public transport group.

It further went on to say:

The Transport Minister, Mr Wilson, had failed to consult us on these proposed cuts and has therefore effectively denied our constituents the opportunity to make submissions to the State Transport Authority of the Government.

I recall writing to the Minister, going back to October of last year, pointing out to him the need for consultation with members and their constituents. At no time since then have I received anything stating that he was prepared to carry out any surveys, not of those people using public transport but of those people who were not using transport and the reasons why they do not use it. If this Government is really sincere about getting more people back on to public transport, I suggest it should go out and survey those people to find out why they do not use public transport. I am cynical in my approach to what the Government is doing, because it is clear to me that this Government wants to reduce more and more of the metropolitan rail services. I can recall as a union official, going back to 1969, the Hill-Hall Government and its intention, I understand, to close the Adelaide railway station down at 7.30 or 8 o'clock at night. It would not surprise me if this Government does exactly the same thing.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to support the motion. In doing so, I join with others in expressing condolences to the family of Sir Thomas Playford. It is a pity that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat, and his Leader, did not take a little time to understand the economic philosophy which Sir Thomas put into effect during the long period that he occupied the position of Premier and Treasurer of this State.

**Mr. Hamilton:** Maybe we haven't had that much time.

**Mr GUNN:** If the honourable member would stop to consider the methods he used, he would have a better appreciation of what this Government is trying to do to benefit the people of this State.

**Mr Slater:** Turn back the clock.

**Mr GUNN:** I am surprised that the honourable member, who sleeps most of the time in this place, talks about the clock. Let me make some brief comments about a number

of matters. When I arrived back in the House last Thursday after having had the opportunity of briefly travelling overseas, I was surprised to listen to the Leader of the Opposition expounding his economic theories. I heard a well thought out and prepared speech put forward by the Premier, who is obviously not only concerned about the welfare of the people of this State, but who also is taking positive steps to improve their welfare on a long-term basis. The Leader of the Opposition gave us one of his academic socialist economic lectures. It was not a speech: it was a lecture. I do not know who prepared the document for him, but earlier this afternoon, just before the member for Albert Park spoke, Mr Muirden was handing out speeches. If he was the author of that speech and the author of the speech the Leader made, I am not surprised at anything they may put forward. We have become accustomed to the rantings and ravings of Mr Muirden over a long period.

I want to draw to the attention of the Leader of the Opposition some comments that one of his political friends in Europe made. I understand that Chancellor Schmidt and his Government consider themselves to be on the left of the political spectrum. They are social democrats—I think that is the way they describe themselves. I understand that Mr McRae describes himself as a social democrat. I do not know what the Leader of the Opposition describes himself as, but I will come to that later. I will now quote the report of what Chancellor Schmidt said:

The chancellor said his Left-Liberal Government had agreed so far on savings worth 14.5 billion marks (about £3.2 billion) in next year's Budget, and the Finance Minister . . . would seek more cuts in Ministerial talks over summer. The total Budget would be just under 241 billion marks and the Federal Government's net borrowing requirement would be restricted to 26.5 billion marks—a big cut on this year's expected record, 33.8 billion marks. The Government's aim was to free more money for productive investment and enable the central bank to lower interest rates. The president of the bank, who had attended the Cabinet meeting, had said that these figures should have a positive influence on money markets and on West Germany's economic outlook. Among the moves the Chancellor outlined—

and I would like the Leader to listen to this—

were a three-month public service pay freeze for each of the next three years, a one per cent cut in the number of state employees through natural wastage, and a cut in family allowances. The one exception to public personnel cuts would be the armed forces.

I suggest to the honourable gentleman that he ought to read and try to understand what one of his social democratic colleagues had to say in West Germany, someone who has some basic understanding of economics, unlike the Leader of the Opposition. For the benefit of the honourable gentleman, I point out that the quotes appear in *The Scotsman* of Friday 31 July 1981. I happened to be reading that newspaper and immediately thought of the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Ashenden:** It must have ruined your holiday to think of him.

**Mr GUNN:** I must be charitable. During my visit to the United Kingdom I had the pleasure of meeting many members of Parliament. It reminded me of home, because, in the Labor Party in the United Kingdom, there is the public affairs section, and two members of the Labor Party would be arguing their policies, one from the left and one from the right. I arrived back in South Australia, and the member for Elizabeth and the Leader of the Opposition were engaged in mortal combat to see who was going to lead the Labor Party.

**Mr Olsen:** Aided and abetted by Normie Foster.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, aided and abetted by the Hon. Mr Foster.

**Mr Ashenden:** Surely you would not consider the Leader of the Opposition to the right?

**Mr GUNN:** No, I was being charitable. However, there were one or two things I wanted to say about the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues. I attended the Whyalla show on Saturday, as a diligent member looking after my electorate, trying to make sure that my constituents had the opportunity to keep in close contact with their member. The Labor Party was handing out a number of interesting documents at that show. One of the documents was headed 'Labor Forum: the new quarterly journal for people in the Labor movement'. It lists the number of people who are going to make contributions to it. Listed together are Lionel Bowen, Frank Wilks, Peter Duncan and John Bannon together.

I do not know whether we have had the first instalment but we are looking forward to the second instalment when John Bannon and Peter Duncan both write their articles for this new quarterly journal.

**Mr Becker:** Who is the referee?

**Mr GUNN:** Mr Blewett is the Chairman. I do not know whether he is going to chair the meeting or act as referee. However, we will follow the progress with some interest. There will be an added interest by those two major contributors. I want to say something about what has been happening in the Labor Party. The Leader of the Opposition has had a lot to say about credibility and the standing of the Government over the past 12 months. We have had the Leader talking about the alternative policies that should be put into effect. We have all been waiting with baited breath for him to come forward with a positive package that will be not only acceptable but also financially feasible to put to the South Australian people.

When we are talking about credibility, one of the most significant problems facing State Governments is the funding of the public transport system. I am of the belief that, unless positive action is taken soon, there could be a possibility of breaking State Governments in Australia. The cost of funding the public transport system is out of control. During the course of my trip overseas I took the opportunity, as did a number of my colleagues on this side, to look at the O'Bahn guided bus system in Essen, Germany. I would suggest to members opposite that instead of continuing with their ill-informed and ill-conceived criticism of the project—

**Mr Slater:** That's not the answer to all our problems.

**Mr GUNN:** I am coming to that. I would suggest that honourable members ought to give careful consideration to this project. I am quite prepared to admit that at the time this project was put forward I had some doubts about it, and my colleagues were aware of that. However, I thought that I ought to take the trouble to personally examine it. I have to admit that those doubts that I had were ill-founded and I believe that the project will be of great benefit to the people living in the north-eastern suburbs, and I will give the reasons.

First, it is possible to finance it. The cost of the buses is only about a third of that of a light rail vehicle, they are not as noisy, and they are far more flexible. Once the O'Bahn guided rail system is built and operating, it is possible at a later date to put light rails down the track so that we can have a dual system. That is the next system that will take place at Essen. For the benefit of honourable members who doubt this project, I point out that this Government does have a policy to look after the needs of the people in the north-eastern part of the metropolitan area, unlike the A.L.P. Mr Bannon has been very critical of the O'Bahn system. The Hon. Mr Wright says that it should be stopped, so he wants to give the people nothing.

**Mr Ashenden:** And the member for Salisbury.

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Salisbury does not know where he is going: he is large in words. The member for

Elizabeth, the demoted spokesman on that, says we should have the Northfield extension. So we have three policies from three spokesmen and no-one knows where he is going.

**Mr Becker:** All in circles.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, around in circles. The member for Elizabeth, at the time of the last increases in public transport fares in this State, sought an assurance from the Leader of the Opposition (the person who sets himself up as the alternative Premier of South Australia) that under a Labor Government there would be no rises in public transport costs in this State. However, he could not obtain that assurance. The Leader of the Opposition to this date has not denied that conversation.

I issue the invitation to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon, who sets himself up as the alternative Premier of this State and speaks on behalf of a future Labor Government, to state where he stands on this issue. I want him to tell the House. He makes many comments. He has an army of people putting out statements. Let him make a statement to the House and tell us where he stands on the issue. We want to know where the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition stand in regard to increases in public transport costs. Will he give an unequivocal assurance to the House that it is the policy of the Labor Party not to increase public transport fares?

**Mr Slater:** Fares—I'm with you now.

**Mr GUNN:** I do not think that the honourable member is.

**Mr Slater:** I am trying to help you.

**Mr GUNN:** When I needed assistance from the honourable member, I would consider that it was time that we packed up and went home. However, I do not want to be side-tracked. I will proceed, because I think that it is very important that the people of South Australia know where the Leader and the Labor Party stand on these issues. We have had an interesting debate this afternoon in which we have heard a number of speeches. However, what did interest me in relation to the member for Napier and the Leader was that they did not put forward anything new. There were no new suggestions as to how we should solve this difficult situation.

However, they did support a package that would lead to higher interest rates and higher inflation, because the more money that the Government takes out of the system the higher the interest rates must go. The Leader was shedding crocodile tears about high interest rates, but if the Government sets out to take more and more of the available finance the interest rates must go up higher. Surely the honourable gentleman does not subscribe to Dr Cairns' philosophy that we just print more money. The Government either has to borrow it or print it. Both will create inflation. Where does the Leader of the Opposition stand on the issue? The other issues—

**Mr Slater:** You have not finished with public transport yet.

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member side-tracked me. The people of South Australia are fortunate that the Minister and the member for Davenport at the time of the last election, were able quickly to make an examination of the proposals, bring them back, put them to the people of South Australia, and have them accepted.

**Mr Slater:** Not accepted. Have you convinced the people of St Peters and Walkerville yet?

**Mr GUNN:** I ask the honourable member, 'Is it the policy of the Labor Party now to do nothing?' That Party has talked about proposals for the north-eastern suburbs for too long and it is time we took action. That is what the Government is doing and that is the policy of the Government. There will be a few problems and a few people will be upset. That is unfortunate, but the Government has a

responsibility to provide adequate transport systems and that is what the Government is doing. It will cause less disturbance than did the proposals of the previous Government. Let us not have any more of it. I say to the member opposite and to his colleagues who have the opportunity to go overseas that they go to Essen and look at the project and discuss it with the people involved, who have had long experience in providing adequate public transport. They will then be in a position to make an objective judgment.

During my trip overseas I took the opportunity to refresh my memory and look at the latest developments in relation to the need for uranium to fuel the nuclear reactors already in operation in Europe and those that will be built. I am sorry that there is only one member of the Opposition in the Chamber.

**Mr Slater:** We have quality rather than quantity.

**Mr GUNN:** Being a charitable person, I will not respond. I do not want to be insulting, and Standing Orders prevent me from saying what I had on the tip of my tongue.

There was one facet of policy that the people of Europe could not understand, namely, the attitude of certain sections of the union movement and the policy of the A.L.P. in this country to permit the mining, export and treatment of uranium. Wherever one went, one found that people knew about Roxby Downs, the Olympic Dam site, and they all looked upon it as an exciting development which not only had long-term benefits for the people of South Australia but also would provide a diversity in supply. In all the countries that I went to all the people to whom I spoke and who are involved in this industry believe that Australia is a reasonably politically-stable country and that it has a moral obligation to provide uranium to those countries who need it so they can meet their increasing energy demands.

The next point that I wish to make, which is very important, is that overseas countries stressed over and over again that, if Australia wanted to have any influence concerning safety factors in relation to the industry, it must be involved. Such countries accepted that the conditions that the Australian Government had laid down were by far the most stringent in the world. I think some of them were not particularly happy with the conditions that Mr Anthony and Mr Fraser had adopted. However, they accepted that they were dealing with a most responsible Government.

Such countries made the point that if Australia did not get involved, countries in Europe, in particular, would have to trade with certain African countries, many of which do not have regard to safety factors at all. All such countries wanted to do was get the money from the mining, because unfortunately they were undeveloped countries and they did not have any other areas of the economy that they could improve or from which they can generate income.

**Mr Slater:** Which African countries are you referring to?

**Mr GUNN:** I suggest to the honourable gentleman that, if he knows so little about the industry that he does not know where uranium is mined in Africa, it is about time that he goes to the Library to refresh his limited memory. So much for the quality, as my good friend reminds me. Has he heard of Namibia? Also, he ought to go to Niger, and I have mentioned only two countries for his edification. At the very time that I had the pleasure of visiting the United Kingdom, the Secretary of State for Energy presented a white paper to the House of Commons headed 'Nuclear Power'. He was commenting on a Select Committee report that had been tabled a few months before, and he had this to say:

The starting point for the committee's investigation was the statement by the Secretary of State for Energy on 18 December 1979. That set out the Government's view that a sizable contribution by nuclear power would be necessary to meet Britain's long-term energy needs.

The Government's nuclear strategy. The Government has a duty to ensure as far as possible that both now and in the future Britain has available at a competitive and economic price secure supplies of energy sufficient to sustain economic activity, to accommodate growth, and to provide for our people's personal welfare.

That is the policy of that Government, which is a most responsible attitude to adopt, unlike the Labor Party's attitude in this country, which recognises that it will not be in Government either at a Federal level or a State level and that therefore it can afford to be irresponsible.

**Mr Keneally:** Can you give us a slide evening? Did you take any slides over there?

**Mr GUNN:** I suggest that the honourable member deal with his friend the Mayor of Port Pirie; he has the measure of the member for Stuart and his friends. I suggest that the member go up and have his debate with the Mayor of Port Pirie. We know that the member for Stuart is endeavouring to organise some of his conservation-minded friends in that area. However, from the information I have received, I suspect that it will be to no avail. I want to put to the member for Stuart and the Leader of the Opposition the following questions.

**Mr Keneally:** Have you got them written on the palm of your hand?

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, I have, for the benefit of the member. I ask these questions of the honourable gentlemen: does the member representing Port Pirie support the establishment of a uranium treatment plant in that particular city?

**Mr Keneally:** Refer to your previous questions and to the previous answers.

**Mr GUNN:** It is obvious that the honourable gentleman has not yet been given his instructions by Mr Muirden and his left-wing friends. Are we waiting for the next instalment of the heroine, or is that going to be taken over by the next instalment of the Duncan-Bannon conflict? I pose the question to the honourable gentleman. Does he support the continuation of mining at the Olympic Dam site, in my electorate? Does he support that?

**Mr Keneally:** All of the things that are going on at Olympic Dam were done under the Labor Government. Nothing has happened under your Government.

**Mr GUNN:** The member for Stuart says that nothing has happened under this Government, but there has been about \$1 000 000 a month spent there! The members of the Labor Party will have to make up their minds and are going to have to make a conscience vote when the indenture Bill is brought into this place. I ask the question of the member for Stuart and the Leader of the Opposition: would a Labor Government permit that project to continue to the stage where the mining and the product mined, uranium, would be allowed to be exported?

**Mr Ashenden:** Would you answer that one?

**Mr Keneally:** No.

**Mr GUNN:** Therefore, the member for Stuart has said that a Labor Government would not permit the continuation of the Olympic Dam mine, which has been operated by Western Mining Company and basically financed by funds provided by B.P. Therefore, of all the money which B.P. raised on the London market a few weeks ago, a lot of which is earmarked for South Australia, the honourable member for Stuart is saying that the State does not want that money, that project, or the jobs, and that he does not believe that those countries that do not have a supply of energy should be allowed to develop their nuclear options.

**Mr Keneally:** They invested \$50 000 000, knowing what our position was.

**Mr GUNN:** Because they were hoping that reality would catch up with the Labor Party. Unfortunately, it has escaped even the member for Stuart, and one hoped that that member, who lives so close to that project, would have



at least allowed common sense to dictate the course of action that he took. Obviously, he is not going to follow what is a reasonable and sensible course of action. I turn now to one or two other matters.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** The honourable member has a background in railways. I pose this question to him, as there was an interesting article in the *Advertiser* this morning. Does the honourable member entirely support the actions of the railways union in preventing the—

**Mr KENEALLY:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As this appears to be developing into a Question Time, is the honourable member able to continually direct questions at me and, if so, am I able to take the time of the House to answer them?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order. The member for Stuart, having sat in the Chair on a number of occasions, would know Standing Orders quite well, and know that no such provision exists.

**Mr GUNN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I suggest that the honourable member refer to Erskine May again if his memory has lapsed. For a number of years we have been told that the Labor Party is a united Party, that it is solid in its support of a set of basic principles and that it supported the democratically elected Leader. That has been interesting. However, for some time we have been witnessing what appeared to be a few ripples displayed behind the scenes, but they had not come to the surface. However, during the past couple of weeks we have witnessed the amazing scene where the now back-bencher, the member for Elizabeth, has implied that the Leader of the Opposition is unfit to lead the Labor Party.

