

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 22 July 1982

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 523 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 Hons Jennifer Adamson and J. D. Corcoran, and Messrs Lynn Arnold, Becker, Mathwin, and Russack.

Petitions received.

PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD REPORT

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the report of the Public Service Board review team on the organisation and staffing of support services to Parliament. Report to be circulated to all members and staff.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MORTGAGE AND RENT RELIEF SCHEME

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: The Commonwealth Government outlined its new housing package to assist home buyers on 15 March 1982. As part of this package the Federal Treasurer announced that a mortgage and rent relief scheme would be implemented in conjunction with the States. He stated that up to \$20 000 000 per annum will be provided by the Commonwealth for a period of three years from and including 1982-83, provided these sums are matched each year dollar-for-dollar with new expenditure by the States and Territories.

Since this time all the States and Territories have been negotiating with the Federal Government on the preferred details of such a scheme. In fact, South Australia was the first State to put proposals to the Federal Government on how the funds should be used to assist home buyers and tenants who are in financial difficulty. To date no State Government has been in a position to take up the funds from the Federal Government for this mortgage and rent relief scheme. It was not until yesterday that the Federal Government confirmed the arrangements and outlined the proposals for the scheme to all States.

South Australia's share of the national assistance of \$20 000 000 is \$1 760 000, and the South Australian Government will match this amount. Therefore, more than \$3 500 000 will now be available each year, for an initial period of three years, to assist South Australians in difficulty with their home loan mortgage repayments and private rents. The mortgage and rent relief scheme will provide short-term housing assistance to both tenants and purchasers who are experiencing genuine financial difficulty in meeting rent or mortgage commitments. The actual amount of assistance to be provided will be determined in the light of income and financial obligations, following an examination of the personal circumstances of each case.

In determining eligibility for assistance, regard will be taken of gross family income, mortgage payments, or rent, as a percentage of gross family income, and other financial commitments. Purchasers who believe they qualify for mortgage crisis relief are advised to contact their own finance provider, or the Housing Trust's advisory service (telephone 50 0200). These applications will be treated in the same way as the State-sponsored home-purchasers-in-a-crisis scheme which has been operating for the last several months.

In view of the substantial increase in funds available the Government is reviewing the criteria under which assistance is given, as a matter of urgency, to determine in what manner they can be broadened. Before the rent relief scheme can be implemented the question of the social security and taxation treatment of payments to individuals under the scheme must be determined. These issues are being examined by the Commonwealth Government in the context of the 1982-83 Budget. In the interim, private sector tenants in severe difficulties because of their rent payments are advised to contact the South Australian Housing Trust. Once full details of the scheme are known the trust will then provide the appropriate advice and assistance.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXATION

Mr BANNON: Will the Premier say how much longer it is to be the Government's policy to levy back-door taxation by gazetting week after week increases in charges for the whole range of services provided to the public, which have been a long way above the rate of inflation? In January 1981 all Ministers were asked to consider as a matter of urgency increases in all State charges. They were asked to introduce appropriate increases as soon as possible. By July of that year there were some 50 such increases that were identified, most of them well above inflation.

By April of this year the total had gone to 90 and this did not include Electricity Trust charges, bus and train fares, water rates and motor registration fees. These charges are hardly ever announced. They have to be determined by—

The **SPEAKER**: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr BANNON: In the *Gazette* this morning a further charge was recorded, as is usual with the weekly issue of *Gazettes*. These are associated with courts of summary jurisdiction, and they were increased by an average of 13 per cent. They had already been raised considerably last year. There have been at least 108 increases in the time since the memorandum was issued by the Premier and that is on top of an 11 per cent increase in what the Premier calls State taxation, that is, those items he designates as taxes, and excluding those charges.

The **SPEAKER**: The honourable the Premier.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: Perhaps the Leader would like me to sit down until he stops mumbling. The Leader of the Opposition is asking the 'have you stopped beating your wife?' question, which is usual for him. The whole question of taxes and charges and what the Leader of the Opposition calls a back-door approach to taxation is one which the Labor Party has been making great play of in recent months. The long and short of it is that the costs to Government of providing essential services have gone up considerably.

Mr Keneally: Not as much as the charges have gone up.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: The charges in some cases have been raised for the first time in many years and, if one takes the aggregate of those years and the average inflationary trend, we still have not kept up with inflation.

It was largely a question of the former Government totally neglecting to keep up with the need to increase charges so as to keep up with the cost of providing services. Basically, I would remind the Leader of the Opposition that if he cares to look at his own Party's record in Government over 10 years he will find that charges went up by the same sort of amounts to keep pace with the cost of the services. Unfortunately, the former Labor Government, the predecessor of the Leader of the Opposition, allowed wage claims of a very excessive nature to come in and we have also had to face such wage claims since we have come into office.

We have never actually supported the granting of excessive wage claims, which the Deputy Leader has the reputation of doing. Simply, we have had to face average wage increases of up to 19 per cent, which is well above the inflation rate. We have had to find those wages, and that means that, in the provision of services, the taxpayers of South Australia have had to face the choice either of increased taxation or increased charges in order to keep pace with the cost of providing services. I know what the taxpayers want: they want the Government to keep State taxation as low as it possibly can, but they are prepared to pay charges for the services that they receive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have heard the Leader say recently that we should not increase water rates. I simply ask again whether the Leader therefore intends that the filtration programme should be cut. Should we abandon the Happy Valley water filtration programme, which I am sure the member for Baudin is keen to have?

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: Read this morning's paper.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: The member for Baudin is not interested. What does he intend to cut back? What services will he cut back if he does not increase charges? The fact is that Governments of all complexions, be they Liberal or Labor, have been unable to avoid raising charges, and the Leader of the Opposition, if ever he gets into a position of leading a Government (which I very strongly doubt) would find that he, too, would have to increase charges.

If one looks at the policies and the economic package that the A.L.P. has put forward recently, one sees, on the most elementary costing that has been made available, that a sum of over \$200 000 000 is involved for all the measures that have been promoted by the Leader and the Labor Party. With many other of the health and other policies that are coming forward, the figure is now more nearly \$250 000 000. I want merely to know when the Labor Party will release the other half of its economic package, because it must have another half.

The Labor Party has decided what money it will spend. On present indications, it will spend at least \$250 000 000 over and above the present Budget. Obviously, the figure will be a great deal more by the time that the Labor Party has released its other policies. Will it therefore come clean and tell us how it will raise the extra \$250 000 000-plus that it will need to implement the policies that it is now promoting? The Labor Party must obviously have done all this work and worked out its policies. Indeed, it has worked out and publicised its economic and health packages. Obviously, therefore, it has done a great deal of work on this matter.

Why should not the Labor Party come clean with the other half of its economic package which states whence the money involved will come? Which taxes will it increase or re-establish, and which taxes will it reimpose? Will the Labor Party introduce succession duties again, and will it reintroduce gift duties? Will it re-establish land tax on the principal place of residence? Will it impose a pay-roll tax

surcharge as its colleagues have done permanently in Victoria and New South Wales?

Will the Labor Party move into something totally different, and will it impose what seems to be a particularly favoured form of taxation with Labor Party members and Governments, that is, a wealth tax? Is a wealth tax on its list? I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and the Australian Labor Party to release that—

Mr Bannon: I will see you on television.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Really, all that this man can do is to challenge me into a schoolboy debate—that is about all he can do. He seems to be able to debate one side of the question or the other at the drop of the hat because he does not particularly mind whether what he says is true or not.

I challenge the Leader of the Opposition and the A.L.P. to release the other half of their economic document which tells us what taxation measures they are going to bring in, and where they are going to find the money to finance the \$250 000 000-worth that they so carelessly throw upon the people of South Australia. That is what the taxpayers of South Australia want to know. Where is the money coming from? How much more tax are they going to have to pay? When will the A.L.P. come clean and tell the people exactly what taxation measures it is going to bring in?

MORTGAGE AND RENT RELIEF SCHEMES

Mr OSWALD: Is it a fact, as has been claimed persistently by the Opposition, that South Australia was the only State which did not take up the Federal Government funds for the recently announced mortgage and rent relief schemes? In this morning's *Advertiser* I noticed the headlines which read that more than \$3 500 000 would now be available to assist South Australians in difficulty with their home loan mortgage repayments and rents. I also noted a report in last night's *News* that stated:

The Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, said the scheme announced by the Premier had been in effect since March. 'S.A. is the only State which has not taken up its funds under the scheme,' Mr Bannon said. 'We have been pointing that out to Mr Tonkin ever since. It has taken him this long to act.'

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: This is a matter which I regard as being of great concern. It is a matter which amplifies to some extent the remarks which I made a little while ago. It is in my view a very sad thing that the Opposition members seem to work on the principle that if they say something often enough, regardless of whether or not it is true or whether it is accurate, it will be believed by the electorate. This is a particularly important matter because as far as they are concerned it seems that truth is of secondary importance and consideration in any attempt made to score political points. The fact is that the Leader of the Opposition is a master of this principle and is a master in the art of deceiving the public.

Yes, I read those statements in the press and I also heard and saw the Leader on television making the same statements. Frankly, I was surprised and disappointed that he should persist in making public statements which he obviously must have known were not true. His credibility has already taken a very heavy battering together with that of his Deputy Leader, over the scurrilous accusations which he and the Deputy Leader made in respect of the introduction of the casino legislation, allegations which I may repeat he was quite unable to substantiate or justify, and which were totally false. In this present example the truth of the matter is this: no State has been in a position to take up the Federal funds for the mortgage and rent relief scheme until yesterday.

All State housing authorities of all States were written to yesterday by the Federal Government concerning the details of the scheme.

Most States, including South Australia, have approved the introduction of some form of home buyer prices relief scheme before the Federal housing package was announced last March, and of course the Private Home Purchasers In Crisis Relief Scheme has been operating in South Australia since well before that time. Since March all the States and Territories have been negotiating with the Federal Government on the preferred details of the proposed Mortgage and Rent Relief Scheme and, in fact, the South Australian Government was the first Government to put forth proposals to the Federal Government on how the funds should be used, and used to best assist home buyers and tenants in financial difficulty.

Our home buyers relief scheme was an initiative taken to ensure that as far as possible rising interest rates would not force couples out of their homes. We put forward submissions to the Federal Government because we believed that that scheme would provide a great deal more assistance and, indeed, we have found, as of yesterday, that it has done so, and we are happy to take this first opportunity of joining in with it.

I do not believe that the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition recently that the South Australian Government was the only Government not to have taken up the scheme, and was the only Government involved where nothing was done—

Mr Bannon: You didn't even attend the meeting.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I do not believe that the Leader made those statements in ignorance; I am quite certain that he knew what the truth of the matter was, and I can only conclude that he is a master of deception, duplicity and deceit. All I can say is that, if that is the sort of standard of credibility we can expect from the Leader of the Opposition and his Party, when it comes to the point, the people of South Australia will make their choice on trust, and we certainly will not be found wanting.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE SWITCHBOARD

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: Is the Minister of Health aware of the problems affecting the operation of the Flinders Medical Centre switchboard? If so, can she tell the House what steps are being taken to overcome these problems? The problem arises from there being only one number available for the entire centre. Fairly often the telephone will ring through the entire sequence (about 30 rings) and then stop without being answered. This is not the fault of the switchboard operators, who are working as hard as they can. Problems seem to be within the switchboard itself which is inadequate to cope at peak times with consulting clinic calls for appointments, and the switchboard also has faults, in that incoming calls are not registered on the board. The problem is exacerbated by some 500 beepers, which need phasing out. The effect on people telephoning the hospital in times of emergency and having the telephone stop ringing without being answered is obvious.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Yes, I am aware of the problem involving the switchboard at the Flinders Medical Centre. I know that the board of the hospital is aware of it and that steps are in train to have this situation rectified. I am happy to obtain precise details of when a new board or a new system will be installed and to provide the member for Mitcham with those details.

FOREST INDUSTRY

Mr BECKER: Can the Minister of Forests say what action the Government is taking to assist the forest industries in this State? I understand that the Minister of Forests will be travelling to New Zealand for a meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council to be held next month and that he will have the opportunity then to discuss with the Federal Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Nixon) and his Ministerial colleagues problems facing the forest industries in this country. Prior to the Minister's departing for New Zealand, I would like him to tell the House what action his Government has taken to assist the forest industries.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: I am pleased that the member for Hanson has asked this question today, because concern is being expressed within the timber industry in Australia about the unfair competition that the industry is facing in the market place.

I respect also question No. 651 on this matter raised during the closing days of the last session by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is clear that concern prevails not only within the industry but also within the Government and the Opposition. On 22 June this year, immediately before the Premiers' Conference, I furnished the Premier with details of the situation concerning our State-based industry.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: You owe me an apology.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: You have it.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Did you send it in writing?

