

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 21 July 1982

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

PETITION: BUS SERVICE

A petition signed by 388 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to retain a limited stop bus service to Athelstone during peak-hour travel was presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 264 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hon. R. G. Payne and Messrs Billard, Mathwin, Peterson, Schmidt, and Whitten.

Petitions received.

PETITION: DENTAL CLINIC

A petition signed by 1 596 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to establish a dental clinic within the confines of the Whyalla and District Hospital was presented by Mr Max Brown.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONSTITUTION

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: I wish to inform the Parliament of the decisions made at the June 1982 Premiers' Conference which will lead to many of Australia's anachronistic constitutional links with the United Kingdom being terminated. These decisions do not in any way affect our links with the Crown. It is also appropriate that I detail some of the background, and put into proper perspective the historic significance of these decisions and their impact on South Australia.

The constitutional framework of South Australia and the other Australian States has remained virtually unchanged since the nineteenth century and remains colonial in character. By name, the Australian colonies were transformed into States with the coming of federation but this did nothing to change the status of their governmental systems except where their powers were affected by the new national constitution.

The Australian States failed to join in the wholesale revision that Britain undertook in ordering its relationships with its old colonies in the 1930s. The enactment of the Statute of Westminster by the British Parliament and its adoption by the Federal Parliament in 1942 created the situation in which the Australian Federal Government could enjoy the fullest degree of national autonomy, while the States remained in a situation of dependent colonisation. Our colonial constitutional status still affects the working of

Government. There are a variety of British enactments called statutes of paramount force which still form part of the law of South Australia and the other Australian States.

Statutes which apply by paramount force are those British statutes which named colonies, either generally or specifically, as being subject to such laws and those British statutes which could be construed as applying to colonies in general, or specific colonies, by 'necessary intendment' of the British legislature. These laws cannot be amended or repealed by the South Australian Parliament. Even if these statutes have been repealed by the British Parliament they may still be part of South Australian law.

A clear example of the way in which the continuing existence of this situation may complicate the conduct of South Australian affairs is to be found in the working of the law. The State has no power to abolish appeals to the Privy Council. The Federal Parliament has abolished all appeals in cases dealing with State matters which are appealed in the High Court. But there remains a separate optional right of appeal in purely State matters to the Privy Council, by-passing the High Court. This means that there can be separate decisions given by different ultimate courts of appeal which are not necessarily compatible with each other. This uncertainty in the law is highly undesirable.

As South Australia found to its loss in 1978, the British Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, is still part of the law of this State. The freighter *Wuzhou* caused more than \$1 000 000 damage to the Wallaroo jetty yet the Merchant Shipping Act limited the ship owner's liability to eight pounds sterling per registered ton of ship.

It is not only U.K. legislation from colonial times that can apply to the States. In 1976 the Privy Council upheld the conviction of two Western Australian fishermen for stealing crayfish pots 22 miles off the Western Australian coast. The fishermen had been charged under a British statute of 1968. No Australian legislature, Commonwealth or State, had approved of the application of this Act in any fashion in these circumstances. Lord Diplock, in the opinion of the Privy Council affirmed that it might 'seem surprising' that two Australian citizens whose home was in Fremantle 'should find themselves subject to English law', but this was the inexorable result of the constitutional situation.

Apart from the practical effects of the State's colonial status there are theoretical possibilities of very real interference by both the Commonwealth and British Governments in the conduct of the affairs of the State. In theory it might be possible for the Commonwealth Government to advise the Queen not to assent to an amendment to the State Constitution. The Queen's assent to amendments to the Constitution is required under a U.K. statute applying by paramount force.

Other anachronisms can be found in instruments such as the British Letters Patent and Royal Instruction to the Governor. These have been updated sometime since the coming of responsible Government, but at least on the face of it they are not necessarily in accord with the requirements of modern style responsible Government. For example, the Instructions to the Governor permit the Governor to dissent from advice tendered in Executive Council. There is no detailed specification as to when this might be done. The only caveat is that if this occurs the matter should be reported to the Sovereign 'without delay'. While there may be circumstances where the Governor should act in effect as an 'umpire' in dealing with limited, special circumstances, the possibility that a Governor's independent authority could extend beyond this is contrary to conventional practice in Britain and elsewhere.

At the 1979 Premiers' Conference the need to remove anachronistic colonial links with the United Kingdom was discussed and referred to the Standing Committee of Attor-

neys-General. Eventually, after much discussion and research on the complex legal issues involved, the standing committee was able to agree on the approach to be taken. The committee reported to the June 1982 Premiers' Conference which supported the Attorneys' recommendations, and passed the following resolutions:

1. That the present constitutional arrangements between the United Kingdom and Australia affecting the Commonwealth and the States should be brought into conformity with the status of Australia as a sovereign and independent nation.
2. That the necessary measures be taken to sever the remaining constitutional links (other than the Crown), in particular, those existing in relation to the following matters:
 - (i) The sovereignty, if any, of the United Kingdom Parliament over Australian matters, Commonwealth and State;
 - (ii) Subordination of State Parliaments to United Kingdom legislation still applying as part of the law of the States;
 - (iii) The power of the Crown to disallow Commonwealth and State legislation;
 - (iv) Appeals to the Privy Council from State Supreme Courts on State matters;
 - (v) The marks of colonial status remaining in the Instructions to the Governor-General and to State Governors.
3. That, at the same time as the residual links are removed, any limitation on the extra-territorial competence of the States to legislate for their peace, order and good government be removed.
4. That the measures to be taken are to include simultaneous and parallel Commonwealth legislation at the request of the States pursuant to Section 51 (XXXVIII) of the Constitution and United Kingdom legislation at the request of and with the consent of the Commonwealth, that request being made and that consent being given with the concurrence of the States, such legislation to come into effect simultaneously.
5. That the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General be instructed to prepare the necessary draft legislation to implement the above matters.

In summary, a package approach, and not an *ad hoc* approach, is to be adopted to achieve patriation. It will require the concurrence of the States, the Commonwealth and Westminster Parliaments.

The June 1982 Premiers' Conference also agreed on principles and procedures for Commonwealth-State consultation on treaties. This agreement is particularly significant in light of the recent decision in Koowarta's case in which the High Court upheld Commonwealth legislation implementing the provisions of the International Covenant on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. This decision has far-reaching implications so far as the States are concerned, in that the High Court has now said that the Commonwealth external affairs power will support legislation to implement the provisions of treaties in areas that are traditionally State areas of responsibility.

The principles and procedures for consultation are designed to ensure that the States are informed in all cases at an early stage of any treaty discussions in which Australia is considering participation and that the States' views are taken into account at all stages of the treaty-making process when the subject matter of the treaty is one that bears on State interests. Most important, it has been agreed that the consultative process will be continued through to the stage of implementation and, where a treaty that affects an area traditionally regarded as being within the responsibility of the States is to be implemented by the enactment of legis-

lation, the States are to have the first opportunity of implementing the treaty provisions by their own legislation.

The Premiers' Conference decision goes some way towards protecting the integrity of the States, but the State Government is examining what other measures need to be taken to ensure that State areas of responsibility are not diminished as a result of Commonwealth action following the decision in Koowarta's Case.

The SPEAKER: I call on the Premier.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: HOUSING STANDARDS

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the following motion to be moved:

That this House censures the Government for failing to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia for failing to act as other State Governments have acted to establish a package of measures to alleviate the effects of high interest rates, and for its failure to defend the housing standards of South Australians against the policies of the Fraser Government, and calls on it to resign, such suspension to remain in force no later than 5 p.m.

We have had some extraordinary manoeuvring leading to this motion being moved today. As all members know—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will stay with the reason for a suspension of Standing Orders, and will not engage in peripheral activity.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Sir. The reason for the suspension, as is made clear in the motion, is to express no confidence in the Government over the issue of housing, one of today's most vital and pressing issues. In the normal course of events, a matter of this importance, in which the Opposition is moving a censure motion against the Government, would be accepted without quibble. In approaching this matter, courtesies require that the Government is notified of the issue and of the Opposition's intention so to move. That was done in the normal way, but the Opposition was told that it would be denied such a debate. That is quite extraordinary. We were told that this would happen because the Government wished to substitute a motion of its own on a completely unrelated topic. I thought it was interesting that the first call today was given by you, Sir, to the Premier, because presumably you had been advised that the Premier intended to move such a motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader should not presume what has motivated the action taken by the Chair.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Sir. I simply draw your attention then to the facts of the situation. The Premier was called on and remained in his place and then behaved me to rise and move the motion that I have put before you. What an extraordinary sequence of events and I would suggest calculated to ensure that this particular matter was not aired fully before the House. That is an extraordinary state of affairs. It is vital that the House discusses this problem. It is vital that a full debate be held because so many people in our community, whether they be in need of welfare housing, whether they be in rental accommodation, whether they are seeking to raise the finance to buy their own home, or whether they own a home and are paying off their home by way of mortgage repayments, when one adds all those groups in the community one sees that they are in severe need at this moment. Therefore, there should surely be no matter of greater importance for this House to discuss.

For the Government to suggest, as it did initially, that they saw there were matters of greater importance than this, that there was something they wished to discuss and it turned out it had nothing to do with this issue seems to me to indicate how much out of touch they are with the concerns

of ordinary people. Over a period of weeks I have attempted to engage the Government in debate on this matter. I called on the Premier to debate the issue through the media and publicly; he has declined such requests on every occasion. Of course he has, because he has nothing to offer and he does not wish to have it exposed. Now we have an opportunity to have this matter debated here in the House and it is as well that we do because this is the issue that most people are concerned with at this moment. So I am glad that the Government apparently has had some change of heart, that it is now prepared to accept the motion that we are moving, and I need say no more than in moving it than to say we request Standing Orders be suspended until 5 p.m. so that this motion of no confidence in the Government can be fully debated and put to a vote so we know exactly where they stand.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): This is rather an extraordinary situation which has developed. The Government has a most significant and important matter which must be debated for the welfare of the people of South Australia. It would seem that the Opposition having got some word of this is determined to bring on its own motion about housing. Mr Speaker, the Opposition will have every opportunity to bring forward its motion of no confidence, and the Deputy Premier and Leader of the House told them this.

Mr Hemmings: You are a coward.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier will appreciate that that word is unparliamentary. I ask him to withdraw it and apologise.

Mr HEMMINGS: I withdraw it and apologise, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Mr Speaker, the honourable member for Florey, as honourable members know, is not well. He has been granted a pair as is his right and it is proper, but the question which is being debated between the Leader and the Whips on both sides is the question of pairs relating to the suspension of Standing Orders. I refrained from moving a suspension until this matter had been clarified because I expected that we would go on with Question Time until we were sure it was clarified or not. I was rather surprised to find the Leader of the Opposition moving his suspension when we had not moved ours until that matter had been clarified.

I do not intend to accept the suspension of Standing Orders at this stage. Question Time will proceed and the Opposition will have their chance later on today once we have clarified the issue of suspension on both sides. I do not think it is a matter of putting it to the test. I think it is a question of finding out what is right and proper. That is what we have to find out. Until we have clarified that situation—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Until we find out what is the proper situation between the two Parties, I do not propose to agree to the suspension.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Glazbrook, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Pair—Aye—Mr O'Neill. No—Mr Evans.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTION TIME

HOUSING INTEREST RATES

Mr BANNON: Has the Premier examined schemes provided in other States to assist persons with problems caused by mortgage interest rate increases, and what scheme does he intend to introduce in South Australia to attempt to alleviate the position here? Reports in the press have foreshadowed a further increase of about 1.5 per cent in housing interest rates. This will mean on an average mortgage an increased payment of about \$35 a month. Many reports have already appeared in the press of people getting into trouble in relation to mortgage repayments and of other potential home buyers who have been discouraged because of the high level of payments that have to be made.

In the States of New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, and Western Australia (I do not have current details for the Northern Territory or Tasmania) comprehensive State Government schemes of various types have been introduced to assist people in those States with the problems they are experiencing in common with our own people. The details of those schemes have been publicised and are well known; hence my question.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, we have examined the programmes that have been put forward by Governments in other States. For example, in New South Wales the Premier, Mr Wran, has suggested that there should be a moratorium on housing repossessions; in Victoria a scheme was put forward before the last election to provide some subsidy for the balance of interest repayments which resulted from increased interest rates but that scheme was immediately dismantled by the Cain Government when it came to office.

The South Australian Government has already introduced a crisis relief scheme, which has been in operation since the first problems with interest rates arose. We have made representations to the financial institutions and have in fact had much co-operation from those institutions in keeping the impact of interest rates down as far as possible. They have renegotiated mortgages and arrangements, and remarkably few people have had to avail themselves of that facility involving emergency crisis relief assistance. We have also examined carefully indeed a number of projects which could be seen to help in the whole situation of interest rates. I think it is important that we should have this understood, and I think that the Leader of the Opposition will accept that there is in fact no responsibility on the State Governments for what I think we all agree are the unacceptably high interest rates at present.

We have made our position quite clear. At every opportunity we have put pressure on the Federal Government to cut personal income tax, to provide tax deductions for interest paid on home loans, and I have on a number of occasions written to the Prime Minister about this matter, the last occasion being 6 July. I have also suggested that there should be some form of rebate on income derived by investors involving moneys used for housing.

Those are three ways in which the Federal Government could give some assistance. The pilot Home Purchasers and In Crisis Relief Scheme has been operating for a considerable time. The Government has allocated \$100 000 to that initially. It is being administered by the Housing Trust: there have been 39 referrals; 21 have been approved; two applicants have been provided with trust rental accommodation; six applicants have either deferred or withdrawn their applications; six are still being considered; and four have not been approved. I think we are likely to be in a position to make a significant announcement about the Federal Government relief scheme proposed in its housing package.

Mr Bannon: You've been sitting on that for months.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I think the Leader—

Mr Bannon interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Leader of the Opposition really wants the facts, I point out that the thing that has been holding it up has been the divergence of opinion. When the States were asked for their suggestions as to how that money would be best applied the States that took the longest to reply were the States of Victoria and New South Wales. The delay that the Leader of the Opposition has been complaining about has in fact been due to the prevarication of the Labor States of Victoria and New South Wales.

The \$1 760 000 for the relief scheme which has been proposed in the housing package has in fact been approved today. Details are currently coming through to my office, and I hope that when the Leader brings forward his no-confidence motion a little later today, which I am sure he will be able to do, I will be able to give him all the details of the scheme.

The Government has also established, as at March, an advisory service at the Housing Trust to help and advise house buyers who are in financial difficulties: 135 people have sought advice and assistance, and this has been given. It has been so successful in fact that it has been determined to make this advisory service a permanent feature. It has become an indispensable bridge between lending institutions, welfare agencies and home buyers. The Government is very much concerned with the difficulties which face home buyers because of increased interest rates. We will continue to provide every assistance we can; we will continue to work with the Federal Government's proposed \$1 760 000, and we will continue to make available high levels of funding to the Housing Trust and the State Bank.

There has been considerable speculation in the past few days about a likely increase in home loan interest rates applied by building societies in South Australia. The Leader of the Opposition recently has again attempted to mislead the public concerning interest rate increases. I very much resent the scaremongering and fear tactics in which he has indulged. He has said:

About 1 200 South Australian couples would be prevented from owning their own houses if the Premier approved a 1½ per cent rise in South Australian building society home loan interest rates.

That is not a true statement. The Leader has used national figures relating to all lenders, not banks and building societies. If the Leader would care to look at the figures for the March quarter, he would see that building societies represented 15 per cent of housing loans, both in number and in value, in South Australia. The Leader has deliberately misused the figures in an attempt to mislead the public. If it is true that for every .5 per cent increase in interest rates a further 4 000 potential home buyers would be unable to afford to borrow for their own homes across Australia, we are not arguing with that: it is the fact that the Leader has deliberately used figures relating to all lending institutions and not just building societies about which he was complaining. I refer again to the Leader's statement that about 1 200 South Australian couples would be prevented from owning their own houses if there was a rise in South Australian building society home loan interest rates. It is not 1 200 for building society loans. Only 159 buyers in South Australia will find difficulty in affording a home loan from the building societies.

I make the point that the Leader of the Opposition has deliberately misrepresented the case. It is quite ludicrous to suggest that if building societies did increase their rates by 1.5 per cent 1 200 South Australian couples would be prevented from owning their own home. That is just not true. Certainly, at the worst, on the latest figures obtainable from the building societies, 159 couples, but not 1 200 couples, could certainly find some difficulty.

There has been considerable concern and speculation in the past few days about a likely increase in home loan interest rates applied by building societies, and I must say that the Leader of the Opposition was among the first people to jump up and down and say that this was likely. There is no doubt that the Leader is being accused by a large number of people in South Australia of talking up interest rates.

There is no doubt that there has been a great deal of speculation following the Australian savings bonds increases and the suggestion that increases in building societies' rates would follow. There is no question that building societies must retain their ability to compete against other financial institutions for raising funds for lending. I must say that one building society has at present lodged an application with the Government for an increase in interest rates for home loans. I will not say which society is involved. Indeed, it would be quite improper at this stage for me to do so; nor will I give any further details about what the request was, because the Government's advisory committee will very shortly begin an evaluation of the application. So, the Leader of the Opposition will have to contain himself in patience.

Mr Bannon: And so will all the people who—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Their fears have been fired and generated by all the public grandstanding of the Leader of the Opposition. Frankly, I consider that his behaviour in this regard has been absolutely disgraceful.

WATER RATES

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Water Resources advise the House of the benefits that will flow to South Australians following the recent increase in water rates? A number of my constituents have approached me expressing concern at the increase per kilolitre that is now being charged for water supplied to their homes and also about the decreased allowance that they can now use before they incur what is called excess water rates. These people would like to know why it has been necessary for this increase to be charged, bearing in mind the difficulties that they find with cost increases as they occur today.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The most significant benefit to the people of South Australia, and in particular to the people in the metropolitan area, as a result of the increase in water rates and the cost per kilolitre of water is undoubtedly the installation of water filtration in South Australia. The water filtration programme revolves largely around the metropolitan area but, as members would be aware, with Cabinet's approval of the Morgan water filtration plant, which scheme will go before the Public Works Standing Committee, and the fact that money has been made available for that project to proceed, we are looking at a total water filtration project in South Australia costing in the vicinity of \$200 000 000.

Undoubtedly, that cost of filtering not only Adelaide's water supply but also that of the northern towns, the Barossa Valley and Yorke Peninsula will have to be paid for somewhere along the line, and the increasing costs will to some degree offset the deficit, which will forever increase as a result of the water filtration programme. The current deficit on this year's cost of supplying water across the board to South Australia is approximately \$23 000 000, which sum must be made up from general revenue.

So, by no means is the ratepayer in South Australia actually meeting the cost of providing water delivered to the home. In actual fact the cost of water at 37 cents per kilolitre delivered to the home, and the fact that a deal of it is now filtered in the metropolitan area, and with the approval to refer to the Public Works Standing Committee

the massive Happy Valley project, it will mean that a further 40 per cent of the metropolitan area of Adelaide will become involved, but the cost of water filtration is considerably higher. As there will still be a \$23 000 000 deficit, the actual cost of water at 37 cents per kilolitre is not unreasonable for the quality of water that will be provided in the future. As has been mentioned on previous occasions by the former Government, the cost of water filtration will be significantly above the supply of unfiltered water. That I think has been accepted by a large group of thinking people in South Australia. They appreciate that those costs have to be met. There will still be a deficit to be made up of approximately \$23 000 000 from general revenue as a short-fall on the cost of providing water in South Australia.

GAS SUPPLIES

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Can the Minister of Mines and Energy tell the House and gas consumers of South Australia whether there will be a calorific loss in the gas they are presently being supplied with, and, if so, will this mean increased costs to gas users as a result of the liquids terminal at Stony Point and certain works proposed for Moomba? In an article in the *Energy News Journal* of 3 April 1982, headed 'Davy Pacific win South Australian liquids job', the following information is contained:

DM International and its Australian affiliate, Davy McKee Pacific, will be responsible for addition of a crude oil/condensate stabilisation unit, a cryogenic turbo-expander plant for recovery of natural gas liquids . . .

this is the important part—

and a de-ethaniser plus modifications to existing gas processing units at the existing Moomba complex.

The article goes on to point out that the combined Moomba-Stony Point facilities will be designed to process 900 000 000 standard cubic feet a day of gas and a very large amount, approximately 690 000 mtpy, of ethane will be extracted. Presently, as I understand it, the gas supplied in households and to users throughout South Australia contains a proportion of ethane which is burnt at the same time whenever a jet is ignited. Can the Minister say whether the extraction of this ethane will have the effects I have outlined to him in my question?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: I would think not. In fact, one of my responsibilities as Minister administering service and supply in the State chemistry division and one of the functions performed by that department is to test the calorific value of gas. I have seen that equipment. Gas has to be at a certain specification to be suitable to meet the requirements for reticulation. It is an interesting question that the honourable member has raised. The effect of removing ethane from the gas stream in due course is that if a petrochemical plant, first proposed by the Labor Party and carried on albeit with a different firm by this Government, does eventuate then ethane will be extracted from the gas stream. As the honourable member knows, ethane is not the highest—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: It has a heating value.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it has heating value, but ethane has the highest value and the highest calorific value, and the ethane would tend to increase. As it is a technical question I will get a technical reply for the honourable member, but my answer to the question would be that I would certainly not anticipate any increased cost to the consumer as a result of any change in calorific value of gas as a result of the ethanising of the gas stream. We would be at pains to see that that does not occur. In fact, one of the initiatives that I am pursuing with some degree of vigour at the moment is to try and rationalise the gas

contracts in South Australia to see that our gas supplies are ensured beyond 1987. As I pointed out to the honourable member previously, one of the difficulties facing this State are the gas contracts, and I am in active negotiations with Australian Gas Light at the moment.

Unfortunately, the contracts are clear and they are binding, but nonetheless it is of the highest priority as far as I am concerned at the moment that we do something about those contracts. The Government and I are actively pursuing every other avenue to ensure that we have an assured gas supply after 1987. I have been in negotiations with the Northern Territory to try and see that they can speed up the reserves in the fields which are not that far away from the South Australian border. We have been in contact with the people in Bass Strait and we have a record level of exploration going on in South Australia. I am perfectly happy to get a technical answer for the honourable member.

HAPPY VALLEY WATER FILTRATION PROGRAMME

Mr SCHMIDT: Can the Minister of Water Resources, in the light of today's announcement that the Public Works Standing Committee will be examining the Happy Valley water filtration programme, give some indication as to how long it might be before users from the Happy Valley filtration programme will be able to get better water? It is true that since I have been in this House I have constantly raised the question as to when the Happy Valley filtration plant will begin work, because the residents in the southern area have consistently asked not only this Government but the previous Government that something should be done about the quality of water in those areas? To date filtration plants have been provided in the north, yet residents still do not know when they will commence in the southern areas.

We have the problem particularly with the water supply being brought up from Myponga. We have marked turbidity in the water systems in the metropolitan areas and the matter having got to such a stage even our opponents have tried to come in on the issue.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member was given leave to explain the question, not to enter into a debate which borders on political activity.

Mr SCHMIDT: Also from time to time I have been approached by many citizens and I have a rather lengthy file on the number of constituents who have approached me on this matter because of dirty water, especially people with young babies, with the problem of washing nappies, and so forth. It has been a long-standing campaign from residents in the south to have the quality of water upgraded, so the news today that the Happy Valley filtration plant will go ahead is certainly welcome news to the residents in the south and those northwards to the metropolitan area. We would therefore be eager to find out when the quality of water to the metropolitan area will improve.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The Happy Valley water filtration programme is a massive undertaking as can be seen by the estimated cost of \$65 000 000. It makes it massive inasmuch as it will supply 40 per cent of the total filtered water requirements of metropolitan Adelaide. In particular, the honourable member asked how long it would be before consumers would receive filtered water. With an expenditure of that size it is anticipated that the total construction time will be between six and seven years but filtered water will be available from that plant within four years, the reason for this being that the technique the management of the Engineering and Water Supply Department will use will mean that the actual filters will be installed in the early stages of construction and the flocculation plant

will come at a later stage in production. It will mean that filtered water will be provided about midway through the construction of that filtration plant. The programme that was laid down by the previous Government was that filtered water could be anticipated to be available round about 1989. We believe we will be able to supply filtered water before that time by the technique that will be used by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and the programme of construction that will be implemented on that scheme. While the ultimate quality of the water will not be achieved until the plant is completed, there will be significantly improved quality in the water, probably 70 to 80 per cent of the potential of that plant, within four years from the commencement date.

ABORIGINAL YOUTH SERVICES

Mr ABBOTT: Is it true that the Aboriginal Community Youth Services project will cease to exist this year and that the funding for some Aboriginal youth workers working in this programme has already stopped? If so, what action has been taken by the Government to ensure the continuation of the project?

In 1979 the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs approved funding for the Department of Community Welfare for a programme designed to reduce the level of offending by young Aboriginal people. It was originally known as the Aboriginal Young Offenders Programme but this name has been changed to the Aboriginal Community Youth Services project. Six locations in South Australia were approved for the establishment of special programmes to work with Aboriginal youth; these are at Port Adelaide, Murray Bridge, Point Pearce, Port Augusta, Ceduna and Amata. They received grants to employ youth workers, purchase vehicles and sporting, camping and craft equipment and to cover operational costs.

During the 1980-81 financial year a major review of funding occurred and two additional groups were granted funds to purchase a bus, at Port Lincoln and the Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services in Adelaide. Committees have been established at most locations comprising representatives from the Aboriginal community and Aboriginal youth workers were employed. They assisted in the development of programmes designed to provide constructive activities for young Aboriginal people who have offended or who are at risk of offending. These programmes included social and recreational activities, participation in sport, camps and craft work, counselling and opportunities for learning social skills to help them in the work force.

Several Aboriginal youth workers came to me recently expressing their concern about the future of the project which they described as being very successful. Apparently funding has been provided to the end of August for wages only and the funding for the programme itself ceased at the end of June even though contracts had been undertaken by the committee and the Aboriginal community to the end of September. The Aboriginal youth workers will lose their jobs and they want to know what is going to happen with this project and all of the valuable equipment and the bus that are attached to it. In His Excellency's Speech yesterday he said:

In the area of young offenders my Government will develop its alternatives to expensive secure care, while ensuring that the community is protected from serious offenders.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The area of concern to which the honourable member referred is currently under consideration between me and the Federal Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. We recognise that it is far better to provide facilities and assistance which will particularly keep young Aboriginal

offenders out of institutions. The cost of maintaining and operating institutions can far better be used in providing additional assistance by way of sporting institutions and sporting facilities and this is the area that I am currently discussing with the Federal Minister. As soon as that has been finalised I will make a report available to the House.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr GLAZBROOK: My question is directed to the Minister of Water Resources. In view of the statements made yesterday about the quality of the water supplied from the Happy Valley reservoir can the Minister finally allay any fears that there has been a cover up of the situation relating to the safety of the water supply?

Yesterday evening I heard on radio 5DN a statement attributed to the Hon. J. Cornwall in another place that the water supply to the residents in the southern area and in particular to my district had become contaminated due to a breakdown in equipment and that efficient treatment with the quality of the water had been omitted.

It was further alleged that the Health Department had sought to notify the public about the situation but it had been deterred from doing so by members of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Alarming reference was also made to the fact that had this occurred during the summer, untreated water, possibly carrying amoebic meningitis, could have been distributed in the water supply. The suggestion was also made that the current spate of 'wogs' predominant in our community at the moment could have been a direct consequence of this failure of equipment. By 6 p.m. yesterday I had received several calls from constituents who had been scared enough to contact me requesting an explanation and suggesting that this current spate of 'wogs' was a direct consequence of this problem. One caller stated, after I explained the situation to him, that the unsubstantiated irresponsible comments of the Hon. Dr J. Cornwall had caused major and unnecessary concern and worry.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The comments made yesterday by the Hon. J. Cornwall had absolutely no basis of fact or foundation whatsoever. It was completely impossible to cover up the situation because there was absolutely nothing to cover up. The fears that have been once again instilled into the minds of the people of the metropolitan area by this irresponsible action for which the honourable member is renowned and the reasons for his doing it must be becoming fairly obvious to the people of South Australia.