**The Hon. H. Allison:** That's not true, really. Anyone can lead the Party.

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, anyone can lead it down the road to oblivion. It was interesting to read on 13 August the headline 'Bannon betrayed me: Duncan. Claims threaten big split'. That claim was made by Mr Duncan, one of the senior members of the Labor Party, someone who entered this House in 1973, who was supported at South Terrace, and someone who was made Attorney-General by Mr Dunstan. The newspaper report stated:

Labor member Peter Duncan today accused State Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, and other elements in the Party of treachery. They are very strong words. I really think that we are entitled to an explanation.

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

**Mr GUNN:** Prior to the dinner adjournment I was about to refer to the interesting activities that have been taking place within the ranks of the Parliamentary Labor Party. This afternoon, and on previous occasions, the Leader set forth his economic packages and told us at great length how he would implement those policies. He has not yet told us how he will organise and bring his Parliamentary Party together. Over the past few weeks, we have seen the incredible spectacle of not only the Leader's credibility being put to the test but also his ability to lead being tested.

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am interested to hear the comments of the Deputy Leader, because during those interesting activities, the Deputy Leader was silent. Having come under attack once from the member for Elizabeth and just beating off the challenge, the Deputy Leader did not want to run the risk of getting his head chopped off by Mr Duncan.

*Mr Keneally interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I do not want the member for Stuart to become too excited, so I will give him some information. The people of South Australia should have certain facts drawn to their attention. When considering an alternative

Government, the people should be fully aware of what the members of that alternative Government think of one another. An article in the *News* stated:

Mr Duncan said following the publication of those reports, it had become apparent to him that the Party machine was fuelling a campaign for a further election for the national executive, and that he was about to become the victim of a 'political ambush'.

That was within the Labor Party. It was further stated:

He said a subsequent meeting of the State executive had decided on 31 July that a fresh election should be held.

*The Hon. J. D. Wright interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am really pleased that the Deputy leader is enjoying my speech; his manner of interjecting indicates that he will enjoy the rest of my speech.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** You are stating the facts.

**Mr GUNN:** That is right. It was further stated:

Mr Duncan said he had spoken to Mr. Bannon in the Opposition Leader's Parliament House office before the State Council meeting, and told him he would oppose the recommendation for a new ballot.

He had told Mr Bannon he believed he held the office until it was declared vacant by a further A.L.P. convention.

It was also stated:

'The fact that the Leader of the Party moved a motion in terms which contravened our agreement was a serious breach of faith' . . . My credibility is something I value . . .

It is obvious that the honourable member has some credibility; he put his position on the line. However, the Leader—

**The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT:** It is my view that this speech is of such significance that I draw your attention to the state of the House, Mr Speaker.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am delighted that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition wants to bring a few more of his colleagues into the Chamber. This afternoon, only one of the members opposite was present. In the *Advertiser* of 14 August Mr Duncan stated:

Mr Duncan told reporters he no longer regarded Mr Bannon as a suitable Leader for the A.L.P. and that Mr Bannon did not have his support.

That is unity amongst the ranks of the shadow Cabinet!

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** What about Mr Foster?

**Mr GUNN:** I will come to him. Mr Foster is a well known and most vocal member of the A.L.P., one who has been at great pains to discuss the affairs of other political Parties over a long period. He has engaged in what one would call very unusual behaviour for someone who claims to be a dedicated member of the A.L.P. In the *Advertiser* of this morning, under the heading 'Red faces over leaked A.L.P. letter', a report, written by Mr Kelton, stated:

In the two-page letter, which was written the day after the announcement of Mr Duncan's shock resignation from the shadow Cabinet, Mr Foster accuses Mr Bannon of 'weakness,' and 'gross misinterpretation of authority'.

Mr Foster says that Mr Bannon should have consulted Caucus before going public on the Duncan resignation.

'Your manner of roundabout politics and your misunderstanding of the authority to which you gave priority is unforgivable, and it is divisive,' he says.

Mr Foster made other interesting comments in relation to Mr Bannon's ability to lead the Labor Party. It is interesting that that letter was placed in the hands of the *Advertiser*, particularly in view of the great emphasis that the Labor Party places on leaked material. Mr Foster then set out to try to prevent the *Advertiser* printing extracts from the letter.

**Mr HEMMINGS:** I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Do I understand that, if any member of this House refers to members of the other place, he must use the words 'the Hon. Mr Foster, M.L.C.' rather than 'Mr Foster'?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable member is correct in his assertion and I ask the honourable member for Eyre to give due accord to a member in another place.

**Mr GUNN:** I apologise to the Hon. Mr Foster if I have in any way reflected upon that honourable gentleman.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** He is one of the brighter members.

**Mr GUNN:** He is regarded as one of the brighter members, as my Deputy Leader rightly reminds me. I was about to conclude dealing with Mr Foster's activities. As this exercise continues, we will no doubt hear more from Mr Foster and we are all looking forward to reading the comments that he will make in another place when he gives the Legislative Council a full explanation and perhaps reads the letter. It may be inserted in *Hansard* so that we can all know his motives in this matter. The language he used—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Don't you believe the *Advertiser* on this occasion? You did on the last occasion.

**Mr GUNN:** The language Mr Foster used to describe the Leader, even coming from him, adequately describes the Leader's ability to lead the Party. I believe Mr Foster's example was a fine description.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr GUNN:** I am glad honourable members opposite are paying such close attention to what I am saying: they seem to be enjoying my speech.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** We are enjoying your making a fool of yourself.

**Mr GUNN:** I wish to refer to one or two other comments that Mr Duncan was reported by the *News* to have said. That newspaper is near and dear to the hearts of members opposite. I will give a few selective quotes, because they are most applicable to the occasion. On page 2 of the *News*, the following comment appeared:

'This form of treachery was not what I had expected from the Leader of our Parliamentary Party in whose shadow Cabinet I served.' Mr Duncan said . . . 'On reflection I could see no alternative, given the breakdown of trust between us and the lack of propriety on his part.' Mr Duncan said.

A lack of propriety on the part of the alternative Premier of this State! That is rather a strong term. It was further stated:

However, I believe greater damage could be done to the A.L.P. if it does not remain a Party of integrity.

Obviously, Mr Duncan was referring to the fact that Mr Bannon must go before the Labor Party can regain its credibility. After his performance today, most members would agree with those sentiments.

**The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy:** In fact, he was really saying he was as crook as hell, wasn't he?

**Mr GUNN:** I believe he indicated that fairly clearly.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Do you think he needs a bit of help?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am sure the honourable member does not need help from either side.

**Mr GUNN:** That is right, Mr Speaker. I thank you for your assistance in this matter. In the 23 minutes I have at my disposal, I do not need the assistance of members opposite.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Why don't you talk about something useful for your constituents?

**Mr GUNN:** I think that bringing to the attention of the people of this State the divisions within the ranks of the Parliamentary Labor Party is certainly doing something for my constituents, because it clearly indicates that the Labor Party is unfit for Government. It is a most worthwhile contribution if any member on this side can make sure that the Labor Party does not gain the Treasury benches again. While speaking about credibility, I will finally refer to the *Advertiser* where Mr Duncan—

**Mr Langley:** If the honourable member did not have a newspaper he would not be able to make a speech.

**Mr GUNN:** From an orator with the ability of the member for Unley, I take that as a compliment. Mr Duncan was highly critical of the comments Mr Bannon had made about Mr Duncan's performance as shadow Minister of Transport. He said that there had been only one issue of real consequence in the time that he was shadow Minister. It is a real credit to the current Minister, that he has been able to handle his portfolio in such a manner that the Opposition could find only one issue to question him on. That issue was the increase in bus fares. Mr Duncan is reported as follows:

I spoke to Mr Bannon about this and sought an assurance from him before I criticised the Liberals that we would not put up fares in government, he said.

He would not give me that assurance and that was why I did not make any comment on the matter.

That was a rather reasonable manner in which to conduct oneself. At least he was endeavouring to be honest, straightforward and forthright in that matter. I think I have said enough in relation to the Parliamentary Labor Party.

**Mr Langley:** What about Peacock and Fraser? Tell me how that happened.

**Mr Hemmings:** Now come on, Graham, you're stuttering.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Will the honourable member for Eyre please resume his seat. Earlier this evening the honourable member for Napier drew attention to the manner in which members in another place should be referred to. He has now been responsible for involving himself in the use of a member's Christian name when he should, in fact, refer to the member as 'the honourable member'. Interjections are out of order, and I hope they will cease. The honourable member for Eyre.

**Mr GUNN:** I now return to one or two particular matters about my electorate which were referred to in the Speech made by His Excellency the Governor. The first relates to transport. I will mention one or two projects in my electorate that I regard as of great importance and significance to the people of this State. The first is that I am delighted that the Government is continuing to honour the solemn undertakings it made prior to the last election and is spending a considerable amount of money on the Stuart Highway.

**An honourable member:** That's the only one.

**Mr GUNN:** The Government's record, when one compares it with the Labor Party's record, stands up very well. I think that this year the Government will have spent in excess of \$10 000 000 on that particular project, and the road is making considerable progress. Of course, we would like to see even more money spent on it, and I hope that in the forthcoming financial year there will be an even bigger increase in the amount of money made available and that more private contractors can be employed so that the work can proceed at a rapid rate.

The other matter about roads to which I wish to refer relates to the road between Hawker and Orroroo. I have been approached, as has the member for Rocky River, I think, about this road, over which most of the traffic going to the gas fields in the north of South Australia has to travel. This year a detailed submission was made to the Minister in which a programme was set out which it was believed could be financed and would lead to the sealing of that road over a number of years. Unfortunately, no funds were made available this year, so on this occasion I appeal to the Minister to see that, when the Highways Department is preparing its schedule of work for the next financial year, some funds, at least, are made available and that a long-term commitment is given by the Government for the sealing of that road.

We all understand that a high priority has to be given to the road between Hawker and Leigh Creek and, fortunately, rapid progress is being made on that road. However, the other road that I have mentioned carries a lot of traffic and I believe is in need of a considerable amount of money being spent on it. There are a number of other roads in my electorate which are also crying out for expenditure. I suppose in an electorate like mine I could justify the expenditure of \$20 000 000 or \$30 000 000 without a great deal of trouble. However, being a realist, I understand that there are other parts of South Australia which also have problems. I know that the member for Flinders will be making representations in relation to a couple of roads in his area, roads on which I drove on a number of occasions during the seven years I had the pleasure of representing those parts of the Eyre Peninsula. Another matter to which I wish to draw attention is an unfortunate problem and concerns a constituent of mine.

**Mr Keneally:** The constituent's member is the problem, is he?

**Mr GUNN:** Certainly not. I wish to read a statutory declaration which I requested a person living in, I think, the member for Semaphore's electorate, to prepare, a Mr Kader of 5 Company Street, Semaphore, and which states the following:

I do solemnly and sincerely declare I purchased a rare Chevrolet Impala two-door pillarless sedan from—

and I will not give his name because I do not think it is necessary—

I used this car at Andamooka and Coober Pedy for some years, and became very attached to it.

I accepted a job in Sri Lanka in May of 1980 and left the car on my property at Coober Pedy covered with a canvas tarpaulin. I was away until 18 October 1980 and on my return I rang a friend in Adelaide—who asked if I had sold my Chevrolet as he had seen it on a truck in front of 'Super Chev' dealers on the South Road. I was quite surprised by this information and phoned another friend—and together we went to Super Chev to inquire. The man informed us that he had bought the car—

and he gives the registration number—

from a truck driver from Coober Pedy—who had told him that the car had been given to him.

The dealer had then sold it to another dealer—on the South Road and they had sold it to a private buyer.

and I will not give that person's name—

—of Flinders Park. After positively identifying the car as mine. I immediately went to the police—and notified them of its theft.

The police took a statement from me and asked me to contact the C.I.B.—

The case was allotted to Detective ——— at Darlington C.I.B. and I contacted him several times during the next few weeks. Eventually this detective informed me that their inquiries—

and he gives a reference number—

—had shown that—claims that he was given the car by an old Greek man whom nobody can identify or find and had been sold to—and as he bought the car for a fair price the police could not recover it and I should negotiate with—to recover it.

I went to the—address and saw him and the car and he refused to give it to me.

I went to Legal Aid and they said they could not help me.

A car dealer friend of mine—was quite surprised to hear what had happened to me regarding my car and the inability of the police to act.

He attended a meeting of car dealers which had a police representative there and he asked that person if anything could be done regarding my case. This policeman at the meeting was of the opinion that I could recover my car.

I was asked to contact Detective ——— at the Port Adelaide C.I.B. which I did. He was at first confident that he could recover my car but after several phone calls he made while I was with him he was surprised to learn that he could not act because of some new law.

It amazes me and hurts to think that I can have a car stolen from me and because it has been resold I cannot claim it.

I have never given anyone permission to remove or sell this car. He then makes one or two other comments. This poor gentleman, in my view, has been very badly treated. I have

taken the matter up with the Chief Secretary and the Minister of Community Welfare. I have also sought private legal advice from a leading Q.C. in this State. He advised me that the person has every right to go and claim the car but, of course, he is not permitted to breach the peace. My understanding is that this gentleman went to claim the car, accompanied by police officers whose sole duty it was to ensure that there was no breach of the peace. However, they could not enter into any discussion or determination about who the rightful owner of the car was.

This person now finds himself in a situation in which he will have to take court action at considerable cost to himself to recover his own vehicle. If what I have said is correct and the information I have been given is correct, I appeal to the appropriate Ministers to change the law to protect people. In my view, the first person to purchase the car must have committed an offence because he did not check with the registered owner of the vehicle, and therefore the vehicle was illegally transferred. Secondly, someone in the Motor Registration Division could not have paid a great deal of attention to the transfer. In my view, the dealer in question has committed an offence and should be prosecuted.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Which Minister do you think should resign over this?

**Mr GUNN:** No Minister should resign. It is the very same law that has existed for a considerable number of years. It has been suggested to me by people in the legal profession that the person concerned ought to go there with a chain, hook it on to the vehicle and tow it into the street. In fact, I think he actually attempted to do that. The unfortunate person who purchased the vehicle in good faith does not want to part with it if he can avoid it, because he paid money in good faith, too. Therefore, we have two people who are quite within their rights to claim ownership, because they are not at fault. In my view, the law needs to be examined soon to protect people against criminal elements.

When this matter was first brought to my attention, I asked the person involved to make a statutory declaration. This matter had gone on for a long time, so I thought it was proper to read it into *Hansard* without identifying the people concerned to ensure that some action could be taken so that this sort of activity did not take place in the future. I was most concerned about the effect that it has had on this person. Surely he has a right to leave his vehicle on his own property and go where he likes. If that is the case, it would be unsafe for anyone to leave their vehicle—

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** Was the car insured?

**Mr GUNN:** I am not sure of that.

**The Hon. J. D. Wright:** He's probably got a claim against that.

**Mr GUNN:** He may have; I am not sure of that point. To put it mildly, that gentleman is far from impressed with the situation in which he finds himself.

I now wish to refer to one or two other matters in relation to my electorate. The first matter concerns the problems that a number of my constituents have had in relation to kangaroos, which are currently in plague proportions in certain areas of my electorate. I have suggested to the Minister of Environment and Planning that the quota for the slaughter of kangaroos should be increased from 200 000 to 250 000. If that were done it would in no way endanger any species of kangaroo.

In certain parts of this State real problems have been caused. When the Minister is considering this matter, I suggest that he discuss it with practical people who do not want to obliterate every kangaroo but who want to see them properly managed and see the numbers reduced so that they will not cause problems to the grazing industry. Many

people fail to fully understand that, with the development of pastoral properties and a permanent water supply in most of the pastoral areas, the numbers of kangaroos have increased rapidly. The reason for this is that, in the past, when there was no permanent water, they did not breed. If anyone wants to make a comparison, I suggest he go out to certain areas of the State that have not been allocated and make a comparison of the numbers of kangaroos in that part of South Australia with the numbers in the areas adjoining it where there has been an adequate supply of water. One of the problems that takes place when one discusses matters of this nature is that there is immediately ill-informed criticism in the press. In my view, certain conservation groups do their own causes great harm by making statements which are completely emotional and which are not based on fact.

*The Land* of 14 May 1981 contained an interesting article in relation to this matter. A representative of the National Farmers Federation charged that conservationists had lied in relation to the administration to control kangaroos. I have not used his actual words but I entirely agree with the sentiments he has made. I believe there is an urgent requirement for the Minister to immediately increase the number of permits that he should issue. The reality of the situation is that graziers or farmers cannot allow their crops to be destroyed. I do not think I know of any grazier or farmer who wants to see all kangaroos destroyed. Most, like myself, would really like to see kangaroos on their farms.

