

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 28 July 1982

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

PETITION: ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST

A petition signed by 106 residents of South Australia praying that the House take all necessary steps to facilitate the transfer of the whole of section 1, hundred of Bartlett, to the Aboriginal Lands Trust was presented by the Hon. P. B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 111 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 Messrs Evans, Gunn, and Schmidt.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT RELIEF ASSISTANCE

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN (Minister of Agriculture)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN**: Honourable members will be aware that much of South Australia has not received useful rain since May, and in some areas since April. While we have not reached a crisis point, some producers in marginal areas will face low crop yields if the current 'dry' continues. In the Murray Mallee, parts of Yorke Peninsula and parts of the Mid North, cereal crops will be down on last year. Some of the safer areas could also have problems, and the risk is increasing daily. We are in a drought situation on some pastoral properties in the Upper North and North-East.

With the full co-operation of the Premier the Government has formed a committee consisting of representatives of the Treasury, the Department of Agriculture and the United Farmers and Stockowners Association to examine closely the effects of the current dry spell in South Australia, and both the long-term and short-term effects this would have on both the farming community and the State as a whole. A meeting of this group will be held this afternoon.

I point out that in South Australia drought assistance for primary producers is supplied by and administered through the Rural Assistance Branch of the Department of Agriculture. There is no provision for declaring regions of the State 'drought affected'. The provisions of the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act enable applications lodged by individual landholders to be promptly processed by my department. The loan assistance is repayable over terms up to 20 years at interest rates largely determined by the capacity of the individual to meet these commitments. When individually assessed, interest rates and repayment periods are determined by the Minister under that Act. There is no upper loan limit, with most loans during the last drought period ranging from \$20 000 to \$30 000. There is a threshold at which Commonwealth assistance becomes available to

the State. Currently, this is \$3 000 000 for South Australia. After this figure is reached, the Commonwealth will provide \$3 for each \$1 provided by the State for drought assistance.

Officers of my department are skilled in this field, following their experiences in the 1977-78 drought and the devastating storm of November 1979, when collectively some \$10 000 000 was lent to primary producers in South Australia. Reports from district officers are due to arrive in Adelaide tomorrow. From these reports an overall assessment will be made. This should be available by Friday.

We are also closely monitoring livestock prices, which have already shown a down-turn because of the dry period. In this area, I suggest that if it were not for the price obtained for export sheep (that is, export live sheep) the situation would already be disastrous. Our live sheep market in the Middle East is proving yet once again a saviour for our national sheep industry.

I assure the House, the farmers of this State, and all South Australians that the Department of Agriculture is geared and ready to assist any primary producer who demonstrates hardship because of drought. As I pointed out earlier, help has already been provided for pastoralists in the Upper North and North-East in the form of livestock transport and fodder carriage assistance.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr **BECKER** brought up the 23rd report of the Public Accounts Committee relating to compulsory third party insurance premiums.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

TAXATION AVOIDANCE

Mr **BANNON**: Will the Premier make a clear commitment to join the fight against tax avoidance and, in particular, support the proposals made yesterday by the Victorian Premier, Mr Cain? On 1 June I asked the Premier what action was being taken here following revelations in Victoria about tax avoidance schemes that were heaping unfair burdens on ordinary taxpayers. He claimed everything was under control and many of the practices complained of had been stopped.

Subsequent statements by Federal Treasurer Howard indicated to the contrary. Yesterday the Victorian Premier proposed open exchange of information between State and Federal tax collection agencies. When various Leaders were asked to comment on this commendable initiative, the Premier was reported as being 'cautious'. He was said to be concerned about 'erosion of confidentiality on tax matters'. This response followed Mr Cain's statement that he anticipated just such an objection. He was not, he stressed, suggesting any breaches of confidentiality but 'the widening of the cocoon in which it is contained'.

Mr Cain's proposal arose from recent meetings of tax commissioners from all States. The Victorian proposal is that State tax commissioners should be able to refer documents to other commissioners and they could inform each other about a person's tax liability in cases where some doubts arose. Mr Cain is reported as saying:

Confidentiality will be extended, as it were, to other States. But that's a price we have to pay. I believe it's a price people are prepared to pay to crack down on what is being done in this country . . . The graphic detail of the McCabe-Lafranchi report shows how slick tax operators cream hundreds of millions from the system at the expense of ordinary taxpayers.

The **Hon. D. O. TONKIN**: This Government has already given a clear commitment to the Federal Government that

it will co-operate in any way possible to clamp down on various tax avoidance matters. That commitment has been given by letter and verbally to the Prime Minister. We have also offered to help in combating tax avoidance which, as honourable members will know, costs or has cost this State alone some tens of millions of dollars, possibly hundreds of millions of dollars, since the schemes have been in operation.

The open exchange of information proposed by Mr Cain from Victoria was something I first heard about from a journalist late yesterday. I certainly do not agree that there should be any widening of information-giving to other Government departments but, as I now understand it, having read the details of what is being proposed, there certainly has been put forward a reasonable case for an exchange of information between tax authorities, that is the Federal and the State tax authorities. Whether or not this will have the effect Mr Cain believes it will have, however, is a matter of some doubt and is a matter now being investigated by Treasury officials for the South Australian Government.

My concern, nevertheless, is that there should not be any widening up or opening up of the exchange of information which should properly be kept confidential between other Government departments. As I understand it, that is not what Mr Cain is suggesting, and that reassurance was something which has led me to believe there is something worth while in investigating the suggestion made. I repeat that I am not sure at this stage exactly how such an exchange of information between a State taxation authority and a Federal taxation authority is going to help. I would have thought, perhaps, what Mr Cain had in mind was that there should be an exchange of information between the Registrar of Companies and the Federal Taxation Department.

I would have to investigate that very carefully indeed before I approved, but I must say that, if it can be shown that such an exchange of information can be made with appropriate safeguards to respect the privacy of individuals and of companies, then that will be given every consideration.

PUBLIC SERVICE

Mr EVANS: Will the Premier say whether, in percentage terms, women employed in Public Service departments has fallen since this Government came into office? Recently a publication produced by the Public Service Association entitled *Are You Being Served?* claimed that the number of women employed in the Public Service had fallen by 26 per cent since June 1978 compared with a fall in male employment of 14 per cent. That publication, by using further evidence, went on to state:

The State razor gang has also meant staff cut-backs which make a mockery of equal opportunities policies in the Public Service, although the Government claims it is still committed to them.

The feeling of some of my constituents regarding that report was that a reduction may have occurred in percentage terms. They were concerned about the report and I would like the Premier to clear up the situation so that women in the work force can understand whether or not the Government is concerned with equal opportunities.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I have seen that report and I have seen the publication. Indeed, my attention was drawn to the statistics which were published under the heading of 'Women' by my Women's Adviser, who was particularly concerned. Members of the Public Service Board also had drawn my attention to it and I think it is worth clearing up the misapprehension under which apparently the Editors of this publication are suffering.

The statistics given in the document are that women made up 37 per cent of Public Service departments' staff in

June 1978, and by June 1981 this had fallen to 34 per cent. They go on to say that the number of women employed has fallen by 26 per cent compared with a fall in male employment of 14 per cent and that in June 1981 women formed 57 per cent of all temporary employees. If that were an accurate report, there would be very grave cause for concern and, of course, I would be very upset indeed that I had not been informed of such trends. I must say that when I read the report, I knew at once that it could not be accurate.

The statistics on the number of women employed in the Public Service, in fact, as reported in this document, are grossly inaccurate. Some of the figures are the same, but they have got it completely around the wrong way and I hope that that was only an accident. Women made up 31 per cent of department staff in 1978, and by 1981 this rose to 34 per cent. The actual number of women employed has risen by 9 per cent. There has been a fall in male employment of 3 per cent.

These figures, which are the correct ones, clearly indicate that the reverse of what has been said in the Public Service Association's pamphlet is in fact the correct situation. Since this Government has been in office, not only has the proportion of women employed in the Public Service increased but the overall numbers have increased, despite the Government's planned reduction of the size of the public sector by attrition and natural causes.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: There are a lot more women on boards, too.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As the Minister of Health points out, there are a great number more of women appointed to boards and committees. The Public Service Association seems to have taken figures, including hospitals and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, for 1978 and then compared these to figures that exclude the Health Commission and the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, for 1981. In other words, the figures have been selectively used. The figures for 1979, which are closer to the time of the change of Government, excluded health and the I.M.V.S. and obviously, if those who prepared the pamphlet had done their homework, they would not have fallen into this trap.

The note at the bottom of this piece of reporting is that the source is Public Service Board Annual Reports 1978 and 1980-81. Obviously, the P.S.A. have fallen into the error of not including statistics from the Health Commission and the I.M.V.S. I very much hope that it will correct the error and the very grave distortion in the impression that it gives as to women employed in the work force during the time of this Government.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA BOOK

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier say how much longer he will take to reply to my question of Tuesday last week about the very curious ordering of 100 000 books about South Australia? The Premier, at that time, stated:

I will get an answer in due course.

In view of that statement and in view of the Premier's offer to make available copies of that book to members (although it is now known that the Premier has not seen a copy himself), I believe that I have been reasonably patient. The Premier has now had eight days in which to provide some sort of answer, and in those eight days several facts have become more apparent. The first is that the Premier's reply of Tuesday last week was not accurate. He was then apparently unaware that the book had not been completed.

He was also not aware that his offer of a copy for members was simply an empty gesture. The Premier's officers advised

the Opposition that copies even now are not available and it seems they will not be available until at least another week, after Parliament rises. The matter has also been canvassed in another place and there was a similar lack of positive response. We still do not know why such a huge order was placed, at what cost, and where those books will go.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: If the honourable gentleman is so particularly concerned about this matter, may I suggest that he obtain a copy of the last edition of the South Australia book because I understand—

Mr Bannon: It is being remaindered in city book shops. You printed another 100 000.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I would be perfectly happy if the honourable gentleman read the second edition, in which the text is virtually unchanged. However, the photographs have been changed and I believe that the book is remarkably good. I do not believe that the front page has been changed, either. In due course, the honourable gentleman will learn exactly what is happening in regard to that book. He referred previously to, I think, \$1 000 000: I have had some figures taken out and, in fact, if the Deputy Leader had been prepared to wait just a little longer and contain his impatience, he would have received a letter from me at the end of this week or the beginning of next week setting out the information he wants to know.

The production costing of the book is \$1.22 per copy, which is extremely cheap, one reason being that the book is being printed in bulk. I was presented with the first of the copies from Griffin Press, I think, yesterday. It was a leather bound copy and was very well produced. Indeed, I am very grateful to the workers at Griffin Press who have produced such a first class publication which will help to publicise this State.

Regarding the honourable member's suggestion that the book was produced for election purposes (I think that is what he said), I might point out that several thousand copies of the first two editions have been printed and, as for their being for election purposes, a goodly number (several thousand, I remember) of those were printed in Japanese. Whether the Deputy Leader expects that Japanese votes will be counted in the next South Australian election, I do not know.

I understand that copies will be delivered either late this week or early next week, and the first copies will be delivered in bulk. When they become available I will be delighted, as I said the other day, to present each honourable member of this House and of the other place with a copy for his or her personal use. Indeed, I will even autograph copies for the Leader and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF SCHEME

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs, following an announcement yesterday that the Labor Party would establish a job creation scheme when in Government, indicate the cost of such a scheme and how many jobs might be created based on the records of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am afraid that we will have to rely on statistics to cost the Opposition's scheme because the Opposition has never been willing to bring forward any of its own costings. I can assure members that some accurate costings are available. Those figures are available based on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme. Those figures are available in the Auditor-General's Report. I can give the

details. In the last year of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme the cost per full-time equivalent—

Mr Keneally: Can you tell us who is going to win the Melbourne Cup this year?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart and the member for Napier know the rule in regard to addressing another member in this Chamber.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Based on the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, the cost per full-time equivalent for a full-time job over one year was \$13 424. That is based on information supplied by the Auditor-General on a 10 per cent escalation in wage costs, as well as other costs per year, since then. The cost now on a full-time job equivalent basis in 1982-83 would be \$17 866.

The Hon. E. R. Goldsworthy: That's one year's temporary work.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: That is one year's temporary work: it is a temporary job only. It is clear from the figures supplied by the Auditor-General that under job creation schemes people do not get permanent jobs. If we are looking at creating full-time jobs on a temporary basis for a year for 5 000 people (and 5 000 is a fairly small proportion of people on unemployment benefits) the total cost still represents only about 12 per cent of people on unemployment benefits. The full cost per year would be \$90 000 000 to the taxpayers of South Australia. It would cost \$90 000 000 per annum to create 5 000 jobs on a temporary basis for one year.

Those figures are not figures that I have concocted. They are based on the cost of the State Unemployment Relief Scheme as it operated and they are available in the Auditor-General's Report. In addition, we found in looking at State finances that there was a transfer of funds away from the normal building programme of the Government to pay for the State Unemployment Relief Scheme, so the Opposition is taking jobs away from those who work in the permanent private sector of the building industry and giving them to people who are unemployed.

There is yet another pertinent fact: one is doing the whole lot with people who have basically no skills. Therefore, the whole cost of a building as was done under the State Unemployment Relief Scheme project is substantially higher than if the work was done through private contractors. It is quite obvious that the job creation scheme proposed by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday at a press conference would be an absolute disaster for the finances of this State and for unemployment in Australia. All it would end up doing would be taking jobs away from those who have jobs in the building industry because of the transfer of funds and giving them to 5 000 people who are unemployed, at a cost of \$90 000 000 a year.

That equals three or four new taxes and is equivalent to the old land tax on residential properties. That is what the Labor Party will have to impose on the taxpayers of this State to pay for that job creation scheme. Finally, I think it is fair to say that throughout the world it is now acknowledged that job creation schemes, such as the one proposed by the Leader of the Opposition, have been an absolute disaster, and I am sure that the Opposition would not want to precipitate another disaster here in South Australia.

FOOTBALL PARK

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport enlighten members of the House as to the present situation regarding the lighting of Football Park? I have received numerous inquiries from constituents wanting a detailed explanation of the current position between all parties with regard to the lighting of Football Park. I hope

that the Minister can elaborate on the situation so that I can advise my constituents accordingly.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I think that the best way I can sum up the present situation with regard to the lighting of Football Park is to say that it is at a stalemate. I cannot really give the honourable member very much more information, because I understand that the matter has again been before the Industries Development Committee, and obviously I cannot comment on that at this stage. I understand also that there is a possibility that the matter will go before the courts at some stage. However, I would be very happy to let the honourable member have some information in private if he wishes, as I think he deserves that as the local member representing that area. Members will recall that the South Australian National Football League decided to reject the eight-tower compromise scheme, which at one stage had been agreed to by all the parties, and it asked the Woodville council for planning permission to go ahead with the original four-tower scheme, which was proposed at the time of the Royal Commission, or even before that.

Of course, the Government's offer to assist the league had been on the basis of an agreement reached between all the parties concerned, and I refer to the Woodville council; West Lakes Limited, representing the interests of the residents at West Lakes; and the Government. The fact that the league wished to go ahead with the four-tower scheme in fact meant that the Government's offer for financial assistance could not be proceeded with. I should add that part of the Government's original offer was that we would also make provision for accommodation for the league to increase the amount of seating on the outer and also to cover the outer, and that, of course, has already been accomplished; the Government decided that it should allow that work to proceed even though at one stage it was tied into the lighting scheme. However, the Government took the view that the welfare of the sporting public was paramount in that area and that the guarantee should be kept. I cannot add to this, other than repeat that we are at a stalemate situation. At present I do not know what other moves are planned by the South Australian National Football League.