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: You have it twice.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is the question that is to be answered, not the interjection.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I appreciate your comment and also accept the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because not only is he entitled to a reply to that question that slipped off the Notice Paper but also a reply is in the pipeline to be provided to him, involving statistical material that is not directly related to the question asked by the member for Hanson.

When outlining to the Premier the situation as it applies to our State-based industries, I pointed out the free tax credit of 15 per cent, the exchange rate differential between New Zealand and Australia substantially favouring New Zealand at \$NZ1.36 to \$A1. I drew to his attention the lower log royalties that apply in New Zealand which amount to about half those applying in Australia which are to be in force in that country until 1987. I also pointed out to the Premier the anomalies that occur between our industry and theirs, where even in the forest itself the growers of pines or softwoods in that country are subsidised by the Government; the millers of that timber are subsidised at processing level; and, indeed, the freight to transport timber from New Zealand to our shores is also subsidised by the New Zealand Government. The simple fact of the matter is that our Australian-based industries cannot compete fairly with that situation.

On 24 and 25 June when the Premier was attending the Premiers' Conference he raised this subject on behalf of South Australia. On 29 June the Prime Minister acknowledged the sustained case of South Australia and other States and agreed to cease the negotiations applying to the closer economic relationship between Australia and New Zealand. He ceased those negotiations until the details involving each State could be reassessed. On 5 July a special meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council was called to discuss specifically the problems of the respective States, both in agriculture and in forestry. It was made clear by not only me on behalf of South Australia but also other Ministers of Agriculture that we just could not support a closer economic relationship between New Zealand and Australia as had

been proposed by the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Doug Anthony. He was proceeding with a programme which involved cuddling up to the Kiwis in a way that would clearly disadvantage a number of our agriculturally-based industries in this State and would undoubtedly disadvantage, and continue to disadvantage, our timber industry in this State.

As a result of the competition that has been thrust upon us by New Zealand's dumping practices on the seaboard of the Eastern States, our timber industry in South Australia has taken a hard knock. It has suffered for some years, for too long in my view, from the competition and the dumping of American timbers on those same markets, and while this goes on it must indeed erode our opportunities to market reasonably profitably our State-based timber products.

The housing industry throughout Australia is in the throes of a downturn and accordingly the local demand for our product has diminished over recent years and collectively these factors have unfortunately depleted the economics of our timber industry in South Australia. It is well acknowledged that in the private sector there have been retrenchments, and there has of necessity been a run-down in its various functions.

So far in South Australia the Woods and Forests Department, which is the biggest producer and miller of timber in this State, from an area involving about 74 000 hectares, has been able to maintain its permanent work force. It is true to say that, in connection with new planting, fertilizing and associated casual work, we will not employ casual labour in the coming months: we will be drawing from our permanent staff to avoid any retrenchments within that department.

On 8 July the Minister for Primary Industry (Mr Peter Nixon) agreed that the States had a legitimate and sustained case for concern in relation to the Commonwealth proposal for closer economic relations with New Zealand. On 20 July statements from my office appeared in the *Border Watch*, and later in the metropolitan newspapers, further explaining the State Government's expressed concern for the welfare of the timber industry in this State. Today in the *Financial Review*, albeit belatedly, a report appears in some detail involving the respective States' concern for their timber industries and for a number of agriculturally-based industries, and it identifies even at this stage the disaster course on which Mr Anthony was embarked in proceeding with a programme for closer trading and economic relationships with New Zealand without appropriate consultation with the States or with the industries based in those States which would suffer from such a programme.

Finally, I point out that I will be at the Agricultural Council in New Zealand on Monday, and it is clearly an item on the agenda for discussion before the Australian Ministers of Agriculture meet with the New Zealand Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues and, having reaffirmed our up-to-date position, we will then meet with the Minister and his officers in New Zealand. I assure the member for Hanson and others interested in this subject that the course of action is well under way and that we in no circumstances can afford to be bulldozed by the proposal to proceed with this closer economic relationship until our industries back home receive the proper protection they deserve.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: ECONOMIC POLICIES

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith, such suspension to remain in force no later than 4 p.m.

The motion that I intend to move bears directly on the challenge for debate made by the Premier earlier in the proceedings today. I welcome the Premier's challenge, and I welcome, as I am sure do my colleagues and the House, the challenge he has made and the opportunity to have that debate immediately. The motion would be in the following terms:

That this House, having considered the respective economic policies of Government and the Opposition, resolves that the Opposition's policy best meets the needs of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: You're like the two-legged wooden horse; you're still waiting for the other half to come.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BANNON: I am surprised that the colleagues of the Premier, who issued this challenge, are not giving him support. The Minister of Industrial Affairs hazards a comment on our industrial and economic policies.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader of the Opposition has sought leave for a suspension of Standing Orders. His remarks must relate to that particular motion.

Mr BANNON: The point I am about to make is pertinent to that matter, Mr Speaker, namely, that the comments that members such as the Minister of Industrial Affairs have made by way of interjection can well be made in the course of the debate that I propose should be held immediately. Such members cannot have it both ways. The Premier rose to his feet and, in the course of replying to a certain question, went on at length about the challenge that he offered to the Opposition in relation to its economic policies. We are very happy indeed to have that debate here and now, and I put that challenge right back to the Premier and suggest that, by allowing the debate on this motion to proceed, such matters can be canvassed immediately in the House.

It is very interesting that the Premier has taken this attitude today because, when Labor's policy was released on 27 May, I issued just such a challenge for debate with him, and the Premier ducked it. He squibbed: he would not be in it, and that challenge has been repeated a number of times. Time has been offered by the media to allow such a debate to go forward, and again and again the Premier has knocked it back. Indeed, he wrote to me on 1 June saying that he could see no purpose in entering into such a debate. It is very interesting that he says—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Finish the sentence.

Mr BANNON: Is the Premier disagreeing that he saw no purpose—

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: Finish the letter.

Mr BANNON: The Premier can read the whole letter during the course of the debate. I invite the Premier to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BANNON: How abysmally pathetic. The Premier will be able to put that whole letter into the record if he so chooses. Let the House judge how pathetic his statement is. I will not give credence to the Premier's propaganda by reading the whole of that letter into the record of the House. I am saying that the Premier has refused to allow a debate on the matter, and now he has an opportunity to allow the debate to proceed. He should put up or shut up!

Having said that there was no purpose in such a debate or no substance in Labor's economic policy or documents, the Premier has the gall to rise in this House, believing that he is protected by the forms of the House, and challenge me to debate the matter. I take up that challenge here and now. I will debate every line of Labor's policy, and I will put in context where the money will come from. Indeed, a

whole chapter is devoted entirely to that proposition, and I will put that before the House in the course of debate.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is now going far beyond the motion for suspension.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If honourable members want to take part in a three-ring circus, I will facilitate the leave pass that will enable them to attend that circus, but not in this Chamber.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Sir. The point is that the Premier has so far ducked the challenge. Now he issues it publicly in this House today before us on the Opposition benches. We take up that challenge. We are ready, willing and able to debate the matter and to answer the questions that the Premier asks.

The Opposition is ready, in the course of debate, to give the Premier an opportunity to respond and to read to the House his pathetic letter if he so chooses. The Premier having done that, the House can then vote on what it thinks about the respective merits of the two policies. Let me say that this debate should not stop here and now in this Chamber, where there is a small and selective audience, when what we say, depending on how widely it is reported in the media, does not reach out too far. I challenge the Premier to extend the debate, which I believe must take place, in reply to his challenge, to the media beyond—to the television debates that the Premier has ducked out of today.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will return to the reasons for the suspension of Standing Orders, or leave will be withdrawn.

Mr BANNON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The reason in fair and square terms relates to the Premier inviting just such a debate. Now we are ready, willing and able to have that debate. He made some extraordinary statements in the course of the debate today—provocative, inaccurate and misleading statements. As I commenced my remarks on this occasion, his own Ministers were making interjections along the lines that suggested that they too were ignorant of the substance of this document. All right, let us put it before the House. Let us see who cares about the welfare of the South Australian people and their various economic problems relating to houses, to charges (the very question that was raised on which the Premier has issued his challenge), to the direction of industrial and manufacturing policy and to the way in which the whole economic system is being mishandled by this Government. Let that debate be held here and now in response to the Premier's challenge and I would confidently expect that if he has got any guts or any ability to stand up for his abysmal record, if he has any responsibility to the people of this State he will take up this challenge and we will have the debate.

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

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Having just a little while ago resumed my seat, having spoken at the propensity of the Leader of the Opposition to distort and misrepresent, he has now given us a perfect example. Can I just outline again the extent of my challenge? My challenge is quite clear and *Hansard* will show it as such. I am challenging the Opposition and the Leader to put forward the other half of their economic policy—to issue that economic policy and to say whether taxation is going to be raised or not.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is now debating an issue which will come on for discussion if the suspension of Standing Orders is successful.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: With great respect, Mr Speaker, I accept your ruling. Nevertheless, the Leader of the Oppo-

sition is obviously moving to suspend Standing Orders on a misapprehension or a misrepresentation, but I am prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt. I still must make it clear that he is misrepresenting the situation or is mistaken. To do that I must point out that the challenge to the Opposition is to release the other half of its economic document so that we can see what taxation measures it has in mind.

The Leader has misrepresented this to say that he has been challenged to a debate. I am not going to debate with him in any other place than this, because if he were able to read the letter in full which I wrote to him he would find that what I said (I cannot remember the exact wording) was that I was not prepared to give any public credence to his misrepresentations of the truth. That basically is what it is about. If the Leader of the Opposition would stick to the truth in all of these matters—we have had some pretty rotten examples in the past few weeks—then I would not have any hesitation at all, but I am not interested in—

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order. My point of order is this: the Premier seems to be straying from the subject before the Chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not make a correct point of order. He is seeking an opinion of the Chair in a form other than a direct point of order. The Chair will decide when any member on either side of the House is going beyond the bounds of debate. The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition wants to suspend Standing Orders to move a motion which includes amongst other things the statement having considered the economic policies of this House, but this House has not considered the economic policies of the Australian Labor Party because they have only released half of them: they have only released the half that—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will take heed of the advice given earlier, namely, that it is a suspension of Standing Orders to develop a reason why the suspension is presumed not to be accepted. The Premier has made use of material which borders on a transgression of the Standing Orders, and I ask the Premier to stick specifically to the reason for not proceeding with the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Certainly, Mr Speaker. Because the material is not available, because of the challenge which has been issued to the Opposition and which the Opposition is now trying to duck by using this particular technique, and because the Opposition is not prepared to put up the information, there is no point whatever in debating this issue at this time. When that information does become available, when the Opposition comes clean, I would certainly support the suspension of Standing Orders, or indeed, would invite the Leader to put the question on notice for debate, which he is perfectly entitled to do at any time. Under the present circumstances, I can only view this move of members of the Opposition to suspend Standing Orders as being a device to cover up the fact that they do not have any policy on taxation and are not prepared to say where the money is coming from and what taxes they would increase.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question before the Chair is the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition for the suspension of Standing Orders. Those of that opinion say 'Aye', against 'No'. I hear a dissentient voice, so a division is necessary. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18)—Messrs Abbott, L. M. F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M. J. Brown, Corcoran, Duncan, Hamilton, Hop-

good, Keneally, Langley, McRae, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

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

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

QUESTION TIME RESUMED

TEACHERS' ADVERTISEMENTS

Mr RANDALL: Has the Minister of Education had his attention drawn to the series of political advertisements currently being run by the South Australian Institute of Teachers on some radio stations? Since that series of radio announcements commenced I have received many calls at my office about them, so I made it my job to get a copy of the advertisements. In relation to class size a comment is made by a student:

My teacher doesn't have time to answer my questions.

The commentator answers by saying:

Smaller classes would mean more personal attention to your child.

A student also says:

There aren't enough jobs to go around, so what will happen to me when I leave school next year?

The commentator replies by saying:

It is up to the Government and private enterprise to provide jobs. Despite fewer resources, education's role is to prepare us for all aspects of life.

I find that an interesting statement. In the advertisement someone who is presumably a concerned parent says:

My four year old has developed so much since starting pre-school.

The commentator says:

Did you know that the future of pre-school education is uncertain? Getting what we all need from education is an uphill battle while the Government reduces its commitment to education and keeps breaking its election promises.

That is why I believe it is a political advertisement.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now commenting.

Mr RANDALL: Teachers have expressed another concern about the advertisement, and that is that thousands of dollars of their money each week are being spent on political advertisements. They pointed out to me that they believe that every time that advertisement is run it is costing them as teachers \$80 each. The teachers are so annoyed at the misuse of their association's funds that they are calling upon the South Australian Institute of Teachers to withdraw its connection with the Australian Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Henley Beach has already been warned that he is not to enter into a debate when seeking to explain a question. He has been warned twice; there will be no further opportunity.