In actual fact, the problem which was an operational one within the Engineering and Water Supply Department was brought about by a 24-hour strike which was called with absolutely no notice by the charge plant operators who are the operators who control the chlorination injection equipment for the distribution system.

Apparently the Hon. Dr Cornwall does not know how the system operates. The problem occurred in relation to water passing from Happy Valley reservoir to the zone storage tanks, the pressure vessels, but no untreated water got beyond the zone pressure tanks. Therefore the allegation that untreated water arrived at houses or went into the system is quite untrue, and, in fact, deliberately misleading. The comment that was made that the Central Board of Health was urged not to make any statement, is, once again, blatantly untrue and there is absolutely no foundation in that statement. The Chairman of the Central Board of Health is at liberty, and it is his prerogative, to make statements at any time without my approval to proceed. That statement is a further blatant misrepresentation and untruth as it applies to this incident.

Had untreated water got into the distribution system in the metropolitan area then it would have been the responsibility of the Central Board of Health and the Chairman to notify the community at large. As this did not occur there was absolutely nothing about which to inform the public at large. I can only refer to what I said in the beginning, namely, that there is no basis of truth to this whatsoever. In fact, the reputation that Dr Cornwall is rapidly gaining in the community as being the most dishonest politician in Australia is certainly substantiated by this recent action.

LAND RECLAMATION PROGRAMME

Mr PETERSON: Will the Minister of Marine say what is the future of the Department of Marine and Harbors land reclamation programme? The availability of land in the Port Adelaide area generally and the peninsula has been a vital marketing factor used by the Department of Marine and Harbors. There has been an ongoing programme of land reclamation and I think even last year some 17 hectares of land was reclaimed. My information is that the screw pump dredge which is so vital for this operation to take place is now useless. It was temporarily upgraded in 1970, but it has now reached the stage where it is no longer viable to use this piece of equipment. Without this facility to pump dredged material the reclamation of areas adjacent to the main shipping channel is not possible. I understand that there is at least some three years work planned for reclamation. Further to this is the concern about the employment and the jobs of people employed on that dredge together with the ancillary work. I would like to know where that programme now stands.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The honourable member addresses several questions and if I cannot answer all of them I will let him have a detailed response to those that I do not cover at this stage. Certainly, we are having problems with the screw pump dredge. The honourable member should realise that that does not mean that we intend to stop the reclamation programme. The honourable member mentioned that there was a three-year programme. Indeed, there is a great deal longer programme for reclamation of land and I must reinforce the fact that the reclamation of land complements the present initiatives taken by my department in marketing industrial estates throughout the world because, as the member for Semaphore knows more than most members of this House, the port of Adelaide is one of the few ports in the world where there is industrial land with a water frontage or a potential wharf frontage. This fact, together with the attempts by the department and the State Government and my officers in trying to obtain Australian North Bound Shipping Service Conferences into the port of Adelaide, formed the most important initiatives that we have on our hands at the moment.

Of course, as the member for Semaphore would realise, the dredging is vital to that project as it is to any other project. All I can do is to give the honourable member an assurance that the dredging programme is regarded as having a very high priority. As the honourable member mentioned, we do have some problems with the dredge, and he obviously knows that from other information he has received. I would not try to deny that, but we are trying to find a solution to the matter at this stage.

WOMEN'S HEALTH ADVISER

Mr RANDALL: Is the Minister of Health aware that the Australian Labor Party, if it should ever be elected to Gov-

ernment in South Australia, would undertake to appoint a women's health adviser? At a recent Party convention, apparently, the Labor Party passed a policy statement which stated, in part:

A Labor Government will give a new health deal to women. We will create a senior contract position of women's health adviser to consult with and advise women in the health care system and the community. She will report directly to the Minister of Health on policy initiatives, directions and implementation.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I am aware of the Labor Party's policy and I greeted the news with some wry amusement because it seems to me that the Labor Party in enacting such a policy is really engaging in a form of tokenism with an absolutely mistaken understanding of the functions of a health commission. In suggesting that there be a woman's adviser who would be separate from the commission and report directly to the Minister, the Labor Party is really devising a scheme to bypass the commission in its statutory role of co-ordinator of health services.

I can imagine there being many a collision course developing if such an adviser were to be installed without becoming part of the commission's structure. That mistake has been made in relation to several of the positions which the Labor Party apparently has in mind, should it be elected to Government, in terms of the Health Commission and its relationship with the Minister. I could only say that a shambles would result. However, in terms of this new-found interest in women's health it is worth looking back on the situation that pertained when the Government came to office. At that stage within the Health Commission, consisting of eight commissioners, there was one woman.

There were very few women on its registration boards and statutory boards which are under the administration of the Minister of Health, and very few on the various hospital boards which had been appointed by the previous Government. I think it is worthy of note that in addition to having a woman as Minister of Health in South Australia we also have the first statutory authority in this State, and I believe the first in Australia, to be composed of equal numbers of women and men, those four women having been appointed by the Governor during my term of office, three of them quite recently. Of course, they were each appointed on their merits, but they will bring to the deliberations of the commission a perspective which has a very strong sensitivity and a deep sensitivity to the needs of women's health. Such needs, of course, relate principally to the reproductive role of women.

On that note it is worth noting that the commission itself this year adopted recommendations of a very comprehensive report on obstetric services in South Australia for their improvement and to ensure that they are appropriate to the needs of women. In addition to those various actions which I have outlined, I should also point out that it was under this Government that the Adelaide Women's Community Health Centre was established, that it was provided with excellent accommodation, in a very central position on the corner of Pennington Terrace and King William Road, that it was properly staffed, that a first-rate honorary board was appointed consisting of women who are well respected throughout the South Australian community. That Women's Community Health Centre has a budget for 1981-82 of \$291 725.

I commend most warmly the staff and the board of that centre for what it is doing for women's health. I suggest that if the Labor Party is really interested in women's health it would concern itself less with positions such as advisory positions and more with actually installing women in positions of responsibility, both statutory and administrative, in the way in which this Government has done.

I believe that the Liberal Government's record concerning women's health is second to none in the whole of Australia, and I am very proud indeed that our South Australian Health Commission is the first major statutory authority in Australia to be composed of equal numbers of men and women, giving women not just an advisory role but an executive and responsible role at the very top of the health system.

WATER COSTS

Mr TRAINER: I ask the Minister of Water Resources what is the cost per kilolitre of providing water within the metropolitan area. Also, does this provide an overall surplus for the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, if not, what is the size and source of the overall deficit? In the Minister's reply to a Government back-bencher a short while ago, I think that he referred to some benefits flowing to the State from a price of 37 cents per kilolitre. I am curious to know whether that price in the metropolitan area produces a surplus within the metropolitan area, which, in turn, partially subsidises the rural areas of the State. I recall that the Auditor-General's Report indicated that a deficit of about \$20 000 000 was incurred in servicing rural areas.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: What the honourable member has said in relation to deficits is correct: the major part of the deficit is incurred on the country distribution, whereas the major deficit incurred by the State Transport Authority is incurred in the metropolitan area. So, this is a similar sort of situation.

The honourable member asked what is the precise cost of water in Adelaide: that depends on whether or not it is related to actual operating costs or to the total capital costs involved. If we include the cost of water filtration as part and parcel of the total cost of supplying water, the figure is quite different indeed, because we are looking at \$200 000 000 in addition to the existing operating costs. At this stage, the water filtration programme is approximately half way through the construction period. It is, therefore, a matter of how one assesses it: whether one assesses it on an annual operating cost or whether one takes into account debt charges as well; if one does that, the picture is quite different.

YATALA PRISON

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Chief Secretary report to the House the latest information regarding the sit-in by inmates at Yatala Prison? I understand that a number of demands were made by the inmates at Yatala, who also staged a sit-in to add pressure to the granting of their demands.

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: A minor incident occurred at Yatala Labour Prison earlier this afternoon when a small group of inmates decided to sit in in the visitors' room. This occurred shortly after 1 p.m. today, and the acting Superintendent of the institution asked the inmates concerned to return to the yards, which they duly did after being given an indication that they would not be charged with a breach of prison regulations. At no time was prison security in jeopardy.

The grievances put forward by the inmates ranged from clothing requirements to the cleaning up of pigeon droppings in the exercise yard. The prisoners have been given a clear assurance that, if they are prepared to list their grievances and supply them through the Director, they will be given adequate consideration in due course. I assure the House that at no stage was there any jeopardy of security of the institution itself, and I commend the prison authorities for

the way in which they handled the situation, by getting the inmates to return to the exercise yard, and for the efficient way in which extra security precautions were immediately undertaken.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S MISREPRESENTATION

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation on the basis that I have been misrepresented.

Leave granted.

Mr TRAINER: As a result of the response to an interjection by me yesterday, the Minister of Education made certain remarks which were indirectly reported in this morning's *Advertiser* and which I believe misrepresented my position. Accordingly, I would like to read those three brief newspaper paragraphs, as follows:

A few minutes later, it was the Opposition's turn to be caught napping—literally. Mr Allison, Minister of Education, halted one reply to observe, 'The Opposition member who closely resembles Lenin (presumably he meant Mr Trainer, the only bearded ALP member in the House)—

he certainly was not referring to the Democrat on this side—is waking up.

I was not particularly upset about that comment in the Chamber at the time, because I considered it to be a fair standard for what passes as banter in this Chamber. I was not terribly upset at the reference by the Minister of Education to Lenin, bearing in mind the slogan of J. T. Lang in New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable gentleman will make a personal explanation.

Mr TRAINER: I will not then refer to Premier Jack Lang's comment about being 'greater than Lenin'. However, the Minister's comment about me is inaccurate in its reference to any physical attributes that I may or may not have.

An honourable member: You can't even speak Russian.

Mr TRAINER: Indeed, I cannot speak Russian, for a start. In fact Matriculation history classes that I have had in the past, after seeing the film 'Nicholas and Alexander', felt that I had a greater physical resemblance to Czar Nicholas II than to his revolutionary opponent. However, it was the comment about my being asleep that particularly stung. It was, I understand, intended in jest, in the same sense that a schoolmaster would address a class as 'snapping out of daydream'. It would not be difficult to daydream in this environment, because we work long hours in here, and, like many other members of this place, I am sure that I have dozed off from time to time: I have rested my eyes, gazed downwards, and so on. The boring Ministerial dissertations in this place encourage members to doze off: the standard of debate can do the same, and Parliament can be very boring, as people in the gallery have commented. Even the Pope himself has been seen to yawn on global television in the midst of solemn occasions. However, what upset me is that on this occasion I had not fallen asleep. Indeed, I was wide awake, and I trust that the *Advertiser* will be a little more careful in future.

CASINO BILL (1982)

The Hon. M. M. WILSON (Minister of Recreation and Sport): I move:

That the select committee on the Bill have leave to sit during the sittings of the House.

Motion carried.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE: Mr O'NEILL

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): I move:

That six weeks leave of absence be granted to the honourable member for Florey (Mr O'Neill) on account of ill health.

Motion carried.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

ROXBY DOWNS

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is the second chapter in the fairly extraordinary events we had at the beginning of proceedings today. It marks what I believe is yet another attempt by the Government to avoid debating the issue of greatest concern and moment in the community and to replace it with a motion of its own.

On the occasion when we moved for a suspension to have the housing motion discussed, I understand that there was some disagreement over whether or not pairs applied in the case of the motion moved by the Government. If they do apply, it is impossible for the Government to gain the requisite number in the present state.

However, we have since had discussions with the Government and I understand from my Deputy that the situation has been established that in this instance pairs will not apply. Apparently, the precedents and the Standing Orders have been examined, and that has been the agreement that has been reached. That means, of course, that it is in the Government's power to enforce a suspension if it so desires. Prior to that position being clarified, the Government suggested that both these matters (the matters it wished to raise and the matter we wished to raise) could be debated, and I understand that that still applies. At that stage we were told that our housing motion would be the one that would be discussed first. Apparently that is not to apply: the Premier is moving his motion. Again, I say that we will accept that position with some considerable reluctance. Both debates will proceed and we will see what is the outcome of them. However, I think that the whole way in which the Government has handled this matter has been pretty poor.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): I would like to thank the House for its indulgence in this way and abiding by what is obviously the situation which should apply and which I am very pleased has now been clarified. I move:

That this House express its unqualified support for the development to full production and continued operation of the Roxby Downs project, under the terms, safeguards, and conditions set out in the indenture Act recently approved by this Parliament, and for the sale and processing of the copper and all other minerals produced incidentally thereto.

This is a vital motion. It is one which should not be necessary. Indeed, it is one that would not have been necessary had the Opposition at any time in the last two or three weeks simply and honestly declared its commitment to the future of the Roxby Downs project. But the fact of the matter is that it has not, and workers at Roxby Downs, when I visited there at the end of last week, and the hundreds

of workers who depend for their livelihood on the project, are very concerned that the Labor Party is still not giving any indication of its intentions. It is very important that those people should not live under a cloud of suspicion or any uncertainty about their future. At present they are delighted that the Indenture Bill has been passed through this Parliament but they still have fears, because they can get no clear-cut unequivocal 'Yes' or 'No' answer from the Opposition as to exactly what a Labor Government would do if at some time in the future it were to come to office.

Members of the business community have become conscious of this in recent days also and they are becoming more concerned. That concern has been expressed to me in recent days by leading members of the business community who want to know what is going to be done about it and why (this is the major question) does the Opposition avoid the subject—why will it not give a clear commitment, 'Yes' or 'No', as to whether or not Roxby Downs will go ahead? The matter is now being ventilated in the media, as witness the article that appeared in the evening press yesterday.

The question is one that must be answered and it is a vital question—vital because it is quite clear that the vast majority of people in Australia regard Roxby Downs as a vital issue. Its future cannot be held under the sort of cloud which it presently is being held under because of the Opposition's refusal to come clean one way or the other. Several times in the past two weeks I have urged the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of his Party, or on behalf of that section of his Party that he still leads, to say whether or not Roxby would proceed without hindrance if a Labor Government were to come to office at some time in the future. All I want is a simple answer, either 'Yes' or 'No'.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, the member for Stuart is also under some pressure because I believe that the members of his own electorate want to know where he stands on that particular issue also. I was in Port Augusta with the honourable member only a few days ago and the topic of conversation was totally about what the Labor Party is going to do about Roxby Downs and what it will do about the future of the Iron Triangle, which is so strongly bound up in the future of Roxby Downs. The Leader has refused to give a direct reply. He has made contradictory—

An honourable member: What about Peter Duncan?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I sincerely hope that we are going to hear from the member for Elizabeth, and know where he stands on this matter, also. If and when the Labor Party ever comes to office in this State, the member for Elizabeth could well have the honour of leading that Party.

The question basically is where the Labor Party stands on the issue of Roxby Downs now and in the future. The present Leader has not given any direct reply at all. I repeat that he has made contradictory ambiguous statements. He has not answered or addressed the central question: he has totally evaded the issue. This motion is indeed vitally necessary, because the people of South Australia have an undeniable right to know where every member of this House stands in respect of Roxby Downs. There is no mistake about where members on this side of the House stand—none at all. This Government believes that Roxby Downs is vital to the economic and employment stability of South Australia, both now, for the rest of the 1980s, and, indeed, well into the next century, and the majority of South Australian's believe that, too. That is something which cannot be overlooked.

The people who are employed either directly or indirectly (and there are some 1 000 of them now in the Australian community) because of Roxby Downs are entitled to some guarantee about their future, and my Government believes that at least 10 000 additional permanent jobs can be created

by the project. Because of that, no effort should be spared to encourage and safeguard its future.

In the past 34 months, we have done everything we possibly could to assist in the establishment and development of this one billion dollar project. We have pressed relentlessly to have the necessary legislation passed by this Parliament, despite the joint efforts by the Australian Labor Party and the Democrats to block it. Indeed, we saw the rather unwholesome spectacle of members of the Labor Party voting to destroy the 1 000 jobs which already exist because of Roxby Downs.

Now that the Bill has passed this Parliament, the path has been cleared for the joint venturers, Western Mining and B.P., to proceed with feasibility studies which are due to be completed in a little over two years. By itself, this guarantees an investment of some \$50 000 000 in South Australia over the next two years. It has guaranteed the jobs of those 1 000 people, but the refusal of the Labor Party to say whether, if it won Government, it would allow the project to proceed is a matter of growing public concern.

It is not good enough to say that a decision on whether the production stage can proceed will not have to be made until well into the future. I have heard that said a number of times in the Leader's attempt to evade the question. The point is that the feasibility study now being undertaken by B.P. and Western Mining will be completed some time in 1984, the year after next, and, assuming that the companies want to proceed, the Government of the day will be required to make a decision.

In other words, it is not something well down the track and not something that we do not have to worry about until the 1990s. We will have to make a decision on this matter some time within the next two years. It is as close as that, and it is therefore vital to the future of South Australia that we know what the Labor Party's attitude is on this matter. Is it in favour of Roxby Downs going ahead, or will it block it by using one or other of the contradictory parts of its policy? As far as this Government is concerned Roxby Downs will go ahead, and it will continue.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes, yes, yes, as long as the Liberal Government is in office in this State Roxby Downs is safe. Honourable members opposite had better know that, just as the people of South Australia will know that. At the present time, the Opposition indicates that it will let the feasibility study proceed but it will not give any further additional guarantees. It will make up its mind at some time in the future. However, it will have to make up its mind a whole lot sooner than that because, as the people of South Australia now know, the final decision will be made within the next couple of years. They want to know now what the answer is going to be. A big question mark is hanging over any additional guarantees as far as the Labor Party is concerned. I have already said that the refusal of the Labor Party to give any unqualified assurance that it would not stand in the way of full production at Roxby Downs is causing deep concern amongst the business community. It is jeopardising potential investment interstate, and I must say that at present we are better placed than any other State to attract that investment. However, this is one of the shadows that is deterring would-be investors from coming here.

A future Labor Government would have the power, and, under its present policy, which is totally contradictory, it would have a mandate to choose whatever course of action it wanted to. It could repudiate existing contracts and dismantle the Roxby Downs project if it should win an election. Let us look at the policy platform, certainly not widely publicised by Labor, which says:

Resource development will not alone provide a simple solution to the State's economic problems and in fact it may further aggravate them if such development is not adequately met.

A little more negatively, the A.L.P. policy also says:

Noting the long-term nature of resources contracts and development projects, and the volatile nature of world needs, demands and prices, a State Labor Government will regard all long-term agreements as subject to renegotiation where agreements are no longer in the best interest of the people of South Australia.

In whose opinion? Who will put down the opinion as to whether or not a project is in the best interests of South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That is the very thing about which we are talking: who will be the community's representatives? The Opposition Leader has tried to underplay the possibility of a Labor Government repudiating the Roxby Downs indenture by saying that it would not have the power. In fact, it has been said even this afternoon across the Chamber. The Leader said that Labor would try to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: No indenture in South Australia is, or ever will be, in danger from a Liberal Government. Just let the member for Stuart contain himself in patience and I will give him some chapter and verse about what the Labor Party's attitude is to indentures.

An honourable member: What's your attitude?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I repeat it for the benefit of the honourable gentleman and for the benefit of the people of South Australia: as long as a Liberal Government is in office in this State, all indentures are safe.

Mr Trainer: That's not much longer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the member for Ascot Park confirm me in my opinion that the Labor Party is anxious to change indentures. He may well want to get into office, but that will not do him any good. He has clearly put forward as his attitude that he will change an indenture if his Party was to get into office. The Leader recently said that the Labor Party would try to renegotiate the Roxby indenture, and then he added, 'If that renegotiation was not possible, the companies have their indenture as their contractual document, and it would not be in our power to alter it.' Only yesterday the Leader was quoted as saying:

Where a contract has been duly entered into, there is a responsibility on a subsequent Government to honour that understanding. I am pleased that the member for Stuart agrees with that. That is the attitude that we have adopted. Later, in the same article, the Leader of the Opposition is quoted in simple language. Mr Bannon says that the Opposition has accepted the facts of life in the matter of Roxby Downs, and that when the production stage was reached well into the future a Labor Government would have another look at the matter. What does that mean? That look is not well into the future. I repeat for the benefit of the Deputy Leader that that decision will have to be taken some time in 1984. That is not well into the future: that is within the life of the next Government certainly.

We want to know, if at some time in the future the Labor Government does come to office, what it will then do. Will it phase out Roxby Downs? Indications are that it most certainly will, and the Leader does not deny it. He may certainly have a law degree, but the statements that he has made about the inability of future Governments to alter the Roxby arrangements are not true, and he knows it. He is contradicting the legal opinion given recently by the Chief Justice. Also, a Q.C. with extensive experience in this place has given a fair opinion on this matter. In making those statements, the Leader has obviously set out on a policy of deception. The Leader of the Opposition is trying to deceive

the public as well as the hostile and dominant socialist left of his own Party, led by the member for Elizabeth. The Leader of the Opposition knows perfectly well that a Government has the power to override any contract negotiated by a previous Government. If he is still not convinced (if in deluding his left wing he has succeeded in deluding himself) let me quote from a judgment handed down in 1980 by the Chief Justice, Mr Justice King, as follows:

Ministers of State cannot, however, by means of contractual obligations entered into on behalf of the State fetter their own freedom, or the freedom of their successors or the freedom of other members of Parliament, to propose, consider and, if they think fit, vote for laws, even laws which are inconsistent with the contractual obligations.

To enter into a contract containing a provision purporting to fetter members of Parliament in their deliberations and to attempt to enforce any such contractual provision would, in my opinion, be the clearest breach of the privileges of the Parliament and of the members thereof.

The Ministers of State are members of Parliament. As such they are free to propose, to consider, to discuss and to vote on any Bill unconstrained by any contract entered into on behalf of the State.

In other words, the Government has the power to change an indenture without the consent of the other signatories and indeed we had a recent example of that when the previous Government intended to change the West Lakes Indenture Bill without the agreement of the West Lakes people. We have made quite clear that we would not interfere with the indenture and the question really is whether a Labor Government would do so.

Mr Keneally: You're insisting that we do so, because—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Stuart continues to interject, he may find that he is not in the Chamber to take part in the debate if he so desires.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: That might suit him very well. He might be able to avoid having to state where he stands on this whole matter by being outside. Perhaps that is what he is trying to do. In 1955 Labor in Opposition moved to repudiate the indenture agreement which set up the B.H.P. operations in South Australia, the most important investment arrangement this State has entered into up until now. The driving force behind that move to change the indenture was Mr Dunstan, who later became the Premier. If the Leader really believes that a future Labor Government could not change an indenture, he should consult Mr Dunstan who I understand recently led a protest march against the Roxby development. Even if the Leader is not aware of the powers the Government has to repudiate existing contracts and arrangements, he can be assured that major investors and potential investors most certainly are. The repudiation of the Roxby indenture would do enormous harm to the recovery and growth of the South Australian economy. It would not only mean the loss of Roxby Downs: it would also see a massive flight of capital out of the State—capital we simply cannot afford to lose. We have that investment within our grasp, and we must do everything we can to make sure that it remains with us.

This motion is not addressed simply to the Roxby mining venture in isolation: it also seeks to establish the attitude of the Opposition to the additional investment which the mining operation is likely to attract. If the Roxby mining operation went ahead, would a future Labor Government allow the downstream processing, including conversion and enrichment, and the sale of that as minerals mined incidental to the process? Those developments will again mean additional investment in South Australia and inevitably a substantial increase in job opportunities and that extra investment would attract additional returns to the State Treasury and income which could be spent to the benefit of every South Australian on schools, roads and services

and help us to keep down State taxation. However, a Labor Government has a power to slam the door on that investment and it appears now that it would do so without a second thought.

Following the failure of the Opposition Leader to give a direct answer about his Party's attitude to Roxby, I am now convinced that Labor could well intend to scrap the project, whatever the feasibility studies reveal, should it ever come to Government. There is no question that under a Labor Government, Roxby Downs would be very much under a question mark, and anyone who believes that the refusal of the Opposition Leader to say that Roxby would not go ahead means the project will eventually go ahead I think had better have another look at the whole question. Labor does not regard existing contracts tremendously well. Its policy says that it would phase out projects and repudiate contracts whatever the potential economic, employment and investment damage this might cause. Let there be no doubt, that Labor's refusal to give guarantees about the future of Roxby one way or the other means that the project is under very real threat of termination under a future Labor Administration. I repeat, that the Roxby project is too important to South Australia to allow that to happen.

Statements made by the Opposition Leader on the Roxby project in the past 18 months raise grave doubts about the Leader's credibility. The statements have all been contradictory and ambiguous but they all point one-way to Labor's policy of wanting to scrap Roxby. On 4 June 1980, in this House the following interchange took place between the Leader and the member for Eyre:

Mr GUNN: The honourable member says he does not support it—

meaning Roxby Downs—

Mr Bannon: No.

Mr GUNN: He is in total opposition to the Mayor and the City Council of Port Pirie?

Mr Bannon: Yes.

Mr GUNN: And you do not support the mining and export of uranium from Roxby Downs?

Mr Bannon: No.

Mr GUNN: As Premier, you would stop that project?

Mr Bannon: I am opposed to it.

On 5 March last year, the Leader said in an interview on *Nationwide*:

Take the case of Roxby Downs. We have never, as a Party, opposed exploratory work. We have never opposed drilling to find out what mineral resources there are. But at the point when commercial mining operations take place, that is the point we say, judge the facts objectively, and at the moment we would not permit it.

As I have already pointed out, that decision is going to have to be taken within the next two years. Labor's own policy speaks of the volatile nature of world needs, demands and prices. At Port Pirie the Opposition Leader dismissed the future of the Roxby Downs development when he said that depressed prices for copper, gold and uranium made the project unrealistic, but at the end of last year he began changing his tune. He said that negotiations over the indenture agreement had reached an impasse because the companies demanded what he called 'absurdly low electricity rates'. Then he claimed there were grave doubts about the quality and quantity of water which could be supplied, and a little later, in December last year, the Leader sent up a new balloon: he said that Western Mining wanted so much infrastructure that the cost for the State would be enormous. The Leader has been putting artificial and imaginary barriers in the way of this development ever since it came forward. Earlier this year the Leader had again changed his direction when he wrote in a newspaper article:

Without Roxby Downs we could quite easily be better off.

When details of the indenture agreement were revealed to the Parliament, every claim made by the Leader was shown

to be false and without foundation. It is a credit to the negotiators that that indenture was perhaps the best ever negotiated by any State Government in this country. The Opposition is obviously desperate to find a valid criticism of the Roxby project, and it is now sulking, refusing to say what it would do in Government. If it does not say 'Yes' to Roxby wholeheartedly and unqualifiedly, obviously it can only mean 'No'. The need to press ahead with Roxby has never been greater. There is a down-turn in every Western market. The traditional markets for South Australian manufacturing industry, namely, Sydney and Melbourne, are in a depressed condition. We have to create employment, and we have to get on with those jobs that Roxby can bring. We have an opportunity with Roxby to be the lucky State in a lucky country, because it will mean jobs in almost every sector of the South Australian industrial, commercial, retail and public sector work force, a major new town, new industries, business growth and a new-found pride and confidence in South Australia.

No Government has done more in the past 20 years to assist local industry than has the present Liberal Government, but we cannot afford to knock back any opportunities at all. If the Leader of the Opposition does not believe that the 1 000 jobs that are currently in existence because of Roxby Downs are not important, let him get up and say that, too.

The Opposition has pointed rather lamely to its amended Federal uranium policy, which says that a Labor Government would examine on a case-by-case basis projects in which uranium was 'mined incidentally to the mining of other minerals'.

It is no coincidence, of course, that the word 'incidentally' has been introduced into this motion. The new Federal Labor Party policy should give some clues to Labor's intention about Roxby's future, and yet it is a study in ambiguity. Incidentally, too, it would be something that we would like to hear a definition of. One explanation suggests that it means one-third or less of the minerals, but how is the third assessed? Is it by volume, by weight, by ore body or by processed material or by mineral exported, or by the value of minerals extracted? Just what is meant by the words 'incidental thereto'?