**Mr Keneally:** Are there cases where the crops are being damaged, as opposed to the damage done to pastoral land?

**Mr GUNN:** Yes, there are. When the crops are ripening the problem is not the amount that the kangaroos really eat (except when they are in a real plight); unfortunately, kangaroos are fairly clumsy and they get on their knees and tails and knock large sections of the crop down. The last thing that people want to do is unduly slaughter them all. If they issue the tags—there are people—and the member for Stuart has some living in his electorate at Port Augusta—who go out and shoot them and put them to good use. Otherwise, they are shot and left to rot. That is the reality of the situation.

I now turn to another matter. I do not agree with the member for Ascot Park that the Address in Reply debate no longer has any use or benefit. The Address in Reply debate gives members an opportunity to raise a number of matters which concern them. They can raise matters which affect their electorates. One of the unfortunate problems facing Parliament is that there is not enough time for members to debate matters adequately. Governments want to push their legislation through, and the last thing they want is to allow debates because they are time consuming and they hold up the legislation. I believe that the Address in Reply is a useful exercise. Although it may be time-consuming and boring to certain people, it does allow members to raise matters which are of vital concern to their electorate.

Over a long time, there has been a great deal of discussion in relation to how Parliaments can be improved. As far as the member for Ascot Park is concerned, if he does not want to take the hour allocated to him he does not have to speak at all. Perhaps many of us would not care if he did not speak. However, there are those of us who like to make a contribution to this debate; and I know that the member for Mitchell will speak and I have no doubt that he will speak at some some length. In paragraph 11 of the Governor's Speech, reference was made to my electorate, as follows:

A final decision has also been taken to vest in the Aboriginal Lands Trust certain Crown land previously known as the Maralinga

Prohibited Area, and a resolution to that effect will be coming before you shortly.

I sincerely hope that that matter is put into operation very quickly. I have had discussions with the people at Yalata over many years about this matter and, if one looks back through *Hansard* and at the record, one sees that a clear commitment was made by Sir Thomas Playford in about 1961 that some of that land should be returned to the people who were shifted from the Ooldea area at the time of the atomic bomb explosions carried out by the British. I have had lengthy discussions with the gentleman, Mr Gage, who actually had the job of shifting those people from that particular area, and there is no doubt that a commitment was given. They were shifted at very short notice. I am pleased that the Government has again demonstrated its concern for this section of our community by honouring a commitment which was made a long time ago. I sincerely hope that in reaching agreement with the traditional owners of that land that adequate consideration is given to the needs of all South Australians.

I believe that the representations and the work of Mr Lindner in the area for a long time to make sure that the rights of those people have been protected have been appreciated by the Government. He has been able to make clear that this is not only a worthwhile step, but a course of action that we are obliged to implement. I think I have said enough on that topic, except to comment that I will be interested to see, when the Pitjantjatjara land is proclaimed and when the legislation becomes effective, how it will operate. I will watch with interest how the people in those areas put into effect the provisions of the legislation, which I hope will work in the interests of all South Australians.

In conclusion, I want to mention one or two matters in relation to my electorate. A proposal has been afoot for some time to build a new school at Miltaburra. In about 1968, I think, the present Chief Secretary had a trip through the area with one of my predecessors, and the matter was raised when Mrs Steele was Minister of Education. A decision was made to proceed, and land was purchased close to the Eyre Highway, about 20 kilometres up from Wirrulla. However, after much thought and consideration, Education Minister Hudson was forced to take a fairly unpalatable decision to defer the project. It had been ready to go to the Public Works Committee, but a decision had to be taken to hold off.

I hope that the Government, in its wisdom, will proceed with this project, because the overwhelming majority of people in the area are keen to see it go ahead as soon as possible. It is required. There is a large area with only three schools, one having been closed, and there has been much discussion and indecision. I believe it would be quite wrong, an improper course of action, and not in the best interests of my constituents if the project were to be further delayed. I call on the Deputy Premier, the Minister of Education, and the Minister of Public Works to give their early approval for the project. I am aware that they have a great responsibility thrust on them in making sure that the Loan funds available to this State are spent in such a manner as to benefit all South Australians. However, I am sure that they will bear in mind the needs of my constituents in that area, and that they will make the right decision. I hope that I will not have to raise the matter again in this House.

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

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell):** As is customary in these matters, I indicate my support for the motion. The member who has just spoken raised, on behalf of a constituent, as I understand it, the question of the ownership of a Chevrolet in the South Road area. I point out to him that

I own two Chevrolets in the South Road area, RWY-809 and RJO-160. I can assure him that I am in proper possession and ownership of those two vehicles in the South Road area, just in case there is any doubt in his mind. Further, if he is having difficulty reaching finality in the matter, I offer my services to him, as I am expert both in the field of Chevrolets and in the matter of representing my constituents. I hope that is not too immodest.

**An honourable member:** You've got a blue one, haven't you?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I have a white one and a blue one.

**Mr Gunn:** You're a capitalist.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am not a capitalist. I believe I am a person who understands and knows when he sees a good vehicle and decides to own it.

The previous speaker made some curious remarks about the wellknown matter of uranium, and I believe it would be of benefit to the House if I were to refer briefly to them. On one occasion during his travel talk he mentioned that, if Australia wants to have any influence on safety conditions in relation to uranium, apparently in some way it has to get into the act. I was extremely surprised to hear such a remark from the honourable member, because it was my understanding from the Deputy Premier that all safety matters had long been ironed out, that it was a perfectly safe game to be in, and that there was no need for anyone to be worried about uranium or the nuclear fuel cycle as a whole.

I recall the Deputy Premier's assuring the House of that on more than one occasion, but it seems that one of his members, having been overseas, has had some misgivings about this whole area and is putting forward his opinion that the area needs care and attention, and suggesting that one way of achieving that is for South Australia to get into the act. While I might disagree with his conclusion in that matter, I respect the fact that at least one member from the other side has indicated to the House that he does have misgivings about the safety of the whole area of uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle. I believe he is to be commended for the courage he has displayed in at least raising the matter in the House as he did.

The member for Eyre went on to say that the Olympic Dam area and the development which has occurred there up to now were in some way due to the activities of the present Government. I find that, and I believe that you, Sir, would find it, because of the time you have been in this House, a rather unusual statement. I am sure that everyone in South Australia, and certainly members who keep up with these matters, would recall that, well prior to the 1979 election, an announcement was made on this topic by the then Premier, Mr Corcoran, who pointed out that a development was to occur in the area, that the sum of money involved would be \$50 000 000, that B.P. and Western Mining were involved in the activities, and that it was perfectly in accord with the policy of the Labor Party at that time, the policy that is still extant, which is that the Party believes that there is a need to be a completely informed debate in this area, that there is no reason to interfere with prospecting and exploration of the State's mineral resources.

That had been the policy previously, it had been adhered to, and, as I will demonstrate later, there was clear evidence of that policy. I do not know why the honourable member was trying to claim the credit, if that is how he saw it; he did not make it clear. If he believes there is some credit involved in what has occurred at Olympic Dam or Roxby Downs (call it what you like), the new Mount Isa, the rainbow on the horizon, as I think it has been described,

then he cannot claim that credit for the present Government.

Up to this moment, the present Government cannot point to one act or to anything it has done that has resulted in anything occurring in that area that would not have occurred following decisions already taken in the private sector, by the companies concerned, as a result of their consultation and agreement with the Government of the day, which was headed by the Hon. Des Corcoran and which was a Labor Government. Let us put that to rest for good and all. One has an understanding of why the Government is now resorting to these cribbing tactics, because, in its total time in office in this State, the only thing it can point to with any credibility at all in the area of development or mining is that there has been an increase in the number of exploration licences issued. For no other factor can the Government of the day claim credit. I am not sure why a Government should set out to claim credit for an increase in exploration activity.

I say that as carefully as I can, because there is untold evidence that this is a phenomenon occurring all over Australia, and I will refer to that later. It is also occurring in other parts of the world where the prospects are good, doubtful, or hopeful, or where areas have not been fully explored in the past in the hope of finding oil, gas, or other modern energy materials.

**Mr Oswald:** It's funny how it has all happened since September 1979.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I will get around to deal with the member for Morphett, and I trust that he will remain in the Chamber instead of leaving the House to hear the dismal dirge which will be coming over the radio or which is already on the radio from his colleagues and which he will have to live with—this year's Federal Budget. Of course, the honourable member may choose to stay in the Chamber and listen to me as the better alternative of the two. Certainly, this is not the only area where this cribbing has been going on, and I intend to give the House some evidence of that later.

However, at this juncture I find myself forced and driven to refer to the manner in which a member has conducted himself in this House. As far as I can recall, it is the first time in some 11 years or so that I have found personal distaste in the way in which a member has conducted himself. It would be fair to say that it is the only occasion on which I took umbrage at the way in which a member chose to handle a topic in the way that he did. I know that all members would agree that that is a matter for an individual member to choose and that a member has a right to represent views in the way that he sees fit.

However, we are all amongst our peers whenever we are in this Chamber and we are perfectly entitled to have opinions on the way in which a member behaves. I believe that we would be remiss in our duty as members of Parliament, representing the people of this State, people from all shades of political opinion, if we did not on occasion take note of the behaviour of a member and at least take the opportunity to make some comment on it. I am referring to the activities of a member who has since been described as 'Dirty Dick', but who I know as the member for Brighton and, on an earlier occasion in this Chamber, he chose to air a matter which he said he regarded with great concern and which he believed was extremely serious. The honourable member also said that he was vitally concerned about the welfare of the children concerned. Curiously enough, Mr Speaker (and I believe you were in the Chamber at that time and heard this statement), the honourable member stated:

Last year a number of constituents came to me and presented me with some samples of literature which they said appalled them

and which they also said had been made available to their children by their schoolteachers.

'Last year' are the words used, yet such was the concern of the honourable member, he was so vitally concerned about this matter and so upset, that he did nothing to make the matter public or to take it to the Minister. One can confirm my latter statement, because the Minister made a subsequent statement thanking the honourable member for letting him know in the House of this grave problem that existed with this corruption—and that is the word—of children's minds under the guise of education. This member was so concerned, yet he had known about it since last year.

As I indicated earlier, members are entitled to have their own opinion about the *bona fides* of members in relation to the matters they raise in this House. I will indicate my opinion of the honourable member and the way in which he raised that matter and about the time lag that he allowed to occur before raising such an important matter. Let no-one gainsay this fact: I believe that every member, except that one member in this House, would be very concerned about the corruption of young children under the guise of education. I believe that, if this matter came to the attention of any member but that one member, they would take energetic steps to do something about it as soon as possible.

**Mr Hemmings:** He was after cheap publicity.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am absolutely certain, as my colleague suggests, that that member was concerned more about the possible publicity in the matter, and one can only assume the salaciousness of the matter, too, because of the manner in which the speech was delivered, and not with what he ought to have been concerned with, which was the welfare of children who may or may not have been at risk, according to what he found out when he reported the matter or took it immediately to the Minister of Education, which is where such a complaint belongs.

Let me state clearly the position that the member was in: he is a member of the Government Party and had extremely easy access to the Minister concerned. It would have been no trouble at all to take that complaint to the Minister. I will do the Minister the credit of saying that, if such a matter had been brought to his attention, the speech that we would have heard from the member for Brighton would have been, 'Last year I had a complaint and last year the Minister fixed it.' Certainly, it would not have been, 'Last year I had a complaint and I have looked into it and I have practised up how to say the words', and a few other matters about which one might conjecture. What the member has demonstrated is that either he is easily duped—and I suggest that he may have been a tool in the matter—or else he had an unhealthy interest in the topic.

**Mr Hemmings:** I'd go for the latter.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I would not go that far, but one must leave it to the honourable member to vindicate himself in that matter, perhaps at a future time when he has the opportunity. I find that—and I use the word that he used—'appalling': it was appalling that he would handle a matter in such a way and that, when young children were at risk in the manner alleged, he did nothing about it except get enough notes together to make what he thought was going to be a humdinger of a speech in this House. The honourable member was not wrong: it was a humdinger, but it was such a humdinger that he has destroyed his credibility probably for aeons with any member on this side as a member of Parliament and as a member of the Party which occupies the Government benches.

I am sorry that the honourable member is not present in the Chamber now. I have no wish to talk behind his back but, doubtless, he will be able to read in *Hansard* what I

have said and, if he has any response, there are avenues which are open to him. In support of what I have said, members need only study the Ministerial statement subsequently made by the Minister in response to the member's raising this matter in the House. The Minister states:

Firstly, I must thank the honourable member for drawing these matters to the attention of the House.

He did not say what he perhaps wanted to say: 'I wish to God he had the decency and the guts to bring it to me when he first heard about it.' However, he also indicated how he believed the matter should be treated when he stated:

I sought an immediate report on the general allegations made by the member, and I now wish to respond.

As soon as the Minister heard about it he got moving, and he was ready to respond within 24 hours at the most. That is how the Minister regarded it, yet the honourable member thought it was something to make cheap publicity out of, and we can make our own judgment about how concerned he was about the corruption of the morals of the children concerned. I wish to say no more about that, because I have expressed how I feel about this matter.

I now wish to return to the area concerning the portfolio for which I have shadow responsibility, which is mines and energy. I spoke earlier about this topic and about how the Government is being forced to crib and fudge in an area where really it has done nothing—it is living on what went before, as I have demonstrated earlier. It is not in a position to do anything about influencing mines and energy development in this State. As reported in the *Sunday Mail* of 9 August, the Premier said:

'South Australia can expect resource development royalties of about \$40 000 000 a year by the middle of the 1980s, the Premier, Mr Tonkin said yesterday. This would be nearly ten times more than the State is getting now.'

At least that part of the statement is accurate, as that is roughly the figure we are getting now. However, one can find it extremely difficult to ascertain the actual royalty figure that is received by the State of South Australia. The Parliamentary Library research service has at my request been endeavouring to obtain the current figure since November 1980, and the library still has not received a response to the request I lodged for the release of the current royalty figures. One can only assume that the Minister of Mines and Energy, who I understand is holding up the release of this information, has something to hide, or he is ashamed or something. What is it? After all, it is not an unreasonable thing to request. They are matters which involve the State, and the money ultimately arrives at the Treasury, so it ought to be disclosed in some way. It does not have a separate line. Therefore, a member asking for information ought reasonably to expect to be able to obtain it. This is not so. I checked an hour or so before making this speech in the faint hope that, allowing for postal delays or whatever, it would finally reach the library. However, it is still not there. I do not want to digress too far from the figure of \$40 000 000 which the Premier was reported as saying that we would receive by the middle of the 1980s. Sir, perhaps you are sitting there bemused as I am, at this wondrous increase in royalty which is to occur.

**Mr Keneally:** Do you think there has been no increase at the moment?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I suspect that, because the figures are not good at the moment. They are not available for public comment and public consumption. The Minister can always cure that by releasing them to me and, if he has a point to make, he will make it. If he has a reason to suppress them, that will be apparent also. Let us not get away from this \$40 000 000 figure. Apparently, from the Premier's arithmetic, which I am prepared to accept as I

do not know the base figure, \$4 000 000 is currently being received. We are going to get \$40 000 000 by the middle of the 1980s. Where will it come from? Will it come from uranium? Mr Deputy Speaker, perhaps you would wish it were so, from the earlier remarks you made in relation to Olympic Dam, but I suspect that this is not possible, for the following reasons. First, the most likely quick uranium prospect in South Australia, I believe, which would be accepted by all parties concerned, would be the Honeymoon prospect, where a leach mining project has received E.I.S. approval, with a number of conditions to which I may refer later, and which is likely to proceed under the following conditions. The source of my information is the Managing Director of C.S.R., the company which proposes to operate that project. As recently as three to four weeks ago, in discussions with that gentleman, I was told that the present proposal was to proceed to set up an operation which will, in the first year of operation, produce 40 to 100 tonnes of slurry—not saleable yellow cake, not a saleable product, not directly, but slurry. The reason why this is to be produced (bearing in mind that this is the end product of a pilot operation, which the same Managing Director told me would take 18 months to two years to set up in that area) is that to put in the additional stages necessary in the project (the drying plant) costs additional money and, perhaps wisely on the part of the company, the proposition is to proceed with a part-pilot scheme which will at least prove the underground operation, the reclamation of the electrolyte containing the dissolved uranium, and part of the above-ground plant which will produce a slurry. At that time, we were told, the additional stage might well be proceeded with.

If one takes into account those time phases it would seem that it is going to be at least to the mid 1980s before we will get a slurry product out of that project for which the return is not likely to increase greatly the \$4 000 000 currently received and thus will not reach the \$40 000 000 figure which has been quoted by the Premier.

Fair enough! What other source have we for obtaining this large increase in royalty? There is the liquids scheme which it is proposed will terminate a 600 to 700-kilometre pipeline at Stony Point and deliver saleable liquid after fractionisation into tankers, and cheques will be received.