Mr RANDALL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I find it difficult to draw the line because the comments I am trying to express are the ones being made in the community and the concern in the community is that of teachers being connected with the A.L.P. when running political advertisements.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I responded almost immediately to the advertisements which were placed, I think, on two radio stations a week or so ago, by commenting that I did not just feel, I knew, they were blatantly untrue. The first statement made implies that 'my teacher does not have time to answer all my questions' and that the teacher/

student ratios in South Australia are worse since this Government came into power than they were in 1979.

The Schools Commission has now placed South Australia with primary teacher/student ratios first in Australia whereas before we were running in an inferior position, and in the secondary teacher/student ratios we are running almost parallel with Victoria in first position. The precise facts given by the Schools Commission are that in 1979 we had 18.3 students to each primary teacher and this year we have 17.4 students to each primary teacher, a reduction of almost one student per teacher across that massive area of education. In secondary education we have improved the ratio from 11.8 students to each teacher to 11.5 in an area where already the teacher/student ratios are very handsome. The statement therefore that smaller classes would mean more personal attention to each child should be an acknowledgment that under this Government the situation in South Australia has improved quite considerably and at some expense but I will refer to that a little later.

The second statement referred to fewer resources, and I think fewer resources is worthy of comment. It also stated that education is a preparation for all aspects of life. Those resources have been increased from 25 per cent of the State's Budget going into education to 33.3 per cent of our State's Budget going into education, so that fewer resources are reflected by a substantial increase in the State's financial involvement in education.

The next statement was that further education courses are under threat. Under this Government there has been an increased emphasis on the technical and further education aspect with the department being renamed the Department of Technical and Further Education. We are building the Noarlunga College and we will be building the Adelaide College of Further Education soon.

Mr Keneally: What about Port Pirie?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: A number of other colleges are being considered by the State and Federal Governments for the construction of colleges throughout the State. I inspected Port Pirie only recently. The Mount Gambier college has been extended to cater for rural studies.

The emphasis on stream six has been slightly reduced but at the same time we have maintained the substantial Government subsidy for people in need, perhaps they are on pensions, in order that they can still participate in stream six studies. We have emphasised that we believe further education stream six courses should be increasingly self-sufficient and we have given the colleges the right to be entrepreneurial in the sense that if they can raise the funds to provide the finance for a teacher they can introduce courses. Currently I believe we are running at about \$1.6 a student per session which is still reasonable when one considers the importance of it.

The next statement is a blatant untruth. It is being peddled by the Opposition spokesman on education that the future of pre-school education is uncertain. How uncertain can it be when there are about 80 child-parent centres attached to the Education Department, none of which is under threat of closure? All of these centres are being told by the Opposition members as they travel around the countryside that they are under threat. No such thing. We had a situation three or four years ago where this State was responsible for only 20 per cent of pre-school funding but now this State is responsible for almost 90 per cent of pre-school funding. It is the Federal Government that has pegged its involvement, but this State has continued and will continue to pick up the tab for pre-school education.

Let me remind members that instead of closing down kindergartens we have in fact continued to build new ones. I believe a new kindergarten was constructed last year in the district of the member for Albert Park. We are continuing

to staff the new kindergartens that are being constructed. We have the finest pre-school system anywhere in Australia.

We have the cheapest pre-school system as far as parents are concerned, with small parent contributions compared with that major State of New South Wales, where the annual contribution is somewhere in the region of \$150 per child to attend kindergarten. When you consider that there are four statements made in that advertisement, each of which can be tested and found to be wanting, one has to ask what is the motivation. I can understand why the member for Henley Beach attributes some politicking to this subject. Let me refer to the interstate situation. John Cain said, when he became Premier of Victoria, 'I suppose it might be true that by the grace of God and the teachers union I stand here this morning.' That was John Cain senior in 1945. John Cain junior, in 1982, could have said the same thing.

Sam Lipski, the political commentator in Victoria, said that the Australian Labor Party, Victorian branch, is now the teachers party. Why? Because 30-odd teachers stood, some of them odder than others, and about 18 of them are now in Parliament. What concessions? It is almost a form of harlotry. We have the Institute of Teachers in Victoria selling itself before the election to the highest bidder. There was no offer made, and no offer accepted. The question that the press asked was: is it professionalism or is it politics before professionalism? Already the teachers unions have seen a fine yield on their investment. The new Minister of Education (Mr Fordham) has, among other things, put an end to tenure employment and speeded up salary negotiations. Sweetheart deals have been negotiated outside the court, and the Victorian press noted that in 1982 the Victorian teacher will have had 25 per cent salary increases at a cost of \$300 000 000 to that Government. Bankruptcy looms ahead for them.

Mr Trainer: What does this have to do with it?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: It is relevant to the campaign mounted by the Australian Teachers Federation across Australia, and it highlights the fact that there is very little educational merit in the advertisements but a great deal of political merit in responding to the highest bidder. They brought to a halt the restructuring of the Education Department. They agreed to deduct V.S.T.A. membership subscriptions from salaries, which we have been doing for years. Those concessions were teacher oriented.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Education Department—the Government—permits deductions to go to the unions. It is a concession; it is a privilege, not a right.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If one analyses what has happened interstate and the thrust of the campaign mounted by the Australian Teachers Federation through its affiliated and non-affiliated unions, one can see quite clearly that in South Australia the educational rectitude of those statements is sadly wanting. In fact, if the institute was honest, it would state that the South Australian Government had improved the situation on those four counts, as I have quite clearly demonstrated. What is really happening, as I have said, is that it is a form of prostitution to the highest bidder, which the South Australian taxpayer cannot afford to enter into. I will resist any form of collusion based on political grounds rather than educational grounds just as hard as I possibly can.

YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say whether Cabinet will review the composition of the recently appointed

Youth Advisory Panel to include a broader cross-section of young people, including representation of unemployed people and people in training, such as apprentices or students? Further, will the Premier say how many members of the panel belong to the Young Liberals? The Government will be aware that there has been considerable criticism from youth groups, as well as from the Opposition, about the composition of the nine-person panel. It was pointed out to me that only two of the nine panel members are women, even though unemployment among young women—and job seekers aged 15 to 19 years—reached a staggering 23 per cent earlier this year, according to recent figures. I am told that one of the functions of the panel is to advise the Government on youth unemployment problems, as well as training, yet no panel member, as far as I am aware, is either unemployed or in fact an apprentice. The Premier will be aware that the South Australian Youth Forum has said publicly that it believes that the Youth Advisory Panel has not been established in the interests of all young people. The Youth Forum stressed that the panel should have democratically-elected members, not the nominated representatives of political Parties, and should have equal representation of males and females, and that panel members should not be selected on the basis of their political values. Perhaps the Premier will concede that what young people need are jobs and not platitudes.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am quite surprised that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not asked the Minister directly responsible, from whom he would have got an exact answer. I can give him the answer that I know. I congratulate the Minister for his initiative in this respect. It is something that has not been done before. I think this Government can take some credit for a very positive step in the interests of the young people of South Australia. As far as I know, at least two of the members of that committee have been unemployed; if they are not at present, they certainly have been.

Mr Keneally: How many are Young Liberals?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: One. I understand that one has been a member of the Young Liberals, although I am not too sure whether or not he is still a member. I do not know what political allegiances, if any, the others have, but I would obviously not expect to know who was a member of the Young Labor Movement, because I rarely come into contact with members of that organisation. For some reason, they seem to avoid members of the Liberal Party. We do not have the same opportunities of coming into close contact with them, for instance, that we have with our own members. However, that is not a basis for the choice to serve on the committee. There is an ethnic representative who can be broadly considered to represent ethnic interests, and indeed there is a wide range of experience on that committee. I think it is a forward-looking move, one which will be appreciated by the young people of South Australia. There may well be ways in which the working of that committee—

The Hon. J. D. Wright: It's totally unbalanced.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that, I suspect that we have probably done the right thing and the balance is exactly as it should be. It is an experiment to the extent that we will be monitoring the performance of that committee very closely. We will be accepting recommendations from members of the committee itself and from members of the general public as to how its operation can be improved in the future. Our only concern is not to score political points, which seems to be the desire of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, but to do something positive and constructive for the young people of this State, to involve them more and hear what they have to say, and to see what can be done to improve the position of young people in this State. Obviously the Deputy Leader of the

Opposition does not like it. It sounds very much to me as though he regards it from the Liberal Party's point of view simply as a political football to kick at, come what may. We do not. We believe that it is a most significant and important initiative, and we were very pleased to take it.

not simply to preschools but across the electorate. The inference is obvious.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The **SPEAKER** laid on the table the following final reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Highways Department Regional Office, Port Augusta, Robe Water Supply Improvements.
Ordered that reports be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: EDUCATION FACILITIES

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

Leave granted.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: The Minister of Education, on two occasions now, has indicated that I have been wandering (indeed, I think he even said 'perambulating') the State speculating that there will be closures of Kindergarten Union facilities and child-parent centre facilities. The Minister used that as the basis for part of his answer to a question today. I wish to indicate to the House, as I have indicated to all preschool service centres that I have been visiting, that I do not believe that the Government is intent on closing down Kindergarten Union facilities, and that I have not been saying that; nor do I believe that the Government intends to close down the bulk of child-parent centres.

What I have been saying to preschool service providers in this State is that there is an inter-agency committee on preschool education chaired by the Executive Officer from the office of the Ministry and that that committee is to consider, among other things, Education Department involvement in child-parent centres. It is as a result of that inter-agency committee and its existence, and the very clear indication that Education Department involvement would be phased out of child-parent centres, that I have been undertaking the activities that I have undertaken.

I have not, therefore, indicated that I believe that child-parent centres would be closed down but rather that some of them might be closed down if they duplicate with Kindergarten Union facilities. I refer members to the motion that I have on notice for Wednesday 15 September, to be moved in private members' time, in which I ask the House to call on the Minister of Education not to proceed with any proposal to phase out Education Department involvement in child-parent centres. That is a true reflection of my activities and opinions in relation to this matter.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I believe that I am being improperly represented and that my statements which were made earlier were based simply on an allegedly factual document put out by the member for Norwood in which he had a photograph of himself and the shadow education spokesman, with a quite clear statement that preschools in South Australia were under threat, the inference being that here were these two people making that sort of statement,

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 21 July. Page (69).)

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I am pleased to second the motion, and I invite all members and other people who may be interested to sit back, put up their feet, relax, and listen to the explanation that I will give of this Government's outstanding record of service to the people of South Australia in general and to rural communities in particular.

It is a matter of singular pride that, since it came to office, this Government has witnessed an enormous increase in investment in the manufacturing and processing industries in South Australia. From September 1979, more than 80 companies have announced over 110 projects, 95 of which have been completed or formally committed at this time. Included in these projects are five categories, the first 18 costing between \$100 000 and \$500 000; 20 costing between \$500 000 and \$1 000 000; 44 costing between \$1 000 000 and \$10 000 000; 11 costing more than \$10 000 000 but not more than \$100 000 000; and two costing more than \$100 000 000. Additionally, 12 feasibility studies are under way for projects worth \$1 341 000 000.

That is an outstanding record, and it is obvious why we are proud of it. A Commonwealth Department of Industry and Commerce survey shows that in October 1979 only \$300 000 000 was committed in the final feasibility stage or in major manufacturing or mining projects in South Australia. Members do not need me to remind them that just a month before that, in September, the Liberal Government was elected to office. So, that is pretty much what the Labor Party's policies had been able to draw from the business community.

The figure for the same activities at the end of 1981, on the other hand, had risen to a massive \$3 480 000 000. That is an 11-fold increase in three years. These are figures in which all South Australians may take comfort and which reflect great credit on the officers of the Department of Trade and Industry. They also reflect, in my opinion, great credit on the South Australian Government, and they certainly augur well for the future of South Australia.

Let us cast our minds back a bit. In September 1979, the people of South Australia elected a Liberal Government I believe to do three broad categories of things. I am talking not about what the Liberal Party said it would do but about what I believe the people of South Australia expected of it. The first two categories fall into the areas of security and confidence that people could have in relation to their future—in the first instance, their personal security and future, and their capacity to feel as though the State and community in which they were living was being well looked after.

Since coming to office, this Government has done a great deal to restore the South Australian law enforcement agencies and correctional services provided to the community at taxpayers' expense to the very high standard of performance of their duties for which they were noted before the 1970s and, in doing so, restore people's confidence in their personal security and that of their families in a material and social sense.