I would also like to challenge the member for Elizabeth to explain his attitude to Roxby in clear and unambiguous terms, because the honourable member has been noticeably reticent about making public statements about Roxby since he voted against the amendments to the original hard line anti-uranium policy at the Federal conference. But he was quoted as saying that he would abide by the policy. Does this mean that the member for Elizabeth would abide by the single clause which could permit Roxby Downs to proceed under a Labor Government, if that is what is wanted, or by the seven clauses making up the overriding thrust of the policy which quite clearly would prevent the project's proceeding? The view of the member for Elizabeth on this issue is vital, as far as this House is concerned. Until now he has been fundamentally honest in his attitude to uranium and to Roxby. He said that if he had his way all sections of the nuclear cycle around the world would be closed down, and clearly Roxby would come within that broad sweep.

The member for Elizabeth described the new Federal policy as a sell-out, which presumably means that he believes it allows uranium mining to proceed. The Victorian State A.L.P. State Secretary, Mr Bob Hogg, who moved the successful amendment said that it further strengthened the A.L.P.'s anti-uranium policy. Last week he was expelled from the socialist left in Victoria. The Opposition Leader, who spoke in favour of the amendments, said that the new Federal A.L.P. policy made his Party's position easier to explain and claimed that Roxby Downs was exempted from

the policy. However, the policy did not mention Roxby Downs, and the vague form of wording certainly cannot be seen as a guarantee that the project will go ahead.

I remind the House that while there is a single ambiguous clause in Labor's new policy which could technically allow Roxby to proceed, should a Labor Government wish it, there are seven clauses which express direct opposition to uranium mining, processing or export and which would justify a Labor Government's stopping or phasing out Roxby. We need a straight answer now; we need a clear interpretation from members opposite on exactly what they believe the new Federal policy means, and then we want to know which interpretation they intend to use, if ever the Labor Party comes to Government.

I was interested to read that the Labor Party intends to hold a special convention calling together its 200 delegates ostensibly for the purposes of carrying out the vital job of selecting numbers eight, nine, ten and eleven on the Party's Legislative Council ticket. It seems that perhaps the convention might be looking at the uranium question again at that time. We will watch the outcome with great interest. The attitude of the member for Elizabeth who has strong personal support within the Labor convention, will be of particular interest. However, the internal divisions within the Labor Party are incidental to this debate. What we seek today is a clear, unequivocal statement from the Leader of the Opposition about the future of Roxby under a future Labor Government; a clear unequivocal statement of his attitude would also be welcome from the member for Elizabeth, and if the Opposition supports this motion then the people of South Australia will be reassured that whatever the result of future elections, Roxby will proceed, subject to the current feasibility study.

If the Opposition ducks the issue, if it attempts to amend the motion, if it votes against it, then South Australians will also have a clear choice at the next election, because they could only conclude that the Labor Party, in office, would shut down Roxby and drive away hundreds of millions of dollars of investment and the jobs and security and prosperity that that would bring. It is impossible to reach any other conclusion. All that we seek from the Leader of the Opposition is a clear and unequivocal statement about Roxby—yes or no. Surely the A.L.P. must know what it would do. Surely it must know what its policy is, what its attitude is, and it is now time for the Labor Party to come clean. Just where does it stand? This is one of the most important questions that has ever been asked in this Parliament. It is so important because of its tremendous significance to the future welfare and well-being of the people of South Australia. I hope that the Opposition will come up and give a straight unequivocal answer to the question which is now being asked by all South Australians—South Australians deserve an answer.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): Our Premier makes a quite pathetic spectacle standing up and wasting the time of the House and the time of his Government in expending its energies on ridiculous motions of this sort. It is a cynical and fairly contemptible exercise. It shows just how out of touch he is with the immediate concerns of the community of South Australia and it shows that he apparently has no concept of what happened in this House some months ago, or some weeks ago, when I understood that he was breaking out the champagne in company with his Deputy in celebration of the passing of the Indenture Bill. Our attitude to that indenture was made quite clear.

The Opposition moved its amendments, we put our arguments very forcibly in this House and in another place, and the Bill was nonetheless passed. Now we get this pathetic

motion only a few weeks afterwards, a really pathetic attempt to regurgitate the whole issue. If in fact the Premier was genuinely concerned about this project, if he really did believe the propaganda he is trying to thrust down the throats of the people of South Australia we would not be subjected to this sort of nonsensical exercise. The Premier says that the workers at Roxby Downs have an uncertainty about their future. I ask, why? First, they can have no uncertainty, although I can understand that in the longer term they would have, and I will come to that in a minute, but in the short term they can have no uncertainty: the indenture was passed; the companies and the venturers are committed to spend money through the feasibility of this project to the end of 1984.

Those workers are currently employed at that phase of the project and there is no uncertainty about that. The Opposition does not seek, nor have we ever sought, to close off that aspect of the project. Clearly and unequivocally our attitude has always been thus. There can be no uncertainty in that respect. However, indeed, there can be uncertainty on the part of those workers concerning whether the project will actually go ahead, and when. That is the question that the Premier cannot answer for the people of South Australia.

He is so busy building it up and creating propaganda around it, downplaying its dangers and the problems of uranium and the nuclear fuel cycle—he is so busy doing that that he is hoping people will overlook one fundamental thing which indeed should be creating uncertainty, namely, the fact that there is nothing in the indenture about when this project will actually start. If he is able to tell those workers that, then their uncertainty may be dissipated, but, of course, he cannot.

He says that there is uncertainty in the business community. I would suggest to the Minister for Education, who keeps mumbling, that unless he gets back into that electorate of his and does something about the timber industry and something about the ramifications of the Portland deferral, he will be in a lot of trouble. I refer again to the question of business uncertainty; there is no uncertainty about the feasibility stage, but I would certainly agree that there is indeed uncertainty about when or whether production mining will start. Further, there is greater uncertainty caused by the foolish statements by the Premier. A number of business men have expressed the view to me that South Australia is being held up to ridicule interstate because all the Premier can talk about in terms of the State's future is a project which is dependent upon the future market of copper and uranium, in particular, a market which is depressed at the moment, for which no new contracts are being written, and there are closures of these sort of mines all over the world. In the case of nuclear power there is cancellation of generating projects, yet that subject is all the Premier can talk about.

If the Government members want to hear about uncertainty in the business community, let them talk to a few of those people. Our Premier is making us a laughing stock, and I sometimes feel ashamed that he is out there representing us in this context. Is it that the venturer companies are uncertain about our attitudes? Not at all! I have spoken to both of them and explained the situation, and they are quite happy with it. There is no evidence to the contrary. It is important to note that they cannot answer the questions that the Premier cannot answer: when production mining will start, how many will be employed, and what the value will be.

The Premier makes much of the fact that Parliament could repeal the indenture. It seems to me that his efforts over the past few weeks have been to invite us to do so: to turn over this thing that he celebrated in champagne. There is no doubt that we have reservations about the terms of the indenture, but we accept, as I said, from the day it was

passed, as a fact of life, that it is through and that we will not seek to interfere with it. The Premier is inviting us to do so, but we will not seek to interfere with that. I cannot be any more or less unequivocal than that. We have certainly said that there are aspects that could well be renegotiated with the companies, and indeed the companies understand that to be the position and have no objection to it. This Government is making a laughing stock of commercial negotiations over the matter.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BANNON: Those things have already been established during the course of the debate in this Parliament. I refer members back to the debate and the select committee exercise. I am simply saying that the companies are under no illusion, that the business community is under no illusion, and that the public is under no illusion. It is only the Premier who, in a futile manner, attempts to raise this matter. I say that it is a pathetic spectacle. This motion is not even worthy of consideration in this Parliament in any terms of serious debate. If the Premier cannot talk about anything else, he is indicating the sterility and incompetence of his own policies.

This matter has been gone over before, and there is no need for me to do so again. If the Premier wants to toy around with this project and the future of South Australia in the way that he is doing, so be it: it will be on his head in the electorate. Certainly, Opposition members will not lend themselves to this pathetic and shabby exercise.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY (Minister of Mines and Energy): We have had from the Leader of the Opposition one of the shorter speeches of his career since he has been Leader, because really he did not have anything to say. I tried to make a synopsis, as I usually do, of his remarks because it is usually my lot to follow him in debates such as this. However, the Leader said precious little. He said that he had been to Mount Gambier with his shadow Cabinet, and he gave some gratuitous advice to the Minister of Education.

I suggest that the Leader would better employ himself by going to the Iron Triangle region of the State to consult some of the constituents of the member for Stuart, notably, the Mayor of Port Augusta, who is lately of the A.L.P. but who has resigned therefrom because they think that the A.L.P. is absolutely crazy in relation to the Roxby Downs development. So, there is one lady of some note who thinks she understands the Labor Party's policy, which is one of opposition to this development.

The Leader says that Labor will not interfere with the indenture. He said previously, and he repeated today (it was the only other point that he made in his final emotional outburst) that he would seek to renegotiate it. I asked what section he would seek to renegotiate. He said that he would do so in the terms of the debates that took place in this House. That is obviously a clear reference to the five amendments moved by the Labor Party in this House and moved again elsewhere, which puts a torpedo right through the middle of the ship, namely, the indenture. That is the true position of the Labor Party. It has been thrashing around in this dilemma, knowing that the vast majority of its own supporters are not with it on this question. Knowing that, it has been thrashing around not only here but also at its national conference.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation in the Chamber. I ask that conversations be kept to a level that does not interfere with the Deputy Premier's speech.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They have been thrashing around to try to find a way out of this dilemma, because they are on the horns of a dilemma. It is the biggest

double speech to which we have been subjected for many a long year. What does the Labor Party rag, the *Herald*, have to say about this? A report on the front page of the July edition states 'Uranium policy: no backdown'. I am, of course, referring to the official word from the A.L.P. This does not sit too comfortably alongside what the Leader of the Opposition has been trying to say but which he has not got the stomach to say, namely, that the renegotiation means the scuttling of the indenture. That is really what he is on about, but he will not say it.

I, too, and everyone in this Chamber, would be very interested to hear what the member for Elizabeth, who has the numbers out in the field, has to say in relation to this matter. This is the latest word from the official publication of the Labor Party, which is billed as South Australia's Labor voice. The report states:

Wishful thinking frequently gives reality a sideways shove when Australia's media monopolies cast their jaundiced gaze upon the affairs of the Australian Labor Party.

The reporting of the recent A.L.P. national conference deliberations on the Party's uranium policy is a case in point.

On the morning of 8 July, Australians opened their morning newspapers to find bold headlines proclaiming the complete overthrow by the conference of the Party's long-standing policy of opposition to the mining and export of uranium.

So it goes on. The report continues:

It remains an anti-uranium policy. Contrasted with the wishful thinking of the media monopolies, the policy stands as a reaffirmation, rather than the overthrow of the Party's opposition to the mining and export of uranium.

On page 4, one reads the gobbledegook which is the latest version of the A.L.P.'s uranium policy, and it is full of contradictions and inconsistencies. In trying to search out the bits which apply and which are germane to today's motion, one reads:

As an A.L.P. Government, we give total commitment to preventing any new mines from being developed during our period of office.

In relation to Roxby Downs, the saver is that a Labor Government would consider applications for the export of uranium mined incidentally to the mining of other minerals on a case-by-case basis. That puts back into this project all the uncertainty which the joint venturers have sought to remove and which surrounded the A.L.P. amendments.

The Labor Party says, 'Let us wait until the companies have spent their \$200 000 000 and completed their feasibility studies. Then, we will tell them whether they can go on.' That is reiterated in this amendment to its policy. Another point of the so-called new policy is as follows:

Allow no new uranium mine developments to commence or come on stream.

Of course, the Roxby Downs development is not yet on stream, and the Labor Party is saying that it will not allow it to come on stream. That is contradictory. The Labor Party is saying, on the one hand, that it will consider the application, which is quite unsatisfactory, and, on the other hand, it is saying that it will allow no new uranium mine to come on stream. That is an even stronger sentence of death in relation to the Roxby Downs project. It continues:

—not permit the treatment, storage or enrichment of nuclear materials in Australia, nor domestic use of nuclear power.

What is the situation in relation to this great project? I believe that the motion is essential, because the A.L.P. has clearly refused to clarify its position. The Leader of the Opposition made a short speech and said very little, because he knows that he is squarely on the horns of a dilemma and that he cannot reconcile the attitudes that prevail within his own Party. It is interesting to note the people who are taking some interest in this debate.

It is also interesting to note that the Opposition member in this House who appears to have most sway in the Labor Party within the organisational wing is not with us. It speaks

volumes for that Party when it sacks from its Federal delegation its two shadow Ministers in the Federal House and replaces them. The member for Elizabeth—the Leader of the left wing within the State—gets up as one of the official delegates and has had plenty to say about it. He has the numbers out there where it counts. Before the indenture debate and its Federal conference, the Labor Party and the Leader of the Opposition sought to denigrate (as the Premier has pointed out), mislead and misrepresent the position in relation to the project. Now they are trying to suggest that the A.L.P.'s revised policy will allow the project to proceed. The quotes from the Labor *Herald* give the lie to that. One only has to look at the statements of some of the other leading spokesmen of the Labor Party which I will refer to in a moment and which likewise give the lie to that.

This has, of course, generated a great deal of media speculation. No A.L.P. Leader thus far has been able to say clearly and unequivocally what the attitude of his Party is. The Democrats' position is quite clear, although I believe that it is a benighted view. I believe it would be advantageous for members of the Democrats and that Party's leaders to go overseas and to suggest to the French, the English, the Swedes, the Finns, the Japanese, the Germans and the Americans that they close down their nuclear plants and share in the hardship which could attend such action. I think that would help educate the Democrats, but at least we know where they stand, benighted though their attitude may be. That is not the case with the Labor Party. No Labor Leader has the courage to get up and say unequivocally what the position is. Rather, they seek to cloud the issue by making contradictory statements which cannot be clearly understood.

It was interesting to note the majority attitude from South Australia at the Federal Conference of the Labor Party. In fact, the majority from South Australia were against this amendment, because it was perceived by the South Australian delegation that that was a weakening of the anti-uranium stance. In fact, the extant policy at the time, which was the immediate closure of all uranium activities in Australia, was the one that prevailed. In other words, when the A.L.P. comes to office, overnight—bang—the mines are all closed and the workers are sacked. That was the policy which the majority of the South Australian delegation supported.

It was interesting to note how they voted. It indicated a clear division of opinion within both wings of the Labor Party. From the Parliamentary arena, the Hon. Peter Duncan, the Hon. Mr Blevins, and the Hon. Miss Levy, all voted for a continuation of the existing policy. The other members of the South Australian delegation (Miss Anne Pengelly, who is a member of the State Executive of the A.L.P.; Mr Gregory, Secretary of the T.L.C.; and Miss Diedre Tedmanson, President of the A.L.P. Sub-branch at Christies Beach) all joined that group. They are the left wing, six of them, who voted to retain this hard-line anti-uranium policy and to close the project down overnight. The Leader found himself in the minority from South Australia.

Supporting the Leader of the Opposition, we had Mr Chris Schacht, who also got up, along with the Hon. Mr Duncan, as a delegate to the Federal Executive and sacked Mick Young and Chris Hurford—sacked the front-benchers from the Federal House, an unprecedented move in their swing to the left. But Chris Schacht went along with the leader, and so did the Hon. Barbara Wiese; (it must have hurt her to do it, but she did; she has been very outspoken in the past in relation to the uranium question), Mr Frank Evans, Secretary of the breadcarters union, and Mr Mick Young. I can understand Mick Young going that way, because he had just got the biggest kick in the behind from the Party, which he has served so faithfully throughout the whole of his life, that he ever had. To the Leader's credit,

at least he did have on his side Mick Young, for whose common sense I think people do at least have some regard, particularly in view of the fact that his Party treated him so poorly and so shabbily only a week or two previously. The point I am making is that the left wing is well and truly in control of the machine in South Australia and that vote was reflected in its contribution to the Federal deliberations on the uranium policy.

So, the Leader is in a very difficult position. One would not have to be very smart at conjecture to name those members opposite who believe that their policy is benighted and whose common sense dictates that we should get on with this great project. They just do not have the numbers. The only one who has had the courage to buck the system is Norm Foster in the other place—

Mr Mathwin: And you know what happened to him.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know what happened to him, and we know why he has contempt for the Hon. Mr Cornwall. We know what Mr Cornwall said publicly, and we know that he was trodden on, but he does not have the sort of courage that the Hon. Norm Foster has. He is not prepared to follow the dictates of his conscience, and what he knows is the true position. I feel sorry for the members of the Labor Party who are in this invidious position. I feel sorry for the sensible elements in the Labor Party who do not have the numbers at the moment. I think it is a pity that the left wing has gained such ascendancy in South Australia that it can control the machine here and can send a majority off to Canberra to vote on the losing side, but we know that that is where the numbers are in the Party. We know that the headlines proclaimed in the *Herald* this week are a true indication of the situation within the A.L.P.

I am sorry that the member of Elizabeth is not here. He does not speak in this House without speaking his mind. I think it is interesting to recall his attitude—the attitude which really prevails behind the scenes in the A.L.P. It is interesting to recall what he has had to say on this question over the years. There is not one scintilla of evidence to indicate that he has changed his mind, certainly not from his utterances at the Federal A.L.P. deliberations recently. We recall the ability of the left wing, even back in the time of Premier Dunstan, to thwart his attempts to change the policy. We recall the encouragement given by the Labor Party to uranium exploration in this State. We recall the letter written by the Director-General of Mines and Energy, with the endorsement of the then Minister, the Hon. Dr Hoggood, telling companies that they could go ahead and explore uranium in South Australia in the expectation that they would in due course be given mining tenements.

Mr Mathwin: Hugh Hudson supported it. He thought it was pretty good.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and he still does.

The Hon. H. Allison: They dropped him too, didn't they.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: They axed him. The strength of the Labor Party disappeared from this House, and now it has disappeared from the organisation. They have axed Hugh Hudson and Geoff Virgo—they have axed all the elements who had something sensible to contribute. If that is the way they want to behave, they are signing their own death warrant. Let me recall what the member for Elizabeth has said on this question from time to time. At least I will say this for the member for Elizabeth (he has my respect in this regard): he speaks his mind and he does not go on with the gobbledegook that the Leader goes on with, using his fancy footwork in such an indefensible situation and using this double speech. He cannot get up and say that we are going to shut the mine down when he knows damn well that is what his policy means. He cannot actually

say that we are going to renegotiate it and put a torpedo right through the middle, which is what he is really saying in terms of the amendments moved by the Labor Party during the debate which were entirely unacceptable to the companies and which would have meant that the exploration activity would have ceased immediately.

To use the words of the Chairman of Western Mining, the project would be 'put on ice indefinitely'. The Leader cannot say that, because he has to contend with the people in his Party. The member for Elizabeth at least says what he means, and I respect him for that. At least he has the stomach to speak his mind. It may cause some difficulty for him from time to time, but at least it gains him some measure of respect for not beating around the bush with all this double talk with which the official Leader is going on at the moment. As I say, I admire the member for Elizabeth for that.

The Hon. H. Allison: You can trust him, can't you?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: You can trust him to speak his mind. The member for Elizabeth is the unofficial Leader of the Labor Party at the moment: he has the numbers out in the field where it counts. But if he were the official Leader, at least we would know where we stood. He does not have that fatal weakness of not at least being able to speak his mind. I am glad the member for Elizabeth has come back. We know that he has the numbers out there, and we know that he has the numbers to be sent off to Canberra to the Federal conference.

Mr Oswald: Do you think he'll have the numbers eventually?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: If he has them out there, it is only a matter of time in here. This is what he said on 9 July in a speech to the South Australian Council of Social Service:

When I hear some people talking about uranium I find myself becoming unreasonable with those who, for the sake of economic realism or lack of imagination, would rather accept what they would term as the inevitabilities of the energy debate, when a real analysis of the problem leads me to believe that what is at stake is in actual fact the future of the human species.

I believe that that is an honest statement. It is misguided, but at least he speaks his mind. In a speech to the Society for Social Responsibility and Sciences on 15 November he claimed that a nuclear industry would lead 'to the death of civil liberties' and to 'the establishment of a fascist State where vast numbers of police with uninhibited powers spend their time spying upon political groups'. That statement is a bit way out, but that is what he said. He concluded:

It is my firm conviction that in the long term the uranium miners will lose and the conservationists will win.

On 4 August 1979 the honourable member suggested that Western Mining Corporation was 'wasting its money at Roxby Downs' and that it was 'unlikely that uranium would ever be mined in South Australia'. His contribution to the recent debate on the Roxby Downs indenture indicated no moderation at all of these views. He said in relation to whether or not he considered that it would be safe to mine uranium:

I am one of those people who believe that it will probably never be safe to do so. The world is heading irreversibly towards a nuclear holocaust.

Despite the passage of the indenture, the honourable member has subsequently raised the possibility of a future Labor Government closing down the project. I have a copy of a publication which is called *Boom Times*, distributed by the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy, which includes what is said to be an exclusive interview with the member for Elizabeth under the headline 'We'll close down uranium mines'. The honourable member is quoted as follows in referring to what a future Labor Government would do with existing mines:

We would be obliged to take action to close them down until the Labor Party at least had been satisfied that the requirements of our policy had been met.

I have concentrated to some extent on the statements of the member for Elizabeth, because recent history has shown that he has been able to have his views accepted as official Labor Party policy, and the quote from the official Labor Party publication indicates that. He is an avowed member of the left, which controls the South Australian branch and which, as such, is the most extreme State branch of the Party which has lurched to the extreme left in the past two years. The Leader in this House is a prisoner in just the same way as the Federal Leader of the Opposition is now the captive of the Federal left wing of the Caucus, as indicated by last week's vote. During the Federal conference, the member for Elizabeth said:

I don't believe the rank and file will be prepared to cop the change that occurs.

He suggested that the rank and file had been led up the garden path in an outrageous and disgraceful manner. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition is seeking to mislead the public of this State in an outrageous and disgraceful manner. He is saying that they will seek to renegotiate this indenture in terms of the amendments they moved in this House, which in effect is a repudiation of all that the companies say is essential in order to proceed. Of course, this is not the first time that the member for Elizabeth has indicated that he has been tricked. We recall only too vividly words such as 'treachery' and 'impropriety', when we think back to his efforts to be elected to the Federal executive 12 months ago. When he was elected then, he was declared unelected. These are also his feelings on this matter, because he and the Leader voted on different sides during the conference. The member for Elizabeth now has an opportunity in this House to make his position clear.

Because he has been so prominent in the uranium debate for so long and because he so obviously controls the policies and actions of the A.L.P., the honourable member has a responsibility to put his views so that the public will know exactly where the Labor Party stands on this important issue. Let me recall a *News* editorial on 8 July, as follows:

While Labor supporters will doubtless argue that the move was a step in the right direction, the confusion and ambiguities remaining must worry any serious resource developer.

The *Advertiser* stated on 9 July:

How the new policy would be interpreted by a Labor Government is uncertain.

I believe that that is an understatement. To those questions I would add this one to the members of the Opposition: how do they reconcile different clauses in the same policy statement, which on the one hand are strongly anti-uranium and seek to close down the industry in Australia yet, on the other, according to some interpretations, will allow uranium mining at Roxby Downs to proceed for, say, 50 and possibly 100 years in what could become the world's largest single uranium mining operation?

I do not believe for a moment that the member for Elizabeth has changed his view, or that the majority of the South Australian delegates would share that view. Perhaps this is what the honourable member was referring to when he said at the recent conference that the new policy was full of drafting areas and full of holes. That is a classic understatement. There is a simple answer so far as the Roxby Downs project is concerned, and that can be provided by the Opposition supporting the motion, which allows the Labor Party to tell this House and the public exactly what its new policy does mean. In fact, if one can interpret what the Leader of the Opposition says, he does support the motion. Anything less than full support or any attempt to amend the motion will expose this policy for what it seems

to be—a cheap and cynical attempt to deceive the public about the real intentions of any future Labor Government to stop the development of the Roxby Downs project. But then at least the public will know, once and for all, whether or not the Labor Party supports the project and who is leading the Party.

Opposition to this motion or any attempt to change it will give the South Australian public a clear choice between a Government committed to encouraging more jobs, more growth, more investment and the sharing of the State's resources for the benefit of all under appropriate environmental, safety and safeguard arrangements, and an Opposition which is so ideologically divided that it will put personal political power before the best interests of this State.

Roxby Downs is not the be all and end all of this State's future, and the Government has never presented it as such, despite the Leader's fulminations. There have been significant achievements during the life of this Government, and the Stony Point liquids scheme is one. The employment generated as a result of that scheme has been upgraded significantly in the past couple of days to a total of 3 000 people. The Roxby Downs project ranks alongside that scheme and will provide to this State benefits that will outlast the benefits of the other resource development in contemplation, that is, the liquids scheme which this Government has been able to implement and which will bring tangible benefits to the State in the next calendar year, when oil will be flowing through that pipeline. This project has the potential, and indeed I believe that it will provide benefits to the State for up to 100 years.

We have had no clear answer from the Leader, none whatsoever. We have had the same evasive fulmination which we have had before, we have had the same charge which he has laid falsely in regard to the Government's attitude in relation to this project. We have had no clear answer, but one thing we surely do know is that the Labor Party is under the control of the left wing of that Party to an extent that I believe now is even greater than that which obtains in any other State in Australia, including Victoria. The delegation which is now sent to the Federal councils of that Party and the votes that have been recorded at the Federal councils of that Party are clear proof of that. This motion deserves the unanimous support of this House.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): It is with a considerable degree of surprise that I find that I have been called to speak at this time. It shows obviously that the members of the Labor Party are absolutely inept and have no concern whatsoever for the future welfare of South Australians in regard to what Roxby Downs can do for them. It is obvious that they have no interest at all in encouraging the development that is going on there; they have no interest in the jobs already created there; they have no interest in the jobs that will be created because of Roxby Downs, and they cannot be bothered entering into a Parliamentary debate on an issue as vital as any that has ever come before this Parliament.

Earlier this afternoon the Leader of the Opposition tried to bluster and fluster his way through a short speech and the contempt with which the Labor Party is treating this issue absolutely staggers me. I certainly trust that members of the public will become fully aware of the way in which those members who reputedly are elected to look after the welfare of the people of this State have no concern whatsoever for the greatest major development with which this State has ever had the opportunity to proceed. Perhaps it also reflects the embarrassment of the members Opposite, because the Leader has only just returned from a Caucus meeting and I will be most interested to know whether the Caucus has given him the permission to say, 'Yes', 'No', or to say

nothing, because the Premier in his speech earlier this afternoon asked the Leader of the Opposition to state categorically whether or not his Party will support the Roxby Downs development. With a lot of bluster and a lot of fluster, the Leader of the Opposition spoke for a few minutes, but he could not even say, 'Yes', or 'No'. That is incredible from the Leader of the Opposition in this State, of the Party that hopes one day to be on the Treasury benches, although certainly, on its performance over the past three years and on the performance in relation to Roxby Downs, such hopes are not well founded at all.

Let us look at some of the comments made regarding the Labor Party's actions in relation to Roxby Downs and its future development in the mining of copper, gold, uranium and rare earths.

Just after the meeting in Canberra of the Federal Executive of the Labor Party a report in the *News* made the following statement:

But overall, and especially from the point of view of its Federal fortunes, the Party may have done itself more harm than good with its unfortunate halfway house of a policy.

As the Prime Minister so aptly put it, all the policy changes is that any mining companies that want to develop in this State, or in Australia for that matter, instead of being pushed straight over the side of the boat to drown, can walk the gangplank slowly. That is the only way of looking at the way in which one part of the Labor Party is handling this uranium issue. The editorial also stated:

And not without reason—

reflecting back on the Prime Minister's comments that the Labor Party would have the mining companies walk the gangplank slowly—

for while Labor supporters will doubtless argue that the move was a step in the right direction, the confusion and ambiguities remaining must worry any serious resource developer.

The Labor Party has big problems: on the one hand, it has the moderates and those who can see reason who realise that it is imperative that mining be allowed to continue, and I note with great interest that the member who is most directly affected by the development in the North, and is a member of the Labor Party, the member for Stuart, has just left the House, perhaps in embarrassment at the fact that he has one of the biggest majorities in his seat of any Labor member, but he is now worried about losing his seat because he knows full well that the present policy has put him in a most invidious position. The editorial in the *News* continues:

As things appear, the Labor Party will allow mining, sort of, but miners would be well advised to hire a metaphysician along with the geologist. The impression left at the end of the angry debate is that Labor is trying to have its yellowcake and eat it, too.