ROXBY DOWNS

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy report to the House the latest exploration and evaluation work being undertaken at Roxby Downs?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes. The Leader of the Opposition has consistently and incessantly accused the Government of talking up the Roxby Downs mineral deposits and he has consistently and incessantly talked it down and voted against it in this House. I would have thought the Leader of the Opposition would be interested in having a look at the reports not only in the South Australian press but also in the national press in relation to the latest information. In fact, I urge him and his staff and all the knockers opposite and all who voted against this project to read assiduously what has been stated in the *Financial Review*, the *Sydney Morning Herald* and the Melbourne papers to get what is now obviously a national appreciation of this project.

The Government has certainly not sought to talk this up. This Government has done its level best to see that the public is properly informed and that the indenture, which had been worked out over 12 months of hard slogging, passed this House. The Opposition has done its best to impede it at every step. The Opposition will no doubt be educated by reading the statements in question. The report confirms that we do have a massive resource and the company's quarterly report says in part:

The estimated amount of mineralisation so far drilled on a 200-metre grid is about 2 000 million tonnes at an average grade of 1.6 per cent copper, 0.6 kg/tonne u308 and 0.6 grams/tonne gold, commencing approximately 350 metres below the surface.

If members opposite did some simple arithmetic they would realise that, with a production rate which was delineated in the indenture of 150 000 tonnes of copper a year, which is a lot of copper, the life of that mine could be upwards of 200 years. We have talked of between 50 years and 100 years, which for a mining operation is an enormously valuable project, but if the reserves are examined it indicates about 200 years.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: That's incredible.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is incredible. The resource seems to be far greater than that at Bougainville; in fact, it ranks alongside the largest in the world, when we think of the major copper mines around the world. If we think only of copper, it ranks alongside those mines; certainly it is the largest mining operation in Australia and dwarfs the Mount Isa mineralisation. I would think that the figures would give the Labor Party plenty of food for thought. It was a bit disturbing to read what the Federal Labor spokesman for the Environment, Mr Stewart, said in the national press.

Mr Trainer: There's no doubt about you—you're well informed.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is Mr Stewart West. I am glad members opposite know who their Federal spokesman is. Members opposite have obviously read this statement (much to their acute discomfort):

The A.L.P.'s recent national conference decisions meant that the only uranium mines able to continue operating under a Labor Government would be Ranger and Nabarlek.

Both those mines are operative in the Northern Territory. That is the death knell we have known all along: the people developing Honeymoon have wasted their time and money coming to South Australia, as have also the people connected with the project at Beverley. Indeed, it shows that the \$50 000 000 spent at Roxby and the \$50 000 000 committed under the indenture would be wasted money in the event of the tragedy of a Labor Government coming into power in Canberra or South Australia. Nothing could be clearer from the statement by Mr West. Let me draw to the attention of the Leader and his comrades the front page of yesterday's *Sydney Morning Herald* which ran the headline 'Roxby worth \$140 billion plus'. The editorial in today's *Sydney Morning Herald* is worth quoting. This is what has been said in the interstate press. In part, the report states:

As of yesterday it [South Australia] has a mine prospect that dwarfs all that has gone before it.

That is in the Australian context. The report continues:

Roxby Downs is a mineral resource of such immensity—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know some of the honourable member's skills but, if he can interject and listen at the same time, then he is more clever than we think he is. It would be to his undying edification if he were to open his ears and listen. The report states:

As of yesterday, it has a mine prospect that dwarfs all that has gone before it. Roxby Downs is a mineral resource of such immensity that it all but defies comprehension.

The editorial continues elsewhere:

For the nation, it represents enormous export potential in a world which will grow ever hungrier for stable supplies of key minerals. Certainly it bids fair to become a very long-term addition to the maps of Australia. If Roxby Downs were to begin production in 1985, mining ore at the same rate Mount Isa maintains today, its managers would be thinking seriously about reserves running out around the year 2270.

That is about 200 years away from the present time.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Try 300.

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is getting better all the time. I do not know about the honourable member's mathematical prowess, but if he persists with the calumny of his Leader in suggesting that we have tried to talk this project up unduly, I refer him again to the national press in the past couple of days, and I suggest that he should closely peruse the statement made to the Stock Exchange by the companies. The statements of Mr West clearly show, as does the lack of response from the Leader of the Opposition and his comrades in the debate last week, that that enormous resource is doomed under a Labor Government.

PIE CART

Mr SLATER: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning ask the Minister of Local Government, in another place, to make representations to the Adelaide City Council for the reinstatement of the previous trading hours of the pie cart stand on North Terrace, adjacent to the Adelaide railway station? The trading hours of the pie cart for many years were from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. seven days a week. From 30 June this year the hours were reduced by the Adelaide City Council from 6 p.m. to 11.30 p.m. seven days a week. Licence fees to operate the pie cart were substantially increased—almost doubled—by the council, and the reduction in trading hours has seriously affected the viability of the operation. The proprietor has informed me that the number of customers has fallen from 7 000 a week on average to fewer than 3 000 a week on average. The pie cart is very much a part of the Adelaide scene and has a uniqueness which is a part of the Adelaide tourist scene. This might be indicated by the smiling face of the Minister of Tourism—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: It was a different pie cart.

Mr SLATER: Yes, but at the same time it indicates—

An honourable member: The same pie?

Mr SLATER: It may have been the pie in the sky that we hear about—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SLATER:—from members on the other side. The pie cart services shift workers, in particular police officers, ambulance drivers, taxi drivers, and the public generally after normal trading hours. It did service members of this House to some extent. Several persons have been retrenched from employment because of the reduction of hours, and strong public feeling on the matter has been indicated by the large number of persons who signed a petition presented to this House by the member for Hanson and me. I believe that this is a matter of public interest, and I ask the Minister to undertake to make representations to the Adelaide City Council to restore the trading hours to those that were previously applicable.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I know the member for Gilles is missing his floaters. I know also that this matter has caused a certain amount of concern. I will refer to my colleague some of the saucy points the honourable member has raised and ask him to bring down a report.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr ASHENDEN: Is the Minister of Industrial Affairs aware of alleged levels of unemployment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition in an article published in the *News* on Monday 26 July, under the heading '15 per cent unemployment hits 25 suburbs'? The report states:

Twenty-five Adelaide suburbs had been hit by increases in unemployment of more than 15 per cent in the past year, the Opposition Leader (Mr Bannon) claimed today . . . In some areas

the increase in people's receiving unemployment benefits had been higher than 25 per cent.

Later in the article he refers to the suburbs hardest hit, including (and he chose two from my electorate; I am sure that is more than a coincidence) Holden Hill (26.3 per cent) and St Agnes (32.4 per cent). Incredibly the article then goes on to state:

Mr Bannon said the figures did not show the level of unemployment.

I have been advised by the Bureau of Statistics that there is no population record that can allow the calculations put forward by the Leader of the Opposition to be accurately determined. I have also been advised that the figures do not match records held by the Department of Social Security.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: This information supports the incredulity with which the article was greeted by my constituents. Can the Minister therefore provide information on the true situation that exists in relation to unemployment?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: At the outset, I would say that the figures presented by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday had no credibility, just like the Leader of the Opposition himself. The overall picture painted yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition is entirely false. The only way to accurately assess what has occurred regarding unemployment in this State is to take overall figures supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, and those figures show that in the last year unemployment in South Australia has increased by 2.9 per cent, not the 25 per cent that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to suggest as a representative figure.

Mr Bannon: I said 'in those suburbs!'

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I will come to what your figures show shortly. Unemployment in South Australia has increased by 2.9 per cent, not the 25 per cent that the Leader of the Opposition is trying to suggest by using selective figures. Unemployment for the same period throughout the rest of Australia has increased by 27 per cent. Why did he not pick New South Wales, where unemployment has increased by almost 50 per cent under a Labor Government in the same time? The Leader has tried to suggest, by expressing his figures in such a way, that Holden Hill, for instance, is suffering from unemployment amounting to about 26 per cent—you do not quite say that but that is the way it comes over.

Mr Bannon: I didn't say that.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: No, but that is what comes over by reading your article. The Leader has implied that unemployment at Holden Hill was 26.3 per cent, when we all know that that is not true. But that is what he tried to suggest in this report. He then suggested that a certain level of increase has occurred at St Agnes—

Mr Bannon: It's all been fixed up by the Minister—no worries.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister of Industrial Affairs has the call.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: It is interesting that the Leader of the Opposition gets very toey when one starts to reveal the extent to which he has tried to deceive the people of South Australia. The next point is that he quoted the increase at St Agnes at 32.4 per cent and we all know that he has based that on postcodes. But there are several other suburbs included under the same postcode, so it is again quite misleading for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest that that figure represents what occurred in St Agnes because, in fact, that figure of an apparent increase of 32.4 per cent reflects a number of suburbs and not just the one suburb.

The next point is that some of the figures are very small. Some of them are incredibly small, and to take one post code and to work out an exact percentage increase and to suggest that that reflects what has occurred in the outer

suburbs of Adelaide is extremely inaccurate, extremely deceiving, and not fitting of any politician of this Parliament.

If he has any credibility at all, the Leader of the Opposition will use the Australian bureau figures, and those figures show a 2.9 per cent increase in unemployment in the last year, and it shows that South Australia is in fact the best State in Australia in terms of holding the line. Now, talking of a 2.9 per cent increase, we talk of actual increase in numbers. In actual percentage terms that is an increase of about .2 of 1 per cent.

HOUSING INTEREST RATES

Mrs SOUTHCOTT: I direct my question to the Premier in his capacity as Treasurer. Will he seek an assurance from the South Australian building societies during the course of the current negotiations that, if any further interest rate increases are approved, they will be passed on to the mortgagees with the option of extending the period of the mortgage and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Indeed, it is a great pleasure to hear the familiar question asked in the familiar form coming from the honourable member from Mitcham, particularly as we so often heard it from her predecessor: 'If not, why not.' The advisory committee which is looking at the application which has been made by one building society has not yet completed its deliberations as was reported earlier this week because it will be discussing the matter further tomorrow. But I would like to make the point to the honourable member, because I think it was before she came into this place, that it has been the Government's policy at all times to speak not only to the building society members but to members of the banks and other financial institutions to make sure that they treat the effects of interest rate rises in the most sympathetic way possible. Indeed, I am satisfied from what I have had reported to me that they have taken every opportunity to restructure loans and, indeed, to increase the period of the loan in every case of difficulty that has come to them. It has not been successful in every case, but as I understand it they have adopted this attitude and obviously, when one considers it, it is in their own interests to do so.

It would be inappropriate for me, at this stage, to comment on what is likely to be the outcome of the meeting of the building society advisory committee tomorrow, and I am sure the honourable member would not expect me to do so. But I can give her an assurance that this Government will continue to ask finance houses and finance institutions of all kinds to be as sympathetic and helpful as they possibly can to mitigate the effects of interest rises which are already becoming very difficult for many people and to consider that matter further if there should be any interest rate increases in the future.

RYE GRASS TOXICITY

Mr GUNN: My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and I ask him: is his department in a position to supply assistance to the agricultural and particularly the merino sheep industry to control the problems caused by rye grass toxicity?

This disease, which began near Black Springs on the border of your electorate, Mr Speaker, and my electorate in the Mid North, is spreading rapidly across the State. At least 10 000 hectares are now affected. To this date, about 6 500 sheep and 230 head of cattle have died because of the disease. I understand that the Merino Breeders Association has undertaken to provide funds to assist in the

control of this disease. I would be pleased if the Minister could inform me what his department will do about this matter.

The Hon. W. E. CHAPMAN: The Department of Agriculture is, and has been for some time, engaged in a programme of researching antitoxins to combat the annual rye grass toxicity problem identified in this State. It is true, as the honourable member has outlined, that annual rye grass toxicity has already caused the death of a significant number of livestock. This problem will not blow away with a hot northerly or with a high tide: it is with us and it is spreading in this State and, indeed, interstate.

It is a serious matter and in that respect this year the Government intends to subsidise the funding that has recently been offered by the livestock producers in this State to add to our programme contingent to employ specifically a bacteriologist to assist in the programme. I believe that it is appropriate to acknowledge the offer that has been made by the Merino Breeders Association of South Australia, which has undertaken to raise \$10 000 positively to assist this campaign. The colleagues of the members of that association in other specific fields of the livestock industry have been called on to contribute to this special programme funding, and we look forward to their contribution. This year the State will match the funding to speed up this programme investigation of annual rye grass toxicity and its effects on the rural community.

SALISBURY INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr PLUNKETT: Regarding the protracted dispute involving the Salisbury council, has the attention of the Minister of Industrial Affairs been drawn to statements made by the *de facto* Town Clerk of Salisbury, a Dr McMenemy, attacking the South Australian Industrial Commission and accusing it of succumbing to terrorist tactics and being biased? Will the Minister inform the House what steps he has taken or proposes to take to ensure that such vicious attacks on the Industrial Commission do not occur again?

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: Can I indicate from the outset that I have received a number of detailed reports on the dispute. In fact, I have talked to some of the men who are involved in that dispute, who have expressed their views to me and have said what they would like to occur in this dispute. Those men have indicated that there appears to be a lot of heat involved. Those employees, who are on the job and who are involved in the strike, have stated that it appears that some wild claims have been made by the trade union.

It is fairly important that the heat be taken out of the situation, which means that perhaps both the council and the trade union will have to retract or back down from where they currently stand. This matter is currently before the Supreme Court, as the honourable member should realise. I believe it is most inappropriate to pass judgment on people or situations in regard to this dispute.

Mr Plunkett: They were reinstated last Friday. I don't know whether the Minister is aware of that.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: I am fully aware that the matter is still before the courts, and the honourable member should realise that.

It is unfortunate that he should stand in this place and try to criticise one side of the dispute in a particular way. The honourable member has particularly criticised a statement made by one of the parties. I am indicating that, having talked to the men involved who have been on strike and who believe there is too much heat and wrong on behalf of both the council and the trade union involved,

the men would like the two parties to sit down and resolve the issue as quickly as possible. I will not comment further because the matter is currently before the courts. I am sure that if unfair comments have been passed against the Industrial Commission, the President of the Industrial Commission is only too capable of standing up and defending those comments under the jurisdiction of his court, as he has the right to do.

HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr BECKER: Will the Deputy Premier say what action the Government has taken to implement the Government's pre-election promise to assist disabled persons to purchase motor vehicles at concessional rates? Our health policy released in August 1979 stated:

Where a disabled person needs a motor vehicle, we will provide procedures by which such a vehicle may be purchased by that person through the State Supply Department at a concession price.

A constituent of mine, who is a quadriplegic with a paraplegic wife, had to purchase a new motor vehicle recently which was needed for them to obtain gainful employment. I checked with the Sales Tax Office of the Federal Government and was advised that persons who were to qualify for a sales tax exemption on new vehicles must be unable to use public transport and that it is necessary to have a medical examination by the Department of Social Security to determine whether they are incapable of using public transport. The vehicle must be used to travel to and from gainful employment and they must be employed or produce an undertaking from a prospective employer that a job is available.

On further contact with the department I was advised that my constituent and his wife were previously employed at a sheltered workshop and were receiving \$10 each per week. The department advised that sales tax exemption could be considered for persons employed in sheltered workshops but there is no hard ruling on it and they would look sympathetically at each individual case and judge it on its merits. I further understand that sales tax exemptions are now given to certain disabled students who can be considered to be gainfully employed if in receipt of a social security pension and also an amount of money in consideration of the fact that the person is undertaking formal study, that is, for a TEAS allowance. The problem with my constituents is that to enable them to obtain more rewarding employment they need a suitable motor vehicle for mobility. I therefore ask the Minister whether he can inform the House how many disabled persons have been assisted by the Government's policy and whether my constituents would benefit under our proposal? What other benefits are offered by the Government as has been proposed?

The Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY: First, I commend the honourable member for his continued interest in the question of assistance for the handicapped. Some of his efforts are well known to me and to the public. I recall, after the State election, being reminded by the honourable member of that election undertaking. The Government did develop a scheme whereby Government motor vehicles (secondhand vehicles which the Government intended to dispose of) could become available for handicapped people. We developed a policy whereby the normal procedures of quitting Government vehicles and selling them at auction would not apply in this case and vehicles would be made available for direct purchase by handicapped people. That policy has been developed. It is also interesting to note that we had an inquiry from the previous Labor Government in Tasmania. It heard of this scheme and asked for details about it from us. I understand that it has copied the scheme which was developed here.

The groundrules for the scheme were introduced in October 1980 and vehicles are available for purchase by or on behalf of disabled people, who, because of their disability, are not able to use public transport, as the honourable member said. A certificate of impairment completed by a medical practitioner has been required. Special cases, though, which do not meet this particular criterion will be supported by the Australian Council for the Rehabilitation of the Disabled. In other words, if that organisation is prepared to support the application, then a person can be accommodated.

As the honourable member mentioned, the scheme is operated by the Supply and Tender Board, which is responsible to me. The Salvage Officer, State Supply Division, sets the reserve prices at which vehicles are to be sold, and there has been no complaint in that regard. My understanding is that thus far under the scheme we have accommodated five handicapped people. If there is any special case such as the one cited by the honourable member, honourable members should give me the details so that the matter can be followed up. The second criterion that I have mentioned today might accommodate this particular inquiry. Again, I repeat that I think it is a very good scheme and the Government is only too happy to assist handicapped people in this way.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr KENEALLY: Will the Minister of Water Resources say whether, in its pre-1979 election policy, the Opposition Liberal Party deliberately misled the people of South Australia in relation to water rates, or whether there was a miscalculation caused by carelessness or incompetence? In its election policy the Liberal Party promised to both, 'continue to implement the filtration of Adelaide's water supply', and at the same time, 'arrest increases in water charges'. Yet, last week the Minister said:

Undoubtedly, the cost of filtering not only Adelaide's water supply but also that of northern towns, the Barossa Valley and Yorke Peninsula, would have to be paid for somewhere along the line, and the increasing costs will to some degree offset the deficit which will for ever increase as a result of the water filtration programme.

The Minister also said, in part:

The cost of water filtration will be significantly above the supply of unfiltered water. That, I think, has been accepted by a large group of thinking people in South Australia. They appreciate that those costs have to be met.

Those statements are quite contrary to the pre-election policy, as increases in water charges in South Australia under the present Administration have amounted to 54 per cent, far in excess of inflation. The promise and the performance do not match up.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: There is absolutely no doubt whatsoever that under the present Government costs have been contained to an absolute minimum. One has only to consider the extent to which growth of the department has been contained as far as employees are concerned. Under the present Government, services have been maintained at a very high level, yet we have actually been able to reduce by 1 500 the number of weekly-paid employees and staff members during the period of three years. It is quite obvious that, had that action not been taken, we in South Australia would have been confronted with exactly the same situation with which New South Wales is currently confronted, namely, massive increases in the cost of water, plus a massive deficit, which I think is somewhere in the vicinity of \$150 000 000.

The honourable member has referred to increases, and I think he highlighted the various increases that have occurred since the present Government has been in office. I would simply remind the honourable member of the increases which occurred in 1975 and 1976 during the time of the

previous Government and which amounted to 41.5 per cent during those two years. I point out to honourable members that there have been no increases of that magnitude during the past three years.

Also, this Government has certainly adhered to its programme of water filtration and, what is more, it has substantially increased that commitment for water filtration by making a commitment to the northern towns without reducing the water filtration programme for the metropolitan area. A further \$34 000 000 commitment above what was committed before we came into Government has been made. We have been able to absorb that commitment and provide for the people of the northern towns as well as a large proportion of South Australia not only in the northern agricultural areas but also on Yorke Peninsula, and the advent of the Swan Reach and Stockwell filtration plant will provide filtered water to most of the Barossa Valley.

We have contained the increases in the cost of water. We have been able to expand the water filtration programme in this State and when one considers that, even with the works that are in hand, water is delivered to the majority of the people of South Australia at a cost of 37 cents per tonne, it is seen that that is still a remarkable effort by the Engineering and Water Supply Department in this State.

Mr Keneally: Thirty seven cents a tonne?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: Quite obviously, the member for Stuart has never stopped to work that out. The water is treated and in many instances it is filtered and it is chemically treated for the safety of the people of South Australia and delivered to their doors for 37 cents a tonne. That is probably the best value for money that I can think of. I think that this indicates quite clearly that this Government has not only contained the cost of water but has significantly expanded its commitment to provide filtered water to the majority of South Australians.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BANNON: During Question Time, in response to a question from the member for Todd, the Minister of Industrial Affairs claimed that I had used false and misleading figures that were not derived from a proper source when releasing a press statement pointing out that 25 Adelaide suburbs had been hit by increases in unemployment of more than 15 per cent over the past 12 months.

My statement was quite correct. Contrary to what the Minister claimed I was implying, it was a statement relating to the increase in the rate of unemployment in those suburbs. The figures were based on official Department of Social Security figures.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That's nonsense.

Mr BANNON: I have the computer printout which obviously has not been—

Mr Ashenden: They don't print them in suburbs, so that is not true.

Mr BANNON: Let me finish, and you will be enlightened.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a personal explanation, not a debate.

Mr BANNON: The figures are official Department of Social Security figures of persons receiving unemployment benefits. The latest available are those of May 1982 and they were the figures used. They show that for South Australia as a whole in the period May 1981 to May 1982 there was

an increase of 12.6 per cent in the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits, from 39 747 to 44 770. Apparently, members opposite are not aware that those figures are broken down into postcode districts, which means that in fact based on those postcode districts suburban counts can be obtained. Those were the calculations and figures that were presented.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: VIBRATION PROBLEM

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr HAMILTON: During my Address in Reply speech last evening I was attempting to relate a problem that a constituent of mine was encountering owing to vibration problems associated with an adjoining factory. The Minister of Industrial Affairs interjected, saying:

That is the one you would not help.

Clearly, the Minister is ignorant of the facts. First, my file reveals that, since 16 October 1981, I have been in contact with my constituent not only about this problem but also about many other problems she is experiencing. This morning I telephoned my constituent at 11.50—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr HAMILTON: I asked my constituent whether she was satisfied with the way in which I had acted on her behalf. I related to her the comments by the Minister of Industrial Affairs. She pointed out to me—

Mr Randall: Where's the copy of your speech? I haven't seen it yet.

Mr Hemmings: Shut up!

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Napier can assist the decorum of this House if he is a little less uncouth in his language.

Mr HAMILTON: My constituent told me that I had done everything possible to assist her in regard to the problems in her current plight. My constituent also recalled to my attention the fact that I had contacted the Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Woodville, as well as the ward councillors involved, and had picked her and another person up and driven them to the Ombudsman's office. I drove them many times to places to try to assist them. My constituent also pointed out that she was most annoyed by the statement by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and that she would like to confront him on this matter, at any time he chose to meet her. So much for the credibility of the Minister of Industrial Affairs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: In comments made by the Leader of the Opposition in his personal explanation I felt that statement that he made could be taken to imply that the information I had given to the Minister in my question was incorrect. I would like to ensure that the House is quite clear that I want the truth of these figures brought forward so that there is no doubt that what I was putting forward was in fact the case.

First, it is impossible for the Leader of the Opposition to have obtained the figures that he said he obtained relating

to St Agnes, because I have been advised that the figures are not broken down by suburb but are broken down by postcode areas, which include a number of suburbs.

Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition cannot extrapolate the figures in the way that he was done because, as he would well know, St Agnes is one of the most rapidly growing areas in the north-eastern suburbs. Therefore, it must be expected that in an area that has more than trebled in the past three years the number of unemployed persons would have increased and therefore the number of unemployed persons in that area must be affected by that rapid growth.

Thirdly, the sample used by the Leader is so small that he cannot possibly draw the inferences that he has drawn, and the figures he has relating to the number of persons receiving unemployment benefits does not reflect a growth in the number of unemployed persons. I believe that the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition reflect most unfairly on the points I was making.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 27 July. Page 192.)

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): In rising to support the motion, I wish first to refer to the initial part of His Excellency's Speech in which he expressed regret at the death of two former members of Parliament. I refer specifically to the passing of the Hon. Sir John McLeay and the Hon. Jim Dunford, as we all knew him. Without any disrespect to His Excellency, I believe that there has been an omission in relation to the custom previously followed in that I understand that, earlier this year, the Hon. Cyril Hutchens died, yet the Speech contains no reference to his passing. I do not allege anything on the part of His Excellency, but there appears to have been some failure of the system in that due recognition is normally given to such matters in the Speech.

The Governor's Speech, as is customary, covered many matters relating to the Government function in South Australia. There were references to the provision of power and to the agricultural scene and, as one would expect, a wide-ranging list of legislation that is likely to be introduced during the present session. In that respect, I should like to take some time of the House to bring to the attention of members some of the less credible attempts by the Minister of Mines and Energy to mislead the House and the people of South Australia in the statements that he often makes, and particularly a Ministerial statement made yesterday. That statement purported to inform the House of costs of electricity in South Australia as compared with the cost of the same commodity in other States.

The Minister went on to say, in making a comparison with New South Wales, that there had been a down-turn in sales (I believe he was referring to white goods, although it was not all that clear) as a result of the failure of the Wran Government (these are the Minister's words) to properly manage the provision of electricity in New South Wales. The Minister in that instance was most misleading and unfair, and he was not telling the truth. He was referring to the power problems which have been experienced recently in New South Wales and which have been given some press coverage in recent times. Quite unfairly, the Minister set out to put the blame on the Wran Government, attributing to it any problem associated with the supply of electricity in New South Wales.

What are the facts? Knowing well the Minister's penchant for doing this kind of thing in the House, I sought to do some checking. In the proceedings of the Legislative Council

in New South Wales on 24 November 1981, a question from the Hon. E. P. Pickering was answered by the Hon. Paul Landa, the Minister charged with the responsibility for energy in New South Wales. The question was as follows:

How many power generators are currently out of service in New South Wales and where are they located?

The reply given in the House by the Minister and reported in *Hansard* was as follows:

I can advise the honourable member clearly: at Liddell three units are out of service with serious mechanical design faults and another unit will go out of operation tonight for boiler repairs and will remain out of service for three to five days.

That is at least 1 500 megawatts of generating capacity out of order. The Minister continued:

To clear up any apprehension the honourable member may feel, I hasten to add that the design fault experienced at that station is attributable to manufacture. It is lamentable that that station bought that equipment. It has proved to be less than satisfactory. Liddell Power Station is the one station for which the equipment was ordered by the previous Askin Liberal Party and Country Party Government.

The Minister went on to explain the efforts he had made to try to see what was the problem and what needed to be done to improve the situation. In reply to a subsequent question from the Hon. E. P. Pickering, the Minister said:

The public is entitled to know. There will be a thorough investigation of the former Government's purchase of the equipment. I do not make any allegations at this stage. New South Wales is suffering the sins of equipment purchased that perhaps further investigation might reveal should not have been purchased.

The Minister went on to say that he would get further technical information in response to the question from Mr Pickering. Clearly, if there is any blame to be attributed in the matter of New South Wales power supplies, the blame should be sheeted home not to the Wran Government, as the Minister tried to do in this misleading Ministerial statement, but to the Askin Government of that earlier period.

I suspect that the Minister of Mines and Energy well knew that, because the provision of generating equipment of 500 megawatts capacity is not something that is done by getting on the telephone and asking for equipment to be delivered next week. In such a situation, the ordering time is probably anywhere from five years to possibly as long as eight years, and to try to put the blame on a subsequent Government in relation to equipment that no doubt was bought in good faith by the previous Askin Government is reprehensible.

Mr Trainer: One would hope so.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Well, I would expect that, whoever is in Government, technical officers of a department are involved. In my experience here I have never had cause to doubt the integrity, honesty or ability of technical officers employed in departments in this State. I suspect the situation is no different in New South Wales, Queensland or wherever else one would go in Australia. I believe the Minister was particularly wrong in trying to put to the House such a misleading piece of information in order to justify some argument that he wished to put forward. The opening of the Ministerial statement read as follows:

I wish to inform the House that I have been provided with figures by the Electricity Trust which show that, on average, the electricity tariffs in South Australia are the lowest of any mainland State.

Such a table might well be capable of being prepared, and in fact it has been and is appended to the Ministerial statement, but to suggest that that is all that need be considered is not all correct. It would have been more pertinent to the public of South Australia and to members of this House if the Minister had provided a table showing the rates of increase in respective States since the present Liberal Government in South Australia came to office. I suspect if that had been done a somewhat different picture would be

presented to the House. Possibly, that is why it has not been done.

The Minister went on to say that he was tabling those figures, bringing them to the attention of the House, because the Leader of the Opposition had made constant efforts to suggest to the public that electricity tariffs in South Australia are much higher than they should be, or than those applying in other parts of Australia. The Leader has never said that, and I challenge the Minister to demonstrate that. What the Leader has very properly been doing is pointing out that the price of electricity in South Australia is a very important and vital matter, as it is in other States, because of its effect on industry, and its effect on the ordinary home consumer, and so on, who, in many cases must use that commodity. The Leader would be remiss if he was not closely watching this situation and bringing the question of increased electricity prices constantly to the attention of members of the House and the public. The Minister rather shot his own argument down in the fourth paragraph when he said:

Indeed, it will be a matter of fundamental importance to the future economic development of South Australia that we maintain the efficiency and competitive cost of electricity generation for both domestic and industrial purposes.

The Minister was saying what I have just put to the House in a rather simpler form. Of course it is a vital matter in the running of the State affecting everyone in the State. The Leader ought to be watch dog and guardian in such a matter and he has been very properly doing just that. The Minister confirms that in the fourth paragraph, which I have just read. The Minister went on to say:

I point out, however, that the alternative to a consistent and well managed structure of tariffs will be a decline in the efficiency of our power system which, in the long term, will cost all consumers much more to rectify, as New South Wales is now finding out.

We have dealt with the New South Wales situation, and I suspect that in future the Minister might get a bit more research done before he tries to put blame where it does not belong. It is the other part of the statement that I am concerned with. At no time have I ever heard the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the Electricity Trust should have other than a well-managed structure of charging tariffs, allowing the trust to continue its wellknown good record of performance in South Australia, as well as accommodating the smallest, most humble home consumer and allowing the largest industrial user in South Australia to stay in business.

I mentioned earlier that the Minister implied that a downturn in sales in New South Wales (which he claimed was the fault of the Wran Government but I have just demonstrated that it can be attributed to the earlier Government—the Askin Government—which was not a Labor Government) was causing some problem with sales of whitegoods. He did not go into any detail, I suspect, once again, because it gets a little harder to sustain the argument as distinct from the statement. It is quite all right for the Minister—he just makes the statement and does not back it up, but leaves it to lie. We are going to examine a little further what he actually said. Is he claiming, for example, that our South Australian whitegoods industry is being affected in respect of refrigerator sales because of some shortage of electricity in New South Wales? If he is doing that, why has he not proved it in the statement?