The Petroleum Act says that royalty will be payable at 10 per cent of the well-head value of liquids which come under the definition of 'Petroleum'. It would seem that we are talking about something of the order of \$360 000 000 of liquids to be delivered in 1985 through the pipeline from which sum 10 per cent (\$36 000 000) may be added, leaving out all the other complications—is it new oil, is it old oil, do the excise arrangements apply, and so on? I am being very generous in this, because some of the oil which may be concerned has been in wells and holes for quite some time, where gas has also resided, and it was left there because to recover the gas earlier would have meant the loss of the liquids, which represent a valuable asset to the State. I do not quarrel with that. If this is the case, we are going to be in a position apparently to get this kind of revenue. How will that happen?

I have been told by Santos, as recently as one week ago, that the construction of the jetty, the berth for loading the tanker, might take two and a half years from the time of commencement of construction and that in the interim the pipeline, if it can be constructed before that time, might be used, and an attempt will be made to use the field tankers with an interim submersible pipe arrangement before the berth is completed. So, it is feasible that some liquid may be delivered at that time. One assumes that constructing a fractionisation plant and turning it on does not give any problems, and I would think that the history

of these matters shows that some problems often arise in the commissioning of such plants and that perhaps the most generous opinion on that matter that one might take is that perhaps it might be three years before worthwhile liquids are available for sale in bulk in such a way as to generate \$36 000 000 in royalty. I am not opposed to the State's gaining royalty, nor is my Party. If one examines the South Australian Oil and Gas Corporation Act and so on, one can see that all along the Labor Party has been most concerned to see that a proper return for the people of this State is obtained from the exploitation of resources beneath the surface of the State, which belongs to the people of the State and not to the exploiters in the first instance.

Exploiters are entitled to a return on their money if they are prepared to do the finding and to do the work involved in getting those commodities above the ground and into marketable form. My quarrel is not with the fact that the State may get royalties; my quarrel is with that fact that the Premier seems to be anticipating somewhat that fact, which may well be what occurs at a later date.

So, once again we are left with the query in our minds about whether the present Government is so barren of achievement in its own right that it is forced into a position where constantly it is cribbing and trying to claim achievements which were made possible by its predecessor, the State Labor Government in South Australia, and which have come to fruition. That is what is going on. One can say that a Government in that position is in a fairly poor state. There is no pun intended in respect of the word 'state'. It is a comment on the condition of the Government Party and not necessarily on the condition of the people of South Australia. So much for that class of announcement.

Governments are not the only organisations in society that are wont to make optimistic statements, to claim credit for work done by predecessors, and so on. A recent news release in the State by the same organisation as I mentioned earlier, C.S.R. Ltd, on Wednesday 22 July this year referred to the existence of brown coal suitable for electricity generation in the Mannum area, east of Adelaide. The release begins:

Adelaide, Wednesday 22 July 1981. C.S.R. Ltd has established the existence of deposits of brown coal suitable for electricity generation in the Mannum area, east of Adelaide.

Of course, it was the subject of some comment that afternoon by the Minister of Mines and Energy as though he had personally drilled the holes and, secondly, I believe, it triggered off that amazing outburst from the Minister of Education, who explained to us what had happened in the coal mining industry in the United Kingdom over 200 or 300 years and pointed out that it was not all that good.

I only wished that he had listened to members on his side over a long period of time, because we had been saying such things. In fact, as the honourable member for Stuart has often pointed out, the coal industry as a whole became nasty only when the bigger profits appeared in the offing in relation to handling other nasty commodities or even nastier ones, such as uranium.

The statement says that drilling to date has outlined 212 000 000 tonnes of measured and indicated reserves of brown coal in the Sedan and Anna deposits. I do not quarrel with that statement: I am not in a position to. One can believe that drilling programmes have been carried out and assessments made indicating reserves of that nature.

I suggest that C.S.R. may just have had in mind announcements by Western Mining in regard to the Kingston deposits and may have had in mind that now is the time to stake a claim for future goodies that may be in the offing, such as the construction of a power station close to or on a coal field wherein, in fairness, a number of difficulties are solved for two parties in such an arrangement.

First, transport costs for the miner are taken care of and also access and availability of combustible material for the generation of electricity are tied up in a neat package for a utility such as ETSA. My understanding of the real facts relating to that announcement is that coal of that nature is usually better than Wakefield coal but not as good as the standard of coal coming from New South Wales, although South Australia has learnt to cope with such as is burnt in northern power stations, such as Leigh Creek coal. It is below that standard but apparently better than the standard of Wakefield coal. I understand that the deposit in the Mannum area has been known for quite a long time.

The announcement by C.S.R. that it had established existence of deposits would seem somewhat superfluous. It seems fair that they may say that they outlined 212 000 000 tonnes, because the information I have obtained indicates that the size of the reserves was not known in the quantity now available according to the release. I understand also that an evaluation of that coal has been done by ETSA. Let me hasten to assure honourable members that I am not using any leaked document at the moment, which would suggest that these facts are fairly common knowledge. The evaluation by ETSA to date is that what it terms unit costs for generation of the electricity unit concern is such that it would be a very expensive proposition. This refers to the quality of the coal, getting it out of the ground, and so on, and making it available at a price which is not all that competitive with that for the Wakefield deposit.

Wakefield deposits are very much larger, as already proven by drilling programmes. They are of the order of 2 000 000 000 tonnes as distinct from 212 000 000 tonnes. I will now quote from a leaked document. Apparently ETSA has given some consideration to the usage of Wakefield coal, because in schedule one, which is an attachment to a departmental letter to the General Manager of the trust dated 1 April 1981, is a table which states the year in the left-hand column, followed by a generation column in thousands of megawatt hours, the projected sales figures to ETSA consumers for the year under consideration and, finally, the plant programme is the last column. Listed under the base installed section of the plant programme for the year 1990-91 are the words, 'Wakefield, 250 megawatts 1; 1991-92, Wakefield 250 megawatts 2. It continues on up to 1994-95, 'Wakefield No. 4, 250 megawatts 4'.

Clearly, on 1 April 1981, ETSA was committed to a programme that follows directly on the completion (and I am referring to the same column) of the northern power station, 250 megawatts 1 and 2 listed for completion in 1984-85, 1985-86, followed by a third northern power station 250 megawatts generator No. 3 listed for completion in 1988-89. This latter one you may remember, Sir, was elicited from the Premier only a week or so ago in answer to a question that I raised with him when he pointed out to the House that it was not yet announced publicly but that a third generating unit was now mooted to join the other two currently under construction as additions at Port Augusta to the northern power station.

It would seem that at least to the end of this decade and into the next one ETSA is committed to further construction of a total of 1 000 megawatts in four separate 250-megawatt stations on a site associated with Wakefield coal.

I have said earlier that there has been an attempt by the Government in some way to suggest that mining and activity associated with mining is the salvation of South Australia and that all we have to do is issue a lot of exploration licences and all will be well with employment and prosperity in this State. Research that I have had done in the Parliamentary Library by the excellent people there who pander to our wishes tends to show that something other than what

the Government claims is really what happens in these matters.

If one looks at tables showing figures for mining and employment for the States of South Australia, Western Australia and Queensland, the latter two States being chosen as two areas of known frenzied mineral activity and therefore reasonable yardsticks to go by for a comparison with South Australia, perhaps one may find the truth of the matter, which is not that being purveyed by the Government. An examination of those tables reveals that between the years 1972-73 and 1978-79 in Western Australia employment in mining increased from 12 000 people to 13 796. Also, one finds that the fixed capital expenditure in that time increased from \$87 785 000 to \$337 736 000. An equivalent scan of the table for Queensland reveals figures not exactly the same, but certainly of that same order, and for South Australia it gives the following figures: in 1972-73 employment was 2 550 and in 1978-79 the figure was 2 834. Capital figures respectively for the earlier year and the later year were \$16 062 000 and \$31 786 000.

I have not attempted to have the tables incorporated in *Hansard* because I do not want to unnecessarily clutter up *Hansard*, but the figures are available to anyone in the Parliamentary Library. A number of comments follow those figures. In terms of turnover, the mining industries in Queensland and Western Australia are seven and eight times larger than the South Australian industry. In terms of fixed capital expenditure per year, they are ten times larger, yet the employment figures show that only 13 796 people are currently employed in Western Australia and 15 924 in Queensland. Therefore, if the South Australian mining industry was to expand by 800 to 1 000 per cent only, another 10 000 jobs could be expected, with that enormous expansion.

Furthermore, if one examines the figures I have quoted, it is noticeable that mining employment in Queensland and Western Australia has been static or even declining for some years. The figures I refer to are available in the Parliamentary Library and are from reputable authorities such as the Australian Bureau of Statistics. A second factor worth noting, Sir (I am sure you would have an understanding in this area as a person who has had to consider these sorts of things in your own enterprise), is the large amount of capital expenditure required to create jobs in mining. In Western Australia, since 1972 new fixed capital expenditure has amounted to \$1.3 billion. During the same period the mining work force has expanded by only 1 795. Therefore, for every job created during that period, \$715 000 has been spent.

Some estimates are even higher. In Queensland the figures are \$1.1 billion fixed capital expenditure and \$667 000 per job for the same period. The Commonwealth Department of Commerce and Industry estimated that a projected investment of \$7.6 billion would provide only 6 700 jobs, which is more than \$1 000 000 per job.

The argument is generally raised at this point that jobs in mining create jobs elsewhere because of the so-called multiplier effect. There is no general agreement among economists about what that multiplier ought to be. In a recent book, Barry Hughes, a South Australian economist, said that the mining multiplier is about four, which would mean, in terms of Roxby Downs when it is in full production, that South Australia could expect only another 8 800 jobs by the multiplier effect which would be provided over the length of time the project took to reach full development; say, five years at the very least.

If the South Australian economy is to be restored to its pre-slump conditions, about 10 000 jobs per year will have to be created just to keep up with the necessary annual job creation figures taken from the average annual increase



that has applied over the past 12 years, irrespective of which Party has been in Government. One can realise that we would not even be holding our own against the tide on the basis of those figures.

If one looks at unemployment in South Australia, Queensland and Western Australia, one finds that if one takes the last 105 months up to the time of the figures I have given, South Australia had a higher unemployment rate than did Queensland for 55 months and a lower one than Queensland for the other 50. Regarding Western Australia, the figures show South Australia higher for 58 months and lower for 47 months. I have had to use C.E.S. figures here because it is possible to use a longer time series and because of the unreliability of A.B.S. figures for the smaller States. No-one, especially anyone on the other side of the House, would argue that Queensland and Western Australia have not experienced a mining boom, yet they have performed little better than South Australia in terms of unemployment.

**The Hon. D. C. Brown:** There has been a substantial migration into Western Australia. If one looks at the migration figures, those figures more than account for the reason why their unemployment has remained the same.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am talking not about the percentage figures, but about the actual jobs created by the mining sector. If the Minister had been here earlier he would not have needed that little correction that I had to give him, so that he does not get carried away while he is signing documents or whatever he is handling. What conclusions can we draw from all this? I believe these are valid ones: mining is not a large-scale employer of labour. Only 60 000 people were employed in mining in the whole of Australia last year. Let any member gainsay those figures, which are available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Sixty thousand is not a tremendous work force!

**Mr Ashenden:** What about the support industries like those at Mount Isa and Broken Hill? Don't they count?

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** There we are! The member concerned raised the question about the ancillary and the small industries which are the back-up. If he had done me the courtesy of listening he would have heard the discussion that has already gone on about the multiplier effect. It is of no greater factor than four, which figure is generally accepted as applying in these matters. No-one knows for sure, but this is a figure that is generally accepted in these matters by economists.

If the honourable member will go back to playing with his little kiddy cars, where he is best employed, we may be able to make some progress. The damaging conclusion that follows is that Queensland and Western Australia had similar levels of unemployment to those in South Australia, despite the so-called mining boom. That is quite a fair conclusion from the figures available.

This may be a bitter pill to swallow for members opposite and perhaps even for you, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I point out that in recent years the growth in public sector employment in the three smaller States has been the significant factor in providing employment in those States. The figures to substantiate this are also readily available in respect of Western Australia, which had the largest increase in public sector employment. My source for these figures once again is the Australian Bureau of Statistics: the figures are available for all to peruse. So much for the so-called mining boom prosperity band waggon! The present Government suggests that all we have to do is get on that band waggon and all will be well in this State. I am almost tempted to say that I wish it were true because, if that was the case, it would be helpful, but that is not the case.

The member for Morphett interjected earlier and has now had the sense to bail out, because he probably thought

it was about time I responded to his interjection. He tried to show in a completely phoney way that during the 1970s, the period of the Dunstan Labor Government, there was low activity in the mining area in South Australia only—nowhere else in the world. He stated that that proved that the Labor Party did not handle things well and had not done its job. I would like to quote from *Johnny Green's Journal*, which is a fairly august journal about mining, people, places, training, employment, money, products, firms, and issues. It is published by no less a body than the South Australian Chamber of Mines Incorporated, a body that I do not believe has ever been claimed to have any affiliation with the Labor Party in South Australia. No less an authority than Sir Arvi Parbo, in the July issue of that journal and in regard to this very matter, stated:

After a pause in new developments—

note the following words—

during the world-wide economic recession in the 1970s—

and he was speaking of the Australian scene and, of course, South Australia is concerned in that—

it now looks as if the 1980s will be another active decade.

There is recognition from no less an authority than Sir Arvi Parbo that these things are somewhat cyclic in manner and that the reason for the down-turn in the 1970s was the lower prices in the metals market. Who would argue with that? Does the member for Morphett expect companies to expend capital and throw shareholders' money and dividend money away on exploration and so on when metal prices are low? Does he argue that that is good business practice or good commercial and industrial practice? Of course it is not. I do not suggest that those firms are not equipped with intelligent men, such as Sir Arvi Parbo, who will make the necessary decisions in the light of the climate in which they have to operate. That is the reason for the down-turn.

If the member for Morphett does not believe me, I suggest he look at the annual report of the Department of Mines and Energy. Perhaps he does not want to take Sir Arvi's word: the honourable member may be prepared to believe what is printed in the annual report of the Department of Mines and Energy, which states, in not dissimilar words, the very same thing—that depressed markets, lower prices for metals and so on led to a general down-turn in world activity. It had nothing to do with the activities of the Dunstan Labor Government. As I have shown already, this Government has not done a damn thing in the minerals and energy areas that has contributed to the increased activity that is now becoming apparent world wide, not only in South Australia.

The honourable member is still indicating some disbelief. Perhaps I should quote from another authority to illustrate to him that it is time he woke up and learned how these matters go. One finds very strange, from the gestures and indications of disbelief from a member who was allegedly involved in the automobile industry in this State, that that honourable member does not understand such terms as market demand, prices paid by customers, and so on.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Fancy the honourable member suggesting, as I believe he just did, that the automobile industry is a leader and is clued up in this area, when General Motors and other firms of long standing made some of the greatest boo-boos in the history of transportation in the past 10 years in the United States, the home of the automobile. If I were the honourable member, I would shut up for about five years, not say a word, and hope it would all go away. Surely he is not suggesting that the automobile industry should be seen as a guide to how the mining industry should operate. If they operated that way they would have gone broke long ago.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** And been buried, probably in their own mining ventures. A person such as yourself, Mr Deputy Speaker, who is involved in primary industry would not fall for the sorts of traps which occurred in the United States and which should have been foreseen. The automobile makers began to sell people cars that they told the people they should have, not the cars that the people wanted. The people were told, 'You should have this kind of car.' No market research or anything else was done.

I have shown, from *Johnny Green's Journal*, that Sir Arvi Parbo is not in the category of the member for Todd: Sir Arvi has a brain, and he pointed out there was a world down-turn because prices had fallen. Does the honourable member suggest that to flog G.M.H. cars (or whatever model with which he was involved) they should be manufactured when they cost more than the selling price? Is that what the honourable member suggests? A person who is skilled in the area, with an international reputation in mining, has clearly referred to a pause in new developments during the world-wide recession of the 1970s.

Is the honourable member suggesting that in some way South Australia is not in the world and that we can operate totally divorced from the world? Clearly, on reflection, when the honourable member calms down, I am sure he will see, as you, Mr Deputy Speaker, have seen, that the kinds of principles that apply in primary industry can be repeated in the automobile industry and have application in the mining industry. One must have regard to demand. You, Sir, would not buy 50 000 sheep if sheep were a glut on the market. I am absolutely certain of that. A mining company, involved at a time when metal prices are down, will not pay out half of its income on exploration. The companies must tell the shareholders what is being done with their money. Cautiousness was displayed all over the world. This was mirrored and repeated in South Australia. The Government should be honest, at least in that area, and have the decency and the guts to say that what happened in the 1970s was no-one's fault, certainly not the Government's fault. If the honourable member is still not convinced, I refer him to the annual report of the Department of Mines and Energy, which will clearly show him, by way of a table, the way in which—

**Mr Ashenden:** Tell us about world demand for uranium in the 1970s.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections across the Chamber.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** Now that there is a lull in interjections I am sure the member for Newland, with his analytical ability, will be able to show the colleague on his left the tables that are available in the report (not in any commercial publication). For some reason or other the mention of Sir Arvi Parbo has upset the honourable member terribly.