During the first two years of office, our Chief Secretary, as the Government's agent, instigated inquiries into the prison system, the police and other aspects of correctional services, in order to ascertain just how big a mess we had

inherited. Of course, we uncovered a far bigger mess than we originally expected and, during the course of these inquiries, we constantly had Opposition members, assisted by their *confreres* like friend Bleechmore and prisoners at Yatala, complaining that the Government had been irresponsible and indifferent and had, indeed, caused a deterioration of circumstances relating to the enforcement of law and order in South Australia when, in fact, all that we were doing was uncovering the mess that had been left to us by the previous Administration. Quite unjustly and unreasonably, they mounted an attack on the Chief Secretary, an honourable and honest man, and did nothing whatever to sheet home the blame where it really belonged—the former Labor Government.

We have uncovered that mess and taken measures necessary to restore people's confidence in those agencies, which will take probably as long as the 10 years it took to destroy that confidence and to destroy the agencies' functional capacity by innuendo as well as by maladministration.

Let us now look at the other aspect, namely, the confidence and security which the people of South Australia expected this Government to restore when it was elected in 1979. I refer particularly to the economy. The very first part of my remarks relates to the way in which this Government has restored business confidence in South Australia and, in doing so, increased the amount of investment in the State and thereby the number of jobs available to people who want to work. Of course, this has meant that we are now able to stand before the people of South Australia and ask for their confidence again for another term to continue the work of restoration which we have just begun and which continues to improve apace as time goes by.

I turn now to the rural industry, which is a vital part of our State's economy and which we have been successful in diversifying and expanding even further. Let us look back for the moment. Sir Thomas Playford was a primary producer, and proud of it, throughout his life. He also recognised that the State's fundamental need was to expand and develop secondary and manufacturing industries. He saw the need to attract industry to this State, and he did just that, enticing major companies to come to South Australia, including Chrysler (now Mitsubishi), General Motors, and B.H.P. at Whyalla to exploit Iron Knob and the other iron ore bodies in the Middleback Ranges. The State went through a phenomenal phase of development and possibly during this period the agricultural community may have felt a little left out, although I doubt it, as they played an important part in ensuring the breadth of base the economy needed to secure that continuing development.

Sir Thomas Playford never underestimated or doubted the rural sector's importance to the economy of this State. Indeed, not only did he extend to South Australia an independent supply of electricity (independent of the strikes which caused the blackouts and brownouts of the late 1940s) by developing the Leigh Creek coalfield after having nationalised the Adelaide Electric Supply Company and turned it into the Electricity Trust of South Australia, but also he developed the brown coal deposits at Leigh Creek which provided the fossil fuel energy source for power generation. By doing that not only did he ensure South Australians living in the metropolitan area would have a reliable supply of power (I emphasise 'reliable') but also he extended the provision of electric energy to the entire rural community and invoked the new technology of the s.w.e.r. (single wire earth return) line and enabled the Electricity Trust to do this.

Let us now look at the agricultural production coming from farms in South Australia which was exported: it amounted to more than 13 per cent of the nation's total, even though South Australia has less than 10 per cent of

the nation's population. The agricultural industry is also a significant employer. At the last census 47 500 people were employed in rural activities. Comparative figures in other industries show conclusively how crucial the rural sector is to the State's overall economy. In 1979-80, for example, the gross value of mining production was \$223 000 000. That is about \$1 000 000 000 less than the figure for agriculture.

The multiplier effect of investment in agriculture is also significant. Every extra dollar's worth of production from farming results in about \$2.50 growth in the State's economy. By comparison, an extra dollar of coal production generates only \$1.60 growth. A dollar increase in petro-chemical production leads to about \$1.95 in growth. So, we can see that, although resource development is important in creating jobs and economic security, by broadening the economic base of any community (including ours), it is equally vital to preserve and strengthen our rural sector.

As the farming community knows only too well (probably better than any other section of the community), early seasonal expectations can end in disappointment. It behoves us all to realise that at present we are experiencing a drought. Farmers are at the mercy of prevailing weather conditions. For instance, there have been two bouts of severe frosts so far this season, most recently during the last week. Farmers also know that disease can strike livestock and crops at any time. Changing market conditions and fluctuating demand can depress their expectations of income. Strikes can destroy years of hard work and plunge a farmer into debt quite outside his control. For instance, in 1979 bans on freight movement at the Western District freight centres held up some \$20 000 000-worth of export and wheat cargoes and put at risk the likelihood of future orders.

Closer to home, here in South Australia, the dispute over live sheep exports in 1978 cost producers between \$2 000 000 and \$3 000 000. Of course, this Government has never resiled from its responsibilities in connection with industrial matters and has been made plain to the South Australian community in general and to the sheep producers in particular that it stands behind the live sheep export industry and will continue to ensure that it serves not only the rural sector but also the South Australian community at large. The sale of each live sheep generates a greater number of jobs than would be generated if the sheep were sold as a slaughtered carcass to overseas buyers.

The Agriculture Department's role has now been expanded to include responsibility in recent times for laboratory animals and laboratory work associated with pets, zoo animals and animals used in sport. That is because of the transfer of the Veterinary Science Division of the I.M.V.S. to that department. In this last year there has been another highlight: the first net profit posted by Samcor's Gepps Cross operation. Members will recall that it was the financially reconstructed Samcor which did that, and that was an operation we undertook early in 1981. In addition, earlier this year we obtained approval for Samcor's Port Lincoln works to be an export abattoir for the United States trade. The ultimate success of this will largely rest with the producers on Eyre Peninsula in supplying suitable stock in sufficient numbers.

For the dairy and cattle industries we have lifted the \$300 maximum which existed previously to \$400 as the maximum amount payable to farmers whose cattle have been condemned under the Cattle Compensation Act. In addition, after long negotiations with the Federal income tax authorities the Minister has been able to gain relief for farmers voluntarily de-stocking their properties to control footrot in sheep under quarantine. That has particular relevance to the people living in the southern part of my electorate and those in the electorates of Victoria and Mount Gambier. The Taxation Department has agreed that these producers will be able to average their income from the sale of the

stock which they have to sell for slaughter in the same way as do other breeders who have to de-stock compulsorily to contain disease.

I now turn to the wine and grape industries. We have continued our representations to the Federal Treasurer to ensure that no form of sales tax or excise is imposed on Australian wine. That assurance has been given in connection with this matter with regard to the forthcoming Budget. As the nation's major wine producer, South Australia is concerned about the effect that any tax would have on the producers, their families and the communities in which they live.

The Government has given approval, through the Department of Agriculture, for a \$500 000 extension to the pig research facilities at Northfield, allowing for research in this most important industry.

Also proposed is \$500 000 for the Barossa viticultural centre at Nuriootpa which will service the other grapegrowing areas of the State.

The Department of Agriculture has introduced a testing service for annual rye grass toxicity to assist farmers to check whether their pastures contain the organisms associated with the toxicity, that is, the nematode, the small animal, and the fungus, in the seed heads of rye grass. For the benefit of farmers a film on rye grass toxicity will be produced, and another film on soil conservation will also be produced.

Following the devastation of lucerne stands throughout South Australia, the department has been engaged actively in the development and extension of new medic cultivars throughout the State. The aphids which affected *Medicago Sativa*, the Hunter River variety, and decimated its population also adversely affected Barrelmedic, Snailmedic and other members of the medicago family. There is considerable overseas interest in these new varieties which could produce valuable markets for our seed producers. It has been estimated that the South American market alone could absorb at least 12 000 tonnes of lucerne seed a year. That has particular importance for the fine seed producers in the Keith region, which forms part of my electorate and the adjacent electorate of Victoria.

Extension services have been expanded in the Department of Agriculture in other areas and in other ways. The Central District office of the department has moved to new premises to provide a more responsive service to producers in its area of responsibility, which covers the Adelaide plains, the southern vales and the central and southern Hills. The office for that purpose was opened at Victor Harbor and is staffed by an agronomist, and a dairy adviser. A service centre has been opened at Strathalbyn, and an office has been opened at Virginia. Five technical officers have been appointed to the soil conservation programme and three officers have been appointed to strengthen the Vertebrate Pest Control Authority in preparation for the amalgamation of that authority with the Pest Plant Authority.

The department is engaging in trials in using a new information source called Videotex in association with other Government departments and the *Advertiser* newspaper. The Videotex system uses a simple television screen which is linked through a telephone line to a central storage computer to enable farmers to obtain information about management, not only of their crops, livestock and pastures but also of their money.

Since being elected, I, personally, assisted by other members of the back bench, have been constantly campaigning for the appointment of a training and development officer for the Rural Youth Movement and I believe that in the near future the expectation which the Rural Youth Movement has, regarding its services to the youth of rural communities, will be fulfilled. The submission presented by the

current President of that movement, Miss Ruth Robinson, was very well put together by her and other members of the movement and has commanded the respect and attention of the Government in such a way as to compel us to comply.

The department is continuing its research into, and development of, Guayule as a possible source of latex for a natural rubber industry in this State. I should point out that the plant is a native of Mexico.

Mr Mathwin: Why doesn't the member for Elizabeth come on to the front bench?

Mr LEWIS: The member for Elizabeth, being the only member here representing the Opposition, and very capably, too, will be interested to learn that I expect, and other world economists expect, that the traditional natural rubber producing countries will combine, in the same way that the oil producing countries recently combined during the past decade, in a price fixing cartel for latex. This will make it imperative for us to have an alternative source of latex from agricultural crops that can be grown in cool temperate regions. Guayule looks the best prospect.

I now draw the attention of members of the House to the importance the Liberal Party places on country representation and I refer to some figures that may be of interest to rural people, in particular, and to the people of South Australia in general. In the South Australian House of Assembly there are 24 Liberal members, 11 of whom represent rural seats. In the Legislative Council there are 11 members of the Liberal Party, five of whom are from rural backgrounds. That means that, of a total of 35 Liberal members of Parliament, 16 are members with rural interests. Further, and more importantly, within the Cabinet of 13 there are seven people who come from rural electorates, and still two others who have specific interests in rural production and/or training.

The Rural Committee of the lay members of the Liberal Party is playing an increasingly important part in the affairs of the Party. Its functions are to co-ordinate the rural activities of the South Australian Division, to promote a concern for the welfare of persons in rural communities, to contribute to the development of policy on rural matters and to demonstrate the involvement of the Division in rural affairs. The Rural Committee is made up of delegates from all State and Federal rural Electorate Committees of the Party. It meets regularly to discuss and debate its commitment to the functions as I have previously outlined. Any matters of concern expressed by any financial member of the Liberal Party which are, supported by the committee are passed on to the representative State or Federal Minister and followed up. In every case where Ministers are required to contribute to a matter they also make themselves available. Meetings between members of that committee and Ministers, as well as meetings of the committee itself, are well attended by the people charged with the responsibility. Almost without exception the Minister of Agriculture attends those meetings for advice and questioning. In the event that any debate arises needing expert advice from the industry, it is immediately sought and presented to a meeting of the Rural Committee. Recent examples of that have included discussions on plant variety rights and on foreign investment, on which occasions experts were called before the committee to address the delegates, before these subjects were debated. Matters for discussion have also included a consideration of the Campbell Committee Report. Another important aspect of the committee is its strong and direct link with the Federal Government.

Mr Geoff Giles is Chairman, and members might be interested to learn that this is a Joint Government Members Rural Committee. He is the Chairman of a committee that comprises Parliamentary members from both the Liberal Party and the National Country Party. He, with Mr Bert Kelly and the South Australian Rural Chairman, Mr Jamie

Irwin, ensure that the strong rural voice of South Australia is heard at the Federal Rural Committee level. As a matter of interest, I point out that the Prime Minister is also a member of that committee and that there is always a Federal Cabinet member present whenever it meets.

I know from personal experience that on a day-to-day basis Mr Irwin is in continual contact with the Minister of Agriculture and any other Minister as the need arises. He calls on advice from around the State on any matter that needs urgent attention in the interests of country people and is of great assistance to the Parliamentary Party in that respect. He is a member of the State Executive of the Liberal Party, which meets every two weeks. He constantly keeps that executive of the lay Party organisation aware of the feelings of country people. Members of this Chamber would know that the Premier or senior Cabinet members always attend those meetings.

I point out that the effectiveness and the responsibility with which the Minister of Agriculture has discharged his responsibility in connection with the matters pertaining to his portfolio is in stark contrast to some of the National Country Party Federal Ministers, such as the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Doug Anthony, who recently commenced the closer economic relationship negotiations with New Zealand without even giving the States a chance to discuss it with him. By so doing, he has, by his irresponsible, precipitate and unilateral action, placed in jeopardy the South Australian forestry industry and the commercial operations of the Woods and Forests Department.

I would like to comment now on how the people in rural South Australia have benefited from the efforts of the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Peter Arnold). We have received approval from the New South Wales, Victorian and Commonwealth Governments for a new River Murray Waters Agreement. We have also received approval for design work to proceed on the first of two water filtration plants for South Australia's northern towns. Although the member for Elizabeth has left and the members for Whyalla and Stuart are not present, I am sure that the only other Opposition member present, the member for Gilles, will be interested to take note of that point.