My understanding is that one large manufacturer here, Kelvinators, has sold fewer than 20 refrigerators in a recent (I think it is two months) period. Is that the fault of electricity shortages in New South Wales, or not? Is this the time of the year in New South Wales when one is normally rushing out to buy a refrigerator? I suspect that it is not. I suspect that people tend to change their refrigerators, or order a new one, at a time when it becomes somewhat more topical

to have some means of cooling beverages and food in the home. But that is what I am demonstrating to the House. The Minister, almost in a throw-away line, puts it in the statement and leaves that impression, anyway, in the minds of the public of South Australia, an impression that is totally incorrect.

The Minister of Mines and Energy is at least consistent in this House. Because the inaccuracies and half truths that he utters demonstrate the sort of behaviour in which he is prepared to indulge, I believe that it will come as no surprise to members, if we examine further activities of the Minister, when they see the sort of credibility he is building up in relation to other aspects of his portfolio. The Minister has said, more than once and as recently as yesterday, that the Labor Government in South Australia had no liquids policy. He was referring to the liquids scheme which is coming to fruition at Stony Point and Moomba, involving liquids from the gas and oil fields in the Cooper Basin. He said that the Labor Party never had any policy, and 'Everything that is happening up there is lovely and it is all due to me and to the fact that we have a Liberal Government in South Australia.' I suppose the Minister thinks that if he says it often enough somebody might believe him. We do not believe it; I do not think that any member in this House believes it.

Mr Oswald: People outside do.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Well, if the people outside believe it, they are being misled by the Minister. The election policy prior to the 1979 election (which is available in the library in the form of a press release from the Hon. Hugh Hudson for anyone to look at, and I will not take up the time of the House by waving it around) stated that every assistance will be given to provide for a liquids scheme in South Australia to handle the Cooper Basin liquids. There is only one difference between what actually happened and Liberal Party policy on this matter. At that time the then Minister favoured a scheme that involved the refinery being located at Lonsdale.

Let the Minister get around that. Those are the facts. I discussed this question with the manager at Lonsdale only recently: I made the same statement to him as I have just made to the House, and he agreed with it. Apparently, there was dialogue, and certainly there was a policy. For the Minister to suggest that it is solely because of him and the Liberal Government that that scheme is making headway and coming to fruition is absolute rubbish.

Mr Hemmings: It is dishonest.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I will not go that far. I may say that it is misleading but, as members were called on not to impute improper motives to members on the other side, I do not say that the Minister deliberately misled the House. I might think that, but I will not say it. It is a fact that the information that the Minister put out was misleading.

Let us further consider the kind of thing that the Minister has been saying. According to the Minister, after a reign (if that is the right word) of two years and nine months (it seems longer than that—it is like purgatory) of the present Liberal Government, everything is coming up rosy in South Australia in the minerals and energy field. The Minister went on record as saying (as did the Premier) that the Government has produced literature inviting people to invest in South Australia because we have oodles of power, and is trying to poach possible industrial enterprises from New South Wales. How is it that we have that power? What has the Minister or the Liberal Government done in relation to the present supply of electricity in South Australia which they can claim could not have occurred unless they were in Government? The answer is simple—nothing.

The construction of the new capacity Northern Power Station was already a going entity. All existing stations were already operating or about to come on stream (in the case

of the last generator at Torrens Island). What has the Government done that it can say that it is doing it all, that one can get better electricity in South Australia than anywhere else, and that everything is due solely to the Government? I do not believe that people will swallow that altogether, but it is so misleading that it should be corrected whenever the opportunity arises.

There are many more examples of the Minister in action. The Minister stated, in answer to a question that I raised with him at least 12 months ago, that the Government has an active l.p.g. policy. I asked the Minister what the Government is doing about fostering the use of l.p.g. in a State which produces l.p.g. at the refinery at Lonsdale and in which further very large quantities of l.p.g. will be produced at the fractionalisation plant that is to be completed at Stony Point. The Minister at that time mumbled something like, 'We are a private enterprise Government. It is sort of going along. We might get a couple of buses to try it out.' That is the sort of thing that the Minister said, indicating the Government's policy.

Is that a sensible policy to follow in a State that will have such a large quantity of l.p.g.? Does that sort of policy make energy sense to the people of South Australia when they are told that we will export to Japan 1 250 000 tonnes of l.p.g. a year as soon as it starts to come on stream? Should there be a change in the arrangements that presently apply in regard to oil from the Middle East? We could be back to where we were a couple of years ago with shortages of oil looming, vast price increases in the offering, and so on. We have an alternative fuel which could be used and which is already being used in a limited way by fleet owners, taxi drivers, and other people, thus proving its worth and its economics. Taxi drivers would not use l.p.g. if it did not pay them to do so. We have yet to hear a statement from the Minister about a sensible policy in this matter.

Mr Hemmings: He has Roxby in his eyes.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: My colleague's interjection is relevant. The Minister and the Premier continue to trumpet Roxby. They say that things might be a bit crook in South Australia, but we should not worry too much because, once Roxby is off the ground, it will solve all the State's energy, jobs and money problems, but the Minister does not elaborate. As soon as Roxby comes on stream, we are told that there will be no worry.

Almost daily the tune is becoming louder. Today the Minister informed the House that the project involves at least 200 years. It began as a likely 50-year mine, but the odds went up and it became a 100-year mine: now it is a 200-year mine. The last fellow whom I heard talk like that, so help me God, was Adolf Hitler when he talked about a 1 000-year reich. Why does not the Minister put this matter in its proper context?

The Hon. H. Allison: It happens to be the world's largest mine.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Here we go again. One only has to mention Roxby to get a tune. There is no difficulty whatsoever.

The Hon. H. Allison: Didn't you hear the Deputy Leader quoting? Everyone interstate seems to think that it is good.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: If that is said two or three more times, we will get a complete suite. We will need a whole orchestra instead of one or two soloists on the front bench. It is absolute nonsense to carry on in this way when the rest of the State is coming down around the Government's ears.

Mr Oswald: Are you going to close the mine?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Does the honourable member want me to quote the poll which was released today and which shows how the people perceive the present Government and the Opposition? There has been a concerted

attempt by Government members to misrepresent and distort the position in respect of this project.

Members opposite should not get too carried away: it is still only a project. The mine is not yet producing 150 000 tonnes of copper. The Minister stated today that that is a lot of copper. I could use another word in relation to copper, but I thought that you, Mr Speaker, would probably object, so I did not actually amend the phrase. The Minister is serving no useful purpose for the people of this State by doing this, and I suggest that, if the member for Morphett does not believe me, perhaps he will listen to Sir Arvi Parbo, who is saying, 'Will you cut out being ridiculous in the political sphere about this sort of matter—'

Mr Oswald: He was referring to your side.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: He was referring to all of us. There is no doubt that he was referring to all politicians. I am not trying to single out members on one side or another. Sir Arvi Parbo was saying that this matter does not deserve to be handled in this way.

Mr Oswald: All you have to do is let it proceed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member says that we should let it proceed. Was he asleep when a certain indenture went through the Parliament in relation to this matter?

Mr Oswald: You have not committed yourself to letting it proceed. Tell us today that you will let it proceed.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member knows the stand that is being followed by my Party in this matter. I will explain it to him again if he wishes. There is no way in which my Party has stopped what is occurring at that location at present. It is very interesting to look at what happened in this matter a day or two after the passage of that famous indenture. The week before, it was the pie-in-the-sky 50-year mine. It has now got up to 200 years. I am frightened to get up tomorrow, as it may be a 400-year project the way it has been going lately. Some rationality is needed in the matter and not the rantings and carrying on of the Minister.

Mr Oswald: Why not let it proceed after the feasibility study?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Has the honourable member spoken? So few listen to him that one does not know whether or not he has spoken. It may well be that he will have his opportunity. I invite him to take it when his turn comes to be called by the Speaker. I will not be diverted by the honourable member in respect of this matter, about which he probably knows very little. At least some of the members on the other side of the House served on the select committee and did learn a little along the way. I have seen no evidence of the honourable member having any knowledge in the area. I do not know whether he has ever been up to the mine. Has he ever visited and inspected the mine shaft? Apparently not. That is what one has come to expect from the honourable member—talking without basis of fact or knowledge. If that is how he wants to operate, I do not mind.

Mr Oswald interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There have been other similar arguments put forward by the Minister of Mines and Energy. He says to the people of South Australia, and unfortunately to us here, 'Thank God you have had a Liberal Government for the last 2¼ years, because things have been so much better for you, particularly in the energy and mining field. The great bonanza that was going to come to your State has already come,' which he so often implies is due solely to himself and his Government. If one examines such statements, it may be argued that he is justified in making them. He claims that there has been

a great increase in mineral exploration in South Australia which he attributes solely to a change in the State Government. Something must have been done by the Government to get that increased activity.

What has the Government done in its 2¾ years in office to get that alleged increase in activity? Governments can do legislative things. That can be helpful in the area of mineral exploration. However, if we check the House of Assembly digests in which is recorded everything legislative that happens in this place, we can see the Government's record. I refer to Bill No. 85 of 1980, which provided for an enlarged membership of ETSA and shortened terms of office of its members. That must have been a big help in the provision of energy and a tremendous help to mineral exploration! I refer also to the Gas Act Amendment Act, No. 63 of 1980. That was an administrative Bill tidying up a few matters. I am sure Western Mining was thrilled when that Bill passed the House. Bill No. 84 of 1980 was the Liquefied Petroleum Gas Subsidy Act. A member may say, 'You are not quite right—the Minister has done something about l.p.g.' However, that is not the case because that was Commonwealth-required legislation. The Commonwealth passed legislation, and it was agreed that all States would pass similar corollary legislation, so that what was contemplated in the Commonwealth Bill could happen in the States. I bet that had a wonderful and exciting effect on mineral and hydrocarbon exploration in South Australia.

To continue, Bill No. 64 of 1980 was the Motor Fuel (Temporary Restriction) Act. The Minister deserves some credit for that, but I do not think it will have much effect on whether we do much mining. However, it needed to be done in relation to possible shortages of motor spirit, and the Minister deserves some credit.

Mr Hemmings: He opposed us when we tried to do it, though.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: Perhaps he is wiser now that he is older. He has also found that things are not the same when they are different, because he is now the Minister and he is in Government. We are now up to 1981. One could say that the Government was slow in getting moving and taking up the reins. Maybe in 1981 we will see some improvement. Maybe the Government will get going legislatively and cause all these wonderful things to happen and take credit for them. What are the true facts?

There was a further Petroleum Act Amendment Act. That Act provided for licensees under the Petroleum Act to keep records and to keep the Minister and the department informed of the progress of operations and the extent of reserves and their long-term plans for development, to facilitate planning and assessment by the Government. I have news for the Minister there: that was not welcomed by hydrocarbon explorers, as I checked with at least two of them in South Australia. They said, 'We are not overly concerned about it—there are just one or two extra things we will damn well have to do.' I guess that did not cause them to go out and order three or four more drilling rigs.

I am still trying to find something that the Minister can justifiably claim was done solely by the present Government to build up a high level of mineral exploration activity in South Australia. He claims it is out of context with what has been going on in the rest of the country. Only in South Australia has this been happening, because we are so lucky to have a Liberal Government! That is what the Minister claims. Nothing could be further from the truth, as I will demonstrate shortly. However, I will not be deterred from canvassing (so that I can be fair to the Minister) the full period. Perhaps somewhere there is legislation that is helpful.

I now refer to Bill No. 84 of 1980, which was a further Motor Fuel Rationing Bill. We could not say that that would have a great deal of effect on mineral exploration or on the

hydrocarbon exploration scene. We have already covered Bill No. 62 of 1980, and we are back to the stage where there is only a change to the Pipelines Authority Act to protect the authority, but I am sure that it had nothing to do with the field to which I am referring. There was also the South Australian Gas Company's Act Amendment Act, which was a useful piece of legislation and one which we supported. The Minister deserves some credit for that. However, it does not have much effect on the mining and exploration field. That is the sum total.

Mr Hemmings: Do you think he believes in his own propaganda?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: One is not supposed to impute other than the correct motives to members opposite. I may postulate privately in my own mind but it would be better left unsaid at the moment. The Minister has been claiming that in mineral exploration South Australia is doing extremely well because there is a Liberal Government in power and, what is more, that it is well ahead of what is going on in the rest of the country. Nothing can be further from the truth, and the Minister knows it.

One can peruse the booklet *Petroleum Exploration and Development in South Australia* issued by the department in Canberra and edited by Senator Carrick. Presumably the figures will be acceptable to the Minister, as that is a Federal colleague of his. We find here that the pattern of increased petroleum exploration is Australia-wide. It involves a certain line of thinking, and it will not take long to let the House have the benefit of those figures. In 1976 petroleum exploration expenditure totalled \$49 000 000.

For 1977 a figure of \$82 000 000 is given; for 1978, \$112 000 000; for 1979, \$222 000 000; for 1980, \$290 000 000, and for 1981, \$455 000 000. I hasten to add that in this publication of the Commonwealth it has put a proviso by those figures that at the time of publication they were preliminary figures subject to minor revision. An increasing tempo in the area of petroleum exploration Australia-wide from 1976 onwards is evident. If we consider for a moment what caused that we can understand it. We know that there was a reconsideration by the Commonwealth Government in respect to old oil and new oil and the pricing structure attached to that. In point of fact that is the reason why the Stony Point liquids scheme has been able to go ahead, why the very large sums of money which needed to be borrowed and the investment that had to be organised to construct that very large undertaking were possible, namely, because of the pricing structure that will apply.

At the old oil price of a few bucks a barrel the project would never have got off the ground, but at the present price the situation is different. There are charts in the Commonwealth publication which are very useful and which show the prices that apply to various oil throughout Australia, prices which range from some \$27 to \$31. Clearly the economic situation changed dramatically during the very period about which I have been speaking and that was responsible for the increased activity with respect to the search for hydrocarbons throughout Australia. Of course, there was one place in Australia where basins were known to exist and which had been geophysically established over a long period, namely, the Cooper Basin and other basins in that area. Therefore, the petroleum explorers, who are a pretty hard-headed race and who are not nutty, realised that they ought to be operating in those areas. That is how we got an increased level of exploration activity in South Australia in respect to hydrocarbons.

I refer now to the scene in respect to minerals. I have already dealt with liquid gold, as it is called: it has been described to me in that way by the petroleum explorers, namely, that oil is liquid gold, that one parlays some money drills some holes and if one is lucky one puts a plug on it,

connects a pipe, and if there is a handy market one starts ringing up the cash register.

Mr Hemmings: And then you can plug it until the price goes higher.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: I suggest that that might not be as possible as it used to be, and I refer to the warehousing of underground reserves. The Minister might claim one tiny bit of credit for that, as members might recall that one of the requirements in an amendment to an Act which I mentioned earlier was a provision that licence holders had to provide additional information which they were not required to provide prior to that time. One of the matters involved was in relation to reserves, and the amendment was useful. I do not think that there is a lot of warehousing going on at present; it may have gone on in the past when the price was down, but the situation is now a new ball game.

I refer to the situation relating to mineral exploration in South Australia, another area for which the Minister claims sole credit and that it is solely due to his efforts, that it is due to his efforts and those of the present Liberal Government that there has been a great expansion in activity. However, what are the facts? I refer to figures which are contained in Mineral Exploration: Australia 1978-79 to 1980-81 (Australian Bureau of Statistics 8407). All States are listed, and the following figures for each financial year are given for South Australia. The total private expenditure in this State in 1977-78 was \$9 341 000; for 1978-79 it was \$10 508 000, which represents an increase of 12.5 per cent. At that time that was not the lowest increase with regard to all States—it was certainly not the highest but it was a lower figure than that of three other States and it was higher than the figures given for the remainder. For the next financial year, 1979-80, a total of \$18 877 000 was spent, representing a handsome increase, namely, 79.6 per cent. For the following year, 1980-81, there was a total expenditure of \$26 853 000, which was not as great an increase as that which occurred in the subsequent year but which is one of the years for which the Minister is claiming credit so, perhaps, he ought to be more selective in the future. The increase for the year 1980-81 was 42.2 per cent.