I thought the honourable member would have been willing to accept the word of Sir Arvi; that is why I brought him into the matter. I apologise. I will take Sir Arvi out and introduce an official Government publication. Maybe that will convince the honourable member. If he refers to this current report at page 23 (and it is available in the Library) he will see, in relation to expenditure on petroleum exploration, that in the on-shore area the very picture I have endeavoured to present to him, supported by the word of Sir Arvi Parbo, is available for all to see. It is shown in simple graph form. There are columns, so it does not take a great deal of understanding. There are tall ones for years of high activity and short ones when things were not very lively. If we look at that table we see it describes a curve. From my experience in electronics I would say it bears a rough resemblance to a sine wave. Will the honourable

member accept the words of the Department of Mines and Energy on these matters that I have done my best to get over to him?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections. The honourable member for Mitchell has the floor and has two minutes to go.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** There was a worldwide cyclic downturn in mining activity because the market was poor. You know that, Sir, and I would have thought a person in the automobile industry would have known about it, but obviously the honourable member does not.

**Mr Ashenden:** Tell us about uranium.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** The honourable member wants me to return to uranium. I would not have thought he would want me to repeat the curious remarks you made on this subject earlier, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Repetition is out of order.

**The Hon. R. G. PAYNE:** I am glad you said that, Sir, because I was about to point out that I would have to transgress in order to do that, to point out that you said, Sir, that you were worried about safety in this matter. I was surprised at that, because the Deputy Premier has been assuring us for nearly two years that all is apples in that area, that there is no need to worry about it. Yet, only today, Sir, in your speech, which I thought was a good speech, you said you had reservations about safety in this area and that we had to get into the act in order to get some control in this area. I cannot convince the honourable member opposite, so I conclude on the note that the Government has to get weaving and do something instead of trying to live on the credit in this area which was created by the previous Government in South Australia headed by Don Dunstan and, latterly, by the Hon. Des Corcoran.

**Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson):** I support the motion. In so doing I wish, first, to convey and express my personal sympathy to Lady Playford and members of the Playford family and to endorse the many words of praise and admiration extended to the late Sir Thomas Playford, whom we must regard as being one of the foremost South Australians ever to grace our land. Sir Thomas was obviously a man who had great dedication to this State and, in the words of Don Dunstan, he was also a man who was prepared to give advice to someone of opposite political persuasion to his own in order to promote the wellbeing of South Australia. Truly we, as young politicians, should look upon Sir Thomas's attitude and dedication towards South Australia and try to exemplify the same attitude.

I sincerely hope that the Opposition will take a positive approach to promoting South Australia rather than promoting the gloom that we have heard in this House over the past two years, and particularly that we heard when the Leader came back from his overseas tour and immediately said that there was no future ahead of us. We heard nothing but gloom from the Leader. Thank goodness we have heard a slight change in that attitude since that time. It has become patently obvious from the hollow rhetoric we have heard from the Opposition side during this Address in Reply debate that the Opposition is still smarting from the electoral loss it suffered in 1979 because at that time the Opposition indicated quite categorically to the electorate that it had let the needs of the little man, the working man, down.

The Labor Party, since its earliest formation, has relied upon rhetoric to fabricate a class cleavage in an Australian society which was then, and is now, an egalitarian society. There has also been a rhetorical attempt to imply that the 'masses', as they were called then, and which are often

referred to today as the 'working class', must vote Labor—that is, because one is branded as a working-class man one must vote Labor. What a false syllogism.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** It is not a syllogism at all.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** It is a syllogism. You are trying to imply that one thing leads to another, so therefore the conclusion is that they must vote Labor. What an absolute syllogism.

**The Hon. D. J. Hopgood:** Go back to the university.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I suggest that the debate taking place across the Chamber could be carried on on a later occasion.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. Fortunately for the well being of Australians, and particularly South Australians, many of these working class people, if one wants to use that label, have been prepared to cross this mythical class barrier and vote for the only poll that counts, the poll at the election. They have chosen, over the years, the Party they have seen as the most effective Party to rule this country and, particularly, this State.

It is also quite evident, from repeated elections since 1975, and from the September 1979 election, that people have quite clearly seen the strangling effect that the left has upon the A.L.P. here in Australia and particularly in South Australia. The A.L.P. left has strangled South Australian development to such an extent that by the time we took office it had become patently obvious to all and sundry throughout South Australia that there was no future under the South Australian Labor Party as we knew it then. Since that time there has been a great endeavour by the Labor Party to try to promote a moderate (and I repeat 'moderate') approach to the electorate. This, Sir, I class as being nothing more than an absolute con job on the electorate. One knows how desperately the Labor Party is endeavouring to woo the electorate, and this whole wooing process can be seen in the change in appearances on the opposite side. We have suddenly seen the member for Elizabeth turning up in the House with short back and sides and a nice tie. No longer do we see the jeans and ragamuffin clothes we saw a few years ago. We have even had a new approach by the Leader himself, as we saw in a *Sunday Mail* article some time back, when in the middle of the summer he was prepared to wear nice suits on a hot day; he was branded by the papers as being rather conservative in his dress approach and quite a contrast to his predecessor.

I think it more pertinent that I refer to an article which appeared in the *Bulletin* dated 28 July 1981 in which there appeared a good feature article addressing itself to how the left is winning A.L.P. numbers. It is important to note that the first point made in relation to the Federal Leader of the Opposition refers to his engineering of the Queensland intervention, that is, in the Queensland A.L.P. branch. It refers to how these strategies have advanced the militant socialist left of the A.L.P. We saw the same thing happen in Tasmania many years ago. Consequently, we now have a Senator, Senator Harradine, standing as an Independent because of the move by the Federal A.L.P. at that time to try to gain control of the Tasmanian A.L.P. Also, and this is particularly evident later on (and I will make a few more comments about it), it points out that the socialist objective has been a factor of the platform of the A.L.P. since it was first introduced back in 1921 and that this is a platform they cannot change no matter what they try to do and no matter what words they use to try to indicate that the platform is no longer as blatantly socialist as it was then. Also, it points out that since the defeat of the Corcoran Government in South Australia there have been some truly amazing machine ineptitudes due to the socialist left in what was formerly regarded as a fairly right-wing State. Obviously, the control Mr Dunstan once had over the Party

machine is rapidly being lost by the present Leader, who no longer has that control. I will come to that point a little later.

Another point in the article is that the gentleman who is referred to as Mr Duncan (we refer to him, so that we do not impute any disrespect towards him, as the honourable member for Elizabeth) is regarded as being a leading member of the young militant left. The actions of this young militant were so great that he had himself elected, against the tradition of the South Australian A.L.P., to the Federal Executive. Importantly, although there was to be some change at a later stage he was able to keep himself in that position long enough to attend the Federal conference, about which we have heard so much in recent weeks. It was important that he stay in that position because he was able to give support and strength to the South Australian motion which sought the socialist objective at Federal level. It is to be noted that at that conference the thrust by the South Australian A.L.P. was thwarted by the more moderate elements interstate.

The article also points out that Tasmania is regarded as being a very left wing or socialist left stronghold, so this great move or surge to the left is occurring right across the spectrum of Australia. The fact that the motion succeeded in this State also represents a victory of great significance to the socialist left in South Australia. It is now a nationally organised force in Labor Party politics. It is interesting to note the statement in that article that, even among Parliamentary members, the left wing is so organised that members get together and have regular meetings. Finally, the article points out that in New South Wales where the left is not quite as strong, significant moves are being made by the left through minor organisations such as the Labor Women's Committee.

*Mr Trainer interjecting:*

**Mr SCHMIDT:** It is interesting that the member for Ascot Park is interjecting because he made the great play of quoting this article some time back. Lo and behold he did not quote the part about the A.L.P. because it was too embarrassing for him as a member of the State Party. The important thing is that in this endeavour to try to create a new image for the electorate, or to try to con the electorate, Mr Hayden in 1967 described himself as being a social democrat. All of a sudden, for expediency he is now a democratic socialist. That is a slight change in terminology, and no doubt there is very little difference in the basis behind it. It is there to try to persuade the electorate that the Labor Party has changed its stripes. However, a leopard or a tiger can never change its spots or stripes, and members opposite know that to be true.

It is also quite pertinent and obvious that in the past the actions taken in this place by the former State A.L.P. Government have been no different from the attitudes of the Federal Opposition Leader, Mr Hayden, whose own policy is stated in this article, as preferring the idea of developing State enterprises in competition with private enterprise. That is his method of nationalising industry, rather than trying to do it through legal or constitutional mechanisms, a process which he realises would be rather difficult for him to achieve. The best way to do it is by subterfuge, and that is by setting up another industry in opposition to private enterprise.

We saw a lot of this occur during the former Government's time in office. I can give a classic example of that by looking at some of the things it tried to develop. One was the Land Commission which was set up initially as a land bank but which turned out to be a developer of great magnitude. It was in great competition with private developers. Its purpose was to nationalise the whole industry as

such. It cost taxpayers millions of dollars, and we are still paying for the debts incurred by the Land Commission.

Another very good example is the Housing Trust, which we know was initially set up to provide welfare housing. The former Government, in direct competition with private enterprise, put trust homes on the open market for those people who could raise bank finance. Surely we cannot class that as welfare housing. If people have the ability to raise bank finance, they should have the ability to buy private housing. It is also a well known factor—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Randall):** Order! Interjections are out of order. The member for Mawson has the call.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Another example is the Frozen Food Factory, which has cost this State about \$10 000 000. I also refer to the Riverland Cannery. Surely any enterprise that would buy secondhand machinery to set itself up should have its whole process of administration re-examined. That in itself has cost the taxpayer millions of dollars. We can also look at Samcor, which has cost this State about \$23 000 000. Monarto has also cost us some \$23 000 000. In total, this Government has inherited from the former Administration debts to the value of about \$200 000 000. Surely this amounts to a little con trick by the A.L.P. platform to try to nationalise whatever it can through subterfuge, and we will not stand for it.

**Mr O'Neill:** Don't talk rubbish. You can't nationalise anything in this country.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** That is correct, because the Constitution protects us from that. That is why a person like Mr Hayden tries to do it through the subtle means of competing with private enterprise, because he knows that he cannot do it through the Constitution. He will try to get around the constitution and negate all the tradition we have through the Constitution to attempt to achieve his own ends. During all this time, whilst our erstwhile opponents were trying to set up these great monoliths to socialist glory, they allowed many other things in our community to run down.

A prime example of an area that was allowed to run down is the prison area. The problems that have been inherited in that area can only be due to the fact that previous Governments, particularly over the past 10 years, allowed that whole area to run down to bare bottom. We saw very little done about the Murray River in the time that members opposite were in office. They did not take a skerrick in their time in office towards water filtration in the North. It would not touch it with a barge pole. Although a very similar incident to that which recurred recently occurred there in the early 1970s, Mr Dunstan did not take any steps to provide water filtration after that incident. It has been some seven years since then, and there has been another incident owing to the rather dry summer we experienced. We heard great cries of disaster from the Opposition who said that something should be done about it, yet its members did absolutely nothing about it themselves.

The member for Salisbury said that, in relation to education, an allocation should be made to at least meet the inflation rate. Yet we did not see that occur in the latter years of the former Administration. In the last few years of the former Government's office it did not once meet the inflation rate. This Government has been saddled with a number of legacies, yet we have made progress despite the Opposition's rhetoric which we know is there only to try to con the electorate.

The Opposition must surely look at its recent convention and be somewhat embarrassed at what occurred. The national leader of the Party pointed out categorically that there were great dangers in applying a blanket socialisation policy across the A.L.P. throughout Australia. For that

reason, a very heavy campaign was lobbied to try to defeat the South Australian motion which said that the socialisation element should remain. We know that the Federal body lobbied very strongly to include at the end of the motion the words 'socialisation to the extent necessary'. The cartoon which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 28 July was very apt.

**Mr Becker:** Put it in *Hansard*.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** It would be good if we could put it in *Hansard*. The cartoonist, Mr Hayden, said that it is necessary to include these words at the end of the motion to put the point of wanting to win votes. What a con! How sincere are members opposite in their policy when that policy is there for the purpose of trying to con the electorate by saying, 'Let us make this platform not so socialist. It is too difficult, too hot for us to handle. Let us tone it down and make it look more moderate, going back to the concept of Tweedle Dum and Tweedle Dee that if the people out there think there is no difference between us and the others, then we stand a good chance of being voted back in at the next election'.

It is pertinent to point out a comment made by none other than the then President of the State A.L.P. branch, the Hon. Barbara Wiese, speaking at a luncheon at Flinders University on 2 April of this year. She was addressing a Young Labor luncheon, and she said:

The forthcoming convention will change the wording of the platform to sound less socialist—

and it is important to repeat that—

to sound less socialist—

and this is even more interesting—

because the community is not yet ready for the socialist platform of the A.L.P.

That is what they are trying to cover up by changing their policy platform. I repeat the words of the then President, Hon. Barbara Wiese: the community is not yet ready for the socialist platform of the A.L.P. When she was further questioned as to her personal views, she said that she would like to see State control of the railways. How ironic is that! Only a few years ago, we had her colleague, Don Dunstan, selling off the railways to the Commonwealth, and now she is saying that there should be State control over the railways. She wants it both ways.

The most important comment she made at the luncheon was in relation to the fact that she thinks there should be State control of the banks. We recall the furore that arose throughout the whole of Australia back in the late 1940s when the then Labor Government introduced the idea of trying to nationalise the banks. Now she is advocating the same thing. Where has the A.L.P. changed in all these years?

**An honourable member:** When is the next League of Rights meeting?

**Mr SCHMIDT:** It has nothing to do with the League of Rights. That was the comment of a member of the honourable member's own Party.

**Mr O'Neill:** What's your ticket number?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr SCHMIDT:** The honourable member should recall what his own Party is saying. They are trying to con the electorate by saying that the socialist platform of the A.L.P. cannot be presented because the electorate is not yet ready. What can we expect of a Party that will change its policy to make it look more moderate? The only conclusion is that it is trying to con the electorate.

**Mr Langley:** And we'll con them well, like you did.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** My oath, you will con them. It is little wonder that we have seen headlines of the type we have seen of late, especially in South Australia, where we have

this tremendous rift now occurring between the so-called 'con-moderates' and those who are true to the ideology of their Party, such as the member for Elizabeth, as we have seen recently in the papers. The headlines plastered around portrayed to an alarming extent what are the factions within the A.L.P. Obviously the member for Elizabeth, the only person who is prepared to support the ideology of his Party, is not receiving the support he should be getting from his counterparts.

**Mr Langley:** Are you on the side of the member for Elizabeth?

**Mr SCHMIDT:** He is the only person on the other side who is prepared to stand up for the ideology and beliefs that he holds. No-one else on that side is prepared to stand up for the true ideology which they purport to support. They are changing the policy, and trying to use moderate terms and nice images to woo the electorate. As soon as one of their members says that he believes in their ideology, he is ostracised by the rest of the Caucus. He is justified in claiming the treachery of his Leader when he said that the Leader had done him an injustice by not allowing the vote to go back to the State Conference, because it was at the State Conference that the member for Elizabeth got his support. There he got it from the rank and file, and he could not have a dirty deal done on him by the executive. That was a prime example of the executive's stabbing him in the back because he stood up for his beliefs. I think the important comment to which I should refer in the newspaper report about Mr Bannon's resignation from the so-called shadow Cabinet—

**Mr O'Neill:** Mr Duncan—wrong again.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I did not want to use his name. I have to refer to him as the member for Elizabeth.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members opposite are not helping the debate in any way.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** I will quote from the *News* of Thursday 13 August his concluding comments as follows:

On reflection, I could see no alternative, given the breakdown of trust between us—

referring to himself and the Leader—

and the lack of propriety on his part—

The member for Elizabeth said that he had no alternative but to resign. He branded his own Leader as a person lacking propriety, and I brand the Deputy Leader as a person lacking propriety, as I do the Leader in New South Wales, Mr Wran. They lack propriety for the comment they made after the London riots to the effect that one day we will see this happen in Australia. Mr Wran, at the A.L.P. Convention, said that he drew a parallel between the recent British riots and the possible disruptive effect which we could see here in Australia.

That reminds me of an incident that occurred not long ago, in 1975, when Mr Whitlam was seen to do the same thing. He was painted against the wall because he had made a number of political manoeuvres which had backfired on him, as had his poor leadership. He relied on trying to generate fear, animosity and anarchy within society by using terms such as, 'Kerr's cur', and other such terms, for one purpose only: to try to incite riot in Australia and to justify the fact that he should be kept in office. It was the Australian electors who would not be conned by such a manoeuvre and who pointed out to Mr Whitlam in no uncertain terms what they thought of the time he was in office and his tactics.