It is trying to appease that group within the Party that knows it is essential that uranium mining be allowed to proceed but it is under the great problem that the left wing now controls that Party. The left wing will not allow the mining of uranium at any cost, so therefore it is trying to find some way in which the Party will come to appeasement. I am quite certain that the Party will not be able to do that, although the Leader of the Opposition might be able to say later that his Caucus has allowed him back to make a statement on this matter. Not only the *News* but also the *Advertiser* commented on Labor's new policy, as follows:

How the new policy would be interpreted by a Labor Government is uncertain.

That is what the Premier has asked the Leader to try and clarify for us this afternoon. He has asked just exactly what the new policy means. Will the Leader of the Opposition support the development of Roxby Downs, or will he not? It was such a short speech that he could, if he had wanted to, have made it even shorter. He needed to say only 'Yes'

or 'No', but he has not yet done that. Hopefully his Caucus will allow him to say something that will throw a bit of light on the subject. However, it would be most interesting if the Leader were to say that his Party would support it. How would the member for Elizabeth regard such a statement? Perhaps they are in Caucus to work out whether they can give a definitive statement.

Mr Lewis: They are outside sorting each other out. I wonder whether that is in Caucus or not.

Mr ASHENDEN: As the member for Mallee says, they are trying to sort each other out. The editorial in the *Advertiser* also said:

The new policy could be used to block the development of the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium prospects and the development of an enrichment industry in South Australia.

In other words, the present policy of the Labor Party is such that two other mining developments will be stopped; not only that, a potential uranium enrichment industry will be stopped, and they have the gall to say that the debate brought on today about this matter is not important. That is what they said. The Leader of the Opposition said that this matter is unimportant and we should not be wasting the Parliament's time. He is embarrassed (and I can understand his embarrassment but I do not think he meant it in the way we have interpreted it) that the Parliament's time is being used in this way. We have three major developments, thousands of millions of dollars of potential investment, thousands upon thousands of potential jobs, but the Leader of the Opposition says that it is unimportant. The editorial in the *Advertiser* continued:

Certainly, as the Opposition Leader Mr Bannon says, there is room for argument about implementation, but given the divided response within the Party, the question of what emphasis will prevail remains.

In other words, there is doubt. All the Government has tried to do is to have the members of the Opposition come straight out and remove the doubt and tell us where their policies lie: will they allow Roxby Downs to proceed or will they not?

Surely that is not an unreasonable question to ask. The *Advertiser* editorial from which I am quoting concludes by stating that the new policy 'poses more questions for the public than it answers'. However, the Leader of the Opposition says that we have no right to ask questions. Obviously, he is therefore implying that the public does not have the right to ask any questions. The only reason why the Leader of the Opposition does not want questions asked, of course, is because he is severely embarrassed by the present position into which his Party has forced him.

Not only is this a matter of interest to South Australia, but we also find editorial comment in the *Age* in Melbourne. That editorial states:

... to the extent that the motion tried to have it both ways, it was a vague, contradictory, even intellectually dishonest compromise.

So, again, even the astute press from interstate is not able to determine in which direction the Labor Party intends to move.

I think it is of great concern that at the last State convention the A.L.P. reaffirmed a policy decision that it passed at the 1981 convention. With regard to this, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition and other members opposite would like to comment. The current policy of the South Australian branch of the Labor Party, as adopted in the June 1981 convention, and reaffirmed this year, states:

That State Convention approve the establishment of a nuclear hazards committee consisting of eight persons whose task it will be to undertake all activities necessary to promote Labor's policy on uranium and nuclear power; such activities to include the conduct of community education—

I think that by that they mean propaganda—

programmes to offset the propaganda of the Liberal Party and mining corporations on this issue.

It is further stated, and again, I shall quote directly from its policy:

That this Convention calls for the declaration of South Australia as a nuclear free zone—

That is pretty unequivocal. If South Australia becomes a nuclear free zone, just as the House is a Labor free zone at the moment with more of its members in here—

An honourable member: They are looking at their policy statements.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes, they are out there caucusing, determining what their approach will be.

The Hon. H. Allison: The shadow, not the substance . . .

Mr ASHENDEN: I thank the Minister for his comment. I think that the statement contained in the convention policy was a fairly categorical statement from members opposite. It should be noted also that the State convention rejected a proposed amendment to its policy which would have required the Party to continue to monitor overseas developments. In other words, the 1982 convention, in which the left made major gains, including, of course, the election of the member for Elizabeth to the Federal executive, also took a strong anti-uranium line. But, of course, that was prior to the Federal convention.

Mr Gunn: What did he say about the Leader?

Mr ASHENDEN: I think that is fairly well known now; I think we should address ourselves to the issues which certainly this Government regards as important, even if members opposite do not. Let us now look at the effect that the split in the Labor Party is having, where the moderates, those who realise the importance of projects like Roxby Downs, are being completely beaten by the left. The Leader of the Opposition was quoted as having made certain comments; I have not yet seen any retraction by the Leader, so we can assume that the comments as reported in the *Advertiser* are accurate. The *Advertiser* reported the Leader of the Opposition with regard to the admission that there are factions within the Labor Party at the moment. The following comments were made:

In an unexpected move the Party's left won four seats on the State executive, removing four long-standing members, Mr Hurford, M.H.R., former State Minister, Mr G. T. Virgo and Mr Hugh Hudson and Miss Wiese, M.L.C. Members elected to the new executive . . .

It then goes on to list those members. After those members have been listed, the Leader of the Opposition was reported as saying:

'It is a great pity factionism does seem to have taken hold of the South Australian branch,' Mr Bannon said.

That is of extreme concern not only to the Labor Party, but it must be of concern to the people of South Australia, because there is the Leader of the Opposition admitting that his Party is divided, that his Party is not united, that his Party cannot agree on major platform issues. I think that is why the Leader of the Opposition today cannot give an answer to the question that the Government has raised. I now refer to what else the Leader had to say. He was reported as saying:

I am concerned that the evident factionism does not increase and that people outside the Party do not misunderstand what it means, but I have no reason to be upset about it affecting election possibilities.

Perhaps time will tell on that one. He continues with further details of the split that has occurred in the Labor Party and the difficulties that that is presenting to him as Leader. This is very much reflected in the Federal meeting that was held by the Labor Party recently, when Mr Young, M.H.R., we know was removed from the executive by the left wing, but at least he had the common sense to realise that it is essential that mining of uranium goes ahead. I refer to

comments by Mr Young, who indicated to the national conference that he had just come back from an overseas conference at which 105 countries were represented, and who spoke on the uranium issue. Mr Young stated:

We have taken on a very big argument and it is an argument that a lot of people outside this country cannot understand.

There are many people inside the country who cannot understand the Labor Party's attitude, either. He further stated:

We have got to understand the plight of the underdeveloped world and what they are going to do about energy, and lift their standard of living.

There is no doubt at all that there are responsible members of the Labor Party who realise that what this Government has achieved and what it is attempting to achieve is dead right. But, again, unfortunately, we find that the left does not allow those reasonable elements to have sway. Again, we find another report in the *News*, which, again, has not been denied by those who are reported as having made comments. The article in the *News* stated, in part:

The Federal Labor Party is headed for a major row over its new uranium policy—

although we still cannot find out really what that is—

and a war of words already has erupted between the Party's S.A. Leader, Mr Bannon, and leading S.A. left-winger, Mr Peter Duncan. Mr Duncan declared the Party rank and file would not stand for the softening of the Party policy. Ordinary Labor members had been 'led up the garden path'. Mr Bannon, who voted for the policy change at the Party's national conference yesterday, said he did not think he would have any problems with the rank and file or Mr Duncan.

Goodness gracious! The article continues:

Left-wing delegates at the Conference declared they would fight to overturn yesterday's vote.

The Hon. H. Allison: It's the biggest ostrich act of all time.

Mr ASHENDEN: Well, it indicates what a pathetic Leader he really is. The article further states:

Federal Parliamentary Leader of Labor left wing, Mr Tom Uren, today dissociated himself from the new policy. He said the document accepted by the Party's national conference yesterday was 'tragedy and politically stupid'. Mr Uren told the conference yesterday the positive policy was: 'Uranium is guilty and will remain guilty until proven innocent.'

Here we have the Leader of the Opposition saying 'No problems', that there is no disagreement, but it is obvious that he and the left wing of the Party just cannot reach agreement. Again, I take note of the fact that obviously caucusing on the matter is still going on outside the Chamber.

Let me now refer to what was said by the member for Elizabeth. Again, we have had no denial that he did not make this statement, so we can only assume it is correct. In an article headed, 'A.L.P. "rage" on new U-policy', it was stated:

There was a 'lot of anger' in the A.L.P. over the Federal Party's new uranium policy, left wing M.P., Mr Peter Duncan, said today.

The article goes on to say:

At the conference Mr Duncan put himself at odds with the Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, when he declared the new policy pro uranium, and that the rank and file in SA would not stand for it. Mr Duncan said: 'I think there will be a bit of aggro tomorrow night. We'll have to wait and see.' Mr Bannon said he did not believe there was any 'major feeling' against the new policy, and he did not expect big problems at the meeting.

Once again, the Minister of Education's earlier comment about the Leader of the Opposition's perhaps being related to the ostrich seems relevant.

If that is the situation as it is perceived by the media, industry and the public, surely industry, Parliament and the public have the right to be told by the Leader, representing his Party, what is true. Is the new policy a softening? Does it allow uranium mining to proceed at Roxby Downs, or is it the left wing, the old policy, which is in control and which

will ban uranium mining, thereby not enabling Roxby Downs to proceed?

One can only ask that members opposite provide the courtesy to industry, Parliament and the public to remove these doubts. It may be said that the public, Parliament and industry are unreasonable in having these doubts. Let us say that that may be a possibility and that all those groups are unreasonable. Whether or not they are, surely it is up to the Labor Party to clarify the matter, clear the air, and say, 'We cannot understand why you are confused, and we would like to remove that confusion. This is our policy. We will categorically state here and now that Roxby Downs will be allowed to proceed.' After that, there can be no more confusion. I ask members what could be more simple. Surely it is not too much for the people of South Australia and industry to expect the Party that could become the Government of this State to indicate clearly where it stands on the greatest potential development that has ever come before this State.

Let us find what else has been said regarding the matter. Let us look at the member for Elizabeth, who has made the matter clear in the Cane Journal *Boom Times*. I will quote directly what he has said, namely, 'We will close down uranium mines.' That is a categorical statement, yet members opposite, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, have said, 'But industry is not concerned. We have talked to them, and they have said that they are happy with our policy.'

Does the Leader of the Opposition really expect us to believe that industry is happy when the *de facto* Leader has stated categorically, 'We will close down uranium mines.' Do members opposite think that that will engender a lot of confidence in industry? The Leader of the Opposition said that he was embarrassed about the way in which the Premier is building up the image of Roxby Downs. I can understand his embarrassment, particularly on the points that I have already made. However, this State has nothing for which to apologise in relation to the Premier or the Deputy Premier and the work that they have done to ensure that Roxby Downs proceeds.

The embarrassment that this State must suffer is that we are seen as a laughing stock, not just because of the ridiculous points made by the Leader of the Opposition but because other States and countries cannot comprehend that any Party that could potentially lead a State could be so stupid as to ban a project like Roxby Downs.

The Leader of the Opposition has not indicated whether or not he supports Roxby Downs. He has tried to smoke-screen on all sorts of other issues and has said, 'Tell us when it will start.' However, the Government wants the Leader to tell it whether, if Labor assumes office, he would allow the scheme to start. It is ridiculous for the Leader to ask when it will start when he cannot even tell us whether, if he was in Government, he would allow it to start. He will not say whether a future Labor Government would seek to put obstacles in the way of the project.

The Leader has already said that a future Labor Government would renegotiate the indenture, and this must raise a significant question mark for the joint venturers regarding whether or not their project will proceed if, in the event, members opposite should form a Government.

The Labor Party's suggestion that, in the light of the Federal conference decision, Roxby Downs can proceed is not enough. We need a categorical statement that that is the case, because it is in marked contrast to the statement that the Labor Party made before and during the debate in Parliament and before the Federal executive met; they took complete exception to any development at Roxby Downs.

We have already had the Premier quote to the House the interchange between the member for Eyre and the Leader

of the Opposition, where the Leader made only too clear that he was opposed to it. In other words, he is opposed to Roxby Downs. He has said that not only in the House but also on *Nationwide*, on which programme he said:

But at the point when commercial mining operations take place, that is the point we say, judge the facts and objectively at the moment we would not permit it.

They are the words that I want to underline. Not only has the Leader said in the House that Labor would not permit it but also he has said on television that he would not permit the development at Roxby Downs to proceed. We find in the *Port Pirie Recorder* the headline, of which I can find no retraction, 'Bannon says no future for Roxby'. The potential Premier of this State made comments like that publicly before the Federal convention. He will not deny that that is still his stance. He will not confirm that it is his stance, but the Government is accused of being ridiculous in wanting the Leader to indicate where he and his Party stand. Why cannot they do so? I am sure that we could all give reasons why.

I think that the most likely reason is that which I have been canvassing throughout the speech. Labor members cannot agree amongst themselves. Unfortunately, the left wing controls the Party, and it has said, 'No'. I believe that the Leader hopes that perhaps the numbers will come his way and that he may be able to say, 'Yes, we support it.' However, at the moment it is obvious that he cannot do that. If the Leader could do so and had Caucus behind him, he could say, 'Yes, we support Roxby Downs,' or 'No, we do not support it.' But, while the Labor Party continues in the way in which it is going, it accuses us, industry and the South Australian public of being unfair because they are confused. I am confused, and I should be happy for the next Labor spokesman (that is, if they have one) to make the matter clear. I am staggered that no Labor members spoke before I rose after the Deputy Premier's speech. I hope that the next Labor spokesman will make clear to the Government and the South Australian public where they stand.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: Perhaps the Leader was not in a position to do so. However, perhaps the *de facto* Leader, the member for Elizabeth, may have the numbers and will say later what is the Labor Party's policy. I have referred to the extracts of statements made by Labor members, as well as to their policies from the State convention and their Federal convention. They are indeed contradictory statements. However, most of those statements indicate clearly that the Labor Party does not support the production of uranium at Roxby Downs. In those circumstances, the joint venturers have every right to know whether the Opposition, if it comes to Government, will ever support the development of their project at Roxby Downs.

I suppose that it is a little hypothetical in a lot of ways, as I certainly cannot see, after the Labor Party's performance on Roxby Downs and in so many other areas over the past three years, including the dissension and split that exists in the State and Federal branches of the Labor Party, and the way in which it has axed the reasonable, logical thinkers of its Party and removed them (the left having moved in and grabbed power ruthlessly—just as ruthlessly as it is determined to strangle South Australia), that this will happen. If that is not so, let Opposition members say so.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I commence my remarks by referring briefly to the motion, and remind the House of the context thereof and some of the important aspects therein, because, in the course of the debate, it is easy for one to get away from the main criteria and benchmarks to which we are working. I quote from the resolution, which states:

That this House expresses its unqualified support for the development to full production and continued operation of the Roxby Downs project, under the terms, safeguards, and conditions set out in the indenture Act recently approved by this Parliament, and for the sale and processing of the copper and all other minerals produced incidentally thereto.

The key words are the development of the project 'to full production and continued operation' and the subsequent sale of the products from that operation. We are looking for a commitment to develop that mine past the feasibility stage—past that stage so that we will have a mine operating in this State which will bring prosperity to the people. It is a matter of history now that the Labor Party has attempted to change parts of its policy towards uranium mining at the recent national conference held early this month.

The simple explanation for the modifying of the Labor Party policy on uranium mining is so that they can go to the people with an alleged pro-uranium attitude towards the future of Roxby Downs and so that at the next election the people will think that the Labor Party is pro Roxby Downs and that the security of the project is not in question. There is before this House an attitude put forward by the Labor Party which if put abroad will make the public of this State feel that Roxby Downs is assured, and nothing could be further from the truth if the Labor Party regains the Treasury benches. Their new policy is a policy of contradictions. It is a desperate attempt to please all factions of the Labor Party and to cover up the deep divisions that exist within that Party.

The Labor Party says it has changed its policy on mining and processing and exporting uranium, but nobody yet knows what those changes mean to South Australia or what effect it would have if the Labor Party does regain the Treasury benches. No-one knows what the future holds for our three uranium projects. No-one knows what the future holds for Honeymoon, the Beverley project and the major Roxby Downs project itself. I believe it is vital for this debate that we hear what the attitude is of the left wing faction that controls the Labor Party in South Australia.

I acknowledge that there is a division of opinion within the Parliamentary wing of the Labor Party and there are some Labor Parliamentary members who would genuinely wish that Roxby proceed. However, to use the words of the Federal shadow Attorney-General, Senator Evans, who said, 'Those wishing to see a change have been subjected to thuggishness and threats to their preselection.' There is little doubt that that existed here in South Australia at the time of taking the vote. Already the left in South Australia has dedicated itself to reverse the decision. The member for Elizabeth, the spokesman for the left in South Australia, already talks about the anger of the left and his determination to reverse the policy. That anger—and it is not a disguised anger—is the anger of the left which is determined to get out and reverse this policy as soon as possible.

He also is on record as saying (let me quote from a press release) 'We will close down uranium mines.' The journalist put the question to the member for Elizabeth, and said, 'Could you simply state the present A.L.P. policy on uranium mining at both Federal and State level?' In reply, the member for Elizabeth is quoted as follows:

The Labor Party's attitude, both at national level and the State level, having regard to the recently unresolved problems in relation to uranium mining and the nuclear fuel cycle, is, first, that there should be no uranium mining under a Labor Government until the problems in relation to waste disposal and international safeguards have been satisfactorily resolved.

Secondly, that there should be no mining of uranium and any contracts or commitments entered into by non-Labor Governments should be repudiated.

I repeat that:

Secondly, that there should be no mining of uranium and any contracts or commitments entered into by non-Labor Governments should be repudiated.

Those are the words of the member for Elizabeth, who is holding such commanding strength in the Labor movement in this State. The report continues:

Thirdly, and finally, we would not allow any uranium mining or the entering into of any contracts for supply of uranium to a customer country which was in contravention of Labor Party policy.

The interviewer then posed a second question:

In view of those policies, what is the South Australian Labor Party likely to do when in office to stop such mines as Roxby Downs, Honeymoon and Beverley?

In reply to that the member for Elizabeth said:

In relation to mines that were then existing in South Australia under that policy we would be obliged—

and I repeat 'obliged'—

to take action to close them down until the Labor Party at least had been satisfied that the requirements of our policy in relation to safeguards had been met.

The Labor Party is rattled over Roxby Downs. We continue to ask where the Labor Party stands today on Roxby Downs. Where does the Leader stand? Where do his supporters stand? How strong is the member for Elizabeth and his supporters? How close is he to becoming Leader and implementing his particular policies? They are all questions which are on the minds of concerned South Australians. What guarantee do South Australians have that the Labor Party will not do an about-face on the issue to satisfy the factions led by such people as the member for Elizabeth? We do not have a guarantee. The people of this State do not have a guarantee about where the Labor Party is going. The about-face in A.L.P. policy is nothing more than a cosmetic cover-up to make the Party more politically palatable to the people of South Australia and to force Roxby Downs on to the back pages of the newspapers in this State.

In fact, we saw the Opposition seize the opportunity to put forward at its convention an amended policy, which is one of cynicism, dishonesty and public deception. Far from a relaxation in policy, the amendment strengthens the A.L.P. anti-uranium stance and threatens our major projects in the State at Roxby Downs, Beverley and Honeymoon. Even blind Freddy would know the effects on boardrooms around the world of the A.L.P. amendment, which clearly states that an incoming Labor Government is already committed to repudiating all existing commitments. The commitment 'to phase out' Australia's involvement in the uranium industry, will spell doom for the South Australian project. Not only is the Roxby Downs project under threat, but so are the Government's plans for uranium conversion and enrichment industries in this State.

I listened carefully earlier to the Leader, and to the points I thought he was going to make. However, he failed to convince a confused electorate (and it is a confused electorate out there) that the open-ended commitment to phase out Australia's involvement in the uranium industry will not, in fact, mean the demise of the Roxby Downs, Honeymoon and Beverley projects.

The Leader also failed to explain the difference between the contracts that future State and Federal Labor Governments are committed to repudiate, and repudiate without compensation (and that last aspect is terribly important). He failed to give any assurances to the people of this State. The Leader deliberately, I felt, by the very nature and the shortness of his speech, avoided that part of the Party's amendment policy which states that mining projects would be considered on a case-by-case basis and on the criterion of whether the mining of such minerals is in the national interest. He totally avoided that area because he is frightened to discuss it. He is probably frightened because he would

be out of line with decisions being taken perhaps out of his own jurisdiction but within his own Party.

Earlier this afternoon the Leader was asked to give a clear 'Yes' or 'No' answer to the question posed as to the future of Roxby Downs. He failed to do so, because he knows that he and his Party are not prepared to give Western Mining a water-tight guarantee that the project will proceed if it ever comes to power. He will not give the guarantee because he cannot give it. The Labor Party is not prepared to give the people of this State any guarantee that Roxby has any future at all if it ever again gains office in this State. The people of South Australia are fully justified in not trusting the Labor Party, if ever they were to see it resume the Treasury benches. I hope the people of this State remember at the next election the way the Leader has ducked and weaved the questions raised in this motion here today. I hope they remember it and condemn him and his Party for his deception when polling day comes.

The text of the motion was very clear. It calls for a commitment by this House of unqualified support for the development of the Roxby project to full production and its continued production so that the products mined from that massive mineralisation eventually will become available to this State. It is criminal for anyone to block such a proposal, which will bring to this State the prosperity that it desperately needs.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion ably moved by the Premier this afternoon. I remind the House, as it appears that we are not going to get any representation from members opposite other than the Leader, that the motion was that the House express its unqualified support for the development to full production and continued operation of the Roxby Downs project under the terms, safeguards and conditions set out by the indenture Act recently approved by this Parliament (and we all remember that quite well) and for the sale and processing of copper and all other minerals produced incidentally thereto.

As I said earlier, although we may hear others from the Opposition benches, the only speaker has been the Leader, who made no commitment as far as his Party is concerned. I suggest that it was the best demonstration of shadow boxing and the neatest footwork I have seen in this place for some time. The Leader spoke for some time and said nothing. In relation to the situation generally as far as the Opposition is concerned, it is a shocking situation where members opposite have been barred from speaking in this House on this matter. They have been forbidden to speak to this motion or against it, to declare themselves as to where they are going.

The consequences, of course, are that when given orders from Caucus, or from wherever else members of the Party receive their orders (orders may come from South Terrace or somewhere like that), they must obey, because the consequences of disobeying orders are quite dramatic. We saw what happened with regard to that quite recently in the Upper House, and of course, over a period we have seen what has happened to people who disobey those who dictate the policies of the Labor Party. We know very well that A.L.P. members are under some obligation; they are under an oath; they sign a pledge to obey.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg will bring his speech to matters of relevance to the motion.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, Mr Speaker, I will indeed. Perhaps I was ranging too far from the subject of the debate but, without my doing that, let me say that it amazes me that even the shadow Minister is in the shadows on this particular matter. We have heard nothing from him at all; all we have heard is a number of speeches from this side of the House

and even the shadow Minister has been forbidden to open his mouth on this matter. The only speech, an apology for a speech, that we have had was that given by the Leader of the Opposition. Obviously he was under a certain degree of pressure and he would not say what his Party's policy is on this particular matter. I believe that this House, and indeed, the public generally ought to know just where the Labor Party stands on this issue, and just where the Leader stands as Leader of his Party.

In relation to the matter of uranium at Roxby Downs, in particular, the Leader (and it is he who must wear the crown, of course) has been left to take the responsibility. The Leader is left with the entire responsibility of carrying the burden and the pressure of his Party and the pressure that has resulted from the recent lurch to the left. At the recent Labor Party conference the matter of uranium and the matter of Roxby Downs were brought forward. Because of the attitude to uranium and mining at Roxby Downs, a great deal of bloodletting occurred. The convention removed from office experienced members and the brains of the Party, and I refer particularly to Mr Hurford, Mr Virgo, the Hon. Hugh Hudson, and Mick Young, who was only able to get 9 208 votes out of a total vote of 131 200. That was a vote for a man with great experience, great talent and great ability, if I may say so, with all due respect to Mick Young. That was all the votes he was able to rally in that situation because of his attitude and because the man happened to stand on his feet at the conference and say just what he believed in relation to mining at Roxby Downs in particular. He warned other members about the situation and asked them to think again before they made their decisions.

The Leader today was trying to convince us (and has done so over a period since that conference) that there are no problems within the Party in regard to this matter. It is a question of the right not knowing what the left is doing, if it is the case that the Leader really believes that there are no problems in relation to this matter.

I am disappointed that the heir apparent, the member for Elizabeth, has not given his version of this particular matter, because in the past he has had a great deal to say in relation to this problem—what the honourable member refers to as a problem. The member for Elizabeth has been very outspoken on this matter in the past and I have no doubt that he will be just as outspoken in the future, but I was disappointed that he has not seen fit to speak on a matter that is so dear to his heart, namely, the matter of mining and the matter of Roxby Downs.

Mr Randall: He might have had a change of heart.

Mr MATHWIN: I doubt whether the honourable member has, because his power comes from those who support his thoughts in relation to this particular matter. I remind the House about the Labor Party discussions on its policy in relation to this particular matter. On 8 July the *News* stated:

The Federal Labor Party is headed for a major row over its new uranium policy. And a war of words already has erupted between the Party's South Australian Leader, Mr Bannon, and leading South Australian left-winger Mr Peter Duncan.

Mr Duncan declared the Party rank-and-file would not stand for the softening of the Party policy. Ordinary Labor members had been 'led up the garden path.'

The press also referred to another person who has very strong thoughts about the Party's policy in relation to uranium mining as follows:

Federal Parliamentary Leader of the Labor left-wing Mr Tom Uren, today dissociated himself from the new policy.

He said the document accepted by the Party's national conference yesterday was 'tragedy and politically stupid'.

Mr Uren told the conference yesterday the positive policy was: 'Uranium is guilty and will remain guilty until proven innocent.'

Before the vote was taken, he said Labor's then existing policy was not only a sane, just and humane policy, but it was an election winner.

About 90 per cent of people in Labor Party branches supported the old policy—which totally banned uranium mining.

Many left-wing delegates declared they would try to overturn yesterday's vote.

The press also referred to statements made by Mr Peter Duncan, as follows:

Mr Duncan declared the Party rank-and-file in South Australia would not stand for softening of the policy.

He told the conference: 'If you are going to vote for it, you want to be very certain about why you are going to vote for it.'

'I don't believe the rank-and-file will be prepared to cop the change that occurs.'

Mr Duncan said ordinary Labor members had been 'led up the garden path'.

It was 'outrageous and disgraceful' that they have not been consulted. 'If you have to look at the thing it is full of drafting errors and full of holes,' he said.

And none of the lawyers who sit around would have copped it under normal circumstances.

'They copped it because they saw it as a way of changing the uranium policy to a pro-mining policy.'

There is no doubt at all that Mr Peter Duncan, the member for Elizabeth, is quite sure that the policy has been changed, as far as he is concerned, in relation to this matter.

The honourable member is also quite concerned about what he terms the 'rank-and-file' and ordinary members of the Labor Party, who are the people in the field. He has made no secret about the fact that he opposes what happened at the last convention. I remind the House about what happened at the recent A.L.P. State Conference. I also remind the House about what happened in relation to the Hon. Norm Foster, M.L.C., who raised the possibility of voting for the indenture Bill in another place. Of course, that was the beginning of the end for Mr Foster; we all know what happened to him. We all know about the extreme pressures that were placed on Mr Foster and his family because he saw the light. He had actually been a member of the select committee inquiring into uranium mining and he visited Roxby Downs on a number of occasions. Indeed, he visited that area only a day or two before the debate on the indenture Bill in another place. Of course, the Hon. Mr Foster is no longer a member of the Labor Party.