Mr Slater: I was not listening; give it to me again.

Mr LEWIS: For the honourable member's benefit, I repeat that two water filtration plants are to be constructed in South Australia's northern towns. If he cannot recall my having said it this time, the honourable member can read it in the *Hansard* of yesterday and will also be able to read it tomorrow in the *Hansard* of today's proceedings.

Mr Slater: I do not represent those areas, do I?

Mr LEWIS: No, I was lamenting the fact that you are the only member of the Opposition in this Chamber. Of course, a significant number of Government members here are very interested not only in what I am saying about the Government's record but also support the fact that I am taking the trouble to do so. The new agreement with the River Murray Commission provides that it will have power to consider any or all relevant water management objectives, including water quality in the investigation, planning and operation of works; to monitor water quality; and to co-ordinate studies concerning water quality in the Murray River.

It will have power to recommend water quality standards for adoption by the States; to make recommendations to any Government agency or tribunal on any matter which may affect the quantity and quality of Murray River waters; to make representations to any Government agency or tribunal concerning any proposal which may significantly affect the flow, use, control or quality of Murray River waters; and to recommend future changes to the agreement. Also, there will be new water accounting provisions. The agreement

still retains the fundamental principles of the former agreement on such matters as water sharing and the requirement of unanimity for most commission decisions.

The Government also requested the commission to accelerate the completion of its water quality model for the proposed salinity standards for the Murray River, particularly at the South Australian border, and to give priority to identifying projects and measures for salinity mitigation consideration by the States and the Commonwealth. That matter has far-reaching implications for the health and welfare of all South Australians in general. This applies particularly to one project, involving the cutting of a channel across the isthmus of the Narrung Peninsula at Meningie to try to reduce the salinity level that has been building up in Lake Albert ever since the barrages were constructed 60 years ago to make it a permanent body of water. Lake Albert is an appendage to the lake systems at the mouth of the Murray on the southern side of Lake Alexandrina.

Since coming to office the Government's commitment to water quality is demonstrated by the fact that the total value of works undertaken in relation to water quality programmes is just over \$38 000 000, that is \$27 300 000 on water filtration so far and \$10 900 000 on River Murray salinity control works. The result of this expenditure can be seen with the nearing of completion of the Barossa and also the Little Para filtration plants. That will be in September 1982 and December 1983 respectively.

Let us turn to the Lands Department. Since coming to office surplus land has been sold and that is land surplus to Government requirements. Its value has exceeded \$4 500 000 in the 1981-82 financial year. At Monarto, of course, other surplus land was disposed of and has realised, so far, a value of more than \$6 000 000 from an area of 13 000 hectares. There remains still some 2 500 hectares to be sold, and by disposing of it in this way we now relieve ourselves of that awesome burden of debt created by the previous Government on a project which was a white elephant from the outset and which cost South Australians an enormous amount of money, quite unnecessarily. This money could have been better spent and of greater use in other areas of the South Australian economy, particularly if it had been left with the people who had paid it into the Government coffers as taxation. On industrial land, 35 blocks of land have been sold at Regency Park for industrial use for an amount of \$2 695 000. There remains another 10 blocks to be sold with an approximate value of \$1 000 000.

We have made changes to the valuation system based on notional values on the use of land rather than its potential use in particular circumstances in both urban and rural areas. There are plans to establish a valuation review panel and instructions have been issued by the Minister, the Hon. Peter Arnold, to the Parliamentary Counsel to draft appropriate amendments to the Valuation of Land Act for that purpose, and the legislation will be introduced in this session. Under the proposals property owners dissatisfied with their valuations will be able to appeal for a review to an independent reviewer.

I want to refer to the success the department has had in its execution of the Government's freeholding policy; in keeping with that policy the Irrigation Act has been amended to permit freeholding of irrigation perpetual leases. Proposals to extend freeholding opportunities to marginal land perpetual leases are contained in amendments to the Marginal Lands Act to be presented to Parliament in the coming session. It is proposed that these amendments, and also amendments to the Crown Lands Act, will streamline many archaic provisions of those Acts and also embrace provisions of the Irrigation Act, the Marginal Lands Act, the War Service Act, but not the Pastoral Act.

The general thrust of these proposals is to consolidate land tenure legislation into one central Statute, thereby repealing the many peripheral Statutes and decreasing the level of bureaucratic involvement necessary to administer them. This will streamline the operation of the department. I draw attention to the Government's attempt to amend the Pastoral Act to improve the law and tenure relating to pastoralist graziers. This was foiled and thwarted by the A.L.P. in combination with the irresponsible Democrat in the Upper House.

Other improvements which have been made by the Minister through the department during the previous two and a half years in which we have been in office are to provide for war service irrigation perpetual lessees to retain their lifetime homes on the leases when they retire; that is, subdividing them from the lease and then selling the residual land to be used for production purposes. We look at the freeholding statistics up to June 1982 and we can see that, of the total number of applications which could have been received, about 1 590, 1 450 offers were received by the department in response. There are a number of applications with the Valuer-General; that is 46; 17 have been withdrawn; some applications are with the regional offices—67 in all there; two are with the Surveyor-General; 751 have been accepted as land grants; 209 agreements to purchase, making a total of 1 041 acceptances altogether, and 340 of the offers made have lapsed. There are still 69 offers that have been made to lessees who may yet take them up and there are five awaiting the Minister's signature as of that date, 30 June. So we can see the ratio of acceptance to offers is 79.79 per cent. Incidentally, war service perpetual lessees can now also borrow on second mortgages from private sources against their properties, which was impossible under the previous Government's policy and administration.

If we look at the Fisheries Department now, we can see the enormous benefits which have accrued to the people living in our coastal communities depending upon fishing for their livelihood, as well as those great number of other South Australians who enjoy fishing as a recreational activity. In accordance with our policy we created a separate Department of Fisheries and appointed a Director of Fisheries, Mr Richard Stevens. The previous Minister, Mr Rodda, and the current Minister, Mr Olsen, have done a tremendous job in ensuring the safe passage, and implementation of the new Fisheries Act, an Act which is unequalled anywhere in Australia for its extensive and comprehensive nature. Very full and frank consultation was undertaken by the Minister with not only back-benchers of the Liberal Party but also all sections of the industry, whether they were professional or amateur recreational fishermen.

If we look at transferability of licences for professional fishermen, prior to our coming to Government only rock lobster and prawn licences could be transferred. Now, licence transferability has been introduced into the abalone fishery, the lakes and Coorong fisheries and a discussion paper is currently with the industry outlining possible means whereby transferability of licences may be introduced into the marine scale fishery. Once it is, all major fisheries will have transferability in their licences.

We have increased the amount of surveillance by appointing seven field officers so that all country stations can be staffed by at least two fisheries officers to police the regulations established under the legislation by the new fisheries Bill to which I earlier referred. Schemes of management for each of the State's fisheries are now being drafted under the terms of that Bill, in consultation with AFIC. The Bill and the schemes of management will provide the basis for sound fisheries management into the foreseeable future and for many years to come.

The Government is proud of its record of consultation with all parts of the community in the industry. Currently,

research is being undertaken into many parts of the fishing industry, development of new fisheries like crab trapping, sea urchins, and so on, research into oyster culture, and, in conjunction with I.C.I at Dry Creek, work on an oyster hatchery is being undertaken.

Prawns have had refined management procedures introduced in both gulfs, and this is resulting in that particular fishery being assured of a better sustained economic yield and greater security. In the rock lobster fishery, a management liaison committee has been established for the industry to ensure continuing consultation with departmental officers and the Minister.

The South Australian Government also provides scholarships for fishermen and their families to acquire better training and specific vessel handling qualifications. During 1981, five fishermen were granted assistance by the South Australian Government to continue with the course in the Certificate in Technology, Fisheries, and in 1982 eight were granted assistance. Therefore, we can see that, since coming to office in 1979, the Government has made a number of necessary decisions of far-reaching implication to ensure the wellbeing of the State's fisheries overall.

It is important to note that the Government also in recent weeks has provided at Lake Butler, at Robe, docking facilities at a cost of \$650 000 for the new dry dock system. No longer will it be necessary for vessels to go to either Portland or Port Adelaide to find themselves an adequate, efficient dry-dock facility for servicing.

Mr Slater: I hope that Mr Craddock reads this speech.

Mr LEWIS: He is non-existent, according to all inquiries that I have been able to make—that is, if the honourable member is referring to the gentleman who wrote the scurrilous, irresponsible letter to the *Advertiser* yesterday. I rather suspect that some officer in the National Country Party had a hand in that business.

The Department of Environment and Planning has also been well managed by the current Minister (Hon. D. C. Wotton) and has produced policies that people in rural communities in particular (and throughout the State in general) will welcome. A large number of important and continuing projects are funded and supported by the department. I suppose the most significant has been the native vegetation heritage scheme.

The Government has introduced a vegetation retention scheme aimed at encouraging landowners to retain stands of native vegetation. Under the scheme, financial assistance and management advice is available to landholders wishing to set aside areas with native vegetation on their private land through the heritage agreement. Over 400 applications from private land holders have been received in the 18 months since the scheme was introduced. So far, more than 18 000 hectares of native vegetation is to be retained by virtue of this initiative.

The Government, having established this successful programme, is now looking towards the need to assist farmers in the replacement of trees in the landscape where they have been completely eliminated in the past. A programme of direct seeding of native plants has begun in two areas of the State in an initiative designed to conserve native species and reverse the trend of denudation.

The Government believes in supporting the basic aims of the World Conservation Strategy which, in the longer term, will not only be of benefit to city dwellers but also of more benefit to farmers. To determine South Australia's stance on the National Conservation Strategy, a conference is to be held in Adelaide next month. More than 150 people from a broad cross-section of the community will participate. These will include representatives from industry and commerce, State and local government, professional institutions, voluntary conservation groups, and farmers. The major

challenges to be addressed are the use of resources so that the greatest benefit occurs, the efficient long-term use of available resources, and the human use of resources conducted in a way that minimises long-term adverse effects.

The State Government has provided a \$10 000 grant for a research programme in the South-East into the Long-Billed Corrella. The habitat of this species extends across the South-East and the western districts of Victoria. It has become a nuisance to oilseed and other grain producing farmers in that locality in recent years.

A grant has been made to the South Australian Field and Game Association so that it will be able to develop a teaching programme under which it will teach hunters to identify a rare protected species—something with which the Minister of Environment has become closely identified, namely, the Freckled Duck. It would be a pity if the species was to pass into the oblivion of extinction through ignorance.

Some other grants made through the Wildlife Conservation Fund will also help us understand the importance of other species to our rural eco systems. These include a grant of \$2 600 for an investigation into the possibility of increasing the population of the Mallee Fowl, \$4 240 for research into the Striated Grass Wren, \$1 800 for continued research into the Peregrine Falcon, and \$1 500 for research into the Hooded Plover, the plover perhaps being amongst the most important of them.

Kangaroo culling rates have continued to be reviewed, and this year the rate has been set at 400 000 which can be taken under a licence. Perhaps the most important step that the Government has taken for farmers and landholders is the setting up of consultative committees for national parks in this State, in direct response to suggestions made by me to the Minister and supported by other back-bench members. Those committees comprise local people in the immediate vicinity of the parks and who will be able to give the Government and the department a clear insight into the problems of management of those parks and ensure that they become good neighbours to the surrounding farms.

In referring to the area of housing, one can see how the Government has been responsible, through the Housing Trust, in providing additional facilities for people in rural communities. The most exciting programme that has arisen as a result of the Housing Trust initiatives has been the trust's assistance in the provision of single bedroom unit accommodation for the elderly in rural communities, enabling them to move into their towns, staying in the communities where they have always lived, but freeing for younger families the homes in which they otherwise needed to remain, thereby reducing the number of homeless and retaining the population in rural areas.

In education we have had a growing commitment to the school-to-work transition programme. The problems of transition from secondary school to employment have been more significant in the country, particularly with students having to shift from rural areas to urban centres or the metropolitan area in the belief that that will enhance their job prospects. The sum of \$2 500 000 was spent on that programme in 1981-82. Technical and further education in country areas has been extensively developed. Thirdly, there has been the establishment of a State-isolated children's allowance of \$500 to enable children in isolated areas to live away from home and attend secondary school.

Fourthly, the Correspondence School has been relocated from overcrowded conditions at North Adelaide to the Education Centre. That problem was ignored by the A.L.P., which had no plans to do anything for that school or for the country children who depended on it. My fifth point concerns the extension of eligibility for a transport allowance to recipients of the isolated children's allowance so that they can receive both benefits. The sixth point is the expansion

of the timber technology courses and the establishment of a national saw doctor centre in Mount Gambier to which we have already attracted applications from interstate to study. The seventh point concerns teacher housing accommodation rentals, which have been increased only once since 1974, therefore and thereby effectively subsidising to a far greater extent the cost of rent to teachers and providing them with an additional incentive to serve in rural areas.