The increase in expenditure from 1978-79 to 1980-81 in South Australia was 155.5 per cent. That sounds great and I have no quarrel with the fact that there was an increase, but if one refers to the percentage increase applying to all the other States one finds that South Australia's increase was the second lowest of all the States and the lowest of the five major mainland States, and well below the Australian average. This is an area about which the Minister has been trumpeting, claiming some special credit for the increase in mineral exploration, as though it had occurred only in South Australia and only as a result of the present Government's efforts: nothing could be further from the truth.

Another matter that I want to canvass briefly concerns the matter of light rail transit. All members know that there was a proposal earlier for the construction of a light rail system in the north-eastern suburbs which was subsequently supplanted by the present O'Bahn bus scheme which was put forward and supported by the present Government. I simply point out to the Minister of Transport and those of his officers who will read *Hansard* that it is possible to have another view on this matter, and that even on Australian experience it might be that the Minister will feel that he has not necessarily made the best decision. In an article entitled 'Success notched by Melbourne light rail', by D. W. Lees, contained in the publication *Australian Energy Review*, March 1982 (and this article refers to contemporaneous experience, although it is not hot off the press), reference is made to experience in Melbourne concerning a modern tram system. In fact the article is accompanied by a photograph of a tram and a statement is made 'Up with

the best of technology and efficiency'. Those who have been on the modern Melbourne trams would agree that they provide a very fine service and are an excellent example of light traction and that they do a good job in moving passengers who need to use public transport in Victoria.

Mr Lynn Arnold: No pollution, either.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The article goes on to illustrate that very point and to illustrate energy-saving features of electric traction vehicles, including the braking system which can be employed which actually takes account of the fact that the machine is propelled electrically.

The article also points out that the system it is speaking of effectively serves the outer suburban areas and operates cheaply. A review was conducted before the decision was taken in Victoria in respect of this system that a first-class public transport system was essential for large urban areas. The fact that the use of a private motor car should not be encouraged and no doubt other factors not contained in the article, such as rapidly increasing costs of liquid fuels, were taken into consideration before a decision was made for the upgrading of tram routes. As we all know, Melbourne has had tram services for many years. The braking system to which I was referring is known as 'regenerative braking' and the energy contained in the moving tram can actually be put to good use, when it has to be stopped as part of the braking system. It is a conservation of the energy source.

I want now to refer to another aspect of the activities of the Minister of Mines and Energy. On 17 October 1981 in the *Advertiser* an article by the Finance Editor had the headline '\$100 000 000 royalties likely' which related to the royalties expected from the Roxby Downs project and the liquids scheme at Stony Point. John Field, the writer of the article, said:

Mr Goldsworthy told the 120 delegates at the A.I.C.M. seminar that the transfer of South Australia's country railways to the Commonwealth would deny the State the opportunity of financial return from resources development.

He said indenture arrangements on resource development could include a commitment to use specific State Government facilities such as ports and railways.

'It is to be regretted that, because of the transfer of our country railways to the Commonwealth by the former Government, it is not possible for South Australia to seek a commitment from resource developers to use State railways,' Mr Goldsworthy said.

Implicit in that statement was the fact that a charge could be made for the carriage of the commodity. The Minister quite clearly showed in October last year that he knew that because he included it in his remarks to a seminar. I ask the Minister to explain what, knowing that, was included in the Roxby Downs indenture to make up for the fact that he had pointed out that that would be a responsible action. Having the perspicacity to note, so the Minister claimed, that there was a defect in South Australia in relation to these matters in that we might not gain certain moneys or royalties (he was aware of the fact and since then an indenture has been negotiated) I wonder what component the Minister managed to get included in that indenture that will provide an alternative or compensating component for the royalty structure. I think we will have to wait for a long time for the answer but I will be happy to receive one.

Finally, I would like to refer to a booklet entitled 'Uranium—A Nuclear Dilemma'. This is a concerned examination of nuclear energy and its consequences that has been published by the Social Justice Commission and the Christian Education Committee of the Synod of South Australia, Uniting Church in Australia, as recently as May this year. It contains much information, arguments and fact to which I will not refer at this time. It also contains a paper entitled 'A Scientist's View' which was apparently given some time before the preparation of this booklet. It was written by Dr

Lindsay Dodd, who is the Senior Lecturer in Mathematical Physics at the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I went to school with him.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: From reading what Dr Dodd has said in the paper I am impressed with the logic of his thinking. In relation to this whole matter that we have argued, thrashed out and done to death in this House for many years, a particularly interesting point put forward by Dr Dodd which had not occurred to me before is that one needs to pose this question. I invite the member for Mawson who was so interested before, to continue showing the same interest. Dr Dodd asks:

Even given satisfactory answers to the technical problems of nuclear power, are our political and social institutions sufficiently developed to control it adequately?

Dr Dodd is saying that there may well be technical answers to many of the problems that have been so often raised either in support of or against the use of nuclear power but, given that, are there technical and social institutions sufficiently developed to control it adequately? He has drawn to my attention what I have been concerned about but in a less organised way. Let us say that given that everything concerning safety standards and regulations is under control, would we be able to handle the energy source adequately and satisfactorily, or, sufficiently, which is the word used by Dr Dodd?

I think that article is food for thought. It is evidence of a genuine concern by a person of no small accomplishment in the community, a senior lecturer in mathematical physics, whom one would assume is capable of thinking reasonably analytically. That is the conclusion to which he has come. I have tried to explain that that conclusion has also been reached by me. I think that is probably as good a note as any on which to finish my remarks in response to His Excellency's Speech.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I have much pleasure this afternoon in supporting the motion so ably moved by my colleague the member for Brighton, and seconded by the member for Mallee. Initially, I would like to express my condolences to the families of those members and past members who have passed away during the past 12 months.

I would also, in opening my remarks, like to congratulate the South Australian State Government on its management of the State's economy. The Liberal Party came to Government in 1979 with the aim of creating a stable and secure future for all South Australians. Without doubt, this Government is achieving that aim at the moment. Quite clearly, the Labor Party has been embarrassed—and I emphasise this, because it has been very evident over the past few weeks—particularly during the past 2½ years, by the achievements of the Liberal Government, which has proved its ability and its competence, under Premier David Tonkin, to manage the affairs of this State.

Ever since this Government came to office, the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party generally have attempted to play down its achievements. Not only that, they have been quite deceptive in the presentation of their plans to manage the economy if they ever should be returned to office. We have recently had presented to us the Labor Party economic package for the future development of South Australia as that Party sees it. When it is studied, far from being the document of a responsible alternative Government, it turns out to be nothing more than a document containing deceptions. Certainly, they have plans which they have thought through and, in common with some of our policies, they are policies that will work, but that document contains plans which are put up for electoral window dressing, plans which are set up to deceive the public.

If honourable members think the A.L.P. is incapable of attempting to deceive the public in South Australia, let me remind the House of the performance of the Leader of the Opposition and his Deputy when they recently accused Ministers of this Government of accepting bribes on the casino issue. It was a disgraceful and unproven attack that reduced its authors, in my personal opinion, to the level of gutter politics and destroyed, I believe, the credibility of the Leader and his Deputy in the eyes of the media and the public at large in this State. The question of bribes could not be backed up when put to the test.

Mr Langley interjecting:

Mr OSWALD: It could not, and the member for Unley would be well aware of that. I submit that, when we look at the financial documents placed before us, neither could many of the projects that they intend bringing to fruition when they come to power. Many of them cannot be backed up with financial documentation to prove that they will work.

I would like to comment briefly on the Labor Party's proposal for what it calls the South Australian Enterprise Fund. It has put forward the scheme as a panacea to solve the imbalance in our State's economy. That Party hopes to use it to expand the economic base of this State and thereby promote industrial development. What really is this scheme? All it is in fact is a revamped S.A.D.C., and we all recall the difficulties in that. We can recall the difficulties that we inherited, when we came to office through that scheme.

Let us look at what members opposite are trying to achieve. I am quoting now from page 76 of their document under the heading, 'South Australian Enterprise Fund', as follows:

Labor will establish a South Australian Enterprise Fund to marshal capital resources to facilitate the development of industry within South Australia, and in particular to assist the growth of those industries which will strengthen and provide balance for the State's economic base.

That is very admirable. It goes on:

It is envisaged that initially funds will be drawn from the State's financial sector and from private investors—

I think these points are very valid—

but over time a revolving investment account will enable the fund to become a generator of capital in its own right. It will also provide opportunities for South Australians to invest in the developments that are taking place in their State through the issue of shares.

Theoretically, perhaps, they are fairly well-chosen words, but this whole scheme is a sham, a pie-in-the-sky political promotion; that is all it is. If the Leader thinks that the fund will attract massive investments with the current interest rates available elsewhere in the financial community, he is in for a shock. It is nothing more than a document that is designed to let the public think that the A.L.P. is doing something for the State. The scheme will not work.

The fund is little different from the Victorian development fund which was abandoned by Premier Cain within a month of the A.L.P.'s coming to office in that State. The same thing will happen in South Australia. At the time, Victorians were told that an extra \$475 000 000 would be injected for job creating capital works programmes—and what happened? The scheme was shelved after a month when they came to office.

The only other source of money available for the fund would be from revenue raised by taxes, charges and royalties, or alternatively, I ask the Opposition whether it intends to raid the massive funds being held by unions, by telling them that their members should put money into the enterprise fund for the purpose of propping up the Labor Government or, in particular, its promises. Is the money to come from the unions? I do not know. Perhaps I could be enlightened on that aspect.

The Victorian development fund was an ill-researched pipe dream which failed to survive the transition to reality. It just did not get there. The South Australian Enterprise Fund of the Labor Party is destined for the same fate. The sad aspect of the fund is that the Labor Party will use the enterprise fund proposal as an election gimmick (that is a sad thing, but that is the reality of it), just as the Victorian Leader used it as an election gimmick while he was in Opposition. The whole concept of the fund is quite impractical but, in its typical fashion, the Labor Opposition will no doubt continue to use it as a smoke screen to deceive the public about its true plans in this State for State taxation. People in this State are already asking where the money is coming from. When he came to Government in New South Wales, Mr Wran thought that he had a few hollow logs. Mr Cain, in Victoria, when he came to Government, thought that he had a few hollow logs. If the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia thinks that, when he comes to Government, he can look around for some hollow logs in our statutory authorities, then I believe he should take a few quick lessons in simple economics, because he will find that there are no hollow logs tucked away in the State's resources to fund the massive expenditure he proposes to undertake in this State.

Yesterday, the Premier posed five questions of the Leader of the Opposition on behalf of the people of South Australia. I believe they are very topical questions that should be repeated here again, because until now the Opposition has failed to respond to them. They relate to the enterprise fund proposals, and they are as follows:

First, from what State Government authorities does the Opposition propose to raise the capital for the fund?

Secondly, will it divest depositors' funds from the Savings Bank of South Australia and therefore from housing, so that the money can be shifted to the fund?

Thirdly, what capital reserves will it take from planned projects to be put into the fund?

Fourthly, how will it attract large sums from the public and private investors without offering very high interest rates and putting further pressure [and this is important] on capital markets by the fund?

Finally, what tax increases will be necessary to subsidise the interest rates charged by the funds?

We must not forget that this fund will be competing for finances in the market place and will be susceptible to interest rates abroad at the time. The State is embarking on a new era of prosperity not experienced since the boom years of the 1960s. During the 1979 election campaign the Premier, as the then Leader of the Opposition, said that South Australia was again open for business. Truer words have not been spoken, and the record of this Government over the last 2 1/2 years bears that out. Looking back over this last 2 1/2 years we have seen a reversal of the trend and millions of investment dollars are now flowing back into South Australia. A survey, published during April this year by the Federal Department of Industry and Commerce, of the total cost of projects listed by developers at the committed and final feasibility stages indicated that investments in South Australian projects increased by a further \$570 000 000 in the second half of 1982 to at least 3.48 billion dollars. This is a very significant figure. We can now boast 10.6 per cent of the total investment in South Australian manufacturing and mining projects, which is greater than this State's percentage of the national population. This has all happened since the Liberal Government came to power in 1979 and changed the philosophy and policies of the State Government.

Excluding money (and I emphasise this point) committed to Roxby Downs on that project, actual dollars being spent by investors in the future of South Australia have increased on those figures I mentioned earlier by 1 160 per cent, a very significant figure, bearing in mind that it does not

include Roxby Downs. I take up the point made by the previous speaker, who insists on saying that this Government says that Roxby Downs is the saviour of South Australia. I think that those figures give the lie to his statement in that those figures, the 1 160 per cent increase in investment dollars, do not include the Roxby Downs project.

The Tonkin Government has established a record which a Labor Government, with its socialist philosophy, could never match. Not only has it restored the flow of investment dollars, but the Tonkin Government has succeeded in encouraging business to re-establish and expand in this State. Above all, the Liberal Government has created jobs. Certainly, debate goes on in this place at great length during these sessions but one cannot get away from the fact that there is net gain in the number of jobs in South Australia since we came to power, and that is just a straight matter of fact.

The Leader and Deputy Leader are very keen to publicise any company about to lay off workers, but they avoid reference to those companies employing labour and expanding in South Australia. Such is their plan of deception of the public. Earlier this year the Labor Party attempted to set its sights on becoming the champion of small businesses in South Australia. For a short while, I believe members opposite actually started to convince themselves that their policies would in fact help the small business man.

However, the Labor Party certainly did not convince the small business men of its *bona fides* and it certainly did not convince the small business community that it would be of any great help to them, because the small business community still live in fear of a return to office of the Labor Party in South Australia. The A.L.P. criticism of the Government policy on small business is totally absurd, when it is compared with its own policies and its track record of action against small businesses in the Dunstan era. A perusal of the Party's latest State platform does not give anyone in small business any hope that the attitude has changed since the Labor Government was in office three years ago.

Let us look at some of the detailed policies that the Labor Party has towards small businesses should it come to office. I am quoting from its policy document. The A.L.P. is committed to quarterly c.p.i. rises, plus productivity increases, and long-service leave entitlement increases after five years (mark you, after five years). Bear in mind that the employer of labour has to write these particular cost structures into the product he sells, still be able to sell it on a very competitive market and still have some level of profitability left in his business so he can carry on a business.

Other points are a leave loading of up to 25 per cent, six months notice to retrench employees, a restrictive new consumer protection scheme, and forced union involvement in business management. These aspects do nothing but load more and more costs on to the small business man, reducing his profitability. I know that for members opposite 'profitability' is a dirty word, but without profitability we cannot employ people. What I have read are just restrictions imposed that will make it harder to employ and make it more tenuous for families that are relying on their jobs for a living.

These proposals, if implemented by the A.L.P. in office, would spell disaster for many hundreds of business men and would write off many thousands of jobs here in South Australia, as happened in 1979. The business man in this State is under enormous pressure to contain his costs and the last thing he needs is a return of a big spending, high taxation socialist Government here in this State. The A.L.P.'s economic plan (and mark you we have only received part I of it) is a blueprint for big spending and high taxation. Apart from the A.L.P. promising to get its hands on the existing financial resources of this State, the document offers

no proposals or hope. A lot of business men live in hope in this world, but there is no proposal or hope for attracting new companies or additional investment into South Australia.