Mr Young, M.H.R., also suggested that the Party should reconsider its position. This is what happened on the Federal level in relation to the discussions there. Because Mr Young said that the situation should be reconsidered, he was also dealt with. Any honourable member who was here when the Labor Party was in office and when the Minister of Mines and Energy was the Hon. Hugh Hudson (who was a great supporter of getting on with Roxby Downs mining) saw what happened to that gentleman. His feelings were well known in relation to the mining of uranium, certainly at Roxby Downs.

The A.L.P. State Convention rejected the proposed amendment to its policy which should have required the Party to continue to monitor the overseas development. In other words, the 1982 convention had major gains for the left, including the election of the Hon. Mr Duncan to the Federal Executive; that could be termed a major gain, because he is the leader of the left in this State and, from my observations, is the Leader of the Party, because I believe he has the numbers in this place to lead the Labor Party if he so decides and he can take over when he sees fit. Honourable members know that he has taken a strong anti-uranium attitude over the years. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* on 15 June in which Mr Bannon was trying to sort out the situation of the A.L.P. State Convention. The article said:

The factions within the Party which had become evident during the State convention were no reason to become upset in terms of election possibilities, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Bannon,

said yesterday. In an unexpected move the Party's left won four seats on the State executive, removing four long-serving members—Mr Hurford, M.H.R., former State Ministers Mr G. T. Virgo and Mr Hugh Hudson, and Miss Wiese, M.L.C.

The Labor Party decided that in its lurch to the left it should get rid of some of those people who were thinking twice or had some responsibility in relation to the mining of uranium. The article continues:

It is a great pity factionism does seem to have taken hold of the S.A. branch, Mr Bannon said.

We had prided ourselves on our consensus and this has broken down. But in terms of State policies it is not important.

I wonder how the Leader of the Opposition now feels about it after the matter has fermented for a little while and after what has happened federally. Regarding the matter I raised in relation to the Hon. Mr Foster, an article appearing on the same page of the *Advertiser* says:

Before Mr Foster's speech, Mr Young, M.H.R., told the convention he had recently attended an international conference and listened to delegates from 105 countries speak about energy . . .

'We have taken on a very big argument and it is an argument that a lot of people outside this country cannot understand,' he said.

'We have got to understand the plight of the underdeveloped world and what they are going to do about energy, and lift their standard of living.'

It is obvious what Mr Young felt and where he was going on that matter. It is also obvious what happened to him and how he was punished.

I also bring to the attention of the House an article headed 'The real benefits of Roxby Downs'. The article has a sub-heading 'An estimated 5.5 jobs for each miner employed at Roxby Downs highlights the political sensitivity of the project'. It is written by Alan Deans, and it states:

Now that the South Australian Parliament has approved the next stage of the \$100 000 000-plus Roxby Downs mining project, business is assessing the ways it can benefit. An immediate flow-on is expected from the commitment by Western Mining Corporation and B.P. Australia of \$50 000 000 in drilling and mineral studies up to late 1984. But the major opportunities are expected later in the decade if mine development proceeds.

Not only will a major mine be built, but a new town will be constructed, the State electricity grid extended and a transportation system—possibly including a rail link—established. For the development to operate it will require mining equipment and continuous supplies of fuel, chemicals and water. New business opportunities are expected to double the joint venture expenditure, totalling more than \$2 000 000 000.

That is a fair amount of money, and a fair number of jobs in that category. The report further states:

Of the \$50 000 000 spent on the project to date, more than 80 per cent has gone to South Australian industry. The joint venturers are expected to maximise local expenditure during further development . . .

Roxby Downs is sited 240 km north of Port Augusta on the remote Stuart Shelf. Drilling to date has indicated copper, uranium, silver and gold mineralisation covers an area 8 km by 6 km varying in depth from 350 m to 1 100 m. It is a huge deposit by world standards and any future mine would last for more than 50 years.

That is a fair estimate, when one considers that it is only an estimate; it could possibly be double that figure or more. We as a Government, and we have stated that, give Roxby Downs our full support, and we intend to continue to do that. I would like to ask the Opposition once again where it stands on this matter. Will someone from the other side give us some indication? I would like to hear particularly from two members opposite, the first being the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy. Where does he stand? What does he believe should happen? Where does he believe his Party should be going in this matter? I would certainly enjoy an input from the member for Elizabeth who, no doubt, has been warned to keep quiet in this debate.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I thought I was going to lose my opportunity of pointing out to the House some of

my concerns, mainly on behalf of the working man, aimed mainly at those members of the A.L.P. who believe that they represent trade unions in this State. It has been interesting to note that during the debate of the past few weeks no member opposite who could be said to have even loose connections with the trade unions has declared his position in this House. For instance, the member for Price, on the back bench, who has strong trade union connections, has made no public comment and has not gone on record in *Hansard* about his view on Roxby Downs and what benefits he believes the workers of this State will accrue from that project. The member for Peake is also a member of silence. He has said nothing and has not been prepared to declare himself.

We move along to the member for Albert Park, a member who surely has contacts with his former trade union in the railways, who knows full well the implications of having industries such as Roxby Downs going and the resultant necessary rail support, etc. creating jobs in that area and the carting of material.

Mr Mathwin: He gets off the track.

Mr RANDALL: He does get off the track slightly now and again. We could further work ourselves right across the back bench and into the middle bench of the Australian Labor Party, looking at trade union connections. I have noticed quite blatantly and openly that there has been no contribution from those members—only a few from the front bench members have declared their position. I believe that is quite clearly an indication that the Australian Labor Party does have a policy and intends to ensure that all its members retain that policy and do not dare speak out of line.

It is therefore interesting to note in this evening's *News* an article which was quoted earlier in the day and which somewhat changed as the later editions of the *News* have progressed. It is entitled, 'Mayor, ex-Labor, seeks Liberal seat'. We are talking about Port Augusta's outspoken Mayor. The article states:

Port Augusta's outspoken Mayor and former Labor Party official, Mrs Joy Baluch, wants to enter Federal politics as a candidate for the Liberal Party. . . Mrs Baluch, 49, is one of five candidates seeking Liberal Party pre-selection for the seat of Grey. Mrs Baluch, who sought the Labor Party pre-selection for the Legislative Council five years ago, says she was attracted to the Liberal Party by its support for Roxby Downs. As a strong supporter of the Roxby Downs uranium and mineral project, Mrs Baluch says she would have been (another Norm Foster) if she had still been in the A.L.P.

What a statement to be made by a person who has come from the Labor Party, who could not tolerate the rigid guidelines of that Party. That is one of the reasons why she has obviously had to move out to the freedom which the Liberal Party offers and an opportunity to stand for a Party which does believe in mineral development in South Australia. I go on to quote:

Mrs Baluch believes the \$1 000 million uranium mining project located in the Grey electorate will open up the North of South Australia. 'I was born into the Labor Party but I could not believe its stupidity over Roxby Downs. One of the main reasons I was attracted to the Liberal Party was the strong support and sensible approach to the project.'

Even Labor Party people are saying how ridiculous their own Party's stand has been on this matter. I emphasise again that the working class person in the community is saying that to the Labor Party. The worker who wants the job at Roxby Downs is beginning to get the point across to the Australian Labor Party. The problem is that they are so rigid and bound with that left wing influence that they cannot move. The latest issue of the Labor Party *Herald* (the newspaper which I believe is apparently circulated to all Labor Party members) has gone out clearly and predominantly to speak on the uranium issue. It touches predom-

inantly on issues related to uranium, trying to get the message across to members why they have taken such a stand. Let us look at what their Party has affirmed at the Federal conference. Point 9C of that conference document states:

We recognise that on becoming Government that, understanding the difficulties which could be encountered in the implementation of that commitment, our minimum position would be a total unequivocal commitment to phase out Australia's involvement in the uranium industry, and that certain conditions as outlined will and must be applied to those mines existing in production as of July 1982.

Another point says:

As an A.L.P. Government we will give total commitment to preventing any new mines from being developed during our period of office.

Quite rightly, the Premier today needs to move a motion in this House to call on clarification from the South Australian Branch of the Australian Labor Party. Do they adhere to this policy or are they going to bend? I doubt it. Point 10 of that policy spells out:

Accordingly an Australian Labor Party Government will:

D. Allow no new uranium mine developments to commence or come on stream while the Government of Australia.

I ask where the South Australian Labor Party stands on this issue. Is it tied into the Australian Labor Party's policy statement that has been quoted and printed in this document? Are they prepared to abide by it, or are they going to stand by and silently adhere to it, to the detriment of the South Australian community and of people like the Mayor for Whyalla? Point 17 states:

If in implementing this policy opportunities for employment are effected on a regional basis, then provision will be made for adjustment assistance, compensation and alternative employment opportunities to those workers, and the provision of financial assistance to an alternative means of economic development for those Aboriginal communities adversely affected will be guaranteed.

What a broad statement that is if applied, for instance, to the City of Whyalla and if uranium mining were to cease at Roxby Downs because the Labor Party had been elected to Government in South Australia. What would the workers of Whyalla get as payment? What jobs would be given them as an alternative? Where would those jobs be found? The Labor Party in South Australia has no answers to those questions. Point 18 of the document states:

On a regional basis, the provision of special assistance to those local economies adversely affected by the implementation of the policy will be given to facilitate the implementation of alternative policies for economic development.

Point 20 of the document states:

Finally, no revision of this policy with the view of allowing the industry to develop further will be undertaken by the Australian Labor Party until and unless all of our unresolved concerns related to the industry are satisfactorily resolved and agreed to by the A.L.P. national conference.

The South Australian Labor Party has bound itself to the Party's Australian national conference. The South Australian delegates to that conference, as was brought out earlier in this House, have quite clearly bound themselves to that conference. The trade union movement (although it may not wish to) has, because of its affiliation with the Australian Labor Party, also bound itself, and therefore the workers of South Australia must miss out because of the 'no jobs creation' policy of that Party.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): The failure of members opposite to speak to this motion disappoints me and confirms my worst fears. Lack of attendance of members opposite when such a vital motion is being debated also disappoints me. I must say to the member for Mitchell, who has stayed in the Chamber during the whole of this debate, that I feel very sorry indeed for him and admire his courage in doing what his colleagues would not do. However, I do not admire him for not courageously

standing up and saying what he believes. There is no better opportunity, no better place and no more appropriate place than this Chamber for Opposition members to say what they think.

Even if members opposite allow the motion to slide through on the voices, or even if they vote for the motion now, their credibility is such that the people of South Australia must seriously doubt their sincerity and intent, because their failure to support this vital motion (and there has been not one word spoken in support of it) can only be interpreted as their having very deep reservations about it, if not rejecting it outright. This simply goes to show that even an A.L.P. policy that is so equivocal, contradictory and paradoxical as is the current A.L.P. policy reigns supreme so far as members of the Opposition are concerned, even if it is totally and fundamentally against the best interests of the people of South Australia.

I am pleased that the member for Playford has now joined us, and I say to him what I said to the member for Mitchell: at least he has been here for a good part of the debate. The deserted Opposition benches and those people who have not had the courage to join in the debate can only lead me to believe that the gag has been applied and that members of the Opposition have not been allowed to speak on this matter because of the deep divisions and bitter struggle going on within the Party regarding this matter.

Obviously those divisions would perhaps have become more clearly apparent if people had spoken. However, I am surprised and disappointed that no-one on the other side had the guts to get up and say what they thought—not even the member for Elizabeth. The Leader once again, quite deliberately (as we have become used to) has avoided the issue. I exempt the member for Mitcham from what I have had to say because I know where she stands on this issue and what her views are. I am sure she will call 'Divide' if the other members opposite do not have the courage to call 'Divide'. I respect her views but I will not respect a Party that does not say where it stands. That is what this Opposition is now doing.

The Leader has dodged the issue. He also was afraid to speak for any length of time. He was afraid that he might say too much, but he has demonstrated yet again quite clearly by his equivocation and refusal to give a straight-out, honest answer that he is not fit to lead the Party. The Australian Labor Party has certainly shown that it is not worthy of holding Government in this State, because both the Leader and that Party put the benefit of their own party before jobs and security and the welfare of the people of South Australia. It is a matter of great regret and great disappointment to me.

I repeat that, as far as the Liberal Party is concerned, Roxby Downs is safe. Clearly, for as long as the Liberal Government is in office (and I predict that that will be for many years yet), the Roxby Downs Indenture is safe. Clearly, should a Labor Government come to office in the future, Roxby would be threatened. The critical time is within the next two years, because within that time a decision must be made following the feasibility study. Clearly it is vital for the future security of Roxby and for the future well-being of South Australians in terms of jobs and security that it will bring that the Liberal Government remains in office after the next election and after that for many years.

By its silence and its lack of expressed support, by the Leader's dodging of the issues, the A.L.P. tacitly this afternoon have accepted and confirmed that it is essential that a Liberal Government remain in office in this State. We certainly do not intend to let down the people of South Australia.

Motion carried.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: HOUSING INTEREST RATES

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move: That this House censures the Government for failing to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia, for failing to act as other State Governments have acted to establish a package of measures to alleviate the effects of high interest rates, and for its failure to defend the housing standards of South Australians against the policy of the Fraser Government, calls on it to resign, and that the matter be discussed for two hours.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have counted the members present and, only 19 members being present, it is not possible for the motion to proceed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted.

It is a great honour that I have this opportunity to move this motion in reply to the Governor's address, particularly as it is his first as Governor of this State. In that address His Excellency said that during this year the Government intends to pursue its very vigorous support of the tourist industry. Indeed, two very important events will take place within the next few months. One, of course, will be the completion and opening of the Hilton International Hotel in Victoria Square and the other will be the placing of Adelaide on stream internationally with the opening of the airport to international arrivals and departures. Although a small beginning as far as the number of international flights per week is concerned, that development will undoubtedly herald the start of another era in the tourism stakes in South Australia, and it will become the springboard into international tourism development.

Members may remember that just under three years ago I delivered my first Address in Reply speech, and I spoke at some length on my personal philosophy of tourism development, which I had gained over 20 years involvement as a carrier, as an agent and perhaps, to some extent, as an entrepreneur. What I said then attracted some interest and led to an interview on the A.B.C. programme *Nationwide*. During that interview, I was asked, in view of some of my differing views to those held by the Minister of Tourism on some matters, and my criticisms of the former Government in its attention to tourism, whether, after three years I would express any criticism of the present Government's attitude and attention to tourism. My response to that question during that interview was that, no matter who was in Government, I would offer constructive comment, and criticism, if it was warranted, and that I would certainly speak up in that regard.

First, I must say that I believe that the Minister has matured the tourism portfolio and has done far more for tourism in this State than was done by any other previous Minister of Tourism. The Minister has carefully and deliberately restructured the very foundations of the Department of Tourism and is beginning to shape and build a very strong Government department that is able to face up to

the challenges of the 1980s and to what lies ahead of us in tourism.

I am, however, somewhat comforted in the knowledge that some of those predictions or statements that I had made in 1979 have come to pass and that some of my criticisms of that time have led to matters being rectified. On page 160 of *Hansard* of 6 November 1979, I stated that there was a need to develop a plan incorporating the State Government, together with members of industry and commerce. That in fact is taking place through the task force set up by the Minister. I also referred to the need to establish a development council made up of a cross-section of tourism industry leaders, incorporating some from commerce and industry. Again, that move has been taken up and, indeed, is proving to be very profitable through the Tourism Development Board.

Mr Slater: You ought to be the Minister.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The Minister of Tourism has successfully reversed the terrible efforts made previously in relation to promotional advertising. Members may recall that in my speech in 1979 I criticised the fact that in the previous financial year, 1978-79, the Department of Tourism had spent only \$1 890 out of a Budget of \$400 000 in the South Australian metropolitan daily newspapers to advertise the benefits of tourism in South Australia to South Australians.

In that speech I also said that it would be only a matter of time before the Adelaide Airport needed to be upgraded to increase its space and facilities particularly to take the wide-bodied aircraft, and that Adelaide Airport could well become an international airport with the improved facilities, without having to lengthen the runway. The Premier, Cabinet and in particular the Minister of Transport, ably backed by the Minister of Tourism, have relentlessly pursued, lobbied and argued for the international facilities that we will see towards the end of this year. Thus, we now have the fruits of that labour coming to roost. We will have both improvements to the domestic terminal and a new international terminal facility.

Mr Slater: Who will benefit out of this?

Mr GLAZBROOK: The public. The success of the past three years is very ably demonstrated, including bigger budgets, project advertising and tourism themes such as the Visitor in South Australia campaign and the Hit the Trail and Follow the Trail campaigns. The bureau, as it was known then, has now become the Tourist Centre. Following a very in-depth review, it has been restructured and regional managers and a Marketing Director have been appointed.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: An excellent one, too.

Mr GLAZBROOK: We have an excellent staffing arrangement. We also have an advisory committee, a development board and a task force that was formed earlier this year to formulate a five-year development plan for South Australia. Members may recall that earlier this year the department sponsored a workshop, the planning of which was undertaken by the task force of the Tourism Development Board. Outwardly it has the appearance of being a success, but I sound one word of caution. Some members of the industry may well recall that a similar five-year plan was sought some 15 years ago. That attempt 15 years ago foundered almost before it began. I am assured by those involved in the current project that that will not happen again. The scene is set for us to proceed and launch into the serious business of tourism South Australian style. However, that does not mean that we do not have any other problems.

For a few moments I will present some arguments about what I believe Australia as a nation needs to do, and pursue, to chase the value of tourism. If we accept that tourism is the world's second-largest industry and that in a few years it will be acknowledged as the world's largest industry, I

believe that we must pose a few questions. Those questions relate to the national scene in support of what this State is doing to set the scene in South Australia.

We must ask ourselves several questions; for instance, what is Australia doing to participate in gaining a good share of the available international market? What is Australia doing to free it from the restrictive marketing stranglehold (some would regard it as a tourniquet) that has been evident for many years? What is Australia doing to co-ordinate a national tourism development plan that fully integrates the diverse attempts by other States and separate tourist bodies that seem to proliferate throughout Australia? We could also ask about the incentives that the Federal Government is willing to offer entrepreneurial concerns in Australia to attract overseas capital and concerns.

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

Mr GLAZBROOK: That is not to say that the Federal Government has not given any past incentives. Indeed, the Federal Government made an announcement this week. In fact, the Minister of Tourism recently issued a news release welcoming the announcement of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Sir Phillip Lynch, who is also the Minister responsible for tourism. Sir Phillip Lynch announced that tourist operators will now be able to claim a maximum grant of \$200 000 under the export market development grants scheme.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It is double the old rates.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Yes, double the old rates. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the Federal Government allowed a depreciation allowance of 2.5 per cent on buildings and structures, and now this has been extended to include tourist attractions and resort complexes. I point out that, if we are to further the development of international tourism, it will be necessary for the Federal Government to keep pursuing this line of finding incentives to attract entrepreneurial concerns from within Australia and from overseas.

I argue that tourism is, and perhaps has been, regarded as the poor country cousin of commerce and industry. This applies across the board and has been so likened for probably the past 20 years. Tourism as an industry obtains enormous lip service and has been, and is, continually tacked on to other Ministerial portfolios. This happens throughout Australia, both federally and in the States. In practical terms, I have always believed that federally it has been regarded as insignificant. Therefore, it does not rate a Ministry or enjoy a reasonable departmental status.

This is sometimes reflected in its budget through the Australia Tourist Commission. Although greatly increased over the past years, the budget in recent years, particularly in the last three years, represents a mere drop in the ocean of financial commitments. I believe it is only a pittance in relation to its return in tourism expenditure dollars.

Let us consider that last year approximately 930 000 visitors spent around \$1 150 each, creating a total of \$1.086 billion circulating through the community, yet the promotional budget allocated was only \$9 100 000 or .084 per cent. Members should note that that is not even .1 per cent. When one looks at the income received on that—

Mr Becker: It is a good investment.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Exactly. I want to come back to exactly how that relates to investment. I first want to look at the scenario of painting a picture to say that, if 10 000 000 visitors came and spent the same amount of money per person, obviously that sort of amount would yield \$10.086 billion. Let us look at this and ask what sort of budget would be needed to be allocated for promotional purposes based on the same formula we are now getting.

Obviously, I would say that the promotional budget would have to be about \$84 000 000, or \$12 000 000 per State. Let us break that down into population. We find an incredible figure. To obtain that amount, it would cost only \$5.60 per citizen of Australia. Therefore, if we spent \$5.60 per citizen of Australia to attract 10 000 000 visitors who would spend about \$10.086 billion, the return per person would be about \$195 700, or a return of 554 per cent. Nowhere in the world could one get a better investment for such a return.

One might well ask why the Federal Government is tardy in spending more to attract more. Tourism is very big business, and it should be acknowledged and treated as such. In comparison with even New Zealand, our national tourism allocation from the Budget can only be described as a mere drop in the ocean. In other words, despite the efforts of an emerging industrial giant, management and the allocation of money resources for tourism seem to be handled in a piecemeal and miserly fashion. Effectively, we ask the A.T.C. to sell Australia with both hands tied behind its back, and blindfolded as well.

I simply believe that this is a circumstance of events that has emerged because people fail to recognise the true value and benefits of chasing international tourism and because past Governments, as in this State, have failed to recognise the value and the full potential of tourism within Australia and within this State.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That's why we need a tourism awareness campaign.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Exactly. As the Minister has said, the vital necessity of an awareness campaign means that we have to spell out the message to South Australians and to all Australians, and say that tourism is not only big business but also that it means more money and more jobs. I want to consider what the Federal Government is perhaps not doing to free market forces of the restrictive impediments on tourists. I refer first to our flag carrier, Qantas.

Before I criticise Qantas and its policy, I want to say that Qantas is probably one of the best airlines in the world, particularly in regard to its safety record, its standard of service, and its efficiency—as a flying commodity. I do not argue about Qantas as a commodity, but I do argue about its policy. The problem emanates first from the costs and overheads. One would have to admit that Qantas is probably one of the costliest airlines to run considering the number of aircraft it owns. We know that there are many reasons why Qantas is expensive to run. We must consider the cost of wages and salaries for officers on the flight decks, and stewards, as well as airport costs and fees. One must consider a whole range of things. We know why Qantas is costly to run.

We can compare Qantas to airlines such as Cathay-Pacific (which has almost twice the number of aircraft, and which has never made a loss since it started), Malaysian Airline Systems, and Singapore Airlines. When we consider the number of aircraft and the operational costs, those airlines compete actively in the open market. However, Qantas has not broken even for many years. Last year, it lost about \$31 000 000.

Australia has a policy of protection of Qantas at all costs, but I believe that that sort of policy is not only naive but also it is disastrous for the growth of tourism in Australia. Whilst we maintain such a policy, we effectively prevent charter airlines from operating to Australia and we keep the fares to Australia at perhaps an artificial level. One should consider the number of operators from Europe who run charter aircraft to South-East Asia, as far down as Indonesia. An enormous number of passengers fly daily into places such as Bangkok, Djakarta and Bali, and such cities which exist solely on the enormous amount of European trade and the visitors who arrive on charter aircraft.

It is because they can operate at fares much lower than the level of normal scheduled airlines. These are kept fairly artificially high for several reasons. Some people will put the argument that Qantas for the first time lately has been actively competing within the fare structure of the established airline system. I would say 'Rubbish', because what I believe is happening is that they are trying to confuse the market a little more. If one went to a travel agent today and asked for a fare between point A and B one would probably end up with 40 different combinations. Talking about fares, I say that they try to confuse the market even more than has happened in the past. So, it is not trying to pick up lost passengers by actively competing; it is trying to set an artificial level of fares which precludes many people from travelling.

I believe that we have got to actively compete in a way which is perhaps philosophically against what we have been standing for for many years. We have to look for another area of entrepreneurial spirit. I suggest, therefore, that the way to do this is to say perhaps that Qantas must first be given an undertaking by the Australian community that it can have a deficit of around about \$100 000 000 per annum. In exchange for that loss, it must offer its inbound passengers (that means the people that it brings from overseas countries to Australia) promotional fares at a level equal to or cheaper than the cheapest charter rate that operates around the world today. In other words, I believe it should divorce itself totally and completely from competing with other carriers on the departing tourism scene, the departing Australian market going overseas, and it should allow those airlines in that field to compete amongst themselves to find their own fare level.

In doing that, it can act as a promotional airline in bringing passengers to Australia. I am saying it should divorce itself completely from competing with other carriers on the departing Australian tourist market and allow those airlines to offer Australian tourists the best possible deals. Our airline Qantas should be the spearhead of our promotional drive and be a part of a planned expenditure. After all, if we wrote off \$100 000 000 as a loss from a gain of what it could bring in as a promotional airline, the loss would hardly be noticeable. By using Qantas as a tool it becomes necessary expenditure, just as the A.T.C. is a necessary expenditure in the promotion of Australia overseas. To achieve this simple philosophy we need to clear Qantas of a bureaucracy and commercialise its operation on inbound traffic. Australia could then open its sky doors and allow the world's charter industries and operators in. This would certainly swell the inbound tourist operators.

The next important thing is to qualify the need for a national well co-ordinated plan administered by a national Minister of Tourism with a Department of Tourism Development. This State and other States cannot do it alone, no matter how much emphasis this Government puts on tourism and chases the market in New Zealand and overseas. From all the reports that have come back from New Zealand, from the people who attended the New Zealand function recently, our promotional drive in New Zealand has been regarded as one of the best attempts by any State Government in its marketing overseas. The Minister and the department must be congratulated on the efforts they put in in New Zealand. Those efforts alone really are not enough. We need a national concerted effort if we are to market Australia as a destination. The important thing is to qualify the need for a national co-ordinated plan, administered by a Minister of Tourism with a Department of Tourism Development.

First, to do this we must have a nationally structured plan. We need to get our act together. Private enterprise and Government sources must be co-ordinated to promote Australia as a country destination. I believe that we have

reached an age as a nation when we should be able to say that we are a 'single destination' country. We do not need to be tacked on to another country at the end of an itinerary. We do not need to be tacked on to the end of a holiday to New Zealand, Fiji or South-East Asia. We are grown up now, one nation and should be able to sell ourselves as a nation and as a 'single destination' country.

We also need a structured plan to co-ordinate and co-operate with each State's individual plans and policies. At this time the Australian Tourist Commission does things its way and each State does things its way so that each competes against the other in chasing the same sorts of markets. Each State establishes overseas offices in many cases, so there are offices, for instance, in Los Angeles, New Zealand, London, Germany, Singapore or Hong Kong, each trying to promote individual tourism products—not Australia as a country destination but only their part of it.

What do some of these offices offer? They offer half-day sight-seeing in Melbourne or Sydney or half-day cruises on Sydney harbour. If we expect to develop Australia as a destination country what we need to do is co-ordinate these efforts and have them marketed under a national plan. It is like running a factory; if you say to each foreman, 'Look, do your own thing', when the product comes to the end of the line and they try to put it together nothing fits. It is the same with tourism: we end up spending an enormous amount of money, time and effort in marketing, and we produce an expensive product that fails because we cannot put it together.

Where is the Federal Government taking part in this? We can have an active Department of Tourism and an active Minister in this State, but we are really not only fighting for tourism but competing with the rest of Australia, whereas collectively we could produce a much better effort. I believe that we need incentives for both Australian and overseas entrepreneurs to be able to look at a nationally co-ordinated plan so that they know exactly what sort of effort they are going to find.

I believe that either the Federal Government has a very good poker hand or perhaps it is trying to bluff us and is waiting for the States to reach a certain level before showing its cards. Really, there are billions of capital dollars around the world looking for sound capital development and investment, provided a return can be shown and provided it is part of a structured, well-ordered development. For example, Australia needs a world-class convention centre to seat between 2 000 and 6 000 delegates. Sources in the Federal Government in Canberra believe such a centre should be built in Canberra and, therefore, do not want to offer the necessary incentives for it to be built anywhere else.