We are seeing similar tactics being used now by Mr Wran and by the Deputy Leader in South Australia in trying to draw a parallel between the London problem and what could happen in Australia. That reminds me of a play. Obviously members opposite would not know it, because it

was written in German, and not many of them can read German. It was written by Max Frisch, and entitled *Andora*. Members opposite have always supported the arts, so they would not knock a good play. It gives an example of what can happen to a person if one tries to perpetrate an idea on a person long enough to convince him in the end that he is what you make him out to be, when in fact he is not.

In this case, he was in a small town called Andorra. The townspeople there tried to convince that person that he was of Jewish extraction and, in the end, they convinced him so thoroughly that he committed suicide because he could not live with the comments and jibes pushed on him by members of that community. Those are exactly the same sort of tactics being used by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and by Mr Wran when they try to incite people in the community to say, 'Look at the problems in London. They are due to unemployment, so you people, who are unemployed, make sure you do the same thing.' That is what members opposite are trying to do—they are trying to promote anarchy through such subtle means. That sort of attitude is deplorable—that we should put such thoughts into the minds of young persons in our society.

In this debate this afternoon we heard many comments from members opposite, notably from the member for Florey, about the fact that we as the State Liberal Party told the people only last year that they should vote for a Federal Liberal Government. The honourable member forgets (and this was supposed to be in relation to interest rates and the like) that in 1975, midway through the year, Mr Dunstan said, 'Whatever you do, do not align me with the Federal A.L.P. Do not align me with Mr Whitlam. That guy is making so many blunders that I do not want to be part of it.' That is how he won the election in South Australia in 1975—by disassociating himself from Mr Whitlam, because he well knew that what Mr Whitlam was doing was crippling this country and this State. He wanted nothing to do with it, yet only a few months later, during the December 1975 elections, Mr Dunstan went out campaigning for the A.L.P. saying, 'Look how good Mr Whitlam is; make sure you vote for him.' What absolute hypocrisy!

We heard from the ertswhile member opposite, who is never in the House, the member for Albert Park, about increased charges in South Australia. However, quite conveniently the honourable member forgets about the sort of things that Mr Dunstan did. I refer to a newspaper report of 18 June 1976 stating that Mr Dunstan intended to increase motor vehicle registration fees by 25 per cent and drivers licence fees by \$1. Also, on 19 June 1976 Mr Dunstan—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr SCHMIDT:** Members opposite are so embarrassed by this that they do not want to listen. Mr Dunstan said, 'No, I will not increase or raise State taxes, but I shall increase State charges.' He said that water and sewerage rates would go up, and then he said that water and sewerage rates would increase over the next five years, and that that was necessary because of the economics of the undertakings that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had taken on board.

In the *Advertiser* of 11 June 1976 Mr Dunstan attacked Mr Fraser for cutting back on the Budget, saying that Mr Fraser's tactics would create massive unemployment. What have we seen since that time? From the high unemployment created in 1975 by Mr Whitlam there has been a steady decline in unemployment, and there is now only 5.6 per cent unemployment nationally. That shows what a false prophet of doom Mr Dunstan was when he said that these cutbacks would create higher unemployment.

He referred to other factors when he came out of the Premiers' Conference in 1976. He said he would have to look through the Loan programme and that the axe would have to fall. There was no comment or criticism about that. Members opposite were sitting on Government benches then, but they had no opposition to that. Whatever their god (Mr Dunstan) said, it was okay with them. But when someone else has to increase charges, it is the wrong thing to do. In the same *Advertiser* article of 11 June 1976 Mr Dunstan said that he would cut education. There was no comment or opposition from the member for Ascot Park. He was a teacher then, but I do not recall any massive campaigns undertaken by the Teachers Union.

**Mr Trainer:** I was not here then. You referred to 'members opposite'.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** You were not there—they had better members then. Even the better members were not prepared to make any comment about it, because they could see that it was necessary at that time. There were massive education cuts in the four years from 1976, but we did not see any opposition or campaigns criticising Mr Dunstan for his cuts in education. Now, suddenly the Labor Party again (and we saw this last year in the mammoth campaign on its behalf in this House) is promoting the rhetoric of the 3 per cent cuts, yet there were no cuts at all in education last year.

I wish now to refer to the comment made by the member for Napier, who said that this Government had taken no action in trying to provide accommodation for teenagers. I agree with the honourable member that there is no simple and immediate solution to the problem of housing young teenagers, but it was a deliberately inaccurate statement on his behalf to say that the Government had done absolutely nothing about teenage accommodation.

I point out for the benefit of the House a number of actions that this Government has taken in this respect. First, the Housing Trust has agreed to make available up to 50 houses (and members have heard this mentioned already from time to time) which will be leased or owned by the trust for minimally supervised shelters for eligible use. We need supervisors who are able to be incorporated in these houses and who can give the supervision that is required for these youths. The trust has written to 30 organisations involved with young people asking whether they would be interested in leasing houses from the trust for youths under 18 years of age. In my electorate two such houses are provided for teenagers, despite the fact that in previous years there were attempts to obtain houses in the district of the member for Baudin and those houses were not supplied. In the past 12 months two houses were set up in my district, one in Reynella and one in Morphett Vale, and they are successful.

As at 31 July, proposals have been received, and there were a number of indications that the responses would be forthcoming. The Government continued to negotiate with those persons. As at 31 July, seven houses from a total of 50 had been allocated for this purpose. This is a far cry from none. These houses, as I have stated, must have adequate supervision. One cannot go willy-nilly and at random and allow people to take over houses and set them up. If they are to be of any significance they must be run correctly. The trust's success in allocating houses will be affected by the capacity of the Department of Community Welfare to provide financial support. This has been investigated by the department in its Budget deliberations.

Also, it will be subject to local government approval for the use of residential accommodation for youth housing initiatives. Again, that is an area we have to negotiate with local government. Also, the Government has agreed and action has been taken to continue the Emergency Housing

Office for two years. The role of the office is to be extended to include assistance for youth and for the aged. These two categories were never used by the Emergency Housing Office in the past.

We know that this office was set up back in 1978. Also, staff allocations for the Emergency Housing Office have been increased from 10 to 14. In my area we have had a number of requests from persons seeking emergency housing. I add my full support for the persons working in that office, because we have always had good response from them for the needs of the people in my area. In the month to 9 May 1981, which are the latest figures available, 1 276 people made inquiries at the Emergency Housing Office. That is an increase of 53 per cent over the same period for 1980. Some 36 per cent of the new clients were in the new category of youth and aged persons, a new category which did not exist before.

The Minister of Housing has also written to the Federal Minister for Housing and Construction, seeking additional funds for the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement for housing young people. He has requested that funds be in addition to State funds used in the 50 homes planned. The Federal Government is considering the proposal in the light of Budget considerations. Investigations have been made of three large metropolitan hospitals to ascertain the suitability for emergency youth housing of any surplus accommodation. The Minister is currently awaiting a report.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs has asked the Federal Government to grant supplementary assistance to youths aged 16 and 17 years towards meeting their housing costs. This sort of assistance is available only to pensioners at present, not to youths. Therefore, an approach has been made to the Federal Government to try to get this same assistance for teenagers between the ages of 16 and 17 years. Similarly, a joint working party comprising officers from the Department for Community Welfare, the South Australian Housing Trust and the Youth Bureau has been established to maintain a data collection system and oversight of the dissemination of information, which in itself will be of great assistance in determining the needs of the young persons.

The Minister of Local Government has approved and announced a \$45 000 grant to SACOSS and to the Citizens Advice Bureau to compile a new edition of the Directory of Social Welfare Services. This in itself will be seen as a means of disseminating required information to young persons. The Minister of Community Welfare wrote to the Minister for Social Security on 14 May seeking to expand the administrative guidelines determining the allocation of funds under the Homeless Persons Assistance Act. The level of funding made available by the Federal Government is not the problem. The South Australian Government is concerned rather that the \$10 000 000 allocated over three years, beginning last financial year, is for a construction programme only and, as I said earlier, the construction programme only is not sufficient, as we need adequate supervisors. We are asking the Federal Government whether we can use some of that money allocated for the purposes of providing subsidised supervisors.

I understand that this view was shared by the South Australian Homeless Persons Advisory Committee, and that committee conveyed to the Federal Government the points that I have just mentioned. This committee was appointed by the Federal Government and comprised representative groups involved in providing youth accommodation. Hence, the Minister for Social Security was correct (this is in response to a comment the member for Napier made regarding the member for Hindmarsh) in saying that the Federal Government had no record of an approach to the Federal Government for an increase in funding under the

Homeless Persons Assistance Act. There was no approach by the Government: it was done mainly through the advisory committee itself.

There are other matters to which we heard the previous speaker refer, namely, that of increased confidence here in South Australia and particularly relating to employment improvement. It is interesting to note that in less than two years new investment decisions in South Australian companies have amounted to some \$1 000 000 000. This includes some 50 companies, which have established or expanded in South Australia. I ask the member for Mitchell where the employment rate would be now if it was not for this increased confidence in South Australia and the influx by these companies into our economy. Historically, South Australia has always lagged behind any national pick-up or, conversely, always lagged behind any national downturn. Since September 1979 there has been a steady and progressive rate of recovery in South Australia due to the policies of this Government, not to the policies of the previous Government.

As a Government we have halted the employment decline which was occurring between August 1977 and August 1979 in which we saw a loss of some 20 600 jobs. That trend has been reversed by the policies of this Government in the 21 months it has been in office. Employment in South Australia, according to the A.B.S. latest surveys, has risen by some 12 200 jobs, an increase of 2.2 per cent, which is slightly less than the national growth rate of 2.3 per cent. This is a remarkable figure in itself, because for once we are close to the national recovery figure.

Further confidence in South Australia is reflected in the fact that retail sales here have increased remarkably. This can be demonstrated by the figures which relate to the March quarter of this year and which top the national average, being second only to those of Queensland. Record sales were recorded in December 1980. Our March quarter compared to the December quarter showed an increase of 3.45 per cent, whereas the national increase for that same quarter (March compared to December) was only 3.2 per cent. We have increased and are above the national average. Similarly, for the March quarter in 1980 until the March quarter in 1981, the State increase was 14 per cent compared to a national increase of only 13½ per cent. Obviously, the confidence that we have seen here in South Australia has been quite significant.

We have seen large business indicating a renewed confidence in South Australia. The first five months of this year has seen a 24 per cent increase over the same period of last year in non-residential buildings. Approvals at the end of May totalled \$118 600 000, which was an increase of \$23 300 000 over the same period in last year. This Government has taken further steps to try to encourage confidence in this State. As has been stated previously, we have done this by setting up a Small Business Advisory Council, which will be there to advise small businesses as to how to properly manage themselves, where to get the necessary information, and how to go about financing their enterprises.

I want to refer now to just what this Government has done in relation to young people and their desire to try to find employment. One of the significant features that we have undertaken in the time that we have been in office is the fact that the pay-roll tax exemption level has been raised from \$66 000 to \$72 000, and in January this year we raised it to \$84 000. That in itself has enabled employers to employ more people without having to suffer the tax burdens for doing so. We want to encourage more employers to take on more employees.

This Government also has a special exemption from pay-roll tax for under 20-year-olds employed on a full-time basis

(at least a 35-hour week) on or after 31 October of last year. This also constituted a nett addition in the work force. Similarly, we added to that an extra refund of pay-roll tax of over \$600 per annum for the first additional full-time teenager engaged after October 1980. We extended that to \$1 800 per annum for two or more teenagers, in both cases payable quarterly in arrears. Again, that was an incentive to the employer to try to employ more young people.

The member for Mitchell has said that no increases have been made in employment for the young people yet we have seen, through the policies of this Government, an increase in apprenticeships over all this year of some 17 per cent compared to last year, and last year there was an increase over the previous year. Steadily since we have been in office there has been an increase in the number of apprenticeships being offered to our young people.

There was a 60 per cent increase in apprenticeships just in the building industry itself. There was a 24 per cent increase in the metal industry and a 22 per cent increase in the electrical industry. This has been brought about by the incentives we have offered to the various companies. I would like to point out a few other initiatives that this Government has taken in regard to employment for young persons.

There is the Self-Employment Venture Scheme. This scheme provided some 46 ventures which have been funded since 1979. This year alone we had 20 young people employed in one of those pilot training ventures, which cost the Government \$172 000. We have also Community Involvement Through Youth. I have lobbied very strongly in this place to have a part-time CITY youth counsellor in the Noarlunga area. I am grateful to the Minister for making that provision in that area, as we now have that part-time CITY officer operating in the south.

We have undertaken a number of measures down there which have been significant to the well-being of the young people in that area. Some 1 500 unemployed young people have benefited from this scheme, owing to the fact that we gave the scheme an increase in funds in the Budget last year up to a maximum of \$564 000. We have also given training to group apprenticeship schemes, which is particularly relevant in the building industry. We also gave support to the group 1 year apprenticeship scheme by which some 70 first-year apprentices were taken in.

Similarly, additional apprenticeships in Government departments were offered this year, which resulted in 42 additional apprenticeships being offered. These schemes respectively cost \$50 000, \$61 000 and \$80 000. Likewise, we have given support to the School to Work Transition Programme. From Commonwealth funds we received a total in 1980 of \$2 200 000 and in 1981 a total of \$2 300 000. The State itself in 1981 contributed \$1 600 000, which gives a total figure of \$6 100 000 towards the School to Work Transition Programme.

Also, through the youth employment incentives, we have given pay-roll tax refunds. These refunds were offered to some 674 employers in respect of some 982 additional young people being employed, yet the Opposition says that we are doing nothing for our young people. It is the young people whom we are trying to encourage and find employment for, to assist them in future years and more particularly to assist our industries.

I want to refer quickly to an education matter raised by the member for Salisbury. I will endeavour to challenge the member for Salisbury to make further comment on an article that he had in the *Port Pirie Recorder* on 1 May this year in which he said that a department under his administration would have looked at staff cut-backs in areas other than school assistants. There cannot be too many other areas available if he wants to cut back in education

and if he is not going to touch school assistants. The only other area in which he could cut back would be in the central office. We know that already there have been significant cut-backs of some 9 per cent in the central office as such.

**Dr Billard:** It is 19 per cent.

**Mr SCHMIDT:** It has gone up to 19 per cent now. I thank my colleague for that. That leaves only one other area in which to make cut-backs and that is in the teaching staff itself. I do not know whether it was deliberately done by the member for Salisbury but he chose rather a small newspaper and one that would have minimal circulation to try to promote this thesis of his of cutting back education spending, yet he is not prepared to make a comment like that in the House or to make it in the public arena in Adelaide where there is greater circulation. I challenge the member for Salisbury to get up and state where he would cut back in education, what specific programmes he would cut back, and how he would go about doing it, because that would be an interesting exercise. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON (Minister of Environment and Planning):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I take this opportunity to speak in relation to people providing their own shelter and about an attitude that has developed within our society that is going to cost the Governments of the future a lot of money. More particularly, it has already cost many individuals the loss of their capital which they have saved and which they hoped to invest in a home. In many cases, I believe, the cost has been a lot of human illness and it has caused a lot of heartbreak within families.

In all probability, if one was to assess the situation more accurately, the current attitude has probably resulted in many broken marriages and there are probably many cases where children are separated from one of their parents. There is no doubt that one of the most important things that we would all wish to possess is good health. Second would be adequate shelter, and then, education, and tied up in that is the hope of employment.

Over the years we have tended to take an attitude in society that we need not worry about tomorrow, that if we earn something today we can spend it, and mortgage the future. I am not talking only about mortgages on homes, because if there is something that people should borrow for, if they have the capacity to meet the commitment, it is a home. In the environment in which we now live where there is much comment on interest rates for mortgages (and I believe that much of the discussion that has taken place in recent times is justified), there is a concern for the people who are tied up in the present day situation.

We are not going to be able to change their situation by means of what I am going to suggest tonight, nor are we going to change the situation for those who wish to build within the next two or three years. In many cases such people have already taken the path to a situation where they will not be able to afford their own home. That is not entirely their own fault: more particularly, it is because of the attitude we have developed within society.

There is no doubt that the vast majority of our young people and also those in the upper age group have developed an attitude of being slaves to interest rates and working agents for money lenders. Such a situation where a society

has reached that stage must concern us all. For example, within my district there are many people who are very concerned about the latest interest rate rise. When I visit them I notice that they sometimes have a caravan, some have boats, some have two cars, and some have the lot.