I should like also to refer to the benefits of various schemes introduced by the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment for the benefit of South Australia overall and including rural communities. The first one was the Export Bridging Finance Scheme introduced in 1981-82, under which 14 organisations were paid in total about \$60 900 as interest-free loans for 70 per cent of the international air fares paid by *bona fide* exporters who had to go overseas to develop markets.

There has been the provision of cash grant establishment incentives to companies to encourage the creation of employment or investment in South Australia. There were five in each of the two years 1980-81 and 1981-82 resulting from payments made by the Government in the first instance of \$137 000, and in the second instance of \$313 000. There has been the provision of Government guarantees in accordance with the Industries Development Act, in 1980-81.

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

Mr McRAE (Playford): In accordance with tradition, I support the Address in Reply. Traditionally, this debate is a great opportunity to oppose one philosophy and support another and to put in stark contrast one's strategy against another. I must say, as I have said on previous occasions, that the amount of time allocated to this debate is in my view far too long. It appears to me that, after the first six speeches of any significance at all, the rest of the debate becomes a simply enlarged grievance debate. I am sure that we can, and hopefully the Standing Orders Committee will, work out a better system as times goes on. It is a matter of regret that various pressures on the members of that committee have prevented its work over the last year.

His Excellency the Governor speaks for his Government and should never be made to look as a partisan, yet in my belief he was on Tuesday. He had no choice in the matter, and indeed I would give him no choice, but the way in which the Government used his position was bad, in my opinion. He appeared partisan because what he was given was a Liberal Party election speech—not a Liberal Party policy speech but a Liberal Party election speech—and that became very clear as one examines the document.

Before going into the substance of the document in so far as it has any substance, on behalf of the Opposition I should like, first, to place on record that we do give a warm welcome to our new Governor and that we were pleased at the dignified and capable manner in which he opened the session of Parliament. We in the Opposition wish His Excellency and his good lady a fine and constructive period while he is in office. Secondly, we would assuredly join with His Excellency in noting with regret the deaths of the late Sir John McLeay and also the late Hon. Jim Dunford and we pass on, as His Excellency did, our condolences to their families.

Having said that, I come to what might be termed the substance of the Address in Reply. I propose, so far as possible, to attack it in rebuttal order and so go through it paragraph by paragraph. I shall not be dealing, the House will be pleased to know, with every paragraph, because that would make what may be said to be a boring speech quite intolerably boring.

Mr Slater: We have already had one of those.

Mr McRAE: Right. I will try to pick out those parts that do have some interest. As I have said, it was a propaganda speech for the Liberal Party, and it was a disgrace that the Governor had to wear this albatross around his neck. To make the whole situation more alarming, as I see this document, it is a very cunningly contrived set of pseudo logic based on half the truth half the time and then propped up with a spicing of sheer untruth, and I shall deal with that. In a nutshell, it is double-speak based on double-think, and it would have done George Orwell's characters proud.

Of course, the Government is not going to get away with it. It is, by the way, instructive to look at what the two Adelaide dailies made of the speech. After all, the address of His Excellency the Governor in opening the Parliament is one of the key speeches of the year. I suppose next to the Budget, apart from matters of extraordinary urgency, it is the particular time when people's attention is focused on what is happening in the State Parliament, when people want to know (particularly in an election year) what is going on.

Let us have a look at how the *News* dealt with it. First, there was no editorial. Secondly, there was not an extended summary. In fact, the best that that newspaper could do was note in headline fashion, if you could call it a headline (it was in the top quarter of page 3 of the last edition) 'Bill to honour daylight saving'. Not a very auspicious start to what is supposed to be an important speech. Then, having referred to His Excellency's opening the session before a joint sitting of both Houses, and noting that this was his first major ceremonial duty since his investiture, it went on to note 11 points taken apparently quite at random sprinkled throughout this document. I will not quote them all, but just to give an example: major industrial legislation (of course, I grant that that is important, although we are not told what it is, and I would be pleased if in future the Minister who deals with that area could try and lift his game in that respect); legislation enhancing the role of the River Murray Commission (that is an important matter); tightening of medical standards; the establishment of a new Public Commission Authority; legislation regarding regulating insurance intermediaries; changes to the Builders Licensing Act; and new clean air legislation. So, there were a series of points sprinkled at random throughout the article. That was the best that the *News* could do.

I now refer to the *Advertiser*: of course, both political Parties expect that, if the *News* cannot do it, at least the *Advertiser*, even though it is obviously very partial to the policies of the Liberal Party and will protect it wherever possible, at least on most occasions tries to give a reasonable, and at least reasonably dignified, summary of what occurred. What was the situation? First, there was no editorial—that is unheard of. I do not believe I can remember an occasion in the past where the *Advertiser* did not have, either as its leader or one of its follow-ups in the editorial pages, comments on the Governor's Speech. There was not a word.

Secondly, there was no extended summary. Most people in the community do not have the time to read, or perhaps do not know how to get a copy of, the Governor's Speech. At least they are entitled to an extended summary, but apparently the *Advertiser* either was too lazy or, I expect, regarded the document as so trivial that it just did not bother to print it at all. Instead, what happened was that Matt Abraham, under the heading 'Stormy Beginning to State Parliament', gave a somewhat lengthy account, which I do not intend to read in full, but I shall read out portions of it to demonstrate to members what a reasonable person—and I think that Matt Abraham is a reasonable person—made of the opening of Parliament. First of all he noted that:

The woman clutching the 'Scenic Australia' shopping bag disappeared into the cavernous dark of the Adelaide Railway Station entrance, quite happy with the world.

'It was a nice turn-out wasn't it,' she said after taking in the pomp and circumstance.

Full marks to Matt for a very colourful entry on to the scene, but one would have hoped for better after that. He then jumped away completely from the Governor's Speech to refer to what happened in the afternoon in the House of Assembly when the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier crossed swords over the B.H.P. job retrenchment issue. Mr Abraham then referred to the events in the Legislative Council where apparently the Hon. Norm Foster reminded everybody, according to Matt Abraham, that he had no plans to 'climb up the wall and into the woodwork'. Matt Abraham goes on to say:

A little acidic repartee even ate its way into the usual lacklustre House of Assembly Question Time.

He cannot have been in here very often during Question Time for the last couple of sessions as I think you, Sir, will agree that it is not usually lack-lustre. However, that is his opinion. He then continued (as yet we have heard nothing at all of the Governor's Speech):

He [referring to the Governor] walked into the Legislative Council Chamber where members of both Houses were gathered and strode with slapping sword through eight sombre Supreme Court judges arrayed in their red and white ermine robes and wigs—looking, with all due respect, just a little like eight Father Christmases.

I must agree with Mr Abraham; really, it was a rather ludicrous spectacle to see these eight little Father Christmases and to see all these be-wigged and gowned gentlemen. I have said ever since I entered this Parliament, notwithstanding that I am a member of the legal profession and am required in my profession as a barrister to wear a wig and gown in the Supreme Court, that this custom of wearing garments that were commonly worn by some classes of the community in the eighteenth century is hopelessly outmoded and quite ridiculous. It adds nothing to the dignity of the place to have people striding around with long wigs, robes, pantaloons and buckled shoes, nor does it add much dignity to the place to have eight Father Christmas-like figures with these red and white ermine gowns, which, as a matter of interest, were once worn for very good reason, and I shall tell honourable members why: the Great Hall of Westminster, where the Justices sat centuries ago, was icy cold, and that is why they wore the ermine gowns. I do not need to explain that the colour red symbolised the method of punishment in those days.

Dr Billard: Is this sort of thinking characteristic of the profession?

Mr McRAE: In reply to the honourable member, I can say that I think a large number, an increasing number, of members of my profession share my view, and in fact, if one goes down into the yard adjacent to the courts, one finds that judges appear in all colours of the rainbow; it is not just red and white; they can be found there in purple and yellow; indeed, in all the colours of the rainbow, and it has simply got out of hand. It is silly and, what is more, it is very expensive—it costs nearly a thousand dollars to outfit oneself, and people are made to depreciate that amount over 20 years. I do not like it at all.

An honourable member: Does that also apply to the Chief Justice?

Mr McRAE: No, the taxpayer pays for it, as I understand it. I also noted differences in the gowns, depending on status. I noticed that the Chief Justice's garments were of much better quality than the others. Further, I noticed that some of them were snow white, some were a bit yellow, and some were a bit grey, so I think a good dry clean could be recommended. With regard to Matt Abraham's article, to

the stage that I have outlined it, mention of the Governor's Speech has still not been made. The article continues:

Sir Donald then launched into his opening Speech . . . he covered everything from the weather to the legislative measures planned by the Government. The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act and the Lift and Cranes Act even got a mention in a speech which canvassed every possible aspect of the Government's record over the past three years.

The article then goes on to record that Mr Bannon called a 2 p.m. press conference over the B.H.P. issue and it goes on to refer to an up tempo Question Time—which seems to contradict what he said earlier, but I will not worry about that.

Then it refers to observations that were made by the Minister of Education relating to the member for Ascot Park in that he saw a resemblance between that honourable member and Lenin, for some reason. He accused the member of just waking up: we have had a personal explanation of that. The Minister then referred to the member for Elizabeth as giving a good impression of someone asleep. We then go back to the Legislative Council and find that Mr Foster has not climbed up into the woodwork and vanished, but has flexed his new found independence by refusing to allow his arch Roxby foe, Dr Cornwall, the chance to explain a question on water quality. He did a similar thing to the Hon. Mr Sumner. Mr Abraham concluded his comments by saying:

Who needs ceremony? With an election in the air and Stormy Normy on the rampage, State Parliament might see a few more 'nice turn-outs' before the year is through.

That is the extent of the press coverage of one of the most important speeches of the year. All I can say is that I am utterly staggered at the way this has gone on. There was no attempt to make a critical analysis of the text, and there are many things in the text which were forced through the Governor's mouth and which are wrong indeed.

Having referred to his pleasure in taking up office in South Australia and to the death of former members, His Excellency turned to matters of substance. In paragraph 4 he said:

The international and Australian economic climates remain a matter of concern.

That certainly is an understatement. I would like honourable members to listen to the next sentence:

The United States and European economic communities have now been experiencing severe economic down-turn for the past two years.

In other words, this Government would like us to believe that the economic recession in the United States and European economic communities is something that arose in the year 1980, very conveniently after Labor lost office. Anyone who has followed the history of the down-turn of the Western economies knows that the recession started slowly in 1973, has progressed, even worse, in 1974 and 1975, and has got markedly worse as the years have gone on.

The O.E.C.D. publications and every independent publication that I could find bear that out. It is true that, because of the advent of the Reagan Administration, because of the advent of the Thatcher Administration and its wrong-headed monetarist policies, that the economic down-turn has been exacerbated. But to say that this is a new found phenomenon of the last two years is not just wrong; it is a damned lie. What a disgrace to have the Governor utter those remarks. Listen to the next sentence:

Australia first felt the effects of this international recession earlier this year.

Try telling that to the 20 000 to 30 000 textile workers, shoemakers, and other people who lost their jobs seven or eight years ago. Just try telling them that. Try telling that to people who have been out of work for five or six years. Try telling that to people in my district and districts in the outer suburbs who for years have been looking without

success for work. Try telling that to one unfortunate constituent of mine who, in the depths of his despair, not being able to get work, having tried valiantly for four years, eventually attempted suicide. He attempted it on a grand scale, but luckily he was saved. Just try telling them that nonsense; it is absolute nonsense. The Opposition does not intend to let nonsense like that go by. More messages were conveyed to us. In the same paragraph, the Speech continued:

The uncertainty of power supplies in New South Wales has also had an adverse impact on consumer demand for certain South Australian manufactured goods.

I will not dispute that. It continues:

While unemployment has risen nationally by 27 per cent over the last year the rise in South Australia has been only 3 per cent.

I say that that is absolute nonsense, and I will come to that later. The paragraph continues:

Employment in this State's manufacturing industry has increased by four times the national average during the past year.

Again, I say that is nonsense. First, I will deal with employment and then I will deal with unemployment. The May A.B.S. figures show that over the 12 months to May 1982 employment fell in South Australia, while it increased for Australia as a whole. The specific figures were: for South Australia from May 1981 a figure of 561 300, to 560 700 in May 1982, a decrease of 600. For Australia as a whole the figure went from 6 377 200 to 6 404 800; in other words, an increase of 27 600. That declining employment level directly contradicts the many claims made by the Premier in this House, and referred to in the Speech. I will recall the Premier's words in this Parliament on 1 June 1982, when he said:

All of the indicators are proving quite conclusively that, in comparison with other States, we are moving on while the other States are moving back.