Whether an incentive to invest covers, for instance, a cash deal, a services deal, or even perhaps a buy-back deal on property and capital development, is perhaps not for me to argue, although I could well pursue that line. Whether tourism capital could be dispersed to the States on a tax-sharing formula, thus allowing the States to arrange such incentives themselves, is another argument that could be pursued. Perhaps if we had a Department of Tourism Development we could afford to have an officer with a roving commission travelling around the world looking for investment and structured capital cost construction. Such an officer could be well armed with a range of State and Federal incentives so that he would be able to talk to developers and say, 'Here we have South Australia, we can offer you this type of an area to develop.'

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: The Minister reminds me that that is exactly what this State is doing, but I believe it must be much larger if we are going to have the impact that we need. It shows a proper attempt to look at the matter on a State basis could be quite easily reflected in a national

scheme. I ask the question, 'What impact would this have upon Australia?'

The one word that I can think of is 'explosive' because tourism is a great provider of jobs. Let us hypothesise on the fact that, if 10 000 000 international visitors were coming to Australia, effectively it would provide about 400 000 jobs additional to what we have now. On a multiplier effect it would be closer to 600 000 or 700 000 jobs. On a saving of social security (benefits for the unemployed) it would mean probably about \$40 000 000 which we would perhaps add to other welfare savings in both Federal and State Budgets.

Conservatively the nation would save well over \$100 000 000 each year by adopting a more aggressive tourism policy. That \$100 000 000 would be enough to subsidise that loss on Qantas which I suggest should be a planned loss. To me, tourism is too often run by negatives. Of course when it is run by negatives the result is negative. Tourism quite properly should be run by positives and it should, I believe, immediately institute some of the following things.

I believe, first, that there should be a Federal Ministry of tourism and tourism development. I believe also that there should be a structured national tourism plan. I believe that there should be a vibrant Department of Tourism Development. I believe also that there should be a cohesive, co-ordinated State and national Tourism Advisory Council. I believe that we need to abolish the policy of the Qantas protectionist ideology. I believe we need to adopt an 'open sky' policy for charter airlines to be able to come to Australia. We need a realistic budget appropriation of around \$30 000 000 solely for the purpose of promoting Australia. Tourism is big business and it demands treatment in a very big way. I know that the South Australian Government and the Minister particularly believe those points.

For a few moments I wish to turn my attention to the electorate of Brighton which it is my privilege to represent. When I first canvassed the area of Brighton prior to my being elected, I was very impressed by the fact that it represented an area that was developed through the population growth of the late 1950s and enlarged in the 1970s, particularly around the Hills area and Flagstaff Hill. It is a development that has never really been finally completed inasmuch that the finishing touches, for some reason or other, had been forgotten or left to do until another time. Following my election I set myself a task: to fight, as a project, for ways in which to achieve those facilities that were common to other developed and perhaps older areas.

In saying that, I must point out that we must remember that the development of the area within the Brighton electorate occurred at a time when laws, rules and regulations relating to development were far more lax than they are today. Therefore, roads, footpaths, kerbing and drainage were not mandatory installations before the subdevelopments were laid down. In many instances those normal services were not completed. It is my sincere belief that, if we are to seek contentment in the way in which we live and if we seek to have an environment conducive to the way in which we want to live, certain basic commodities and services are not only required within a community but are also essential ingredients to make up the total society. Areas deprived of roads, kerbing, footpaths, streetscaping and reserves are environmental blotches on an area. It is something we should look to overcome. Thus to seek and to improve the area and the quality of living is very important.

So, each month I try to survey localities within my electorate to ascertain the thoughts of constituents about ways to improve our lifestyle and to seek from them their concept of what they believe I, as their representative, should be pursuing on their behalf. It is very interesting to note that most respondents to those surveys hone in on matters which are principally the province of local government. That indi-

cates to me that the matters of most concern are those that affect them directly—what goes past their front door. I acknowledge that and I hope that the efforts that I have put in to encourage local government's attention to these matters together with the joining in with such projects have helped the electorate to become a nicer place in which to live.

During those attempts to understand the electorate I have become increasingly aware of problems of planning a well ordered society and I have realised that in the past we have to a very large degree failed to recognise the needs of an ageing population and also those of young families. In the rush to house people and in the rush by developers to build and sell their homes, and in the rush by councils to lift their rate revenue, little attention was given by any level of government to the necessity of building balanced societies. For instance, very few recreational areas were provided sufficient to meet the needs of residents and very few reserve areas were put aside for development for an ageing population.

The matter of the ageing population concerns me greatly as I have a great number of such people within my electorate facing the difficulties of growing older. It is not that there is a shortage of beds and places to go within the State, but rather a problem related to geography and perhaps demography and the location of those premises. As an example I refer to an ageing couple in their own home, or such a couple might even live in a rented property. The couple is suddenly faced with separation and a vital part of their life seems to be in jeopardy, for if one party of such an elderly ageing couple suddenly becomes ill and can no longer cope or be cared for within the home, then the possibility of that person suddenly having to go to another area, perhaps even to a State institution many miles away from home, is very real. If the remaining party of such a couple is a semi-invalid or finds it difficult to get out, then the chances of that couple meeting regularly diminishes quite considerably; this is particularly the case if a visit necessitates using several buses, with the trip each way taking a couple of hours. Just such a case became known to me the other day. A constituent came to me and outlined the problem concerning his wife's becoming quite ill, no longer being able to be cared for in the home, and she had to be moved to the other side of town to an available bed. He was faced in the difficult position of not being able to move very well because of his problems with rheumatoid arthritis. So, his wife was on one side of town and he on the other. The problem was that he could not get from one point to the other to see his wife; unless he could rely on the generosity of people around to drive him, the chances of his seeing his wife very often were limited indeed. Couples in this position face the heartbreak of separation at a time of life when loneliness is their biggest enemy.

The Government's policy has always advocated a belief that people should be encouraged to remain in their own homes for as long as is humanly possible. For this reason the Government pays considerable attention to its domiciliary care services, to giving assistance to Meals on Wheels and to home assistance. The limitation of finance, of course, precludes the solving of all of these problems. Ideally it would have been tremendous if our forebears had been able to see clearly the progression of our communities, and in the planning of them they would have been able to do something about it.

However, they did not do that, no allowance was made and we now have the problem with us. Thus, as the community ages, so we create more problems. I believe that the community should go through a progression of accommodation for the aged: they could leave their homes to enter units or cottage-type accommodation; at a later date they could perhaps graduate to hostel accommodation; and finally

to nursing home or infirmary care services. In that manner a respectable completion to life would be available to the aged. However, communities have not been designed in that way, so we must look at ways to achieve this.

Our problem is that although such services exist they are not located in the right areas. If it were possible to relocate some of those services perhaps it would provide a solution. We know that we cannot pick them up brick by brick and place them within our communities. Within my electorate people in a section of the community who were probably amongst the first to reside in that area some 25 and 30 years ago have now reached retirement age. Indeed, some of them enjoy occupying some of the trust pensioner units that have been built there. Regrettably, we have no hostel-type accommodation, and we have few aged pensioner cottages.

My electorate has only three types of nursing home and infirmary care services. Coupled with this is the serious shortage of accommodation in the Housing Trust area generally. Like many other electorates, Brighton has many single pensioners and married pensioners who live in three-bedroom homes. We know that they should be housed in cottage-style or unit-type accommodation, but that is not possible. It is not morally right to take those people from this type of accommodation and suddenly transport them to Christies Beach or an area further south where there is available land for this type of accommodation. We have a moral obligation to allow these people to grow old in the community in which they have grown up.

The problem is that we cannot take people out of accommodation and place them in another area. As I have said, because these people have lived in an area for 20 or 30 years they have a right to finish their days within that community. These people sometimes remain in large homes on large blocks and are less able to maintain their property until such time as they must enter a care institution or, if they can afford it, a private nursing home.

I often wonder about the sort of community we could have had if we had really thought our planning requirements through when these communities were first established. I know that some societies, some church groups, social groups, lodges, councils and Government departments have sought to correct the shortsightedness of the past by creating retirement villages and, indeed, they have done a tremendous job. However, they have always been limited by the available funds and by the Federal grants available and, more importantly, by the available land.

Some of these developments are resident funded and have a continuous and growing waiting list of people waiting to move in. Others exist on deficit funding by the Federal Government, and others simply exist on the payment of pensioner benefits supplemented by other Federal funding. As the community ages the problem grows and widens. Even in areas where there is unit development for the ageing some improvements have been able to proceed. Classic mistakes have been made in past planning. Some pensioner cottages and units have been sited much too far from public transport; some have been sited far too distant from shops; and some have been placed far away from post box facilities and delicatessens. For reasons which are beyond their capabilities, when people reach a certain age they cannot get out and use these normal every-day facilities, their world suddenly becomes very small indeed.

They cannot get to the buses or the local shop, and must have someone else cash in their pension cheques. If only we had thought when we designed the areas for these cottages and units that we had made sure that other supporting services existed, we would have done a far better job.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Are you doing it now?

Mr GLAZBROOK: We certainly are. As I said, the world shrinks for those people, and we must look at this. The other day I was encouraged to see that we had achieved a first and that a certain initiative had taken place regarding a new high school that is being built at Aberfoyle Park. Opposition members should understand the way in which a little thought by a Government which understands the problems in planning a well-ordered society saw to it that, in building a new school at Aberfoyle Park, provision was made so that, as the school population dropped the building could be converted to hostel-type accommodation for the elderly. That is a great step in the planning of a future society; to acknowledge that we need to find some solutions.

I shall continue to fight for solutions like that, and to see that in my electorate we develop in a suitable way and find methods to build up society and make up for the losses of the past. To this end, I want to congratulate the councils of Marion and Brighton for the part that they are playing in taking positive action to make up for the past shortsightedness of developments. The development by Marion council of the Cooinda complex needs also to be congratulated, because Cooinda filled a vacuum in that part of our society and has given a centre to the aged in that area. Cooinda has given them a purpose and a place to go. Already it has proved to be far too small for the work that it is doing in the community. In just three years, the membership has grown to over 2 000 members who visit that complex every week. Being adjacent to the Marion Shopping Centre, it has proved to be in an ideal situation and is central for people to get there, as many buses meet at the shopping centre.

My other concern in the area is for the young and the youth. I have tried to use every possible opportunity to gain sufficient recreational areas and to be involved in the creation of work for the young and youth in the area. In caring for the young, I am extremely conscious of the educational needs and the obvious differences associated through having schools located in various socio-economic areas. This leads me to criticise some policies of or decisions taken by people within the Housing Trust regarding the tenancing of trust homes and the construction of new homes and flats.

Members recognise that during the past 10 years the change of social and moral values has created a new level in societies, that of the single parent or single supporting member of a family through divorce and separation, and also in the number of unmarried mothers.

The Brighton electorate has received a very large number of these family units, and regrettably many have had to be accommodated in groups in some of these blocks of flats around the area. Previously, we had a balanced society where there were a number of married couples, a number of unmarried mothers, and a number of single parent unit families; overall, it was a balanced society.

Now, by concentrating many of these separated family units into one area, we have suddenly changed the socio-economics of that area. This relates to education, in that some schools that were very well oriented in and supported by the community have suddenly found that they are socially and economically disadvantaged, because the parents whose children go to such schools suddenly find that they cannot meet the demands of the schools. It also means that, when a school tries to raise funds by fetes and other fund-raising activities, it finds it extremely difficult to meet some of those costs.

By grouping together a particular type of person in the community who, through some difficulty, has found himself alone in supporting a family and has difficulty in coping economically, when his children attend school, his situation reflects on that school and on the education that that school can offer the children. Brighton is no exception: in some schools as many as 50 per cent of the children are from

single-parent families, in low socio-economic situations. At the other end of the scale, some schools have virtually everything, because the parents of the children who attend those schools are drawn from a higher socio-economic area.

Unfortunately, some children are disadvantaged. If we paid attention to the placement of some of these people into a more integrated society, we would find that people help each other and that a stable family situation would help a single family situation. However, if single families are grouped together, we will end up with difficulties.

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of audible conversation is becoming unreasonable.

Mr GLAZBROOK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There is a threat to a balanced society because of iniquities in this type of system. I would hope that, in providing people with accommodation, we could do something about it. We know the enormous financial difficulties and constraints that are encountered in regard to housing. I understand that each week about 130 people register for accommodation with the Housing Trust after a family break-up, and the list increases each week. We try to accommodate these people as a matter of need, but it is unfortunate that we seem to group them together.

That worries me, because, as the offspring of these people grow up, other problems are created, because many flats have no gardens or recreational areas, and children must play in the streets. That creates other problems, in that other people become frightened to walk down the street, because the kids perhaps congregate in gangs. It is only natural that children play together in that way.

Problems are created because we have not learned our lesson in the past. We have not planned for an integrated community. I believe that we have a very long way to go. The district of Brighton is certainly a growing community, and I hope that in some small way I have played a part in seeing that the community grows in a positive and acceptable way. Finally, I want to say a few words about what I believe to be the success of this Government's carefully planned economic strategy of the past three years.

Despite some of the hostile criticisms of Opposition members this strategy that the Government adopted certainly slowed down the rate of borrowings and hopefully set the scene to repay for some of the past indiscretions and reckless projects of the 1970s. In the 10 years of the Labor Government, State borrowings rose from about \$1 500 000 000 to around \$2 750 000 000, and repayments in terms of interest last year took something like 17.5 per cent of this State's income. It totalled about \$284 000 000 during 1980-81. It accounts as being the second highest single expenditure in this State, just in repaying interest only on money borrowed for projects and to meet the payments and commitments of past borrowings.

In trying to meet the repayments on past borrowings, which attracted at that time very low interest rates (I think about 4 per cent in those days) no-one foresaw the problem that was going to happen with inflation, and the 4 per cent suddenly became 8 per cent and then 13 per cent. The money that the previous Government borrowed is now having to be repaid at a rate around about 17.5 per cent up to 20 per cent.

In the earlier years this State developed simply by borrowing the money, and the time to pay for all that money that it borrowed for schools, roads, hospitals, water, electricity, Monarto and the Land Commission has suddenly caught up, because we must now pay for them. For too long this State has been spending far more than it has been receiving. I am quite surprised with the Opposition because it should know, of course, that any family that happened to spend more money than it was receiving would probably end up in the Bankruptcy Court and even in gaol.

When the previous Government used to borrow just to make it work out, it used to spend far more money than what came in. It never increased charges, because that was too unpopular; it was not realistic. So, it suffered with problems in that area. When a State Government spends more than it receives, nothing happens: that is to say, nothing happens except in making future generations (the children of Opposition members as well as mine and everyone else) pay for the indiscretions of what Labor went through in the 1970s. Someone has got to pay for it, and it will take a very long time for any of this money to be repaid. We are forced to pay today for the indiscretions of yesterday, but the problem is that we must pay for it at today's prices. The alternative Government believes that it can stop mineral development, such as Roxby Downs. It says 'You do not need it. We will cancel it.' They are too frightened to speak on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Brighton should not have to shout to be heard.

Mr GLAZBROOK: The Opposition believes that it can go on, if it gets back into Government, by saying, 'Look, do not worry about anything; you do not need Roxby Downs. We are going to borrow money to create a lot of new jobs and we are not going to worry about how to pay for it.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GLAZBROOK: They could if they would, probably, but they will not.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I rise on a point of order. Notwithstanding the quietude of the House, the honourable member is still shouting.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr GLAZBROOK: I am surprised with the honourable member. He must really be getting upset. One of the things that worries me is the fact that we heard many promises from the other side about what they intend to do if they get back into Government. They say, 'We are going to create a lot of jobs.'

Opposition members do not say exactly where they are going to create the jobs. However, the Deputy Leader said, 'We will create jobs within the public sector. We will spend more money in the public sector.' He did not say where he is going to get the money to do that. Presumably, he has a magic wand, and is going to wave it in the air and produce money to do these things. There are very few places in which to create money. One way is from resource development, but members opposite do not want resource development. They have said that. If they are not going to get royalties, where are they going to get the money from? Their Party is going to get it from increased taxes or borrow it, like it did before, and this State will have to pick up the tab. Once again I must say that it is our children who will pick up the tab.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

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

Motion carried.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: HOUSING STANDARDS

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be suspended to allow the House to debate the following motion:

That this House censures the Government for failing to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia, for failing to act as other State Governments have acted to establish a package of measures to alleviate the effects of high interest rates, and for its failure to defend the housing standards of South Australians against the policies of the Fraser Government, and calls on it to resign, such suspension to remain in force for two hours.

I thank the Government for the agreement reached with my Deputy to allow this matter to come before the House again, for the third time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader should not presume. He is seeking a suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr BANNON: I am seeking a suspension, and am suggesting that we may have the opportunity to debate this motion. You are right, Mr Speaker: until the count is taken, we will not know. However, earlier today the Government refused to support such a suspension and we failed to have this matter debated. Later this afternoon, following the collapse of the debate over the Roxby Downs motion that the Government moved, there were not sufficient numbers in the House and, therefore, we have had to ask the indulgence of the Government in order to have this matter debated. I put on record quite sincerely our appreciation of that fact. Having ascertained that the requisite number of members is present and that the Government intends to allow the suspension to take place, I will resume my seat.

Motion carried.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That this House censures the Government for failing to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia, for failing to act as other State Governments have acted to establish a package of measures to alleviate the effects of high interest rates, and for its failure to defend the housing standards of South Australians against the policies of the Fraser Government, and calls on it to resign.

Despite the problems that we have had in ensuring that this matter is debated, and despite the changing mood and attitude in the House over the course of this afternoon and evening, I think that, as we move to debate this motion, it would be most appropriate if some degree of seriousness could attend the subsequent discussion. That is very necessary, because the subject that we are discussing happens to be of great importance to the vast majority of South Australians. In Opposition we have not used the censure motion lightly: we have used it sparingly. We have used it at times and on subjects on which we believe great significance has attached. Our attempt to do so this afternoon, which was made earlier today and is finally successful this evening, indicates clearly that the Opposition treats this subject with the utmost seriousness.

On a previous occasion when the Opposition has attempted to have no-confidence motions, the Government has indicated that it too regards them with seriousness, that it requires the appropriate notice (which indeed was given on this occasion) and that they will be treated accordingly. Despite the misadventures that have occurred in the course of getting this motion before us, let us address our attention to what is in fact the most desperate housing crisis that we have had for probably 50 years in this State.

Any member in this place can produce evidence from his own electorate of the hardship that many South Australians are now facing. For my own part, I meet people who come into my office seeking help, and who may be living in caravans or sleepouts, families that are crowded into single rooms in the house of a relative, or families that are forced to live apart—broken up. These are the people in trouble: people facing the reality of eviction with nowhere to go and no relatives on whom to fall back. Time and again these cases are coming before us. I know that everyone of my colleagues to a greater or lesser extent has experienced this

problem, and I imagine that members on the other side have also experienced it.

These are cases of a kind not seen for 40 or 50 years in this State. They are unlike the experience of the immediate post-war years when jobs and money were available but not a sufficient supply of houses. I know from the position of my own family, in substandard housing for a number of years immediately after the war, that it was difficult. There was a problem, but we shared it with many other people, and we knew that ultimately that problem would be solved. The problem was one of a temporary lack of supply, although there were jobs and money and schemes whereby people would eventually be housed. Indeed, we eventually were, as were most people at that time. In this State massive building programmes took place. However, the attitude that one has to housing hardship in those circumstances is very different indeed from that feeling of hopelessness that as present pervades our community at that lower strata.

It is the same feeling that was felt 50 years ago when people were forced into humpies on the banks of the Torrens River. It is back, stalking our community. I am not suggesting that there are humpies on the banks of the Torrens, but these things are relative. Some of the problems and living conditions experienced by my constituents and many others in this State are very close to it. There seems to be little that can be done in terms of immediate relief for those people in the present crisis.

We are fast reaching the point where we will have to regard decent, safe, and affordable shelter not as a basic social need but merely as a possible option or, for many, something not available at all. We have already reached the stage where the possibility of home ownership (an Australian aspiration and one in which we have progressively built up so that a higher and higher percentage of people could enjoy it) is no longer available to the majority of South Australians. In any event, we are now close to the situation where the ownership of a house, the very symbol of security to average Australians, will have been devalued to the point of liability—where the ownership of a home becomes a burden and a concern for them and not something in which they can relax and which they can enjoy and have security.

Make no mistake: this is the biggest immediate social problem that we currently face. Much of the cause of it is due to the ever increasing interest rates for borrowers, but the results of that, the spin-offs, affect all sections of the community, socially and economically. Financial burdens for those struggling with mortgages are obvious, as are the difficulties for buyers trying to meet higher deposit requirements. Those choosing to rent are not immune, and as more are pushed towards public rental, and pinned in either the public or private rental section, so the Housing Trust's waiting list is growing and the pressure on the Emergency Housing Office is increasing. My colleague, the Labor Party spokesman on housing, the member for Napier will be dealing in particular with that depressing and deplorable situation.

Let me say at once that the Opposition does not pretend that any State Government can control national monetary policy: we do not pretend that South Australia is the only State that is facing these severe problems, but we do say that, while other State Governments have acted, the Tonkin Liberal Government has done very little indeed to assist the majority of home buyers and potential home buyers. The Opposition maintains that the Government feels bound to wait in hope for an initiative from the Fraser Government, while other States have realised that they will be waiting in vain for any serious steps to be taken at that level and have taken independent action to protect the housing standards of their citizens. The Opposition contends that the present Government is so locked into support for the Federal Gov-

ernment and its policies, and so devoid of ideas of its own, that the people of South Australia can expect no help and no protection as long as it remains in office.

Let us look at some of the basic facts concerning interest rate increases which have occurred over the past three years. In 1980 savings bank rates stood at 9½ per cent and they are now at 13½ per cent and likely to increase by another 1½ per cent in the near future in response to the A.S.B. increase. Building society rates have also climbed and now temporarily sit at 14.25 per cent, and they also are likely to go higher very soon. According to the Housing Industry Association, which has done its figures, and which we have no reason to doubt, each 1½ per cent rise in mortgage interest rates excludes a further 4 000 potential home buyers from the national housing market. It increases the deposit gap and the capacity of those people to pay. Translated into South Australian terms, that means that 3 200 couples have been denied the chance to own a home during the last three years, and, if the further 1½ per cent rise goes through, another 1 200 will miss out.

Earlier today the Premier said that that figure is not correct and that that is a dishonest way to use the figures, because he maintained that not everyone is involved with building societies. However, I am talking about the total situation, which is what that figure refers to: it is not just building societies whose rates will increase; other institutions will pick up the increase. In time the banks will follow, as there is no indication that bank interest rates have peaked, and so will the credit unions, although, admittedly, they do not service a large sector of the housing industry. Also, some of the private financial houses, which are mainly concerned with the second mortgage field, will pick up the increase, although, again, they do not service the whole of the area involved. Nonetheless, it is a fact of life that, bearing in mind the totality of those figures and the way in which interest rates are rising in all financial institutions involved in housing, we can confidently say that some thousands of people in this State over the past three years have not been able to, and in the future will not be able to, afford to buy a home.

Meanwhile, the repayments on an average loan have jumped by \$90 per month over the past three years and will move upwards by a further \$35 per month when this extra 1½ per cent is added on. There is no evidence that these higher rates, granted, we are told, to make these institutions more competitive, have increased the capacity of financial bodies to make loans.

This is one of the most distressing features of the situation: the opposite seems to be the case. According to the Bureau of Statistics, finance made available to owner occupation in South Australia fell from \$243 400 000 in the first five months to May 1981 to \$218 800 000 for the same period this year. That is a 10 per cent decrease in the face of rising building costs. In other words, if one adjusts those figures for inflation, and the rate of inflation in building has been running at a higher rate than the general level of inflation, that 10 per cent is even greater.

In the five months to May this year there were almost 900 fewer dwellings financed than for the same period last year. That is the down-turn, that is the parlous situation we are in. The latest full-year figures available for 1981 indicate that only 427 new houses were completed per 100 000 of population in South Australia. Using that means of comparison, South Australia runs dead last among all States and Territories in Australia, even behind Tasmania, with all its current economic problems. We are at the bottom of the table. These facts are well known. By now they have even got through to the Premier. I recall that in September last year he told the *Advertiser* that there had been remarkably few cases of hardship from interest rate increases. He said:

There has been much more talk about hardship than really is the case.

That was not correct then and it is certainly not true now. Unfortunately, the same sort of attitude pervades the Premier's response to this problem today. According to him, on his figures, only 159 couples may be affected by the interest rates of building societies, just as he said yesterday that only a mere 25 people or so are affected by the B.H.P. lay-offs because of that company's current problems.

That sort of dismissal of the problems of individuals cannot overcome the fact that for those people the dream of home ownership is over. Indeed, that figure is a great understatement. The Premier also referred to the number of people who have come forward for counselling. How dire do the circumstances have to be before people expose themselves to that sort of examination of their finances and other implications? Many people faced with these difficulties are too proud or believe that they have a responsibility to fight their own way through, and they do not come forward. They do not complain, and they do not seek counselling. Many are not even aware that such counselling exists.

To use those figures, particularly in circumstances where these services have not been publicised, completely understates the extent of the problem. There are very many people battling away in the community who have not come forward, who have not shown up in official statistics yet, but who represent current, immediate social problems in our community today. I cannot believe that the Premier can suggest that there is not considerable hardship. I suggest that he goes out into the community, talks to people and individuals, and listens to what they are saying.

Let us move away from the statistics and overall figures, which are usually lagging in time and which do not accurately reflect what is happening in the immediate circumstances, and look at individual cases referred to us which give some idea of the problems that are coming up. Many members have received letters about this matter. Many members have had individual cases referred to them, and I will put a few typical ones before the House. A letter from a couple in Modbury Heights states:

After having written to Mr Fraser, Mr Howard and Mr Tonkin and not receiving any compassionate reply, I feel I must let you know of our problem, along with many other families' problems. Both my husband and I are very distressed at the thought of yet another rise to our mortgage. If this rise is added we will be forced to sell our home, as will many other families in the same position unless some assistance can be given.

A family's budget can absorb only so much . . . We have two young boys and my husband has two jobs to assist our survival, but even that is not helping greatly.

Then the correspondent outlines the sort of income and bills the family has to pay. The mortgage rates represent something like 50 per cent of the income coming into the home. The letter continues:

Mr Tonkin stated yesterday that South Australia (The Great State!!!) had the lowest interest rates in Australia, but he failed to add we also have lower wages than other States.

This next part of the letter might apply to any member, such as the member for Mount Gambier, in a marginal seat. The letter continues:

Having been a Liberal voter all my voting life I feel very disappointed and hope the Australian Labor Party can offer something better for the average Australian. Our standard of living has dropped dramatically in the last two years.

This letter was written by a battling couple who claim to be Liberal voters and who are faced with this stark reality today. I received another letter, another example of the things we are being told. The letter states:

I am writing to you about the rising interest rates and this last bit of news that interest rates will rise again. This will take our monthly repayment over the \$300 a month. When we took out our loan three years ago our repayments were \$254 per month. It is getting harder and harder to make repayments. We have only

one income. My husband works for a coach company and is away from home a lot. At the moment he is interstate working to earn a bit of money so we can keep up our house payments. What makes it very hard is that everything else is also going up. Water and sewerage rates, electricity, gas, phone, council rates, hospital and medical benefits are also increasing and the weekly wage can only go so far.

This is another cry of pain, a cry for help from somebody, faced with, incidentally, the burden of those State charges which the Government has put on in the most reckless and cavalier fashion. The outcome for this person who is writing the letter is, as the letter continues:

If the rates keep going up the way they are we will also be forced to sell our home. This is our first home and we would like to keep it and stay there and not have to move around any more.

Listen to that plea. Think of the man who is working interstate, away from his family, on overtime, to try and keep the home and one will realise the dire problems people are in. There are many of these examples. Another letter says:

When we took out our loan in 1977 with the Savings Bank of South Australia, interest rates were 9.5 per cent per annum, and the repayment was \$787.10 per quarter. Now, after five years, we are faced with 13.5 per cent per annum and our repayment is \$944.20, an increase of nearly one-third with the bulk of that coming off the interest and not the principal. To add to our stress, Mr Howard in March this year announced a tax rebate on mortgage payments for the first five years to first home buyers. We missed out by only three months, but the further 1 per cent rise he announced in interest rates did affect us.