After talking to such people, one understands the real predicament in which they find themselves, because the caravan or boat may be on hire purchase, as well as the furniture, and there is a house mortgage. If a person goes to sell the caravan, the equity in the caravan is not enough for the person to recoup any monetary benefits, and, more particularly, a person finds that he must go on paying off the van or lose it altogether. It is beyond such people's financial resources to keep up all the commitments, in particular if there is a variation in interest rates in relation to their housing mortgage.

I do not want to argue about overseas interest rates and things like that: I want to advocate that it is about time we started to use public money to advertise on television, radio and by whatever means we can the message that, if people want to save to buy their own shelter in the future, they can do it. Housing is no dearer today in terms of earning capacity or purchasing power of wages than it was in the 1940s, 1950s or 1960s. Money has been spent in other directions. For example, more young people leave home at an early age, not only because they disagree with their parents but also because they want freedom. They live in flats and pay, on an average, \$20 a week per person. If they do that from age 17 to 25, when they decide they want a partner to live with, under whatever circumstances (whether married or not, and I do not draw judgment on that basis, because that is their prerogative), they have spent at least \$8 000 or \$9 000 in real terms, plus interest on the money spent.

On top of that, both partners have bought cars on hire purchase payment, and thus they have spent \$7 000 to \$10 000 each for motor cars. If honourable members do their sums, they will find at age 25, if people take the attitude that those who have lived in this country before them have taken (that is, grandfathers, grandmothers and fathers), they would have \$40 000 to put towards a house if they wanted to do that. However, we have allowed people to take another path. It is not entirely their fault. Governments have not taken up the challenge. Every time people watch television, read any form of publication, or listen to the radio (except the A.B.C.) someone is pushing the idea down their throat that they should buy a better motor car, some new form of clothing, stereo equipment, a boat, a caravan, and so on, on a hire purchase agreement basis.

We have developed the attitude of 'spend it all today and hope a Government and the rest of the people will pay the taxes to meet the commitment for the future'. We have reached the stage where the taxpayer cannot afford that kind of thing. We are pushing more people into poverty, and thus we have to provide more welfare housing, and we do not have the money to do that. The Commonwealth Government spends \$3 200 000 advertising to recruit people for the permanent Army, \$950 000 to recruit people for the Army reserve and \$250 000 on pamphlets for advertising.

There are 41 different categories of advertising for areas in which people can serve in the armed forces. Considering that we are spending over \$4 000 000 a year advertising for people to join the armed forces, as well as \$675 000 in advertising changes to the health scheme and \$1 200 000 advertising the census, Government advertising is worthwhile.

Never in the history of this country have we advertised the benefit of people saving to provide their own shelter. Young people have not been shown films within the secondary schools that they should do this. Our young children



are as intelligent and dedicated as any generation of Australians before them. No-one has said to them, 'If you take this path, at 25 or 30 years of age you will have nothing and you will be dependent on welfare housing and handouts. However, if you take the alternative path, still have a lot of fun in life, live moderately, and do not necessarily run away from home, talk mum or dad into letting you have freedom, if you live at home and use a room at home, if you do not buy motor cars on flash hire purchase agreements but wait until you can pay for them, you will be better off.

If we could show by film that there is benefit in owning one's own shelter, we would save this country millions of dollars. In particular, many thousands of people would be saved heartbreak. It is no good our saying it cannot be done. If the business community of the world can advertise to persuade people to buy, we can advertise to convince people to save for their own shelter. I put this point to the Housing Industry Association and the Federal Minister, Mr Newman, some four or five years ago, and they accepted the principle, but it was never taken any further.

If Government, the private enterprise sector and the building industry were prepared to pick up the challenge, and if the private enterprise sector spent only 5 per cent of the total amount it spends on advertising in the building industry and advertised as an industry for people to save for the future, we would save that industry a lot of heartbreak and a lot of the recessions that take place at different times. I believe that the challenge is there for us to convince people that there is a benefit in providing their own shelter.

The final point I make is that, unfortunately, our local government by-laws and State Government laws have been changed in the area of zoning where we are trying to force on every individual middle class, or higher than that, standards. At one time a person, if he wished to build the front part of a house and build the back end later, was allowed to do that. Today the law says one is not allowed to do that. There were some 20 or 30 houses that were never completed in the metropolitan area, so people said that it was a bad practice, but there were hundreds of houses completed by people who were able to pay for them as they went along and achieve their goals without being slaves to interest rates or working agents for money lenders. We have changed the laws and now say that we want everybody to be middle class from the time they start to build their first home, or higher than middle class. I say that that is ridiculous. I think it is about time we as a society accepted that there are other options.

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

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin):** It is my desire to expand this evening on some remarks I made over the weekend about the hydrocarbon liquids pipeline from the Moomba gasfields to Stony Point. Along with my colleagues, the Leader and the member for Mitchell, I visited Weroona Bay, which is perhaps the more correct title for the site of the fractionating plant, a week or so ago. I have given some consideration to the contents of a report I have before me at present, a report to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia by the Bechtel-Kinhill joint venture dated July 1981 and titled 'Moomba to Stony Point Pipeline Facilities: Draft Environmental Impact Statement'.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Has the Labor Party put in a submission?

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** I will be dealing with that matter in due course. I have 10 minutes to get to the very vital point that the Minister seems to be so keen on. It is not necessary to go over in any great detail what this is all about. Suffice it to say that as the wet gasfields are brought

on stream it is necessary to find some use for the heavier fractions in the natural gas; otherwise, they will be flared on the gasfield. That, of course, is what the Redcliff petrochemical plant was all about, the use of the ethane from the hydrocarbons in the production of plastics.

The present proposition by Santos is that the heavier fractions, ethane, propane, butane, and the even heavier fractions still, be piped to Stony Point on Spencer Gulf, where a fractionating process would take place separating these various fractions which would be carted in a mixed form through the pipe for various uses; as l.p.g. condensate, and so on. It is necessary that some route be established fairly early for the pipeline. The Bechtel-Kinhill venture suggested six possible routes, two lying completely west of the Flinders Range and four lying, for the most part, east of the Flinders Range and following the route of the dry gas pipeline to station No. 4 just north of Martin's Well, and then by various routes coming through the Flinders Range to the west of the range, whence it would then proceed to Stony Point. One of these routes goes through the Parachilna-Blinman area. A second one goes through the Brachina Gorge. A third one is called the Neuroodla route. It follows a valley between the Chace and Druid Ranges to Neuroodla, which is a siding on the Leigh Creek railway line. Then a fourth goes south of Hawker across the Willochra Plain and past Quorn, and so down to Port Augusta.

In short, through a combination of economic, or should I say rather financial and environmental analysis, the writers of the draft environmental impact statement plumped for route No. 5, the Neuroodla route. This has the drawback that it goes through an area of environmental significance in the Flinders Range. The Chace and Druid Ranges are, in this report, deemed to be in an area of outstanding grade class B as far as landscape value is concerned, and very high grade class A in relation to the planning areas.

Members would be aware that some years ago the State Planning Authority graded the Flinders into three classes of environmental significance. It is admitted in this report that this route goes through an area of A class significance. There are some inconsistencies in the report. In one of the tables, which members can look up, it is suggested that, in relation to the preferred route, 'no important habitat is affected'. Yet, if one looks at the map showing the details of the route through the Chace and Druid Ranges area, one finds that in the vicinity of the old Wonoka homestead, I assume, it goes very close to a habitat of the yellow footed rock wallaby. In fact, that is admitted a little later in the report.

There appears to have been no real evaluation of the costs involved in having to trench through rock in that part of the Flinders Range. It is admitted in the financial analysis later in the report that in fact some rock trenching would be required in going through this route. It is admitted that no rock trenching would be involved in going through the two routes on the western side of the ranges. I can see some advantages in using at least a part of the route of the dry gas pipe. My proposition is that the route of the dry gas pipe should be followed down as far as station 2, whence the route should come across to roughly the vicinity of Lyndhurst, thereby bypassing the Flinders Range, and it could then proceed down the western side of the range.

That would add only 2 to 3 per cent to the actual length of the pipe compared with the Neuroodla route. All other things being equal it would add only 2 per cent to 3 per cent to the cost. Quite possibly, all other things are not equal, because we have to take into account, as I have already indicated, the costs involved in trenching through rock. In part, I was prompted to make a public call for this because, having made such a submission to my colleagues

in the shadow Cabinet, I then started consulting with one or two people in both the environmental movement and in the industry and on two occasions, without prompting from me, people came up with exactly the same proposition, that from compressor station 2 the pipe could skirt the Flinders completely and then pick up one of the western routes.

I was interested in reactions from two members of the Government as reported in the *News* of 17 August, because it seemed that these reactions were somewhat at variance. First, I will deal with the Minister of Environment and Planning who was referred to as follows:

The Environment Minister, Mr Wotton, said he appreciated Mr Hopgood's 'recent interest'—

that is nice—

in the proposed route of the Moomba to Stony Point gas pipeline. Submissions on the pipeline closed today and he hoped Mr Hopgood, the Opposition spokesman on the environment, would make a formal submission on behalf of the Labor Party.

I have not done that, of course. As an Opposition we do not do that; we have a forum here and elsewhere where that can be done. We did not give evidence in relation to the Prisons Royal Commission, and that is on the same footing. It is our job to operate in this place and elsewhere. The Minister's comments are nonsense, and he knows it. When he was in the same position as I am now he did not do that sort of thing, either. We operate here.

If the Minister likes, I am giving my submission right now. Let his experts take *Hansard* away and examine my remarks. Let them explain why my proposition has never been given any sort of reasonable examination by anyone at all. Let them come up with some facts. We have got nothing here. Let me now leave the Minister and go on to someone a little more substantial, the Premier, who wiped me off straight away. He said:

Re-routing the pipeline which will carry natural gas liquids from the Cooper Basin to Whyalla destroys the viability of a refinery near the town.

On the one hand, the Minister is thanking me for my constructive approach and suggesting that I go further; on the other hand, the Premier is wiping me off. Let us proceed:

The Premier, Mr Tonkin, said this today when commenting on a Labor Party call to direct the pipeline along the western edge of the Flinders Ranges. The Cooper Basin producers have proposed a route which follows the existing gas pipeline along the eastern side of the Flinders and passes through the Flinders near Neeroodla.

The A.L.P. plan calls for the route to skirt the ranges near Lyndhurst and follow the Port Augusta-Leigh Creek railway. This would make the pipeline about 3 per cent longer. Mr Tonkin said the extra cost could destroy the viability of the project. 'The added expense could well make the producers stop and think whether it is worth doing,' he said.

The General-Manager of Santos was unavailable for comment, and I have already commented on what the Minister had to say. I think the Premier's response was uncalled for and quite irresponsible. Certainly, the Minister's response, although a little curious, was rather more responsible. Let me suggest to the Minister that, if he ignores this, he is ignoring not only what I am saying but what a lot of other people in the environment movement are also saying: we cannot discount the environmental effects that could occur during the construction stage of the pipeline.

**The Hon. D. C. Wotton:** Are you—

**The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD:** No. I am assisting the Minister and trying to get him off the hook with environmentalists throughout the State. If he ignores my call for this, he ignores it at his peril

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** This evening I would like to spend more time on a topic canvassed widely in the House earlier today, namely, the effect of interest rates on people

purchasing homes. As I am sure members in this House would be only too well aware, I represent an electorate which is made up mostly by residents who are buying their homes. They are people who are younger than perhaps are those in many other electorates, people who have a family and who will be very severely disadvantaged by the present situation in relation to interest rates on housing loans.

I believe that, in the past, the Federal Government has quite overtly encouraged home ownership, and I feel, therefore, that it should be taking steps at the moment to protect the earlier interest and encouragement that it provided. It was not misplaced but well placed, and I believe that that same Government must ensure that those encouraged to buy homes are not forced into a situation where they will have to give up the home they have bought.

This rise in interest rates is hitting people on a broad spectrum of income levels. It is not just the low income earner who is being disadvantaged by the present situation. I have had a number of examples of people living in my electorate who purchased their home three or even more years ago. When they did that, they purchased a home which was at the limit of what they could afford, but at that time they could afford it. It was not uncommon then for two incomes to be coming into the family. When they felt that they had established a firm basis for building a home and having a family, the wife gave up work, and now she has young children who prohibit her return to the work force. Initially, they could afford this change in income, but now, with what is happening with the rapid increase in interest rates, they are no longer able to live on the one income and afford the home which once they could afford.

It is to this and other areas that the Federal Government must address itself, and not overlook the situation, as I believe the Prime Minister and the Treasurer have done in the Budget which was announced tonight. I listened very carefully to the points made by Mr Howard, and I could find nothing that would support the people living in my electorate.

I do not believe that it is correct for the Prime Minister and the Treasurer to blame pressure on Loan moneys as an excuse for raising the interest rate on home loans.

There is no doubt at all that the Federal Government could take action to overcome the difficulty in which so many people now find themselves. It could first compel banks to lend to the home loan market a certain amount of their funds that they have for investment purposes. The home loan market could have its funds provided at an interest rate set below the going rate. Also, I believe that there is no reason at all why interest on home loans cannot be a tax deduction. After all, people who are purchasing properties to rent out able to claim interest on moneys borrowed, yet persons buying a home for their own use do not have a similar advantage.

We see a situation where the Federal Government has been reaping a bonanza on income from various taxation sources in the past few years. Its returns from pay-as-you-earn taxation due to inflation have gone up astronomically. The Federal Government's policy in relation to world parity pricing on oil has also earned it millions upon millions of dollars. I believe that the Federal Government is in a position where it could offer concrete and meaningful support for the person buying his or her own home.

**Mr Slater:** It hasn't done so in the Budget tonight.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I made that point earlier. I said that I was disappointed by the approach that the Federal Government had taken tonight in this regard. I believe that the Federal Treasurer is a little too single-minded in his attack on the way that he wants to contain inflation in Australia. There is no doubt at all that there are other policies which could contain inflation and, at the same time, provide

protection for the many people who are purchasing their homes at this time.

I have certainly had a number of examples where people in my electorate have got to the stage where they are being forced to sell their homes.

I do not believe that any Federal Government should stand by and see this occur. I would strongly urge my Federal colleagues to put pressure upon the Federal Government for a change in its present policy. I point out that this is not a recent interest that I have taken up on this matter. For months I have been making frequent contact with the Premier who, as we all know, has certainly also been making frequent contact with the Federal Government. I have written a number of letters and have had frequent discussions with Federal members of Parliament to put the point of view which I hold.

**Mr Slater:** They have ignored you and your Premier as well.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Members opposite are now trying to score political points, and I am rather disappointed about that, because this is an issue which is so serious we should not be scoring political points. Of course, I am unhappy about the situation, but Opposition members are more interested in attempting to score cheap political points at the Liberal Party's expense than in listening to the points I am trying to make on behalf of the many people in my electorate who are being so severely disadvantaged.

**Mr Slater:** Crocodile tears!

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I certainly object to that comment by the member opposite. I certainly do not have crocodile tears—I am in the same position as are many people in my electorate. I also am in a situation where I have to find increased amounts to pay for the loan on my home, and I am presently earning considerably less than I was when I purchased my home. It is certainly not crocodile tears that I have. Although I am fortunate enough that I am able to afford my home and still stay in it, I am speaking for the many people in my electorate who are not as fortunate as I am in this case. If only Opposition members would be sincere, rather than carrying on as they are now in trying to score these political points, then we would all be a lot better off.

In regard to the policy that presently exists, it is not only the home owner who is being disadvantaged but also the potential home owner who is sitting back and saying, 'Can I afford to buy my own home?' Frequently, the answer coming up is 'No'.

The Premier said earlier today that, as far as Tea Tree Gully was concerned, at this stage there are not many mortgagee sales but there are large numbers of people selling their homes and moving to smaller homes because of the situation in which they now find themselves.

I am also sure the building industry is going to suffer even more. A number of builders could possibly be forced into bankruptcy. I was most disappointed to hear in the Federal Budget tonight of a 2½ per cent tax on home building materials. This will force up the price of homes even more. It will make it more difficult for people to buy homes. The whole situation is one about which I am most disappointed. I do not feel that the Treasurer is correct when he says that the actions the Federal Government is taking are to provide more money for housing loans. It is no good providing more money at higher interest rates if people cannot afford that money. The other point I make is why has the Federal Government now allowed investment money to go overseas? I know for a fact that every night quite substantial amounts of money are going to New York where Australian lenders are able to get 22 per cent. In other words, the Federal Government again is forcing even more pressure on the amount of money that is available here in Australia.

**Mr O'Neill:** But they are bringing it back within 24 hours and they are using it on the short-term money market to invest twice in 24 hours.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** But the honourable member would know that that is absolutely no help to the person wanting to buy a home. This is the point I am trying to make. The policies of the Federal Government at the moment are not assisting the person who wants to buy a home. Tonight I have tried to put my concern for the people who are in this situation and also some concrete suggestions as to what I feel the Federal Government should do in relation to the difficulty these people now have in front of them. I assure honourable members and the constituents in my electorate that I will go on pushing this issue, because it is vital and an issue on which the Federal Government must take action very urgently.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 19 August at 2 p.m.