What has happened is that South Australia is beginning to be a part-time State. The A.B.S. figures for the labour force in Australia in May 1982 (Preliminary number 6202.0) states that, during the three months to May 1982, an average of 19 per cent of the South Australian work force was engaged in part-time work. This was the highest proportion of any State or Territory. The South Australian part-time share was well above the 16.4 per cent proportion of the Australian work force. The proportion of part-time jobs in this State's work force has increased and the increase in the same period was from 18.5 per cent to 19.1 per cent. It is clear that the number of full-time jobs in this State declined by 3 700 during the last 12 months and only an increase in part-time work prevented a large overall employment decline from occurring. We say that obviously an examination of the total employment levels alone significantly overstates the demand for labour in South Australia. The reasons for this demand close analysis by everyone.

I will refer now to unemployment, because the Premier dealt with that as well. One assumes that he takes some credit for it, but I will soon be disabusing the Government of any credit. I will quote the facts again from A.B.S. figures for the labour force, May 1982 (Preliminary Paper 6202.0). As at May 1982 the total level of unemployment in this State was 47 100, and that represented an increase of 500 over the jobless total in May 1981. The current unemployment rate in South Australia is 7.8 per cent compared with the national rate of 6.6 per cent. For 29 consecutive months from January 1980 onwards this State had the highest unemployment rate of any mainland State. In May 1982, the Adelaide metropolitan area unemployment figure was 8.4 per cent and the figure for Playford, Salisbury and Elizabeth is much higher than that, and the youth unemployment figure in Playford is conservatively put at 19 per cent. The sad trend is that the duration of the unemployment is getting greater and greater.

It is evident that in 1982 the average monthly unemployment was 2 000 above that under the former Labor Government in 1979. The unemployment rate averaged 7.8 per cent in the six months to May 1982, compared with 7.6 per cent for the same period to May 1979. In every year under the Tonkin Government the average monthly unemployment rate was above the rate in 1979. This makes nonsense of the various claims made by the Tonkin Government.

I referred earlier to double-talk and double-thinking. There is a remarkable example of this in the last line of paragraph 4. We should take the last two sentences, to be fair:

While unemployment has risen nationally by 27.5 per cent over the last year, the rise in South Australia has been only 3 per cent.

The figures are wrong, of course, but just assume for a moment that they are right, and then read the next sentence, which states:

Employment in this State's manufacturing industry has increased by four times the national average during the past year.

That is wrong, too, but even assuming that it was correct, what worries me is that the last part of paragraph 4 is a sublime exercise in double-thinking.

What this Government promised in 1979 was a reduction in unemployment of 17 000. Very clearly, the young people who work in the outer suburban districts, of which Playford is a good example, and Tea Tree Gully, and other districts around there, understood that if they voted a Liberal Government in their chances of getting a job would increase by 17 000. I have always maintained, when talking to the youth involved, that they understood it to mean that; they did not understand it to mean some casuistry of an argument which would say that it did not really say that, that what it said was that the Government would actually lift the employment level without taking into account anything else. In other words the Liberal Party told these poor young people what I have just said, whereas in fact it is now trying to say, again quite wrongly, that it has provided somehow or other 17 000 extra jobs, therefore it has honoured its promise. If that is the case, I want to know where are those jobs. It is simply not reflected in the figures. It is simply not reflected in what is going on, particularly in the outer metropolitan area.

The fact of the matter is that that promise of the Liberal Party was yet another one of its rash promises, but those who most bitterly regret it are not those who made it but those who suffer under it. I recently came across an article by Giles Merritt in the *New Statesman*. He was looking at the whole question of unemployment and the increasing duration of unemployment. Unlike the last speaker, I intend to try and keep this speech within reasonable limits and allow the grievance debate to go on. I thought that I would read out what this fairly eminent correspondent had to say about the European picture. It fits the Australian picture very well. I refer to the *New Statesman*, 11 June 1982 edition, where, under the heading 'Our blighted generation', on page 6, the following appears:

It is a cruel irony that the tens of millions of young Europeans destined to search fruitlessly for work in the 1980s were born into an age of unparalleled prosperity and optimism. Their birthright was to have been greater economic wealth and sounder social progress than that achieved by their parents. The changes in their fortunes occurred, largely unnoticed, before many of them had even entered their teens. These were structural shifts in the European, and other Western industrialised, economies. More galling, perhaps, to the workless youth of this decade will be the fact that their age and lack of privilege will prevent them taking any great hand in improving matters. They may riot, they will certainly be bitterly resentful, but they are an impotent generation.

As it was the new post-war wealth of Western Europe that had suddenly lifted birthrates, much was lavished on the new generation. Fast-rising educational standards were just a part of a general social progress in Europe that set new horizons for the children's expectations. Those hopes are now being dashed. Over 8 000 000 school-leavers will be seeking employment in the Com-

mon Market countries alone during the first half of the 1980s, and their chances are on average much the same as in Britain, where during 1982 only one youthful job hunter in three is likely to succeed.

There is a remarkable similarity between that situation and what has applied here. It continues:

Until not so very long ago, few people were out of work for long. And the social security benefits designed to tide them over while in between jobs ensured that there was little genuine hardship. Now, when people go out of work they tend to stay out of work.

That is very true, particularly of youth. It continues:

The jobs crisis is creating a new class of underprivileged people, and proving to be a divisive force in countries whose broad twentieth-century commitment has been to greater social and economic equality.

Before the new unemployment took hold, joblessness could be used as a classic instrument for tuning economies. It was standard to brake the rate of inflation at the cost of marginally higher unemployment. Now the dole queues are acting as a parachute drogue jerking whole economies to a crawl.

The report continues:

Failing industries are collapsing just at the point when young people, the product of the 1960s baby boom across Europe, are seeking work in unprecedented numbers.

Overlaying that unfortunate coincidence is the issue of new technology that is rapidly overturning the traditional structure on which industries have been built. There is a compelling intellectual argument that the micro-chip's efficiencies will produce cheaper goods, and because those goods will then come within the reach of so many more consumers the whole cycle of production/consumption will eventually pick up speed. The empirical evidence so far supplied by the industrialists, however, is far from encouraging. Millions upon millions of jobs in both manufacturing and office services are already in the process of being suppressed in the industrialised countries by micro-electronic equipment, and some analysts say that is only the shadow of worse to come.

I must agree with that. The Address in Reply, in so far as it attempts to deal with that issue, is, first, misleading, and, secondly, thoroughly quite sickening to me and very cruel to those young people and adults in my district who are out of work—hundreds and thousands of them—and who have been out of work for long periods. That, of course, is not the only nonsense to which we are subjected. There is paragraph 5, regarding the abolition of death and gift duties. That is the issue which I call 'the hooray for Davenport and Bragg' clause, because the people there are the only ones who will benefit from that concession, whereas people in Playford, Salisbury, and like districts will lose, lose, lose.

I will conclude on the following note, because I want to give the House the opportunity to have a grievance debate, and other speakers may pick up points of this rather disjointed thing. I express my horror and contempt at the way in which paragraph 6 has been framed. It is a cunning and contrived paragraph and starts off with a contrived and, at times, outrageous analysis of the resource capacity of South Australia. It then proceeds deliberately to mix up non-controversial developments (such as the Cooper Basin liquids project), controversial developments (such as the Roxby Downs development), and really outrageous developments (such as the enrichment of uranium).

I want to make quite clear that the Labor Party, throughout its term of office and in Opposition, has consistently supported the development of this State. Of course it supports the development of this State, because we are here to represent the workers of this State, and, if this State does not develop, we cannot get employment. The Government and the Cooper Basin producers know that we have consistently supported development of that project. Anyone who was here in the 1970s would know that that was so. They would also know that we set up the Oil and Gas Corporation, that we got Bond out of this State, and that colleagues of members opposite who were game enough to cross the floor in the Upper House were kicked out of the Liberal Party and lost their preselection. What outrageous nonsense to pump at us.

My Leader dealt with Roxby Downs yesterday, when the House passed unanimously the motion that was moved by the Premier. Nothing more can be said about that. I am outraged that the Premier has gone on deliberately (it is just a deliberate trick) to try to divide the community even more, as if feelings were not high enough, as if the community was not divided deeply enough over Roxby Downs. God knows the feelings on the question of nuclear enrichment. I am no expert on the matter (and perhaps the member for Mitcham can guide me): I understand that yellowcake in itself is dangerous, but to go the extra step and enrich it, in accordance with the expression in paragraph 6, is even more dangerous.

Therefore, those who were worried about the first point of the plan would be doubly worried. There are many other matters to which I could refer but time is too short. In summing up, I state that the Opposition welcomes the Governor and that it is sorry that he is saddled with the Government with which he is saddled, although we are very glad that that will not be the case for much longer. I am very sad that this albatross of a speech was draped around his neck. I am not bitter (although the people in my electorate will be) but very sad that the Government has had to sink to the level to which it has sunk in dealing with the economy, employment, unemployment, and resource development. I support the motion.

Dr BILLARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I want to take this opportunity to say a few words following on the area about which the member for Playford was talking, that of young people, their job opportunities and where they stand, not only in this country but other parts of the world (he referred to Europe in some detail). Unfortunately, history will show that the only time that there is full employment and buoyancy in the world economy is during war time, regrettably, or immediately thereafter. Never in the history of mankind, in any nation, has man been able to handle affluence for long periods. During other periods, when people have not been so affluent, there has been a shortage of jobs or some form of political action, those people have been forced to leave their homelands and seek another. Sometimes they go because they think that there are better opportunities elsewhere, for example, as occurred when Canada, America, Australian and New Zealand were founded.

What are the opportunities now for people who have expertise and who wish to move from this land and use that expertise elsewhere? I will cite one area as an example. If we wished to house all the people of the world in the type of housing that we demand as a right in this land, and we were to attempt to do that by the end of the century, we would have to build more houses in the next 18 years than we have built since man first stood on two legs. That is how far we are behind in housing the world in the standard of housing that we have in Australia.

If one turns to the field of health in the Third World countries one could use the same arguments. The same applies in the field of education. Many nations are now demanding that their students learn to speak English. I believe that this is done for two reasons, first, because English is one of the most widely used languages in the world and can be used for trading purposes, for which it is vital, and, secondly, it provides an opportunity for people

to go to lands where English is the main language, such as England, Australia, Canada or similar countries, to continue their studies. This is done in the hope that they will take their expertise and knowledge back to their own land and use it for the benefit of the people in under-privileged countries.

We know that, quite often, that does not occur because the students become well educated and conditioned to the life in our country. They like it and find that there is a lot more freedom and luxury, and not quite so much congestion, so they seek to marry or find some other way of staying here permanently.

That aside, we as a country must now start looking outside our shores, as do the Germans, French, English, Americans, and Canadians, to see whether we can help others, because it is better to encourage our people to work amongst them than it is to have war. I mentioned earlier that the time of war, or just thereafter, is the only time that we have full employment.

Some of us were privileged last year to go to the Cook Islands as part of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Australasian South-Eastern Pacific Regional Conference. We saw there a race of people, small in number, that was happy. I believe that they have been fairly treated by New Zealand in developing their industries. I am not attacking New Zealand on that basis, but I am saying that is the impression that one gained. These people, who are surrounded by fish in a vast ocean, have never been given advice or help to set up a fishing industry, so that they could export fish to many parts of the world. They have never been encouraged or given the opportunity even to grow their own timber supplies so that they are forced to buy from other islands, more particularly, New Zealand.

People work in the hotels at 75 cents Australian an hour—men and women—for longer than 40 hours, with no penalty rates and no holiday pay of any significance. The people who drove the buses (I am sure the Minister of Transport would like to have them driving at that rate) work for 90 cents per hour. The top typist in Parliament House works for \$1.50 an hour. They are a happy race of people, although their standard of housing was in most cases not up to the standard expected in this country. There are many other areas like that where there were people like that. This race of people is not congested and people have not had the help they need to develop.

Our pioneers left Germany, Scotland, England, or wherever, a century or more ago and came and developed this land, until we all expected a standard of affluence that we cannot afford. That is what it boils down to: we just cannot afford it. We even have people now in our own land who do not wish to go out and give country service within a few hours from the centre of the major population. We also have people who do not wish to go to Darwin and Alice Springs to serve their fellow man. So, we create the problems for ourselves.

I want to take up the editorial in today's *News* which refers to the concessions that have been made available to help people paying high interest rates. It is stated that it is only a small band-aid scheme but at least it is something. They go on to make the point that these people face an increasing burden of debt at the very time that they can least afford it. Such small family tragedies add up to a large national crisis. I agree with that. I have been saying for years that we are heading for this area. No other section of the news media has been concerned about it. If we want to attack the real basis of the problem, we must attack the attitude of our society. I am not condemning these people who find themselves in that position. In their case it is too late to rectify what happened in their earlier life.