Here is the crucial point. The letter continues:

We had hoped to start a family this year but as things stand at present we badly need our two incomes to stay in our home. What can be done?

Those letters cannot be ignored. Those examples are from many suburbs of Adelaide, many income groups, and many people in different family situations, some with two incomes (such as the one I have just read) and some with only one income (such as the other two letters I quoted from). They all complain about the same problem. They are typical and there are many more letters. If anyone doubts the urgency of the problem and the social devastation that is being added to the economic problems we have, then they must be deliberately turning their back on it.

In three years, what have the Premier and his Government done? What are their achievements? We have already seen the sort of indifference to the problem which tries to thrust it off somewhere else, to deny that it exists, or to suggest that if action is to be taken one should not look to the State Government, but should look in the direction of the Prime Minister, who certainly has not shown any inclination to fix this up. I recall that in August last year the Premier read to the House part of a letter which he wrote to Mr Fraser and which 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.

The prospect certainly was daunting. Since that was fired off to Canberra, interest rates have increased by 1 per cent, with another 1.5 per cent to come. Then we had the Minister of Housing's assistance schemes (or, more correctly, scheme, because the same inadequate arrangement has been announced a couple of times). The *Adelaide News* was very generous to that scheme and on 18 January this year it reported that eight South Australian home owners were being considered for assistance. Later on 12 March, the *Advertiser* reported that the Minister had confirmed that only two people had actually qualified—a splendid contribution towards solving the problem!

The Minister denied that guidelines were so strict as to make it virtually impossible for people to obtain assistance. Instead, he took up the Premier's line and suggested that

people had learned to cope with the unfortunate increases in interest rates. Indeed, they might have learned to cope, but they have done so by cutting back all other household expenses, even food and certainly clothing. They have learned to cope by trying to pick up overtime wherever they can or in whatever circumstances they can, by taking a second job if that is possible or by the mother going out to work. Yes indeed, people are learning to cope and to hang on. They are not helped by that sort of response by the Government.

Since March the Government has been waiting, we are told, for details of an initiative from Canberra, even though the outlines of that package were made public last month. Today, this very day, when moving this motion of no confidence in the Government and after publicising this question in particular over the past few days, we heard an announcement from the Premier that, in fact, a mortgage and rent relief scheme is to be introduced which will provide more than \$3 500 000 to South Australians who are in difficulty with their home loan mortgage repayments and private rents.

That is fine and it is very welcome indeed, but it comes very late after the original announcement of that scheme. Incidentally, the terms still do not make clear precisely who will benefit and how many people will benefit. Questioned in that regard, the Premier was unable to say. That scheme was announced by the Housing Minister in this State as far back as 25 March. Under the Commonwealth Government's new housing package, he stated that South Australia could receive up to \$2 000 000 of the \$20 000 000 promised in the next three years. What is \$1 760 000? It is on a matching grant basis and accompanied by certain conditions, which are spelt out in the Premier's press release, but which, of course, are not fully detailed. That is the scheme for which we have been waiting for some months.

Indeed, the Opposition is on record on a number of occasions as having called for that scheme. It was not until today that we had an indication that the Government would pick up the Commonwealth's offer. Other States responded instantly: they said, 'Yes we want it'. They wanted to take advantage of it. Our Government said nothing. Other States participated in an urgent conference of Housing Ministers. Perhaps because it was organised by the Housing Minister in New South Wales, the Liberal Government here did not want to sully itself by attending such a meeting and joining in with the other States, including Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania. Our Minister did not attend. He was not part of that discussion.

Yet that meeting was aimed at obtaining State support to put pressure on the Commonwealth to flush out this money. Nothing was done. So here we are on 21 July and at last the Premier has made an announcement, although he is still not quite sure of the details. What a hoax on people. Why do I say it is a hoax, because I have already said we certainly welcome this money that is being pumped in? It is a hoax because people are being given the impression (that is the intention of the Government) that this is something to protect them from the interest rate increases to come. In fact, it is nothing to do with what is to come; it is to do with what came in March of last year—it is part of that package. It is the final catching up and putting into place of measures that were announced months ago. The Government is recycling it as a new initiative and is saying to people, 'Here is something new with which you can cope with the interest rates that are coming.' What a cruel hoax on people facing the problems they are facing today.

We well remember that there was another aspect of that package. The amount of \$400 000 000 was to be pumped out by the banks in return for the approval of their increases. According to Mr Hill, on 25 March (just remember that date) there would be an additional \$40 000 000 available

for home buyers from South Australian banks. The Minister's press release stated:

Once this money started to flow about 1 200 new loans, many for new houses, would be available. This would be a tremendous fillip to employment and home builders in the private sector, Mr Hill said.

Where is that? What has happened to that pledge? I telegraphed both the Prime Minister and the Premier at the time of the recent Premiers' Conference in June drawing their attention to the fact that the figures released by the banks had indicated that, far from an extra \$400 000 000 (or instalments thereof) for housing loans, there had been a reduction in the amount of money lent out. That reduction has continued. At that time we had the April figures; we have since had the May figures, and the June figures coming up will show the same sorry story. Where is it? Today, just a month later, I got a reply from the Prime Minister. This is what he says under the date line 19 July; talking about a package that he introduced in March, he says:

It is as yet too early to draw conclusions about the extent to which the banks have already altered their rate of lending in accordance with the agreement.

What nonsense that is. We have seen already from the figures published that they have done nothing to alter their rate of lending. On the contrary, their rate of lending has decreased. So much for this bogus package. We are well into this period and we will see what happens over the next few months. I am sure what the Premier will say in support of his friend, the Prime Minister, is that in time the banks will pick it up; in time this money will come out. It is needed now and it is needed urgently, just as the relief scheme announced today was needed three or four months ago. That reply from the Prime Minister is totally inadequate. It does not in any way suggest that pressure is being applied to force the obligations (which apparently were entered into at the time the package was announced) to be put into effect. Of course, we have that other element of the package (today's announcement) which the Premier will try to make much of. I think I have put it firmly into context. Today the Premier admitted that a building society (he has not said which—he is very coy about that) has already made an approach for an increase in rates, and he has not said by how much—he is coy about that, too. Will that receive automatic approval? What is the Premier's attitude going to be to that particular application when it has to be considered? Is he going to deny again, as he did last year and earlier this year, that he has powers to ensure that any such rise is accompanied by realistic relief measures? Let me read to him the *Hansard* of yesterday's Legislative Council in which the Hon. Mr Burdett clearly states the nature and extent of the Government's powers. Of course, to date, all the Premier can do is wash his hands of the problem. First, he suggests it does not really exist; secondly, he says that, if it does exist, he cannot do much about it; thirdly, he says that what he has done is approach the Federal Government and ask Mr Fraser whether he could please do something kindly for South Australia. What has the response been in the other States? It is a sorry contrast with what is being done here in South Australia.

In Victoria the former Liberal Government introduced a home buyers assistance scheme in December 1981. It has provided help to home buyers whose repayments are now a greater percentage of their income than they were when they first took out a loan. The scheme has been maintained by the new Labor Government, which plans to increase funding six-fold in the financial year 1982-83. The new Labor Premier, John Cain, has also made it clear to Victorian building societies that he will not automatically accept increases in their lending rates. For example, after the Australian Savings Bond 1.5 per cent interest increase earlier

this month he said that he would require clear evidence that building society deposits had fallen away before he would consider any interest rate increases, and he is concerned to see proper relief measures in place. That is what happened in Victoria under Liberal and Labor Administrations in the past six months.

In Western Australia, in September of last year, the Government began an interest subsidy scheme for first home buyers, a scheme which assists families which are ineligible for concessional interest loans but which are unable to meet repayments on ordinary loans from a building society or bank. That scheme aims to maintain repayments at around 27 per cent of household income. The generally accepted level is between 25 per cent and 27 per cent. On those figures today, one would have to be in receipt of a family income in excess of \$18 000 to even contemplate entering into an ordinary house loan. No wonder people are not taking up options! No wonder they are finding finance hard to find.

The Western Australian scheme tries to peg those payments at around 27 per cent, yet the evidence cited by those particular examples in the letters I have read out suggests that many people are paying as much as 50 per cent or more of their incomes in mortgage repayments. One couple, in fact, says, 'We are paying 33 per cent and we believe at the moment we can just live with that.' They are already about 8 per cent over what is regarded as being a reasonable amount to allocate to one's shelter. That is the Western Australian scheme.

From 1 July this year (that is three weeks ago) New South Wales commenced a scheme aimed at closing the deposit gap by providing second mortgage finance at lower than normal rates, which remain fixed for the term of the loan; this is similar to something we proposed as a possible scheme to be adopted here. They have also commenced an interest subsidy scheme which provides loans at concessional rates of interest. The New South Wales Government believes this scheme will initially provide homes for about 700 families.

The Premier has already referred to New South Wales and drew attention to a statement by Mr Wran saying, 'We will not allow people to be evicted.' I know the Premier thinks that that is a terrible statement to make, because that indicates some kind of interference by the Government in the free market mechanism which will allow people to be evicted. Let us examine that statement closely. Mr Wran certainly said that that was something that ought to be looked at if the position reached the level of the depression, the sort of scenario I was sketching at the beginning of this speech. He certainly hinted at that. He has certainly given a warning that that may be the desperate measure to which a Government must resort, but he did not say that he had reached that point.

So far, the schemes he has introduced (and I have just outlined two of those) may assist the position, but the crucial thing is that, instead of standing off as the Premier does and saying what a terrible suggestion Mr Wran is making, he is doing something: he is not only expressing concern—he is doing something practical to give effect to that concern at the State Government level. It is about time this Government did that, too.

Turning to Queensland, I point out that that State's conservative Government on 7 July announced a \$100 000 000 housing package. That is designed to put 3 000 families into homes within the year. It involves \$70 000 000 extra allocation to low-income home purchasers. It sets up two new forms of assistance for home buyers. These schemes, which involve interest subsidies, will ease repayment burdens on lower to middle income borrowers. All those States have

acted, and none of them has simply tried to pass the blame off on to someone else.

They have been able to take the initiative and defend the interests of home buyers, unlike the Government here. No other Government has had to wait for the Federal Government to sort out what it plans to do. Two of those States are governed by Liberal or Liberal-Country Party Coalitions, and the original Victorian scheme was introduced during the time of a Liberal Government. But it seems that this Government's particular ideological commitment to non-intervention in the market place and to getting out of the way of business has made it incapable of action, to the further disaster of individuals in this State. The only other explanation could be that the Premier is so compromised in his support for the Fraser Government that he has to wait for it to give a lead. He is so willing to trot along in its wake and to obey the orders of Mr Fraser and not embarrass him in any way. The Government must take action now before the housing crisis facing all South Australians deepens.

As an immediate step it must not approve the full 1½ per cent rise proposed by building societies unless such approval is accompanied by a positive relief package for home buyers facing difficulties, and that package must include Government action. It must not just be left to the building societies and the banks. If this Government is not prepared to take action, I can assure the people of South Australia that a Labor Government will. We will establish a home buyers assistance scheme to provide help for existing home buyers in difficulty and prospective home buyers who cannot get concessional loans through the State Bank. Existing home buyers facing genuine hardship in meeting their mortgage repayments because of interest rate rises will be able to apply for means-tested assistance aimed at ensuring that their repayments remain at a reasonable proportion of their household income.

Prospective home buyers seeking their first home will also be able to apply for assistance, and those families who cannot get concessional interest loans through the State Bank but who still are unable to meet repayments on an ordinary commercial loan will be eligible for means-tested assistance. That commitment is definite, and those schemes that a State Labor Government will introduce will be in addition to the maintenance of a high-volume construction programme by the Housing Trust. We will also consider a scheme to provide insurance of lenders against mortgage default and so encourage lending institutions to lend higher proportions of valuations, which should reduce the deposit gap. There is no question that people in South Australia need and want houses. There is no doubt that unused capacity exists within the housing construction industry. It remains to take initiatives to unlock the funds to make full use of that capacity. A State Labor Government will accept the responsibility of searching out new areas from which funds can be obtained and considering ways to extend the use of funds to which we currently have access.

I am more than willing to concede that the Housing Trust and our State banks are at the moment stretching themselves to help South Australians into their own homes. However, it is not sufficient and new methods, new support must be found. What has been done has not gone far enough, and in the key area of assisting people directly affected by interest rate increases virtually nothing has been done at all. This situation has accelerated. This deterioration has occurred, particularly over the last two or three years of the current joint impact of the Fraser and Tonkin Government policies. What we can do at this level is not simply stand back or pass the buck. We can take action now. I would suggest on their record that the best possible action we can take in this House is to get this motion carried, have the Government

resign and go to an election so that we can get a change of Government and implement some policies on behalf of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): The Leader of the Opposition, having finally got his motion off the ground—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the House before the Premier continues his remarks that I will insist that he be heard in the same silence in which the Leader was heard or I will take the appropriate action, that is, one warning and then naming.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was going to say that the Leader, having finally got his motion off the ground, did his best to make up for the rather bad impression he gave earlier when he moved the motion initially with only two of his members supporting him on the Opposition benches. That was absolutely disgraceful. If the matter is as serious as the Leader says, I would have expected all members of his Party to be on the benches behind him.

The Hon. H. Allison: There were 16 of ours sitting here.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: We did the best we could. The Leader of the Opposition has very accurately painted a picture of housing difficulties throughout Australia. Indeed, I could go further and say that he has very accurately painted a picture of housing difficulties existing throughout the western world at the moment. As he has properly said, it is a matter of very considerable concern and one that concerns all sections of the community. There is considerable hardship; no-one denies that for one moment. It is a matter of very grave concern to this Government, to other State Governments, to the Federal Government and, indeed, to the Governments of many other countries in the western world. The Leader generously spent a very small fraction of the time available for his speech saying that he accepts that State Governments cannot in any way control interest rates or, indeed, exert any influence on the level of interest rates which are set on the national money markets and to some extent on the international money market.

Having given some token acknowledgement of that fact, the Leader then turned around and spent the rest of his speech doing the very best he could to lay the blame for interest rate increases and spirals at the door of the South Australian Government and, indeed, having acknowledged that it is a nationwide problem, he tried to give the impression that it is a situation that applies only in South Australia and is the responsibility only of this Government. I totally refute his suggestion that the South Australian Government is to blame for the situation, either for high interest rates or, indeed, for any difficulty with housing or with the provision of adequate housing, particularly for those in the low-income group, because the record shows that those suggestions are totally without foundation.

I found it very difficult indeed to find out exactly what it was that the Leader of the Opposition was complaining about, whether, as the motion states, it was about 'failing to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia' (although I think that the story I will be able to tell will totally and absolutely rebut that argument), or whether he was concerned about the affect of high interest rates, about which, despite his disclaimer, he is blaming the South Australian Government.

In reference to both those counts, that is, the provision of housing and the effects of high interest rates, and the claim that virtually nothing has been done by the State Government at all, I point out that they are simply not true. The motion as it has been put forward is inaccurate; it is misleading and, of course, it is totally unnecessary, because it does not do anything at all to help the situation.

It is a lot of words; it certainly recognises that a problem exists but there is no need at all for anyone to remind this Government that there is hardship and concern about the high interest rates that must be paid by home buyers. The Government is very well aware of the problem. I also have received the same type of letters that the Leader has received. But what I have done is at least be honest with those people. I have not buoyed them up with promises of some magical relief scheme.

I have not suggested that this is something from which they could get instant relief if the Government were to change, because in fact that would not be true. However, apparently the Leader has done that. In fact, the Government has a good record of achievement in the area of housing, and it is a record that for the past two or three years can be matched by few other States. To suggest that the Government has failed to protect housing standards of the people of South Australia is patently ridiculous; to suggest that we have done less than other States to establish a package of measures to alleviate the effects of high interest rates is also untrue.

Mr Ashenden: Perhaps he has a credibility problem.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Leader's credibility problem is entirely his own, and I am sure that he is quite happy to take responsibility for it. I personally would prefer not to have the same record of lack of credibility. Very soon I will be moving an amendment to the motion to put the position correctly, as it should be put. However, before I do that I want to discuss in some little detail the individual points raised in the wording of the original motion and to demonstrate some of the fallacies which lie behind the Opposition's arguments.

First, I will deal with the initiatives that have been taken by my Government in relation to housing assistance. The State Government has injected record sums into housing. No State Government has done more to provide reasonable cost housing for its people. In fact, we have gone to considerable lengths to find funds from outside sources so that we have been able to build and finance more welfare housing than has been built for many years.

In the 1981-82 financial year the South Australian Housing Trust capital works programme was a record \$110 000 000. The State Bank lending programme for concessional loans was a record \$86 000 000. That is \$196 000 000 from those two sources alone in one year. The Leader of the Opposition has suggested that he could do more to stimulate the building industry and increase concessional home loans. I would be very interested indeed to know how. I note that one of the propensities of the Opposition is that it is very keen to criticise. Indeed, it is carping in its criticism at times. When it comes to making positive suggestions about what can be done it is very short indeed on practical, costed suggestions.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about Queensland and what that State has been able to do and what it has been able to offer. What the Leader of the Opposition did not say is that this year Queensland expects to obtain \$90 000 000 in mining and resource development royalties. South Australia could be enjoying a similar situation if the previous Government had not sat on resource development and, indeed, discouraged it. Indeed, I find that statement very strange coming from someone who leads a Party which just a few weeks ago effectively voted to stop Roxby Downs. Queensland is certainly in a better position to be able to help with housing and many other things because of its mining and resource development royalties.

The Opposition said that it will increase concessional home loans and stimulate the building industry. One simple question I would like answered is this: where will Labor find the additional funds for its vague schemes, because it

must find funds? Schemes are no value unless they can be funded. At present the Opposition has released half its economic package. I say 'half' advisedly, because the costing we have put on most of the proposals contained in the economic package that has been released amounts to in excess of \$200 000 000.

The health parcel and other policies that were recently released are costed at at least another \$20 000 000. It looks very much as though it will cost very close to \$250 000 000 in excess expenditure over and above the current Budget of this State. However, the Leader of the Opposition and his Party have done nothing whatsoever to release the other half of the economic package, which is the package which deals with where that money will come from and what taxes will be increased.

Will we see a return of death duties and gift duties? Will we see increased pay-roll tax and a wealth tax, which seems to be a very popular tax among members of the Labor Party? Obviously, these taxation measures must have already been planned. The economic package to spend the money has been released by the Opposition; when are we going to see the other half of the package telling us where the money will come from and what taxes will be put into effect and inflicted on the people of South Australia? I think the Leader of the Opposition would do well to address himself to that question and do so very seriously indeed.

This Government has already taken the initiative in a very careful costed way and we are living within our means. Additional funds have been raised for the Housing Trust and, indeed, to raise the record sum that has been used we have adopted most innovative approaches. Additional funds have been channelled through the Superannuation Investment Trust (some \$10 000 000) and from S.G.I.C. (some \$5 000 000). We have issued short-term promissory notes (\$5 000 000) and we have used capital from the transfer of the Elizabeth Shopping Centre leases.

To increase further the availability of housing, we have taken other action of joint venture unit projects, leasing from the private sector, a scheme which is the first of its kind in Australia to involve the private sector with Government agencies in providing welfare housing. The results of these Government initiatives is record investment, record building and a huge increase in the provision of low-cost and low-rental housing. The record sums being lent by the State Bank are currently still assisting, on a regular basis, 55 families a week.

This Government has increased the loan limit from \$27 000 to \$33 000. It has permitted loans for new and existing homes and has ensured that those most in need receive assistance. When one remembers that concessional rates of interest for State Bank loans commence at 5.75 per cent per annum for those who qualify, one cannot be much more generous or helpful than that.

The Labor Party recently promised to extend this scheme further for those who do not qualify. Again, I ask where the additional money is coming from. Which taxes will be put on and who will be taxed? Who will meet the cost? That is the fundamental thing that we must ask.

This Government has already tapped every available outside source without increasing taxation, and has done it most successfully. I can only conclude that, if the Labor Party wishes to extend the scheme further for those who presently do not qualify, the waiting list will go up so far that it will be completely unmanageable. I do not think that the Opposition has really thought through its promises, and I do not think it has bothered to cost them thoroughly.

The State Bank is lending \$86 000 000 a year for concessional housing loans. To qualify, applicants must earn less than 85 per cent of average weekly earnings. If the qualification was extended to, say, 90 per cent of the average

weekly earnings, an additional \$12 000 000 would be required by the State Bank. If the qualification was extended to 100 per cent of the average weekly earnings, the State Bank would require an additional \$36 000 000. Again, where will we find this capital sum? Where would the Labor Party find this capital sum? Where would the Labor Party take the money from—its programmes? Would it take it from education? Would it stop the water filtration programmes for Adelaide and the northern towns?

The Hon. H. Allison: Fewer nurses.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Perhaps fewer nurses. Perhaps it would involve hospitals or the Police Department. These questions have been asked from time to time whenever anyone suggests cutting expenditure. We would like to hear some answers from the Opposition spokesman involved. What does the honourable member suggest should be done? Where would that money come from?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The Opposition would do well to look at this Government's record in housing, because we are very proud of what is being done under extreme difficulties, and we will keep working to increase the level of funds. However, we have not and will not promise what we know cannot be achieved. This is something that the people of Victoria are finding now to their great discomfiture, namely, that, to get into office, some Labor Parties will promise almost anything, and then renege immediately they are elected.

Amongst the achievements that this Government has had is the area of home ownership, the Government has adopted wide-ranging measures to honour its commitment to encourage home ownership. I remind honourable members that the Government removed stamp duty as of November 1979 for first home buyers on houses up to a value of \$30 000, and there is a reduction thereafter of \$580 on subsequent transactions. To the end of May 1982, 21 210 home buyers have benefited, and this has cost the Government \$10 400 000 in forgone revenue. Land tax was removed from July 1980 on the principal place of residence, and revenue in 1980-81 amounting to \$6 000 000 was forgone.

The State Bank, as I have already stated, has increased its maximum loan from \$27 000 to \$33 000. The lending rate even then has been maintained at a steady 55 transactions a week. Concessional loans start at 5¼ per cent, and there is a maximum interest of 10 per cent. Guidelines for lending were amended in September 1981 to ensure that concessional assistance is made available to those in greatest need, particularly young families. A new rental purchase scheme was introduced on 1 September 1981. An emergency plan to help home purchasers in crisis was introduced in October 1981, largely in response to the first of the interest rate rises.

Trust tenants have been given the opportunity to purchase their dwellings, although aged cottages and walk-up flats are not included in that. These opportunities have been taken up and alternative approaches to mortgage arrangements have been the subject of discussion between Treasury, housing officials and lending institutions. The Savings Bank scheme has now become a most innovative low-staffed mortgage scheme, which tailors people's repayments according to the likelihood of their being able to pay more as they advance in their employment and earn more. I believe that that is a most innovative scheme and has been well received.

Regarding the private sector, the Housing Advisory Council was established in 1981, replacing the Housing Advisory Committee, which was established the previous year. We are considering building construction standards and trying to consolidate them into one Statute. We will probably be able to do that very soon. The Building Act has been forwarded to industry groups for comment.

We in South Australia have always been very fortunate to have a very fine Housing Trust. The trust has been building houses for sale in competition with private developers. There has been a massive injection of funds, as I have already outlined, from State sources to welfare housing, and \$110 000 000 was spent in 1981-82, which is a 39 per cent increase over the previous year. Commencements in 1981-82 of about 2 000 is about 900 above the number of units constructed in 1980-81. Rental stock is approximately 45 000, representing the highest number of public housing units in any State on a per capita basis. There were 5 868 tenancies arranged in 1980-81, the highest number in any one year since Elizabeth was established in the early 1950s; and it is expected that 1981-82 will show a further record.

There were 64 aged pensioner cottage flats constructed in the last year of the Labor Government, 1978-79, and, between 1 July 1981 and 31 March 1982, 289 such cottage flats were built. That is a considerable increase, and I am quite certain that the member for Napier would be very interested in that fact, because a great deal of that tremendous record has taken place in Elizabeth and surrounding areas.

Mr Hemmings: True.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member acknowledge that. Perhaps he will think twice before he supports the motion that has been moved by the Leader of the Opposition. Housing approvals in April 1982 were the highest for any month since we came to office, and housing costs are being examined. We are doing everything possible to reduce the cost of building. In April 1981, the role of the Emergency Housing Office was expanded to help youth and the aged in addition to its original charter, which was to help families with children.

In the past 12 months, 8 489 applicants have been assisted with either temporary accommodation, advice or aid in obtaining private rental accommodation. Higher rents and a greater incidence of four-week bond charges are creating pressure on the office, on available funds, and, of course, on the number of people seeking assistance. Special home prices planning has been set up, and this involves trust officers visiting owners in crisis, discussing and counselling.

The Home Purchasers in Crisis scheme continues with \$1 500 interest-free loans to help people get over the immediate crisis period caused by increasing interest rates. The trust is prepared to acquire mortgages and restructure them if necessary. It is also prepared to purchase a house from an owner who is in dire financial difficulty and rent back the property to the vendor.

Of course, that is subject to agreement. Negotiations have been continuing with the Commonwealth to utilise grant money for rental subsidies in the private sector. We will continue to support the Housing Trust in its search for more outside funds for housing. We have already undertaken close liaison with local government, especially to help with housing for elderly persons. Indeed, I hope that all local government authorities will take part in the proposal for the Jubilee 150 celebrations in 1986 by taking up the Government's suggestion of constructing special housing accommodation for elderly people.

The scheme that was announced today was announced purely and simply because today we received notification from the Federal Government that money would be available under the new mortgage and rent relief scheme. It is totally wrong for the Leader of the Opposition to say what he has said about this not being a genuine offer and being a sham—I think that was the word he used. I will go into that in more detail later on. The point is that, as a result of this grant from the Commonwealth (which was certainly first announced in principle in March of this year), assistance will be given to people who are in difficulties because of

their high interest rates on purchases and to people who are in difficulties over rental schemes.

This will involve more than \$3 500 000, and it will be matched and made up of a \$1 760 000 grant from the Commonwealth, which the South Australian Government will match; 25 per cent of the funds will be applied to each of the mortgage and rental relief components, and the remaining 50 per cent will be used at the discretion of the States. The State will determine the eligibility criteria having regard to factors, including family income, size of mortgage payments, household assets, and so on. Assistance may take the form of payments to reduce mortgage payments, rental payments, or payments of arrears, and this may be made as loans or grants. States will be encouraged to limit assistance to individual households for a period of one year, and the scheme will be reviewed before the end of the second year.

Those recommendations, which have now come out as guidelines, follow very closely indeed the recommendations that were made by the South Australian Government following the first round of discussions. The other State Governments have not been at an advantage over South Australia. In fact, we have all been waiting to hear the results of the various suggestions that were put forward. The Leader of the Opposition makes some great play of the fact that the Housing Minister was not able to attend the meeting of Housing Ministers to discuss this programme. He did not say that officers of our department have met with officers of the other State departments and that all these details have been thrashed out by those officers.

The scheme will be a great help to home buyers. It certainly will be a great help to people living in rental accommodation and who are being placed under increasing financial strain because of rising interest rates. I certainly welcome the initiative that is being taken by the Federal Government to provide that extra funding which is so necessary to allow the State to establish an improved home loan and rental assistance scheme.

I believe that the scheme is of great importance to many home buyers in this State. I am appalled at the Leader's attempt to misrepresent the true position. The Leader claimed (I think I heard him correctly) that the scheme announced this afternoon had been in effect since March. He said that South Australia was the only State that had not taken up its funds under the scheme. That is a gross distortion of the facts. As I said, the scheme was first announced by the Federal Government in March as part of an overall national housing package, but it is only today that details have been received from the Federal Government on the proposed scheme.

The news has been expected and, indeed, mention was made of it in His Excellency's Speech yesterday. Other State Governments also received their notification today, and to suggest that other States already have received money from the Federal Government, or that this Government had deferred acceptance of that money, is completely incorrect. It is a distortion, and I am quite positive that the Leader knows that it is untrue. It is unfortunately another example of the standard of debate that we have come to expect from the Leader, attempting to distort and misrepresent the facts in any attempt to score some form of cheap political advantage. The Leader suggests that the Government has failed to defend housing standards against the policies of the Federal Government. I gather from his remarks that he is referring to the increase in interest rates and the amount of Federal funding made available to the States for housing. I have already dealt with the fact that this is a problem affecting all of Australia and, indeed, all of the Western world.