The Labor Party's economic document is so vague that it is almost impossible to accurately cost. The conservative estimates put their programme as so far divulged (and I say 'so far divulged' because we wait with bated breath for the next edition) is costed already at over \$200 000 000. In the typical fashion of the Labor Party deception, we hear about an inquiry into State revenue raising, to confuse the public over where the Labor Party is going to find its funds. In the *Advertiser* on 24 July this year, the Leader went to great lengths to point out that an A.L.P. Government would not use State charges to raise general revenue. That was quite a departure from what happened in the Dunstan era. That Government used to use increases in State charges, as a matter of policy, as a source of revenue. In the newspaper report, Mr Bannon went on to say:

While an A.L.P. Government would not raise taxes or bring in new taxes during its first term in power, it would be irresponsible to say, in a blanket way, charges would not rise.

What sort of double talk is that, unless it is intentionally designed for no purpose other than to confuse the electorate? Of course, that is the aim of the exercise, to leave doubts in the mind of the electorate so they do not really know where they stand. That Party keeps saying, 'Of course, we are not going to raise taxes, and of course we are not going to raise charges but it would be irresponsible to say in a blanket sort of way that charges will not rise. Let us go around in a great circle.'

Those are the words of the Leader of the Opposition. It is a clear and inescapable fact that the A.L.P. cannot increase Government spending by in excess of \$200 000 000 and then hope to pluck the money out of thin air. Either the A.L.P. is totally irresponsible in its economic planning and really believes that it can find the extra \$200 000 000 from existing resources or, alternatively, it has embarked on a planned course of deliberate deception of the public in regard to its real motives. The latter is clearly its course of action.

I do not believe that the advisers who sit behind closed doors, the economists, would put up a proposal for an increase in spending of \$200 000 000 without having in view some costing. They know the difficulties involved in raising \$200 000 000: they know they cannot raise that sum without resorting to taxation, charges, or royalties. If the A.L.P. says that it will not increase State charges and taxation, it is a sham to make such propositions that cannot be costed.

For A.L.P. members to meet their commitments to both the State Convention and to their individual socialist philosophies will require no course of action other than to raise \$200 000 000 or stand accused of breaking their promises. They can attempt to deceive the public all they like, but they will never get away from the fact that the money must come from somewhere and the only place from which it can come at State level, as I have repeatedly said, is from State taxation, State charges, or royalties, or all of those combined. The final resort is to raid the statutory authorities.

We on this side would like to know what members opposite are on about. The A.L.P. has already painted itself as an Opposition of deception, but to think that it can promise to spend another \$200 000 000 without raising charges is an insult to the intelligence of the South Australian taxpayer. In response to the question, 'From where will the money come?', I say that the money will come not only from the business houses that have invested and risked capital in this State, which aids the State's development, but also from the pockets of the ordinary man in the street, whom the socialists opposite claims to champion. These are the people

who will be hurt in the long term by the big spending policies of the Labor Party, and they will be hurt where it hurts them most—by the loss of jobs and family incomes.

Businesses will no longer be in a position to employ staff. It is well known that one man's rise is another man's job. We saw this happen throughout the Whitlam era, when wages and inflation took off and jobs started to tumble. There is no earthly reason why that plain fact of life will not apply here again in the future. We already witnessed the demise of the manufacturing base of the State's economy during the 1970s under former Premier Dunstan's socialist laboratory. If the Opposition ever got back into office, we would see the experiment of the development of a socialist State repeat itself all over again. I am sure that the member for Elizabeth would ensure that that occurred.

There are no soft options available to the Government or the public in these times of national economic restraint, but at least the Tonkin Government has demonstrated that it can recognise and respond to those difficulties and, unlike the A.L.P., it has acknowledged that the basic principle of responsible management is that the State cannot spend money that it does not have. It cannot print money. If a Bannon socialist Government wanted more money than it earned, it would have to increase State taxation and State charges, or find a hollow log.

The Tonkin Liberal Government has proved by its actions that it is committed to doing its utmost for those in need. It is for this reason that it will be re-elected at the next State election. There should be no fear about that. As an example of the Tonkin Government's desire to help people in need, I would like to refer briefly to its record in the area of housing. Only last week a magazine was circulated around the suburbs called *Your Home Today*, put out by the *Messenger Press*. An article appeared in that magazine, written by Mr Don Cummings, Chief Executive of the Housing Industry Association of South Australia. I believe Opposition members should listen not to what I say, because they may claim that I have a jaundiced view of the success of the State Government in the area of housing, but to what an executive from the housing industry about housing prospects in South Australia. Under the heading 'Facts show corner turned. South Australia housing goes against trend', it was stated:

South Australia was going against the national downturn in the housing industry, chief executive of the Housing Industry Association Don Cummings said.

We've heard too much about the doom and gloom over housing, he said. It's time some of the facts, which paint a very different story for this State, were brought out.

Mr Cummings said figures for council approvals of housing for the five months to the end of May were up 7 per cent on the corresponding period last year—3 349 compared with 3 135.

He said there was a significant and serious fall off in both approvals and commencements in Sydney, Brisbane and Perth over the early part of this year. But it should be pointed out that the preceding conditions in the other States were different to South Australia's experience and to a lesser extent Victoria's. They had all reached a peak and there was only one way to go, Mr Cummings said.

New South Wales was expecting a drop in approvals by up to 50 per cent for this calendar year. However, housing in South Australia had been at the bottom of a trough for two or three years and the only way to go was up.

Our peak came back in 1975-76. Then we went from 14 900 commencement to a low of about 7 200, he said. Mr Cummings said last April was one of the busiest for housing approvals on record.

The rundown in unsold new housing stocks from around 2 000 six or seven years ago to about 200 and Adelaide's tight rental market—the most undersupplied of any Australian city—were also incentives for home builders.

He said that as the details of the Federal Government's revamped housing package, announced last March, became better understood there would be a beneficial flow-on to the South Australia housing industry.

An important aspect of the legislation was the provision of a tax rebate to first home buyers. Under the scheme, effective from this month, 98 per cent of first home buyers would qualify for the maximum rebate of \$500 or \$700 if they had dependent children.

The rebate is applied at 32 cents in the dollar on mortgage interest payments and ranges from a maximum \$500 for home loan borrowers in the first year of repayments down to cut out after five years of home ownership. Similar reductions apply for a family qualifying for the \$700 rebate.

For the rebate to apply on a pay as you earn basis workers need to complete a declaration available from their paymaster or post offices. Alternatively, the rebate can be claimed in the annual tax return. The scheme would put up to \$58 a month back into the pockets of a family buying a house or \$42 for a individual or couple without dependent children.

That is what the housing industry thinks about the potential for housing in South Australia. I believe that that article speaks for itself. Australians generally have been home owners, although with the increases in inflation and interest rates in recent years, home ownership has been made more difficult.

However, the Liberal Government has adopted wide-ranging measures to honour its commitment to encourage home ownership throughout the community. For the information of members opposite who would like the public to think that this Government's housing policies are ineffective, I would like to remind them of some of our achievements, since we came to office, in the area of housing. They are a few achievements of the Tonkin Liberal Government since coming into office. First, stamp duty was removed in November 1979 for first home buyers on houses up to \$30 000 and a reduction thereafter of \$580. To the end of May 1982, 21 210 buyers had benefited and revenue forgone by the Government was \$10 800 000.

The second achievement was that land tax was removed in July 1980 on the principal place of residence. Revenue forgone by the State Government in 1980-81 amounted to a further \$6 000 000. The third achievement was that the State Bank maximum loan was increased in January 1980 from \$27 000 000 to \$33 000 000. The lending rate has been maintained at 55 loans per week by the injection of new funds from State sources. Concessional loans commenced at 5¼ per cent, with a maximum interest of 10 per cent.

Guidelines for lending were amended in September 1981 to ensure concessional assistance was made available to those in greatest need, in particular young families. Fourthly, a new rental purchase scheme was introduced on 1 September 1981. Fifthly, an emergency plan to help home purchasers in crisis was introduced in October 1981. Sixthly, trust tenants were given the opportunity to purchase their dwellings. I specifically mention that aged cottages and walk-out flats were not included in that. Seventhly, alternative approaches to mortgage arrangements were the subject of discussions between Treasury and housing officers and the lending institutions. The announcement made last week of \$3 500 000 to be made available jointly with the Commonwealth to assist is a matter of history.

Let me go back over that list. In the first achievement, the figure of \$10 400 000 accounted for stamp duty being removed. Land tax being removed accounted for another \$6 000 000, totalling \$16 400 000. Are they the types of things the Leader of the Opposition is planning to reimpose to try to fund his \$200 000 000 economic package which he has presented to the voters in South Australia as part of his panacea to try to sort out this State? In relation to the South Australian Housing Trust, this Government can stand 10ft tall in comparison with the housing policies of the previous socialist Government.

Once again, during the Dunstan decade, the Labor Party boasted at great length about what it was doing in welfare housing. When one matches the record of the Tonkin Government over 2½ years and compare it with the record of

the previous Labor Government in the area of welfare housing, one sees that this Government leaves the Labor Party's policy for dead. Let us look at some of the figures, particularly in reference to building programmes for aged cottage flats. During 1978-79 (the last year of the Labor Government), it commenced 64 cottage flats in the metropolitan area. Compare that with a rise in 1979-80, when the Liberals came into office. The figure rose from 64 the previous year to 289 in 1981. That figure speaks for itself.

The Tonkin Government has mobilised a massive injection of funds from State sources into welfare housing. During 1981-82 the figure was \$109 100 000, which is a 39 per cent increase over the previous year. I believe this is a measure of what the Tonkin Government's attitude is in trying to come to grips with the housing problems in this State—a 39 per cent increase in commitment over the previous year.

In terms of overall commencements in 1981-82, the figure is approximately 2 000, which is 900 above the number of units commenced by the trust in 1981-82. That is very commendable and does show acknowledgment by the Government in an area of concern. We are prepared to get out and do something about it, which is contrary to the previous Government's policy. The rental stock is now approximately 45 000, the highest number of public housing units in any State on a per capita basis. Once again, that is an achievement of this Government.

During 1980-81 we saw the highest number of tenancies arranged in any one year since Elizabeth was established back in the early 1950s, with 5 688 tenants being accommodated. One statistic that members on both sides would be delighted to hear is that during April 1982 housing approvals were the highest for any month since we came to office. It has not only been in the area of welfare housing, but rather across the whole field of welfare services, that this Government has excelled and has sorely embarrassed the Labor Party with its performance. This Government has shown an attitude of compassion in the field of welfare. It can rightfully point out that the community welfare policies of 1979 that we enunciated have now almost been fully implemented.

It is terribly important and rates mention that those high levels of pre-existing community welfare services that existed when we came to office have been maintained, despite severe restrictions imposed on Ministers in regard to Government expenditure. The department is to be congratulated on its continuing concern for young offenders. It is pleasing to see that there will be a further extension of programmes such as the intensive personal supervision and work order programmes for our young offenders. I believe that that is a major achievement. It is not only in the industrial and welfare portfolios that the efficiency of the Liberal Government is causing embarrassment to the socialists.

It is also worth looking at the Liberals' performance in the arts. It is a matter of history that many of our critics said that we would not support the arts as had been done by the previous high-stepping part-time actor, ex-Premier Dunstan. For some reason, Mr Dunstan, ex-Premier, created the impression that he was the father and benefactor of the performing arts in South Australia, to the extent that it has almost been swept under the counter that it was a Liberal Government, under ex-Premier Steele Hall, that laid the foundation for the present Festival Theatre. Certainly, ex-Premier Dunstan has claimed the credit for the Festival Theatre, but one cannot get away from the fact the centre was laid up by ex-Premier Steele Hall.

Be that as it may, the arts have been wonderfully supported by the Liberal Government, even to the surprise of some of our heartiest critics who thought we would turn our back on the arts. There is no doubt that the arts have been well supported, to the extent that not only do the metropolitan

people have access to the facilities but also the lives of many country people have been enriched by having access to performing arts. It is no mean achievement to foster an open regional centre for the arts. They are expensive economic exercises, particularly in times of economic restraint.

Yet a centre has been opened at Mount Gambier, one has been approved for the Riverland, one is almost completed at Port Pirie, and plans are in train for a centre at Whyalla. One policy initiative that I hope will have a desirable effect on my electorate in the near future is the policy of increasing the number of community arts officers since 1979. At that time there were nine, and now there are 16. I understand that most of the increase will be devoted to country areas, but I would like to make the point that the Camden Community Centre is desirous of having an arts officer based there to work in the West Torrens area, a proposal that I totally support. At the moment we are working strongly to bring that about.

While I am referring to the arts, I cannot let the occasion pass without mentioning the Government's increased commitment to the Art Gallery Fund, involving the visual arts, and the big boost in funding for alternative theatre from \$77 000 in 1978-79 to \$200 000. They are areas of the arts in which money is being invested and which our critics said we would never support, but our track record indicates that in fact the Government is supporting the arts to the hilt.

I would now like to turn my attention to some of the local issues concerning the electorate of Morphett. Perhaps I can take this opportunity to inform members of the House of some of the rather important projects that are in train in the electorate. I refer again to the Camden Community Centre to which I have briefly alluded. When I became the member for Morphett in 1979, the entire future of the centre was surrounded by a cloud. The salary of the co-ordinator was being funded by the Department of Local Government on a six-monthly basis, purely as an interim measure.

One can imagine the instability that that was causing within the centre, as the co-ordinator did not know from one six-monthly period to the next whether her salary or job was secure. Of course, that feeling of uncertainty was flowing down through the board of management and to those volunteers responsible for the programmes. Further, they were operating from an old classroom that had been made available on the old campus of the Camden Park Primary School, an old timber-frame classroom in desperate need of renovation. No water or sewerage facilities were connected to the centre, yet the people there were attempting to run what are called pensioner luncheons, which up to 20 or 30 pensioners would attend on a Wednesday, but for which they did not even have the facilities to wash up and had to use buckets.

Nevertheless, the centre had a very enthusiastic co-ordinator and an equally enthusiastic board of management, and supporting them was a large team of volunteer workers who were prepared to put up with the conditions and to press on. Since I became the member for Morphett, we have been able to change that situation by negotiations with the various Government departments, and we now have a situation where the Government is funding the salary of the co-ordinator, and it goes without saying that that has brought stability to the centre.

For some time it was hoped that the West Torrens council would set up a community development board. That has not yet happened but, notwithstanding that, the Government has not stood back and let the centre founder: it has stepped in and provided the salary for the co-ordinator, recognising the immensely valuable work being done in the community by that organisation. Also, I have now been able to have water and sewerage facilities connected to the centre, and although people may take water and sewerage connections

for granted I can assure members that it has made a vast difference to this centre. At least those attending pensioner luncheon days or the children's creche can obtain water by turning on a tap and then have the water run away. That facility has also allowed us to develop trees and a play area. These are all aspects which add to the further security of the place, further establishing it and, overall, considerably raising morale.

Also, we have been able to appoint an aged-care worker to work with the elderly people in the area. Once we can complement that worker with an arts officer, the centre will be well on the way to being a well established entity in the full context of a true community centre. The centre serves an area where the number of those comprising the older population and the number of single-parent families are steadily increasing. The Camden Community Centre provides a wide variety of programmes in response to community needs. These include fitness and health programmes, leisure and recreation opportunities, family support services, information referral services, community awareness and participation, and specific work for isolated aged persons and young children. The Camden area has a senior citizens organisation which meets across the road from the centre.