**KOREAN VISIT**

2. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier: As a result of the Premier's visit to Korea during April 1980, what trading relations, if any, have been entered into between either the Government or private industry in this State (and which) and either the South Korean Government or private industry in that country (and which)?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The principal purpose of my two-day visit to South Korea was to promote the State of South Australia as a suitable area for investment. In addition, I took the opportunity of having discussions with the Government and private sector in relation to our energy and mineral resources.

The South Korean Ambassador has since visited Adelaide on 16 April 1981 for further discussions concerning areas of mutual interest.

Discussions took place in Seoul with representatives from two major companies who were interested in joint ventures with South Australian companies. Subsequently, the representatives from one company visited South Australia and carried out negotiations with a local organisation.

The Government acted in a facilitatory role in this case and took no further action when the parties eventually agreed to terminate discussions.

The Government's emphasis is towards an improved level of understanding and communication with those countries in the region commonly called the Pacific Basin and I believe this visit played its part in achieving that objective.

**COURT CASE**

11. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning:

1. What were the terms of settlement of the Supreme Court action, 1541 of 1979, *Bertram Joseph Bryant Field v. The State of South Australia* and when was settlement reached?

2. Have all such terms of settlement yet been carried out and, if so, when was each term carried out and what has been the reason for the delay, if any, in carrying out each term and, if not, which terms of settlement have been carried out so far and when, which terms of settlement remain to be carried out, when is it expected that they will be carried out and why have they not yet been carried out?

3. What is the estimated value of each bird to be supplied to the plaintiff, Field, by the defendant, the State of South Australia, under the terms of settlement and how is the value of each estimated?

4. How much has it cost the Government to obtain each bird for the purpose of carrying out the terms of settlement and from whom has each such bird been obtained?

5. Have all birds so far supplied to the plaintiff, Field, been healthy when delivered to him and, if not, how many have not been healthy, what has been wrong with each and why have unhealthy birds been delivered to him?

6. Is it intended that all the birds to be supplied to the plaintiff in settlement be healthy and when will delivery of healthy birds to him be completed?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. The terms of settlement of the Supreme Court Action, 1541 of 1979, *B. J. B. Field v The State of South Australia* were:

- (a) pay a sum of \$60 000 compensation to Mr B. J. B. Field.
- (b) pay Mr B. J. B. Field his legal costs and disbursements which were agreed at the sum of \$8 000.
- (c) would not institute any criminal prosecution against Mr B. J. B. Field for any offence arising out of

any of the matters of issue in the action before the Supreme Court.

(d) undertake to supply (within a period of 5 weeks) Mr B. J. B. Field a number of birds for his aviary. This is estimated to cost between \$5 000 and \$6 000.

These terms were settled between the parties prior to the case being called on 6 April 1981. When the matter was called on before Mr Justice Matheson on that day, His Honour made these terms the subject of a judgment.

2. Yes. The sum of \$68 000 was paid to Clark Moody and Westover, solicitors for B. J. B. Field on 5 May 1981. All the birds due to Mr Field under the terms of settlement, except eight Regent parrots, one Scarlet breasted parrot and one Red tailed black cockatoo were delivered on 30 April 1981. The balance, except one Scarlet breasted parrot, were delivered to him on 30 June 1981. The Scarlet breasted parrot was delivered on 1 July 1981.

National Parks and Wildlife Service had been in a position to finalise settlement almost at any time after the birds involved in the settlement were first assembled on 29 April 1981 but Mr Field refused to accept the birds offered, despite the fact that they had been examined by a veterinary surgeon and passed as fit. This delayed their delivery until 1 July 1981.

3. The values of the birds supplied to Mr Field are:

	\$
4 Mulga Parrots (\$37.50 each) .....	150
4 Scarlet Chested Parrots (\$25 each) .....	100
4 Hooded Parrots (2 @ \$55 ea., 2 @ \$50 each) .....	210
8 Eastern Rosella Parrots (\$27.50 each) ...	220
6 Red-tailed Black Cockatoos (5 @ \$600 ea., 1 @ \$750) .....	3 750
6 Rainbow Lorikeets (\$32.50 each) .....	195
8 Regent Parrots (\$65 each) .....	520
1 Major Mitchell cockatoo .....	150
2 Yellow Rosella Parrots (estimated \$30 ea.) .....	60
6 Adelaide Rosella Parrots (estimated \$20 each) .....	120
Total . . .	5 475

(The last two items were supplied from surplus stock held at Para Wirra Fauna Complex.) These are the amounts paid, or agreed to be paid, for the birds.

4. Vide 3.

All these birds, except those supplied from the Para Wirra Fauna Complex, were purchased from recognised and licensed aviculturists and dealers. In the interest of these persons it is considered inappropriate to disclose their names.

5. Yes.

6. Yes.

Delivery has been completed.

**MARION HIGH SCHOOL CLUB**

26. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health representing the Minister of Community Welfare: Will the Minister of Community Welfare be providing funding to allow the highly successful Marion High School Community Club activities to continue and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Marion High School submitted an application for a community welfare grant in November 1980, but was advised that the Grants Committee could not consider such a late application but would

defer it until 1981 for possible consideration if funds were available. On 3 February 1981 the school was advised that all the funds had been allocated. No application for funding has been received for this year but as the project does not fit within the guidelines for the Community Welfare Grants Fund, it is doubtful whether it would be funded.

#### HACKHAM WEST KINDERGARTEN

31. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What was the reason for the reduction from four to three sessions per week at the Brentwood Drive Kindergarten at Hackham West?

2. Why is it not possible for the two staff members of that kindergarten to work five full days a week instead of five half days?

3. Is the Minister aware that there are no vacancies at Brentwood Drive, that the increase in enrolments over the past six months has been 60 per cent and that the adjacent Vintners Walk, Hackham West Kindergarten, is also turning away children?

4. What plans are in hand for providing additional kindergarten places in the Hackham West area?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Since Brentwood Drive Kindergarten is operating to its maximum capacity it is possible to increase the number of enrolments only if each child attends fewer sessions. At Brentwood Drive the need to reduce the number of sessions per child from four per week to three was brought about by the rapidly increasing demand for enrolments of four-year-old children in 1981, rising from 19 in March to 33 in July. In addition, there are children younger than four who have special needs.

2. Kindergarten funds do not at present permit a more comprehensive union service. (The Federal Government's proportion of funds is diminishing annually and the State contribution increases.)

3. Yes, but the Hackham West Kindergarten does not turn children away as the honourable member asserts. Instead it has reduced its sessions to three per week to allow all children to participate for 12 months prior to school entry. The kindergarten was designed for 30 children at a time, and is currently running groups of approximately 38, 37 and 32. In addition, there are several children with specific disabilities and 12 children on a waiting list who will turn four years of age before September 1981. The group sizes in Term III are expected to each be over 40 children.

4. Brentwood Drive Kindergarten has a high priority on the rationalisation programme, which will take effect from Term 1, 1982. The Kindergarten Union proposes to construct a new kindergarten in the Noarlunga Downs area in 1984-85, depending upon the rate of dwelling completions and the numbers of young children. If the Brentwood Drive Kindergarten does not sufficiently relieve the Hackham West Kindergarten, then the union would seek approval to provide a relocatable unit at Hackham West.

2. What was the total funding approved, and what was the amount approved for each State electorate?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. 573 applications were received under the Local Government Assistance Fund 1980-81; 164 applications were approved for funding.

2. Total funding approved for the 164 applications was \$247 242. The amount approved for each State electorate is as follows:

Electorate	Amount \$
Adelaide	11 720
Albert Park	150
Alexandra	15 420
Ascot Park	—
Baudin	2 950
Bragg	—
Brighton	5 000
Chaffey	6 270
Coles	1 800
Davenport	2 240
Elizabeth	5 903
Eyre	15 923
Fisher	1 550
Flinders	8 750
Florey	—
Gilles	1 290
Glenelg	4 766
Goyder	22 815
Hanson	—
Hartley	6 500
Henley Beach	1 050
Kavel	8 000
Light	12 277
Mallee	20 380
Mawson	3 400
Mitcham	—
Mitchell	5 000
Morphett	1 647
Mt Gambier	9 580
Murray	5 850
Napier	2 005
Newland	120
Norwood	7 020
Peake	900
Playford	—
Price	860
Rocky River	21 850
Ross Smith	1 431
Salisbury	5 000
Semaphore	—
Spence	3 470
Stuart	4 000
Todd	2 450
Torrens	3 130
Unley	4 125
Victoria	7 500
Whyalla	3 150

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE FUND

33. **Mr KENEALLY** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Local Government:

1. How many applications for assistance under the Local Government Assistance Fund were received during the 1980-81 financial year, and how many of those applications were approved?

#### CRIMINAL LAW REFORM

34. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General:

1. For how long has the Government been aware of the recommendations with respect to provocation set out on pages 27 and 28 of the Fourth Report entitled 'The Substantive Criminal Law' of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee?

2. Has the Government accepted those recommendations and, if so, when did it decide to accept them and why has nothing yet been done to have the law changed?

3. Does the Government now propose to introduce legislation to give effect to the recommendations and, if so, when and, if not, why not?

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Some time.
2. No.
3. Not at the moment. The law of provocation is being reviewed. Even if the Mitchell Committee's recommendations had been in effect, it would not have assisted the woman in the axe murder case.

**HILLS FLOODING**

35. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. What help, if any, has the Government offered to those adversely affected by flooding in the Hills and eastern suburban areas at the end of June?
2. What are the criteria for eligibility for such help and how were they established?
3. How much such help, if any, has actually been given to date and what was it?
4. When does the Government expect to be able to give further help?

**The Hon. D. O. TONKIN:** The replies are as follows:

1. Financial assistance has been given to clean and repair essential contents or replace them if necessary. Essential contents have included floor coverings, refrigerators, clothing, furnishings, but not stereograms, toys, motor vehicles, gardens, fences.

2. The criteria were as follows:

(a) Aged, sick, invalid pensioners, unemployed (and superannuants on fixed incomes and other disadvantaged persons recommended by the Disaster Relief Committee and approved by Cabinet) shall be entitled to a grant sufficient to reasonably repair their residences; and replace essential household contents (e.g. refrigerators, stoves, beds, etc., but not television sets, radios, jewellery, boats, cars, etc.), provided that any cash in hand, investments or other entitlements in excess of \$2 500 (single person) or \$5 000 (a couple) shall be applied to the repairs or replacement.

(b) Other than in (a) above, persons or couples in receipt of an income from all sources exceeding \$145 a week but less than \$253 a week, and whose cash in hand, investments and other entitlements are less than \$500 shall be entitled to a loan of an amount sufficient to repair the residence normally repayable over seven years, at an interest rate of 4 per cent per annum or interest free if repaid over 18 months. Recipients of this type of assistance are to sign a form agreeing to abide by the conditions of a loan and they must undertake, on request, to enter into a mortgage over realty or personalty to secure the loan, except in cases of real emergency where work may be started beforehand. Any amounts received from insurance cover should be applied to the cost of repairs before money is available under this provision.

(c) In special circumstances approved in Cabinet, a person may receive a grant or a loan outside the aforementioned guidelines or have a previously approved loan commuted to a cash grant.

They were established by the Government on the recommendation of the Storm Damage Committee in relation to the Pt Broughton disaster and have been used several times since. The income standards have recently been increased in accordance with changed money values.

3. Thirty-one claims have been lodged so far with a few more to come, perhaps. Of these, the Storm Damage Committee has so far recommended six receive no help and four to receive a total of \$4 562 in grants or loans. The houses of the remainder have been inspected by an assessor but additional information, either with regard to the financial situation of the applicants or with regard to quotations for work, is awaited. The postal strike has not helped.

4. The range of assistance cannot be extended further.

**BUS SERVICES**

37. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport:

1. In each financial year since inception, what have been the respective operating costs of the Bee-line, Circle-line and City-loop bus services, and how are such costs made up?

2. What revenue, if any, has there been from each of these services?

**The Hon. M. M. WILSON:** The replies are as follows:

1. Separate costs are not maintained for individual routes, including Bee-line, Circle-line and City-loop services. The answers given are estimated annual costs (or portions) based on the number of drivers employed at average wage rates plus the cost of fuel, oil, tyres, etc.

	Year	Labour Costs \$	Distance Costs \$	Total Costs \$
a. Bee-line	1973-74*	47 800	1 800	49 600
	1974-75	93 000	6 400	99 400
	1975-76	104 800	13 000	117 800
	1976-77	116 600	19 400	136 000
	1977-78	124 300	22 000	146 300
	1978-79	135 000	26 000	161 000
	1979-80	154 000	38 000	192 000
	1980-81	196 000	40 000	236 000
b. Circle-line	1977-78*	210 000	87 000	297 000
	1978-79	356 000	184 000	540 000
	1979-80	424 000	260 000	684 000
	1980-81	428 000	315 000	743 000
c. City-loop	1980-81*	121 000	37 000	158 000

\*Part year only

2. The Bee-line and City-loop services are free city distributor services, and thus no revenue is directly attributable to them.

Revenue figures on a route-by-route basis are not maintained by the authority. However, based on an estimate of the number of passengers boarding Circle-line buses, the annual revenue for that service would be in the order of \$400 000.

**SALISBURY EAST HOUSING**

40. **The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Environment and Planning, representing the Minister of Housing:

1. Does the South Australian Housing Trust intend to develop section 3051 at Salisbury East and, if so, what steps has the trust taken to obtain planning approval and when is final planning approval likely to be forthcoming?

2. Is the Government aware of objections from the Salisbury East Residents Committee to those developments and what is the Government's attitude to those objections?

**The Hon. D. C. WOTTON:** The replies are as follows:

1. (a) The trust intends to develop the portion of section 3051 in its ownership for housing.

(b) Negotiations have commenced with the Salisbury council prior to the formal lodgement of the plan of subdivision.

(c) No firm date is available but final subdivision approval is expected in 1983.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) The land is zoned residential two and residential development is therefore a permitted use under the provisions of the council's zoning regulations. There is an ongoing demand for public housing in the Salisbury area.

During the current negotiations with the council on the form of development, meetings have been held with local residents and many of their requests have been taken into account.

#### WATER SAVING

44. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What encouragement, if any, is given to householders to install water saving devices such as dual-flush lavatory cisterns, replaceable tap seats and tap aerators?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The media campaigns over the past few years have promoted water conservation as a general philosophy. The decision to install or convert to the use of water saving devices is seen to be entirely the province of the householder.

#### SOUTH-EAST DRAINAGE

46. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has the feasibility been considered of the drains in the South-East being channelled into the Coorong and, if so, what conclusion, if any, has been reached and, if not, will consideration be given to it?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Yes it has. The conclusion reached is that in view of the inherent engineering problems, the uncertainty of the water supply, the high construction cost and the doubtful benefit which would be derived, the schemes considered do not constitute economical projects for the expenditure of public funds.

#### IRON TRIANGLE WATER

47. **Mr. MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Has any consideration been given to supplying consumers in the Iron Triangle with desalinated

water and, if so, what conclusion, if any, has been reached as to the practicability of doing so and why?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** Yes. However, as the general costs associated with the process of desalination are some three to five times greater than the costs associated with supplying water to the area through the Morgan-Whyalla pipelines, this method was not considered to be a practicable alternative.

#### WATER SAVING

49. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: What encouragement, if any, is the Government giving to industry to save water?

**The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD:** The Government's encouragement in water savings for industry is by way of placing emphasis on the 'pay for use' component of its water rate. This provides a financial incentive to monitor water consumption, which encourages water saving.

#### SALINE RESISTANT PLANTS

50. **Mr MILLHOUSE** (on notice) asked the Minister of Agriculture: Is the Government aware of any research being done into saline resistant rootstocks and varieties of plants for use in the irrigation areas along the Murray River and, if so—

(a) who is doing such research;

(b) what is its nature; and

(c) what encouragement, if any, is the Government giving to such research?

**The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN:** The replies are as follows:

(a) Yes, in South Australia the Department of Agriculture and the C.S.I.R.O.

(b) Vines, citrus, stonefruits and avocado rootstocks are being researched at the Northfield, Loxton and Barossa research centres. In the case of vines, a rootstock which has nematode resistance is also resistant to the uptake of sodium and chloride and is being developed. In citrus a rootstock called Citrange is being investigated. Also a particular plum rootstock is being assessed as an alternative rootstock for peaches and apricots. Four avocado cultivars have already been introduced to the Riverland with some resistance to saline conditions.

(c) The Government is giving constant encouragement to this work. In recent years, for example, the facilities at the Barossa and Loxton research centres have been greatly improved. Currently, seven research officers in the Department of Agriculture are working in this field, devoting a part of their time to rootstock investigations.