However, if the Opposition believes that the Federal Government can somehow magically lower interest rates despite the world trend, the international monetary market rates,

then we would all like to hear how it can be done. Perhaps if the Leader can tell us all, we will all be enlightened. The whole point is that the Leader has no suggestion because other people have no suggestions, either. Even his Federal colleagues have no suggestions as to how world interest rates can be lowered. The only encouraging thing which we have heard in recent days was the lowering of the rate in New York, I think it was, by half of 1 per cent, which may possibly take some of the pressure off high interest levels. Unfortunately, there are many other factors which will apply and inflation is one of them. There is nothing that any State Government can do that will have more than a cosmetic effect on the impact of interest rates on home buyers in this State. The constraint which rising interest rates and wages, and relatively high inflation places on the Federal Treasury inevitably leads to restrictions on money that can be made available to the States for housing. Even given those difficulties, this Government's record on this issue ranks with anything done by any other State Administration. I repeat my question, 'What have the Labor Governments in New South Wales and Victoria done that has not been done in this State?' The answer is that although what has been done is not identical with what has been done in other States, the effect of it has, in fact, been as good as or better than anything done in other States.

We are not responsible, as a State Government, for the unacceptably high level of interest rates. It is a Federal Government responsibility and would be so whether there were a Federal Liberal Government or a Federal Labor Government. We are very concerned about the impact of these interest rates on home buyers, and also on small businesses. We are certainly concerned about the high levels of personal income tax. I believe that we have done everything possible to put pressure on the Federal Government to take the necessary income tax relief measures. I do not intend to go into this matter to any extent except to say that I believe there must be cuts in personal income tax, and I believe that there is great merit in finding tax deductions for interest paid on home loans. That is a matter I have taken up with the Federal Government on a number of occasions because both of these measures would greatly ease the financial pressures on most South Australian families.

It is not just the rising interest rates; the fact is that there are many families who are looking at the end of each month to see whether or not they have enough money left to meet their increasing commitments, whether from high interest rates, or whatever other cause. The point is that, if we can give them some sort of relief and put more money in their pockets at the end of each month so that they can meet those commitments, then they will be a great deal better off. I will continue to put those views forcibly to the Federal Government. I will also (and have done) propose a further taxation concession which I believe will greatly reduce interest rate pressures and provide more funds for home loans. I believe that investments or deposits in institutions for first mortgage housing loans could well be tax exempt. That means that the interest earned by a depositor with a savings bank or building society should not be subject to income tax. I believe that that proposal is worthy of careful consideration by the Federal Treasurer in the coming Budget. In addition to these proposals that Government has put to the Federal Government to provide relief from high interest rates, and other local action has been taken to assist home buyers.

We have been in close consultation with banks and building societies. I am pleased with their willingness to assist borrowers in difficulty by adjusting the term of the loan and deferring interest rate rise increases. In my experience they have always been happy to assist. The State Government

has implemented its home buyer relief scheme. It is, as honourable members know, administered by the Housing Trust. It will be extended substantially by the provision of Federal funds that we have announced in the housing package today.

The Federal Government has made tax rebates available to first home buyers, as provided by the Federal Government in its housing package. I personally do not think the scheme goes far enough, because it does not take up those people who have bought their homes for longer than five years, but at least it is a move in the right direction and at least recent first home buyers are now receiving some direct Federal Government relief—as much as \$13 a week, and sometimes even more. The Leader knows very well that the responsibility for interest rates lies very much at the feet of the Federal Government and that there is not a great deal that the Federal Government can do about it either, regardless of what political Party is in office.

I believe that the Leader is tending to treat a subject which is of great concern to everyone in the community very much as a political football. I believe that that is a dangerous and disruptive game. It can cause nothing but distress and concern for the home buying public. When we look at the Labor Party's attitude to the housing question and, more particularly, to its policy on interest rates, I think we should look at the wording included in the A.L.P. policy platform at its recent State convention. It states:

That the South Australian branch of the A.L.P. supports a policy whereby State and Federal Governments co-operate to use all their available powers to reduce interest rates on all home mortgages and that assistance schemes be established to help first home buyers on a needs basis.

I certainly cannot disagree with the sentiments of this policy, but unfortunately it is ambiguous and it is vague. It has no detail of how it would be implemented, and that criticism applies to the proposals that the Leader has outlined tonight. It does not say how much the assistance schemes would cost. It does not say who would benefit or how many people would benefit. Most important, it does not give any idea from where the money will come. Again, from where does the money come? It does not give any cognisance to the fact that people in rental properties also need assistance because, unless people with rental properties are assisted also, that policy would be discriminatory and unfair in the extreme; it means that people in rental accommodation would be subsidising people who receive assistance while buying their own home.

I believe that this Government has done a great deal for housing in South Australia. I believe the standard of housing is excellent. It is better now than it has ever been. Certainly, the volume of available housing is greater than it has ever been, and there is no doubt at all in my mind that this Government is to be congratulated for the very fine record which it has in this regard. Interest rates are something that the State Government of South Australia cannot be blamed for any more than can the New South Wales, Victorian or any other State Government be blamed for them.

Effectively, the Leader of the Opposition is playing politics. We will continue with the programmes which have been set up to help people in crisis. We will help them with their rental and mortgage repayments. The schemes that have been set up will be developed and followed through. We will continue also to raise funds, in increasing quantities, to increase the amount of welfare housing and rental accommodation available. Indeed, I believe that the record that we have set already is one that can be built on with great effect. Accordingly, I move:

Delete all words after 'House' in the motion presently before the house and insert in lieu thereof 'congratulates the Government for the active and innovative measures it has taken to protect the housing standards of the people of South Australia, for its efforts

to alleviate the effects of high interest rates, and for its success in achieving significant Commonwealth assistance through the mortgage and rental relief scheme.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Is the amendment seconded?

Mr Ashenden: Yes, Sir.

Mr Bannon: Are you on record, Scott, as seconding this?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader may have been out when I stated that the debate will be conducted without interjection. The honourable member for Napier.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): One might be inclined to think that this whole procedure today, as far as the Government is concerned, is a complete sham. Government members were worried earlier this afternoon that the motion put forward by the Leader would be an embarrassment to them, and they used all the procedures of the House available to make sure that we were to debate this motion at this time of night when there are no press people here to cover the proceedings.

Members interjecting:

Mr HEMMINGS: I accept that, but I believe that sincerely, because I think that members opposite will stop at nothing to make sure that the people of South Australia do not realise what is going on within the community.

With regard to one point that the Premier raised, I shall revert to a phrase used in the country of my origin: when the Conservatives are in retreat and an alternative Government is to be elected they always come up with the old saying, 'Where is the money coming from?' When my Leader spoke he outlined some of the policies; he did not say what the costs would be, as our policies have not yet been released, but when they are released they will be costed, and we will promise nothing that we cannot deliver. Looking back to the lukewarm promises made in 1979 by the Liberal Party as far as housing is concerned, one realises that the Government has yet to deliver anything other than the deletion of land tax.

Mr Evans: They have done more than that. What about stamp duty payable on the first home?

Mr HEMMINGS: That is what I said—stamp duty and land tax. I would like to make one comment to liven up the proceedings because Government back-benchers have been rather quiet. Since I have been the Opposition spokesman for housing I have found that, increasingly, people from areas such as Todd, Newland, Mawson and Morphett have been coming to me seeking assistance in their attempts to find homes. They have come to me saying that they have been to their Liberal member of Parliament, but they have been wiped off. I have managed to get those people housing, although I am not saying that it is particularly due to my being the Opposition's shadow Minister for Housing, but because I have approached the problem in a humane fashion. I put on record the fact that the member for Henley Beach, when approached by people in his area who were experiencing hardship, said that people were overcommitting themselves on mortgage repayments, which was an awful thing to say. In Mount Gambier on Monday, on two instances I met people—

The Hon. H. Allison: Names, Terry.

Mr HEMMINGS: I will give the names later, but not in this House; I would never do that. In two instances there were people who were unable to get Housing Trust homes. They were in an awful situation until a religious organisation approached me, because they would not approach their local member. If they had approached him, they would not have received any satisfaction. That is the difference between this side of the House and members opposite in relation to how

both sides approach this situation in this State. Literally thousands of South Australians have been forced into a nightmare situation, not of their own making, in relation to housing.

A decent standard of housing should be and could be everyone's basic right. That is the corner stone of the family unit. I do not say that lightly, because that is a phrase that the Government has used time and time again when it has introduced legislation or opposed legislation introduced by the Labor Government. That basic right for thousands of South Australians no longer exists. Many families are now being forced to sell their homes because they cannot afford the mortgage repayments. Many other families saving for a deposit or trying to raise loan finance to buy a house now find it beyond their capacity to pay.

Together with unemployment, housing is now the most serious social problem in this country. I have said that time and time again in this House, and I make no apology for it, because it is the most major social problem, apart from unemployment. I will keep on saying it until it gets through to the Government exactly what the problem is. Thousands of people are living in substandard, over priced rental accommodation. Many thousands more live in caravans or other temporary accommodation. More and more families, particularly those seeking their first homes, have been forced to give up in the face of crippling repayment burdens.

We have stagnation right across the home building industry in all but a few regions in a few States. Home building firms are going to the wall. South Australia is in a worse situation than anywhere else. The reason for this worsening disaster, as my Leader pointed out earlier, is related to the sharply rising interest rates. In less than two years the repayments on an average bank housing loan of \$30 000 have risen by a massive \$66 per month or \$15 per week. There is no sign that things will get any better.

My Leader dealt with the failure of the Tonkin and Fraser Governments to come to grips with the problem and he referred to the Tonkin Government's pathetic attempt to provide 'band aid' relief to those people in a real crisis situation. I will deal with those areas well within the control of this Government to provide relief, either through legislation or by direct Executive Council direction. Those areas are the private rental market, the exploitation of that market by private, unlicensed letting agencies, the role of the Emergency Housing Office, the abandonment of the Housing Improvement Office, and the South Australian Housing Trust.

In Adelaide within the private rental market the vacancy rate is now at a record low level. In February of this year, and I have been informed that circumstances have not changed to any marked degree to this point in time, the vacancy rate was .7 per cent. This compares with a rate of 2.8 per cent in January 1981. The Adelaide vacancy rate is the lowest in all the capital cities. The cause of the low vacancy rate can be attributed to, first, a marked slow-down in investment in the building of private rental accommodation as a result of a lack of confidence in this Government; secondly, frustrated home buyers remaining in the private rental sector and being unable to meet not only the deposit gap but also the high interest repayments; and, thirdly, the Housing Trust waiting list, which is now around 28 000 applications.

As a result of this, there is now a situation where rents are now around \$85 per week, compared with \$65 per week in May 1981 and \$54 per week in May 1980. One would think that this Government would view this with some concern and look at some form of rent control to stop profiteering but, no, the free market must reign supreme. If one cannot make it in this system, tough luck.

Mr Mathwin: Is that your policy—rent control?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HEMMINGS: I now turn to the exploitation of those people by the unlicensed letting agencies. The severe shortage of rental accommodation has led to many desperate home seekers having to use those despicable agencies. I hope that the member for Brighton will agree with me on this because he raised the matter in this House about those people charging exorbitant sums of money to those people trying to get homes. I hope that the member for Brighton will not laugh at this. The member for Glenelg might laugh, because he laughs at anything. There have been numerous complaints about the high cost and unsatisfactory services from those agencies to the South Australian Housing Trust, the Emergency Housing Office and shelters in South Australia. Complaints have been received about properties being advertised which are not available as they had been previously let or not even constructed.

In a survey conducted by the Emergency Housing Office between November 1981 and January 1982, only four out of 33 people surveyed had received any form of satisfaction. Based on that sample, one could estimate that 1 500 low-income earners use those agencies per year and very few receive satisfaction. The rest are just ripped off. This Government has allowed that exploitation. In fact, it has encouraged it by its statements in the media. In the *Advertiser* of 24 March 1982, an article appeared which dealt with the traps of listing and letting. The article said:

People have said they paid \$40 to the agent for a list of addresses and telephone numbers providing incorrect information.

They claimed to have travelled great distances to look at properties which were unsatisfactory or already let.

Reports included incidents where agencies were advertising properties to let which had not yet been constructed.

The superintendent of the Lutheran City Mission Hostel, Mr K. Fischer, said he had received many complaints from residents at the hostel regarding the practices of the agencies.

He criticised the organisations for exploiting people in a period of housing crisis and recommended that the agencies be licensed and regulated.

The agencies charge between \$35 and \$40 for between three and four months service.

What was the response from the Minister responsible for that particular area, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, the Hon. J. C. Burdett? The Minister stated that consumer education and not regulation was required. How does one educate people who are desperate for homes? The only way in which we can help those people is to regulate those who are ripping them off. This Government says, 'We are a Government of deregulation', but here is a prime example where regulation is required to look after people. People are in real need, but the Government says, 'No, we will educate them.' I would like to know how the Minister will be able to educate people in this area. It is the same old story of the ideology of this Government: if someone can make a buck from another person's misfortune, he can go ahead and do it. I defy any member opposite to deny that attitude.

Let us consider the Government's attitude to the Emergency Housing Office. At best, we can say that the Government's attitude is patronising: at worst, there is complete indifference. The Government is completely indifferent to the pressures being placed on the Emergency Housing Office. The Premier, in his address to this House, stated that the Emergency Housing Office had been expanded. All right, the Emergency Housing Office has been expanded. It was given five extra staff in 1980. However, the demands on the office have increased so much that it takes 14 days for a person who is in a real crisis to obtain an appointment with the Emergency Housing Office.

The Hon. R. G. Payne interjecting:

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes. An office has been established at Elizabeth, but it is only part time; an office has been established at Salisbury, but that only operates part time. The

people who need the services of the Emergency Housing Office cannot get into town. This Government should make a decision here and now to staff the Emergency Housing Office so that it can cope with the demands as they arise. At present, the office cannot do that. I can imagine how someone feels who is in a real housing crisis and who contacts the Emergency Housing Office and is told that it will take at least 14 days before he can be interviewed, let alone gain assistance.

I now refer to one other area in which this Government has really fallen down—the Housing Improvement Act. It was a decision of this Government, although I suspect a decision which was pushed very strongly by the Minister of Housing and which was not really understood by his colleagues in Cabinet, to shift the responsibility for the Housing Improvement Act. I do not say that the Minister of Housing is a cohort of those shark landlords who operate in this society, but it would be fair comment to say that, when the change came about in relation to the Housing Improvement Act, shark landlords thought that all their Christmases had come at once.

The South Australian Housing Trust did not want the change; local government did not want the change. The winners were the shabby landlords, and the losers were those people living in substandard housing. Since 1940, 63 000 dwellings have come under rent control determinations where a landlord has the right of appeal to the court. Only on 29 occasions have landlords appealed against the trust determinations. Clearly, landlords have accepted the role played by the trust in setting rents, or at least they have not sought to challenge it. Since 1963, 16 000 dwellings have been classified substandard. There has never been a successful appeal against a substandard declaration. Clearly, the trust makes very few mistakes.

The Act provides for the improvement of undesirable housing standards, the clearance of run-down housing areas for redevelopment and the control of rents charged for substandard houses. The South Australian Housing Trust has a policy of encouraging improvement under Part VII of the Act. The trust was enabled to serve notice on any owner or registered mortgagee of its intention to declare a house found to be substandard. A minimum of one month was allowed for representation to be made before the trust formally declared the house to be substandard by a notice in the *Government Gazette*. The Act allowed for a period of one month in which an appeal against this action could be lodged with the Local Court. If no appeal was lodged the maximum rent could be fixed if the house was let or capable of being let. During 1980-81, 359 homes were declared to be substandard and 144 rents were fixed. The subsequent improvements to substandard houses resulted in \$3 500 000 of work for private sector builders and contractors. That is a lot of money for a depressed housing industry in this State. However, our Minister of Housing convinced his colleagues in Cabinet, without consulting with the Housing Trust or local government, that his friends, the landlords, should have that provision taken away from them.

Mr Bannon: They didn't tell the public either.

Mr HEMMINGS: No, they did not tell the public. When the announcement was made, the trust was telephoning the Local Government Association, saying, 'What are you doing to us?' Neither organisation knew what was going on.

With only eight minutes remaining, I would like to rebut some of the comments that the Premier made about the public rental market. How the Premier can have the gall to say in 1982 that the trust is the greatest public instrumentality in this country, producing the finest homes and housing the most people, when it has been the Government's avowed intent, ever since it came to power, to decimate the trust,

to reduce it from an entrepreneur and from being a body that provided low-cost purchase homes for people (and I am proud to live in one of those homes, and to provide rental-purchase schemes for people who could not afford the deposit), is the height of hypocrisy. I do not criticise the trust; the trust has been given a direction.

The trust has been told, 'You do this,' and has done it well, but in doing so literally hundreds of years of experience involving design, architecture, engineering, personnel and servicing have been lost through early retirement or through sheer frustration.

Mr Mathwin: Hundreds of years?

Mr HEMMINGS: Hundreds of years collectively, you fool. It is rather interesting that the Premier, when he replied to the Leader, quoted certain things. I was rather taken with the idea that perhaps something is going out in all the electorates. I have an electorate newsletter sent out by the member for Mawson. I understand that this is the same kind of propaganda that is going out in all the marginal electorates, most likely in Newland, Todd, Morphett, Mawson, and possibly Mount Gambier.

I have only five minutes, but I will take the statements that the Premier made which are identical to statements made in this leaflet. One of them is that the Liberal Government has increased State funding over that authorised by the A.L.P. by \$49 000 000 over the past 2½ years. To the ill-informed person who wants to believe that a newsletter is telling the truth, that sounds very good.

The Hon. H. Allison: You send out more than any one; you should know.

Mr HEMMINGS: I only publish the truth. No-one is denying that that \$49 000 000 has been spent over the past 2½ years, but let us look at the meaning, which is pretty obscure. The Liberals have spent \$49 000 000 more on housing than the A.L.P. spent in its last 2½ years in office. If one takes into account the State money allocated in 1982, that figure is probably accurate. However, the reason that the State Government has had to increase Loan funds for housing is that its Federal colleagues, Mr Fraser and those people in Canberra, have largely withdrawn from the area. I have a table detailing the collapse of Federal funding for housing from \$36 000 000 in 1977-78 to \$9 000 000 in 1979-80. I seek leave to have this table incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Can the honourable member give an assurance that the material is purely statistical?

Mr HEMMINGS: Yes, Sir.
Leave granted.

Loan Finance for Housing 1976-77 to 1980-81

| | 1980-81 | 1979-80 | 1978-79 | 1977-78 | 1976-77 |
|---|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | (\$ million) | | | | |
| State Funds | 8.7 | 9.0 | — | — | — |
| C/W State Housing Agreement | 9.96 | 9.0 | 28.205 | 36.128 | 35.667 |
| Loans from Semi-Government Institutions | 26.10 | 17.53 | 11.0 | 15.9 | 12.2 |
| Totals | 44.76 | 35.53 | 39.205 | 52.08 | 47.867 |

Source: S.A. Housing Trust Telephone Information.

When one looks at this table, other facts emerge. During the last two years of the Labor Government, 1977-78 and 1978-79, a total of \$91 200 000 in Loan funds was provided for housing. In the first two years of a Liberal Government, the total amount provided was \$80 300 000, a substantial cut in real terms. So we can say that the State Government has attempted to meet that shortfall, but what has it cost

this Government? Not so much what has it cost this Government but what has it cost Housing Trust tenants, because the money they were getting previously under a State Labour Government and a Federal Labour Government was only costing 4.5 per cent in interest? The much vaunted money coming from the S.G.I.C. and the State Superannuation Fund is costing 17.5 per cent.

The result of that is that Housing Trust rents have increased 100 per cent over the c.p.i. figures. The c.p.i. figures have increased from June 1978 by 39.4 per cent, and Housing Trust rents have increased by 69 per cent. It does not take into account the July increases. So, who is paying? The trust tenants are paying. If the Premier says that he is proud of what he has done for the Housing Trust tenants in this State, he should be ashamed of himself.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I support the amendment moved by the Premier but oppose the motion moved by the Leader. I think that the whole of the last speaker's comments can be taken and judged on the beginning of his speech. He knows quite well why his Party was unable to get this motion on earlier today and yet he deliberately tried to blame the Government. Before 6 o'clock this evening, his Leader wanted to suspend and the member for Napier was one of the offenders. There were 16 members on this side and only two backing his Leader to suspend the House to enable the motion to come on. To try to give the impression that it was the Government's fault is all one needs to say about the honourable member's speech. If he wants to take a dishonest approach in making that suggestion, one can take the whole of his speech as having the same credibility.

I am disappointed, as I had more respect for the man's credibility and integrity until I heard him make that comment. He then set out to suggest that, as shadow Minister, he had received complaints from other electorates. He would know that when I was shadow Minister I had the same experience, and I used to go to the member concerned and say, 'Here is a problem in your area: have you heard of it or taken it up? It was a courtesy that was shown. I wonder whether the member for Napier has ever heard of that sort of courtesy.'

Under the previous Government the then Deputy Leader and former Premier, Mr Corcoran, came to an agreement that it was improper for a member to use political pressure to gain a point for a constituent in regard to housing. The right thing to do was to go through the Department of Community Welfare and, if recommended, it would go from there and political pressures would be avoided. That was an agreement with the previous Government, and it is still honoured, but appears that it is not honoured by the member from Napier. He then picked out electorates and blamed certain actions or inactions on the members concerned. He did not admit that in Mount Gambier the waiting list for Housing Trust homes is 18 months, and that is the shortest period it has been for over a decade. He either did not have the gall to say it or he did not have the knowledge of it. The waiting list is still too long overall (around four years), but it is less than it was when our Government came to office, and that is the important thing to remember.

The honourable member then suggested that this Government was not concerned in the Housing Trust area and that we are trying to decimate the trust. That is untrue. I do not say that it is a deliberate untruth. However, it is either deliberate or the member has not read or taken note of the facts and figures. The Premier gave them tonight for the honourable member to study. Our Government sees the Housing Trust role as one to care for those who are disadvantaged and in the most need of houses because of economic, health or other problems. It is not a role of going out and developing houses to sell in competition with the private sector. We do not see that as its role. That is not

decimating the Housing Trust: it is having it carry out the right role as originally designed in the 1930s. It is the role carried out successfully by the Playford Government in years gone by.

Therefore, the member for Napier has little to his credit in regard to the sort of snide remarks he made. I believe it does his Party little credit if that is the attitude of the shadow Minister. I do not have much more time; there is only eight minutes left, as this debate is due to finish at 10.23 p.m. I refer to one or two areas. It is true that housing costs overall are high—that is not denied, and it has to be the case. When we lowered the age of majority from 21 to 18, we altered the wage structure. Any person going into the building industry at 15 years of age as a builder's labourer was entitled to full adult wages for the first time. That, therefore, lifted the costs in the building industry.

Further, we brought about a workers compensation claim that gave great benefits to workers who are injured, and with that provision came increased costs for the building of houses. We brought about a scheme of guaranteeing the quality of homes by licensing registered builders. That provision might have got rid of some of the bad builders in the area, but further increased the costs of houses for clients. Those were automatic things that occurred. We also set about a long service leave programme which provided for transfer from one employer to another. That also was a cost that was added to the building industry.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Of course, we have done those things through Government's during the past few years. The previous Government, to which the Leader aspired to belong and which he supported, was mainly responsible for bringing about those changes, whether or not the Labor Party now takes the responsibility for the quite substantial increase in costs or for not getting rid of all the faults that it should have done. When the Liberal Party wanted to introduce into Parliament provisions to protect people against faulty homes and provide that there be an indemnity scheme entrenched within the Act, the previous Government refused to implement it; the previous Government would not even take notice of Parliament to have that provision there to protect people in those particular areas.

Mr Keneally interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr EVANS: The member for Stuart, who was a member of the Government at the time, refused to even ask the Government to implement the provision. That gives an example of the shoddiness and slackness of the former Government's attitude towards protecting home owners. Now members opposite come out with their comments simply to play politics, and for no other reason.

The Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to say that it is difficult to control the area of interest rates. There would not be a person in this Parliament who does not understand and sympathise with those people who face high interest rates, and I refer not only to housing but also to businesses. Those people have a problem; some people in business not only have mortgaged the business, but their home as well and suddenly face increased interest rates. The Leader made the point that a State Government has very little control over that area.

In fact, if we go further, it could be stated that a Federal Government has very little control over the monetary situation on the world scene, because we are dictated to by people outside the country. If anyone wants to deny that, I ask them to reflect on a time during the 1970s when Mr Hudson allowed the deferred payments scheme to operate in the housing industry. More people lost their homes during the period following the collapse of that scheme than have lost their homes at present. I am not condoning either

situation, but I have never heard any comment from any member opposite to suggest that Mr Hudson was wrong in the approach that he took at that time in encouraging and accepting the scheme. However, it was not long before he condemned it because he saw the pitfalls. The interest rates for those people who have high mortgages or even average mortgages are a real problem.

Mr Keneally: You are commending the Government for doing nothing?

Mr EVANS: The member for Stuart is either deaf or was outside the Chamber when the Premier outlined a list of all the things that have been done. I ask the honourable member to read those remarks later if he did not understand the matter when it was being spoken about in the Chamber, due to his being deaf or his ignorance—I am not sure which. The interest rate situation is a serious one and is one about which we are all concerned. There is no simple solution. It affects not only people buying houses or in business but also the State Government, local Government and Federal Government, all of which are also confronted with high interest rates, which are pushing up the costs of running local government, State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. All levels of Government face the problem and the world faces that situation.

Recently, on the weekend, when I was doorknocking I spoke to a young couple who had quite high commitments. We sat down and worked out how much they had paid out in hire purchase agreements on their home and during the time that they were flattening before marriage: at ages 29 and 28 they had spent \$48 000 during that period of time.

I give that as an example. When we sat down and talked about the situation the lass expressed concern and understood. An arrangement was made whereby we could help them to dispose of one of their motor vehicles. They were in a position where they could not survive, even if the interest rates dropped by 3 per cent or 4 per cent. The Government is concerned, and it will continue to work in whatever area is possible to relieve the situation.

The Leader of the Opposition did not say tonight in what way he will raise the money. Nor did his back-up speaker, the member for Napier and shadow Minister of Housing, do so. They did not say whether they would increase State charges or increase taxes. They did not say whether they would re-introduce death duties. They did not say whether they would introduce a capital gains tax. They did not say whether they would introduce another form of taxation that we have not heard of. They have not said that we are not spending all the money that is collected in this State; nor did they say whether there is any particular area, such as education, health or whatever, where we should stop spending money. They did not say where we should stop spending money or cut expenditure. So they have not said where they would raise the money or cut expenditure. So one must take their whole argument as a hollow argument with no basis or foundation whatsoever.

Until they can do those things and justify and show where they can obtain extra money, we all know they are playing politics. Perhaps it is an attitude that an Opposition can take, but it is irresponsible to say that they can do these things. We know better.

Mr Bannon: Of course it's political.

Mr EVANS: The Leader admits that it is political. The whole basis of it is politics and not being concerned about the people at all. They hope to win Government and hope that something better will turn up in the meantime. I cast aside the Leader's motion and support the Premier's amendment.

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

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chapman, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Plunkett, Slater, Mrs Southcott, and Messrs. Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Goldsworthy. No—Mr O'Neill.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The House divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes (23)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P. B. Arnold, Ashenden, Becker, Billard, Blacker, D. C. Brown, Chap-

man, Evans, Glazbrook, Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Olsen, Oswald, Randall, Rodda, Russack, Schmidt, Tonkin (teller), Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (19)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Hamilton, Hemmings Hopgood, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Plunkett, and Slater, Mrs Southcott, Messrs Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Pair—Aye—Mr Goldsworthy. No—Mr O'Neill.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion as amended thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.28 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 22 July at 2.00 p.m.