In connection with those who attend the luncheons, the centre sends out people in vehicles to seek out aged citizens who would normally be immobile and not able to attend the regular senior citizens clubs. Therefore, they are collected in cars and brought to the centre for lunch and then delivered home, and this gives them an outing and companionship, which is so desirable. There is a team of volunteers from the community who provide all sorts of the skills needed to carry out these programmes, and co-operation is received from a number of organisations and professions which donate their services. On average, 250 people now use the two-roomed centre each week for various activities, and up to 350 people have used the centre in a week.

Community facilities are utilised for various classes, and these provide additional numbers of people. People from the southern half of the City of West Torrens form a large segment of the population served, and residents also come from Glenelg, Brighton, Marion and the northern West Torrens area, adding to the number of people availing themselves of the centre. All in all, the centre as it is now developed under its co-ordinator and its staff has become a very viable and useful asset to the whole district. It is well used by the district, and I would particularly like to pay a tribute to the two co-ordinators who have been there since I became the member for Morphett, because without them we would not have succeeded in improving the community centre to the stage that it has now reached. They have been absolutely wonderful in their dedication to the Camden Park community.

I am sorry that the member for Glenelg is not in the Chamber, because I would like to pay him a compliment. I refer to a road at Oaklands Park which has never been constructed; it is a section of Morphett Road between Oaklands Road and the Oaklands Park railway station. That section of road was set down for construction in the 1982-83 financial year. Each winter the road flooded and children had to walk through sheets of water to get to the school. Elderly citizens who were immobile had difficulty getting to the shops, but, with the co-operation of the member for Glenelg and after approaches to the Minister of Transport, I was pleased to be able to have the project brought forward a full 12 months, so that in fact construction is now under way. That new section of road will be a great asset to the Oaklands Park area.

One evergreen subject involves pollution in the Patawalonga that comes down from other council areas. It has always been a bone of contention that the Patawalonga

Lake, which is a tourist attraction in the Glenelg area, is polluted by rubbish coming down from council areas as far away as the foothills. In the past, the Glenelg ratepayer has had to bear the cost involved in this problem. When I came to office I said that I believed that this was totally unfair and that I could see no reason why the Glenelg ratepayer should have to bear such a cost.

It has proved impractical to construct boom gates at each council boundary because of the problem of having to clean the gates and also not knowing if they were blocked, whether the gates could withstand a flash flood. The most practical position for a boom gate would appear to be where the Sturt and Keswick Creeks enter the Patawalonga. I have been able to obtain for the Glenelg council a grant of over \$12 000, which at least pays 90 per cent of the cleaning costs, the Glenelg council having to contribute only 10 per cent of those costs. The Government is now picking up the tab for 90 per cent of the costs, which I think is fair and acknowledges the fact that it is the responsibility not only of the Glenelg council but also of the metropolitan area generally to keep the Patawalonga cleared.

It is interesting to note the incidence of aged population living in the Glenelg North area. Behind the Glenelg Town Hall there is an aged citizens' club, and there is another one at Camden Park, but unfortunately there is no provision at all for aged citizens to meet together in what was the old St Leonards suburb, which is now called Glenelg North. I thought about this matter for some time and then approached the executive of the Aged and Invalid Pensioners Association, with whose co-operation and that of some of their executives in the Keswick branch a branch of the Aged and Invalid Pensioners Association was set up in Glenelg North.

I was delighted, following an initial public meeting that I convened which was attended by about 50 people, that the membership has not dropped and has, in fact, now reached more than 70. I arranged for that group to have the use of a kindergarten on Fridays when the children were not using it. It outgrew the facilities available at the kindergarten. The West Torrens council was then gracious enough to provide a hall for those people. They have now outgrown that hall, and we are now looking for larger premises. That shows the great need in the community, and certainly in the Glenelg North area, for an organisation to allow elderly people with a common interest to gather together to enjoy, if nothing else, some company on a regular basis.

It concerns me that a community bus service has not yet been provided in the Glenelg North area. I can report that the Brighton and Glenelg councils are now communicating with each other with a view to establishing a joint project. The population of the Glenelg and Brighton council areas is not great: it is not as great as that of West Torrens, for example, but by combining the two areas it is hoped that it will be possible to establish a community bus service in the district.

One project for which I can claim to have been responsible is designing boarding platforms (mini railway stations, if you like), which are now being constructed along the Glenelg tramline. A trial platform was installed at the Glenelg intersection where the Glenelg tramline meets Brighton Road. It was a great success, because the elderly experience physical difficulty in stepping up on to the first step of the tram and then swinging themselves on to the second step. I designed these platforms to allow the elderly or incapacitated to be able to step straight into the trams. The S.T.A. accepted my idea and put it into practice, and these platforms will be duplicated at points along the entire tramline.

Following a trip to Melbourne to examine the tramlines in that city, I have been successful in convincing the S.T.A. that the lines should be set in concrete. There is a continuing problem in Jetty Road, where trams travelling continuously

along it cause the bitumen to break up, necessitating continual repairs. My view is that any construction project should be made permanent at the outset. I proposed that the tramlines along Jetty Road be set in concrete, and this work will commence in October of this year.

I was pleased to be able to make representations to the Minister of Recreation and Sport just after I came into office in connection with the Marion Community and Recreational Centre. As a result of that deputation introducing Marion councillors, there will be an opening ceremony within a few weeks of a project that has resulted in duplicating the size of that centre on Oaklands Road. The Government's contribution to these extensions was slightly more than \$200 000. I believe that members of the local community will be able to see that the money has been well spent when they attend the opening ceremony.

Finally, it has been an extreme privilege for me to serve the constituents of Morphet over the past 2½ years. I look forward in the years to come to carrying on, to the best of my ability, my work in the area and to providing my constituents with the services they expect of their local member.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. In doing so, I would like to congratulate Mrs Heather Southcott on winning the seat of Mitcham. I am pleased that she has been able to become the member for Mitcham and I think it proves that, whilst the Australian Labor Party might not be able to win Mitcham, at least it can decide who will be the member for that district. I believe that the Australian Labor Party might also be able to decide who are to be the members of some other districts in the next Parliament. The sooner the next election comes about, the better I will be pleased, because I am disappointed about the present situation in South Australia.

I join with the Governor in his expression of regret at the recent deaths of two former members of Parliament. I also express extreme disappointment that the Governor was not advised that a long-serving member of this State House had passed on, and I refer to the late Cyril Hutchens.

The late Cyril Hutchens entered this Parliament on 4 March 1950 and remained here until 29 May 1970. During that time he was a member of the Land Settlement Committee, he was Opposition Whip in 1960, he was Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and then Minister of Works and Minister of Marine. He also had the honour to be State President of the Australian Labor Party during that period.

He represented this Parliament at a conference in London in 1961, and was honoured as a Commander of the British Empire in 1970. He was a man worthy of respect, and I am sure that it was an oversight on the part of the Government that he was not mentioned in the Speech. He was a great man. Cyril Hutchens was first endorsed for the A.L.P. in 1960. He was previously a councillor on the Hindmarsh council. When he was first endorsed, the *Advertiser* reported as follows:

Cyril became aware of the eternal struggle of the classes and quickly and finally decided after the fine mesh sieve of common deduction had been applied that his lot in life was destined to the betterment of conditions of those he was born to and proud to be part of.

Mr Hutchens died on 27 March last at the age of 78, and I join with those other members who have expressed their regret at his passing.

I wish to mention one other person and to say how sorry we are to hear of his passing, which was on the day on which the Governor made his Speech to the Parliament. I refer to the late Norman Makin, and I think we should note his passing. He was a member of the House of Represent-

tatives for Hindmarsh, Sturt and Bonython, and his term of office extended from 1919 to 1964. He died at the age of 93 years on 20 July 1982, the day on which the Governor made his Speech. Mr Makin was awarded the Order of Australia in 1980, I think rather belatedly, and I think it is not to our credit that he was not honoured earlier in his life.

His record probably will never be surpassed. He was elected to the House of Representatives for Hindmarsh in South Australia, in the general elections in 1919, 1922, 1925, and 1928, and in 1929 he was elected unopposed. He was re-elected in 1931, 1934, 1937, 1940, 1943, and resigned in 1946. He was Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1929 to 1931, and Secretary of the Labor Party in the House of Representatives in 1928 and 1929 and until 1934. He was a member of the Commonwealth delegation to the Empire Parliamentary Association that visited England in 1935, and also a member of the delegation that visited England in 1937 for the coronation of King George VI.

His record in the war years shows his worth to South Australia and to Australia. He was Minister for the Navy and Minister for Munitions from 7 October 1941 until 14 August 1946, Minister for Aircraft Production from 2 February 1945 to 14 August 1946, and a member of the War Cabinet from October 1941 to January 1946. He served on many other executive committees. He attended the United Nations conference in London in January 1946, and was President of the United Nations Security Council in 1946 and 1947. He resigned from Parliament on 14 August 1946 on being appointed Australia's first Ambassador to the United States, and that appointment was terminated on 27 April 1951. He was re-elected to the House of Representatives for Sturt in the general election in 1954 and, following redistribution, he was elected for Bonython in the general elections of 1955, 1958 and 1961. That is truly a record of great work for this State, and for the A.L.P., and we are very much the worse for his passing. He was a gentleman who lived to a great age and who was alert until the time of his passing.

I wish to comment on one point in the Governor's Speech. I do not blame His Excellency for it, because I am aware that the Speech is written by his Ministers and is vetted by the Premier before being presented to the Governor to deliver to the Parliament. In paragraph 4 of the Speech the Governor made this statement:

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. That is only a line and a half, and I think it shows the concern of this Government. It is a prevarication and a mishandling of statistics to say that, while the national increase has been 27.5 per cent over the past year, the South Australian figure has been only 3 per cent. Those figures belie the facts.

The two most important issues confronting South Australia at present are unemployment and interest rates. I must express my disappointment that the member for Henley Beach decided not to continue his remarks this afternoon, because I had expected that he would have made some effort to deny the allegations made last night by the member for Albert Park and on Wednesday last by the member for Napier, speaking in the no-confidence motion in relation to unemployment. Last night, the member for Albert Park said this:

We have heard statements attributed to Liberal back-benchers stating that the difficulties thousands of South Australians are experiencing in relation to interest rates are because they have over-committed themselves on their home mortgage repayments.

Mr Max Brown: That's shocking.

Mr WHITTEN: It is shocking that such allegations are made. I am pleased that the member for Henley Beach has

come into the Chamber, because I am always reluctant to speak about a person behind his back. I would far rather that he should be present to hear what I have to say. I do not know whether he heard me say that I was disappointed that he saw fit not to continue—

An honourable member: He was frightened to come in.

Mr WHITTEN: No, that is not right. I will not say that. My information is that he was giving a press conference outside and did not realise what the time was, but I do not know whether that is so. When the member for Albert Park made those allegations, the member for Henley Beach interjected, saying, 'Who said that?' and the member for Albert Park said:

I am glad the interjection came, because I have been reliably informed that the member for Henley Beach has made that statement and I ask him, either within or outside of this House, to categorically deny that he has said it, because I know a person who is prepared to say that that is what the man said.

That is a serious allegation.

Mr Randall: It sure is an allegation, quite unsubstantiated, with no factual information to back it up.

Mr WHITTEN: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that. It is an extremely serious allegation, but I am reliably informed by a person in Port Adelaide that he did make that statement.

Mr Hemmings: It all comes home to roost, doesn't it?

Mr WHITTEN: It does. The two most important things to my mind are unemployment and interest rates, and to my knowledge the member for Henley Beach has not denied that. Let us hear what the member for Napier had to say. The member for Napier, referring to housing and stamp duties, stated:

I have found that, increasingly, people from areas such as Todd, Newland, Mawson and Morphett have been coming to me seeking assistance in their attempts to find homes.

I do not doubt that that is the case. I have found that the member for Napier is extremely truthful. He continued:

I put on record the fact that the member for Henley Beach, when approached by people in his area who were experiencing hardship, said that people were overcommitting themselves on mortgage repayments, which was an awful thing to say.

I would have thought that, if the member for Henley Beach had not said that, he would not have gone outside the House when he knew very well that that matter would come up. He had 30 minutes in which to speak, and he chose not to come into this House but to speak outside to a pressman instead of undertaking his duties in this Parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must not impute improper motives to the member for Henley Beach.

Mr WHITTEN: Certainly not, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am trying to get the member for Henley Beach on his hind legs. He should deny the allegations and, if he will not do that, the truth should stick.

Mr Randall: That is rubbish. It is totally unsubstantiated. Tell me who told you. The member for Napier started it all.

Mr WHITTEN: I heard that said in Port Adelaide, and I believe the person who told me. I refer now to the other important matter that is confronting us at present—unemployment. Unemployment is affecting my district mainly. The high number of unemployed, particularly in my district, relates to State and Federal Liberal policies. I am backed up in these statements by leaders in industry. In fact, the largest company in Australia will back up my statement that unemployment has been brought about by State and Federal Liberal Governments.

This Government was elected in 1979 (and it will never be re-elected, I feel sure of that) on its campaign of 'Stop the job rot'. It was said, 'Elect a Liberal Government and immediately 10 000 jobs will be created, 1 000 now and

10 000 very shortly.' Where are those jobs? They have gone right down the drain. In the past few weeks 1 400 jobs have been lost in South Australia, 220 at G.M.H. because of the early retirement inducement that was given to workers to leave their jobs, an inducement that they could not knock back. Those people will probably never work again. They have had many years of service with General Motors, but they were induced to retire early. To give the company credit, there were no sackings. However, Kelvinator, which employs a lot of workers in my district, has sacked 130 people. At one time we were told that those people were made redundant, and then we were told that they were retrenched. The wording does not matter to those workers.

Mr Lynn Arnold: Now they have all voluntarily retired.

Mr WHITTEN: Yes, but sometimes in that regard they are paid decent redundancy payments. However, Kelvinator does not make such payments. On 17 July, after the redundancies occurred, an article in the *Advertiser* stated that Kelvinator Australia Limited was making a distinction between redundancy and retrenchment in its latest lay-offs, which meant that some of the workers would not receive severance pay. It also stated that workers would be deemed to be retrenched when employment was terminated because of slackness of trade or any other cause outside the control of the company. Any actions that the Federal Government takes absolves Kelvinator from paying redundancy payments or anything like that. It was also stated that retrenched employees could often be re-employed if the trading position improved and that a company spokesman said that 80 per cent of the workers laid off were retrenched because of seasonal factors affecting the industries, tariff cuts, and the down-turn in the economy.

A lot of those people were laid off because of the weather, but many of them were laid off because of the Federal Government's tariff arrangements. Employment in the tool room at Kelvinator has dropped from 188 two years ago to 46 now. So stop the job rot—put the Liberals in and they will sack some more!

Mr Oswald: What about the 9 000 gain?

Mr WHITTEN: I wish that the honourable member would have a record or a tape made of that so that he can play it to himself. I am not interested in the statistics that the Liberals put out. The United Trades and Labor Council also expressed great concern at the loss of jobs at Kelvinator. Bob Gregory, Secretary of the United Trades and Labor Council, stated:

The Federal Government should reimpose a recent 5 per cent tariff cut on white goods and act to combat dumping of white goods from overseas. The U.T.L.C. was very concerned at the down-turn in employment in the South Australian white goods industry.