At least we as a Government, the Federal Government, the Opposition, the news media (electronic or print) and business houses, could, if they have the courage to back it, say that it is time that we stopped encouraging people in their early years to spend every cent they make on luxuries and buy unnecessary items that are not vital to life styles, on hire purchase agreements, thereby becoming slaves of interest rates. I am talking not just about high interest rates but about those that prevailed before. This involves people who are becoming slaves to interest rates and working agents to money lenders. Let us say it. That is the reason why we have got ourselves into this position, as have local councils and the State and Federal Governments. What do we do about it? The news media will not talk about it because they rely on the advertisements. Each and everyone of them relies on the advertisements that are in the press to keep themselves going on television or radio to fund their organisations. If they were to attack those areas initially there would be a set back for the firms that make the money available.

However, if we could start that as an educational programme, within 10 years from now we would find that many young people would have a much bigger deposit towards their home. They would not be concerned with interest rates. They would be collecting interest on their savings while saving for a home, they would then be in a better position to buy a home, and they would not get into the higher mortgage bracket. That would be the difference. We would not be producing goods such as stereo sets, television sets, motor cars and such things, because the demand would not be there until later. Eventually the stream would be picked up and we would sell just as many of those goods to people paying cash for them and they would not be financing other organisations. They would be working to make money work for them instead of working as slaves to interest rates and working agents of money lenders.

I hope that Governments, business, the news media, the Opposition, and others take up the challenge and tell young people that they have a great opportunity to serve their fellow man and to save at the same time, if they are prepared to take up the challenge, and they will not find themselves in a difficult position later in life. I also appreciate the position people find themselves in in regard to mortgage rates. It is difficult to alter that now, but we can stop others from getting into that category if we take the right action.

Mr SLATER (Gilles): The matter I desire to draw to the attention of the House in the limited time available to me this evening is the subject of the T.A.B. proposal to introduce a scheme of commissioned agents at a number of T.A.B. agencies. The matter was brought to my attention last week. I made a statement, which appeared in the *News* on 13 July 1982, and which immediately brought a very strange reaction from the T.A.B. management. The General Manager, Mr Barry Smith, originally denied that the proposal for the commissioned agencies was being contemplated. He subsequently changed his direction. It is surprising to me that such a veil of secrecy prevails in regard to this scheme.

After the press report, the T.A.B. conducted an internal witch hunt and an employee was suspended for an alleged breach of confidentiality. This happened in a most unusual way and in very unusual circumstances. The T.A.B. board appears to be paranoid about its internal operations. I believe it is paranoid because of circumstances relating to the Riverton subagency incident last year. It is my view that all of the matters and the facts of that episode have not come to light. I believe that there has been a cover-up and, as a consequence, the T.A.B. board is quite paranoid about its internal operations.

The Hon. M. M. Wilson: Cover-up of what?

Mr SLATER: There is plenty to be explained as far as the Riverton subagency episode is concerned. I am not satisfied, and I do not think the public is satisfied, that the Minister and the T.A.B. board have revealed the full facts of the T.A.B. incident at Riverton. As a consequence it is covering up. It is paranoid about its internal operations, otherwise it would not be acting in such a strange way in regard to this episode. I believe that staff morale, as far as the employees at head office are concerned, is quite low. This line of action certainly will not help that staff morale.

The latest episode over the alleged leak of information shows that a serious internal staff morale problem exists. I might mention that it is obvious that the Minister of Recreation and Sport was not aware of the proposal to introduce commissioned agents, although the Racing Act provides, in section 52, that the board is under the general control and direction of the Minister. It rather surprises me that this sort of concept should be considered.

The Minister, in a reply to my question on Tuesday, said two things, although I might add that he was pretty limited in his reply. I asked when it was going to be announced, and the Minister stated, 'In the near future', and went on to say that there was nothing new in the concept of commissioned agents. There is something new in the concept of commissioned agents as far as South Australia is concerned; the system has not operated here before. It may have operated in some of the other States, and I make reference to the Victorian experience. In Victoria when the T.A.B. was introduced in 1961, this concept was part and parcel of its initial operations. I might mention for the information of the Minister of the House that at the present time (and this can be seen if the Minister takes the time to read the Victorian T.A.B. reports) commissioned agencies are gradually being phased out in Victoria. Therefore, it is not a new concept there, but it is a new concept for South Australia.

Both the Public Service Association and the Federated Clerks Union are strongly opposed to the proposal to introduce commissioned agents into the T.A.B. in South Australia. They were not privileged to have any discussions on the matter, although the proposals affect their employees. The P.S.A. and the Federated Clerks Union believe that the person who was the subject of a suspension was rather harshly treated. I understand that the P.S.A. made representations to management and that the person was returned to work. I believe that he was the victim of this attitude that exists internally within the T.A.B.

The T.A.B. is a statutory authority established under the Racing Act. Its purpose is to provide revenue in relation to the three racing codes; its purpose is to provide the opportunity for the ordinary punter to place bets and thus obviate illegal betting. Further, and most importantly, it provides a service for the ordinary punter. That is what the T.A.B. is all about.

It was not set up to be farmed out to private agents. There will be industrial problems associated with that. Persons who are presently employed within the T.A.B. are certainly not happy with the proposals, and I bring to the attention of the Minister in the House a circular headed 'Commissioned Agents' which is undated but is probably a recent circular, and which states, in part:

Casual staff employed at agencies which are changed over to commissioned agency operations may either become an employee of the agent or, if possible, be transferred to another position within T.A.B.

In the past 18 months, with the advent of computerisation, employment within the T.A.B. has been reduced considerably. Further, if a system of this nature is introduced, there will be further reductions. Employees will not be transferred to other parts of the T.A.B. operations; they will be pressured

to perform by the person who is the agent for the purpose of profit rather than service to the customer.

I am opposed to the concept. I agree with the Public Service Association and the Federated Clerks Union that it will create difficulties. If it is going to be a cost-cutting exercise I would like to know in which areas those costs will be saved. I can only suggest that they will be saved through a further reduction in staff and a further reduction in service to punters. The T.A.B. was set up to provide such a service in the first place. It is administered as a statutory authority under an Act of Parliament. It is meant to provide employment and a service to punters, and not to reduce employment by farming out its activities to private commission agents.

As I have said, this is not a new concept for other States of Australia, but it is a new concept in South Australia. I strongly oppose it. I ask the Minister to exercise some direction and control, as he is entitled to do under the Act, to ensure that the T.A.B. remains for the benefit of the South Australian public and not for the management of the T.A.B. which believes that it can do as it likes, despite the fact that the T.A.B. is authorised under the Act—

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in the adjournment debate early in the session. There are a couple of matters that I wish to raise. I am pleased that the member for Mitcham is in the Chamber. Later in my speech I will make some comments that I am sure she will be interested in, because they will reflect on her attitude and the attitude of her colleague.

Ever since I became a member of Parliament I have been concerned about the amount of red tape and bureaucratic humbug that many of my constituents have had to endure. I have never been a lover of the State Planning Authority and the more I have had to do with it the less respect I have had for it. Its latest escapade in relation to my constituents tops the lot.

Thanks to the Highways Department and the Minister, a considerable amount of road construction is taking place in my electorate. Work is progressing on the Stuart Highway. A constituent of mine will have his business bypassed in a couple of years due to the realignment of the Stuart Highway. The property of another constituent will be bypassed because of the construction of the road to Leigh Creek. When I took up this matter on behalf of the constituent affected by the Leigh Creek road I was told that an alternative site could not be found. I made further inquiries and was told that the State Planning Office would not approve of it.

It is all very well for bureaucrats to sit in Adelaide and make judgments about people who are doing something constructive for the people of this State. It is about time these people in Adelaide faced up to reality and stopped interfering with people who are doing something constructive for the people of this State and who invest their life savings to perform a service for the travelling public. I regard these decisions as absolutely beyond comprehension.

As long as I am a member of this place I intend to take what I believe is appropriate action whenever decisions such as these are made and air them in this House and elsewhere. My constituents have purchased a business, have developed it and have given good service to the community. What harm will be done if they are given four or five hectares of land out of the hundreds of thousands of hectares? Because of some nonsense known as the Flinders Ranges Development Plan all developments must be in recognised towns. It is all well and good for someone to read that document and adhere to bureaucratic ideas, but common sense should

also apply. In many of these cases common sense does not apply.

It is only necessary for agreement to be reached with the existing pastoralist. If he agrees, the land can be severed from the lease and a new lease created. My other constituent has a small operation and lives north of Coober Pedy. He is giving good service in a very difficult area. It will not cost the Government anything. They are the people who have to put up the capital, borrow the money, provide their own water, and various other things. I find it, to put it mildly, most disturbing. I sincerely hope that those people who are responsible for making those sorts of decisions and recommendations come to their senses.

The second matter I want to talk about is the Pastoral Act. If there has ever been a more scurrilous and inaccurate campaign to criticise and have defeated a piece of legislation, it was carried out by the opponents of that legislation.

Mr Randall interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, and I understand that the honourable member for Mitcham was involved in discussion with her colleague. With all due respect to the member for Mitcham, her knowledge of the pastoral industry would be absolutely nil. Like many people who got on the band wagon, if they were asked to go and live in that country, they would starve. Those people have no experience in the country and the sad thing about it is that the opposite will be done to what they wanted.

Two things have already been done and one is that great ill feeling has been created in the pastoral areas (and I will give an example of this in a moment). Members have stood in this place and said that there is no trouble obtaining loans under the Pastoral Act. Last week this matter was brought to my attention by a constituent of mine who wanted long-term finance so that improvements could be made to protect the country, to extend the water scheme to stop sheep walking such distances and to put in more troughs, and the bank officer said it was not possible to lend under those leases. We all knew that, but the enlightened conservationists and other irresponsible groups who did not understand the legislation created a situation where this person will have to endeavour to get short-term finance at very high rates of interest.

Another constituent whom I called on a few weeks ago and asked how things were going said, 'As usual, we are having a real problem. Last week my water tanker was parked at the bore and people were camping there without being courteous enough to let me know. This keeps the sheep away from the water. I had a brand new Honda engine on my water tank and when I came back the next day the engine was gone and the pump had been tossed into the tank.'

That was bad enough, but what about the inconvenience of having to go hundreds of kilometres to obtain replacement parts? On that day other people were camped at the bore and my constituent had no authority to ask them what they were doing or remove them. It is about time that those people who took that course of action came to their senses.

Mr Ashenden: I wonder how members opposite would like to have country people come and camp on their front lawns.

Mr Plunkett: I wonder how Liberal members worry about people losing their homes through high interest rates.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is all right for the honourable member who interjects; he has an absolute hatred of anyone who has tried to be successful in this country.

Mr Plunkett: You are not worried about people losing their homes in the city; you are worried—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One contribution at a time.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have one or two other matters that I wish to canvass. A person came to me the other day criticising the amendments to the Pastoral Act. That person did not know, and was in a position where he should have known, that all the existing provisions of the Pastoral Act remained. The Pastoral Board still has the authority to issue de-stocking orders, and the other necessary requirements remain. Yet those ill-informed people did not know that. The conduct to which I have referred and also the irresponsible literature Mr Sibley and others put around the country were an absolute insult to anyone who had any knowledge of this area.

I challenge those people with that knowledge to face the realities and to go out and explain to those pastoralists what they are doing wrong. It is all right to sit in one's ivory tower in Adelaide at the university and make these ill-informed judgments, but they should go out and face reality. Most of those pastoralists have lived under difficult conditions for a long time in very isolated parts of the State and have made a great contribution to the welfare of this country.

Mr Plunkett: And got a fair quid out of it, too.

Mr GUNN: There are many of them. If the honourable member was fair, he would know that they have lived under the most difficult conditions.

Mr Plunkett: Most of the people you are talking about are living in the city, are very wealthy squatters and are very good friends of Fraser.

Mr GUNN: That is absolute nonsense.

Mr Plunkett: They took a trip right through the outback at the expense of the taxpayer—the friends of Fraser and the wealthy big land owners.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: That contribution that we have just heard by way of interjection is typical of the arrogant and absolutely ill-informed comment that the people have to put up with. Dozens of people in my district live off their pastoral property and have done so for generations. They are making a contribution to the economy of this State and to the nation, unlike the greedies and those people whom the member for Mitcham claims to represent. It is a pretty sad occasion when they are successful in defeating legislation. Let me make very clear that I shall do everything in my power to have those amendments put into law, because they are fair, just and reasonable, and in the best interests of the people of this State.

Motion carried.

At 5.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 27 July at 2 p.m.