Workers will band together when they believe that their jobs are in jeopardy. So that the majority can be employed, the workers at Kelvinator have agreed to take a 40 per cent reduction in wages. In the tooling area, workers have agreed to work a four-day week in an attempt to save jobs. They have taken a cut in wages, but they have also been told by the company that people who are highly skilled will be downgraded in their skills, with a like reduction in wages. Foremen will become leading hands, leading hands will go into the stores, storemen will become labourers, and labourers will be chucked out. That is the sort of thing that is happening, and the workers are concerned.

The Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union is now suggesting that its members will be able to keep their employment if they refuse to work overtime. A lot of people work overtime to make extra money for the things that they otherwise could not afford, especially if the wife does not work and if they have to pay the high interest rates that are imposed by the Federal Government in conjunction with

the State Government. The State Liberal Government wishes to associate itself wholeheartedly with the re-election of Fraser, so Liberals only have themselves to blame.

People work overtime because they need extra money to buy necessities and to endeavour to pay the high interest rates that are imposed. Employers are quite happy to let their employees work overtime, because they then have to pay less in compensation rates and they need less plant. The penalty rates of time and a half and double time paid to workers are therefore not as great as we may be led to believe.

Employers need less plant, less factory space and do not have to pay such high compensation rates. They need to employ fewer workers, so that overtime does not cost employers a great deal of money. I am unable to ascertain the total number of people laid off at Messenger Press, which has been a good employer and certainly employs a lot of people in Port Adelaide. Unfortunately, it put in a new Japanese press (which can do the work so much quicker) in anticipation of orders they expected to receive. However, some companies desiring high quality advertising have seen fit not to have their advertisements printed by Messenger. So, at least 20 people have been made redundant, including 12 from the Printing Trade Union. I have heard that the number is up to 50, although I do not think that it is that high. However, at least 20 people have lost their jobs at Messenger Press. We can look at B.H.P., which has put off 125 people. An article in the *News*, headed '125 jobs on the line at B.H.P.', written by John Webbe, states:

Up to 75 B.H.P. employees, including tradesmen at Whyalla, Iron Knob and Iron Baron, could be retrenched next month unless they accept transfers to lower-paid, unskilled jobs. And 25 employees—mainly draftsmen—who work in the company's Adelaide drawing office on projects related to Whyalla will not be given the option.

All will be retrenched with the expected closure of the office early next month as part of a continuing 'cost reduction campaign aimed at controlling the escalating cost of production'. B.H.P. announced both moves yesterday in a notice to its 5 643 steel industry workers in South Australia.

I want to relate that matter to the policies of the Federal Government. We can look at what the *B.H.P. News Review* had to say on steel in Australia. It advocated steel import curbs. The article stated:

Quota restrictions on imports of most flat steel products were supported in submissions to the Temporary Assistance Authority on 16 June. The three applicants are the B.H.P. Steel Division, John Lysaght (Australia) Limited and Tubemakers of Australia Limited.

They made a submission, which incidentally has been supported by the Leader of the Opposition and the Mayor of Whyalla. The article further states:

The case was based on projected imports this calendar year of 840 000 tonnes of products in the range covered by the inquiry. These were imports which might have been supplied by B.H.P. and would amount in raw steel equivalent to some 1.1 million ingot tonnes, representing import growth of 53 per cent on 1981 tonnages, which in turn were 58 per cent higher than in 1980.

So, if the Federal Government would endeavour to do something to create employment it would be helping a major, and indeed the largest, company in Australia, B.H.P. It has been said that when steel prices fall so does the rest of the economy. However, Fraser will not do anything. He will not lift his little finger to assist B.H.P. so that it can compete against Japan, Brazil and all other steel-producing companies whose Government's will assist by subsidy for steel production in those countries. However, Fraser will not put an import quota on steel coming into Australia. The article continues:

The submission recorded that these figures mean imports will have gained a share of these markets 'now approaching, or even exceeding, 30 per cent—equivalent to more than 13 per cent of Australia's total steelmaking capacity.

The submission ends as follows:

The submission estimates that imports of 840 000 tonnes in the products under reference can be equated with 3 100 persons employed directly or as supporting staff.

I checked what the Liberal Party people had to say about this matter. Senator Don Jessop, who once represented the electorate of Grey until the people woke up, is now in America. He said the cause of the B.H.P. troubles is dock strikes: that dock strikes hit steel jobs. A report stated:

A senior Government Senator has blamed the cutback in jobs at B.H.P.'s Whyalla operations on industrial disruption on the Australian waterfront.

I am sure that anyone who has an iota of a brain and cares to use it would know that Senator Jessop is not speaking the truth in that case.

Mr Hemmings: But he is a Liberal.

Mr WHITTEN: That may make a difference. It is not positive at all. I compliment the Leader of the Opposition and the mayor of Whyalla, who were prepared to come out in support of the workers of Whyalla. An article in the *News* of 26 July, under a Whyalla dateline, stated:

The Opposition Leader, Mr Bannon, has asked the Prime Minister, Mr Fraser, for immediate temporary assistance for Australian steelmakers.

He is not asking for an ongoing commitment at the present time: he is asking for temporary assistance to get people back to work. Mr Bannon sent a telegram to the Prime Minister. The article further stated:

Mr Bannon's telegram followed transfers announced last week of tradesmen at the Whyalla steelworks to unskilled work and the closing of the B.H.P.'s Adelaide drawing office.

The Mayor of Whyalla, Mrs A. Ekblom, has given support to Mr Bannon's telegram.

'The Industry Assistance Committee's inquiry into the steel industry will take about a year before it makes recommendations to the Federal Government,' Mr Bannon said.

'If we want to avoid further retrenchments in the steel industry, I believe the Temporary Assistance Authority should act immediately. This will allow protection for the industry while the I.A.C. inquiry continues,' he said.

If temporary assistance is given now, some jobs will be saved. However, if we wait for the I.A.C. report to come down that will be next year or the year after, and hopefully we will not have Fraser then: we may get a Government that is sympathetic to the workers and employment. That will be to the benefit of South Australia.

We can look at what happened in the electorate of Spence in regard to Gerard Industries, which was going to take over half of Brompton. It has had to sack 97 employees with no thought of their ever getting a job again. I believe that they are correct in their statement that a downturn in the economy is causing a loss of jobs. Fewer houses are being built and the electrical installations are not needed. Also, they are not able to sell white goods such as refrigerators, washing machines, electric stoves and that type of equipment made by Gerard Industries. Therefore, it has been necessary for them to sack 97 workers.

Mr Abbott: They said they were going to put on another 300.

Mr WHITTEN: They said they were, but that was window-dressing; they did not put on 300: they put off 97.

Mr Evans: Are they too cheap—is that why they can't sell them?

Mr WHITTEN: If the member for Fisher cannot raise above the level of dead sheep when I am talking about important things, because people are important—

Mr Evans: I asked whether they cannot sell them because they are too cheap.

Mr WHITTEN: I apologise to the member for Fisher. I thought he referred to 'dead sheep'. I refer to another good company in my electorate, British Australian Lead Manufacturers, which is now trading as Dulux Australia Limited.

The manager of Dulux was good enough on Friday to send me a telegram to inform me that the company was to sack 27 workers. I have a copy of the telegram, and I want to bring this matter to members' attention because I appreciate the manager's advising me about this matter. Perhaps his choice of words was not very good, as he began by saying, 'I wish to inform you'. I would perhaps have said, 'I regret to inform you.' However, the telegram stated:

I wish to inform you that in view of continuing depressed trading conditions Dulux Australia Limited today advised 27 employees that their services were terminated.

That telegram was from the Manager of the South Australian branch of Dulux. What annoys me on this occasion, once again, is incompetency: the telegram was lodged at 4.45 p.m. on Friday afternoon, yet I received it on Monday at 11.40 a.m. I did not even receive the courtesy of a telephone call from Telecom. That indicates the type of service that we have, because the number of people in Telecom is being reduced. They no longer have the telegram boys to deliver these telegrams, and Telecom did not even have the courtesy to telephone my office.

Mr Hemmings: But they didn't even do that with Mount Barker, did they?

Mr WHITTEN: I shall refer to Johnson Leather Company Ltd. at Mount Barker, where 100 employees were sacked with a minute's notice. However, the company said that it had been so good to its workers and that it had given them a week's pay in lieu. For God's sake, that is only an award provision, and they are compelled to do that. I wonder what they would have done if they had not been compelled to do it. The Johnson tannery had been in existence for 100 years and was taken over by a company called Metro Meat. I do not know what Metro Meat now intends to do with its hides or which tannery will handle them. I do not know whether it is the responsibility of Metro Meat or that of a company higher up, because Metro Meat is owned by Adelaide Steamship. So, there we are: once again we see the vicious circle going round and round.

I am reluctant to say things about a member or a Minister if the person involved is not here in the Chamber to hear it, but I notice that the Minister has just come in, so I point out that I was really disgusted when I looked in the *Sunday Mail* and read the comments of the Minister, which were accompanied by a nice, pretty picture.

Mr Hemmings: I thought it was an awful picture.

Mr WHITTEN: That is a matter of opinion. The Minister of Industrial Affairs was quoted as saying, 'Get off your backsides; get out and sell!' Earlier this afternoon, Mr Speaker, I heard you mention about something being an uncouth utterance, but there can be nothing more uncouth than the words used by the Minister (that is, if he was reported correctly, although I believe that Eric Cummins would report his comments correctly when they are put in inverted commas). The Minister was reported as saying:

The fact is there are parts of the South Australian economy which are doing extremely well and there are some excellent success stories. The parts that are going well are those that get off their arse, get out and sell, adopt new technology and take an aggressive stance.

I can understand people using such terms, and I would use them myself if I was upset about something that had happened. However, I do not believe that the Minister was upset. I think that he was—

Mr Hemmings: Play acting.

Mr WHITTEN: Yes, when using those terms. I want to be fair to the Minister, who made further comments, but I believe that he was not sincere. He was further reported as saying:

It is fairly typical that a recent announcement by the Government of 60 new jobs got a brief mention whereas 25 retrenched by B.H.P. got major headlines.

I want to congratulate Rubery Owen Holdings, as that company has now been able to put on extra men. That is another industry at Woodville North which is in my electorate. It does a great job, and I am pleased that it has been able to buy into an export market and put on an extra 60 men. But what does 60 men represent, when one thinks of the 1 400 people who have lost their jobs in the past few weeks? It is no good saying, 'Here is a little bit of milk to put in your tea, which will make it taste so much better.' In the *Sunday Mail* article to which I referred, the Minister was further reported as saying:

It appears our community places more importance on the loss of 25 jobs than on the creation of 60 new ones.

Reference was then made to consumers and to the fact that they should buy products, which would keep jobs going. How the devil can people get out there and buy if they do not have any money in their pockets with which to buy things? The Minister did not tell us how that is going to happen.

It has appeared to me that over many years Dulux has been a reasonable sort of employer; the company has proved this, because even with the down-turn of the economy caused by Liberal mismanagement the company is prepared to endeavour to find work for its employers with its parent company, I.C.I. However, I am very much concerned that South Australia has lost a capacity for paint manufacture, because a lot of the plant from Dulux will not remain at Port Adelaide in South Australia but will go to Melbourne. A small press item stated:

Part of the plant's production would be moved to Dulux factories in Melbourne, Brisbane and Sydney.

So, it is unfortunate that that capacity will never return to South Australia. That is the situation that the incoming Australian Labor Party Government will be facing, namely, a down-turn in employment, this loss of capacity, with such loss being forever. This is occurring not only in my electorate, but all over the place. I refer to a company in the South-East, namely, Henschkes, who have been sawmillers at Naracoorte for 30 years. I refer to a small press clipping from the *Advertiser* of 23 July, under a Naracoorte dateline, which states:

After 30 years of operation the Naracoorte sawmill owned by Henschke Industries will close today.

I wonder what will happen to those nine men down there at Naracoorte. I wonder whether the Minister will be able to get some sort of jobs for them. The Federal Government is allowing so much imported timber to come into Australia that South Australian timber is not being used. So, there again, I refer to the policies of the Liberal Government, which is without any concern whatsoever for people. If it thinks that some importers can make a quid, that is all right, as they are the persons who support the Liberal Government. I refer also to another company which is located in the district of the member for Napier, namely Atco.

Mr Russack: Do you know the reason for that?

Mr WHITTEN: First, I shall give the reasons that the company has given. The company has stated that it is due to two factors, one being the Iraq-Iran war and the consequent loss of orders, and secondly that the company has finished its contracts for Roxby Downs and Stony Point. We are told by the Minister of Mines and Energy that the Roxby Downs project is a life saver. The member for Goyder asked why there is a down-turn at Atco and why the company has lost 105 employees, and I have pointed out that the company stated that it had completed the Roxby Downs orders and that, because of the Iraqi/Iran war, many other orders have been cancelled.

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

Mr WHITTEN: Before the adjournment I had been expounding on unemployment problems throughout Aus-

tralia, and particularly in South Australia, and I believe the policies of the Liberal Government are causing much of that unemployment. I would like to refer to the attitude of the Minister of Industrial Affairs to workers in Government employment. He has condemned those workers for what he calls 'the grab for 38 hours'. For the past 20-odd years, white collar workers have enjoyed a 37½-hour week. Now, because those who work hard are endeavouring to gain a shorter working week of 38 hours, the Minister has condemned them. A report in the *Sunday Mail* of 4 July states, in part:

Industrial Affairs Minister, Mr Brown, last night accused the unions of suddenly taking a hard and unreasonable line.

In the speech I made in the first Address in Reply debate after this Government came to office, I told the Minister that it was inevitable that a 35-hour week would come about. I believe that the unions have been very soft in saying that it can be done in stages.

Mr W. A. Rodda: It's not like those palmy days at Streaky Bay.

Mr WHITTEN: I am sorry that the member for Victoria has dropped in at this time. He is usually very quiet. When I first started to speak this afternoon, I criticised the Government for not making reference in the Governor's Speech to the former member for Hindmarsh, Cyril Hutchens, a member of this House for 20 years. However, perhaps I can absolve the Government, because I realise now that the member for Victoria, you, Mr Speaker, and perhaps the member for Fisher are the only three members of this Parliament who were here in the time of Cyril Hutchens. Perhaps those three members do not have a great voice in the Ministry and perhaps that is why Cyril Hutchens was ignored.

The Minister of Industrial Affairs is prepared to condemn the unions for endeavouring to get a shorter working week, but that does not seem to be in line with the view of the Master Builders' Association. In the *News* on 28 June the Secretary of that association, Mr Peter Gasteen, is quoted, in part, as follows:

Mr Gasteen said the introduction on 24 May of a 38-hour week had not hit the South Australian building industry hard. 'We haven't any evidence in South Australia that it is causing a turndown,' Mr Gasteen said. In the month since the 38-hour week was introduced, tenders and approvals for construction had picked up, he added.

That gives the lie to what the Minister of Industrial Affairs has been talking about, saying that the shorter working week will be the ruin of the economy. That is not what the heads of the industry are saying.

I turn now to the Federal Government and its policies. The unions are saying that immigration has been a cause of the shortage of jobs. Skilled tradesmen are being brought into the country while skilled tradesmen in South Australia are being downgraded and having to take labouring jobs. Only the other day, my own union, the Amalgamated Metal Workers and Shipwrights Union, stated:

Too many skilled tradesmen are being allowed into the country during a period of high unemployment among Australian tradesmen. The influx was particularly affecting the building and construction industries which have been suffering a slump for many months.

Immigration Minister, Mr Hodges, had advised the Federal Labor member for Sydney (Mr Les McMahon) that 11 192 skilled tradesmen had entered Australia between January 1981 and January 1982, said Mr McMahon. 'The greatest proportion came from the United Kingdom and New Zealand,' he said.

'There were also 524 Germans, 351 Swiss, 200 Danes, 234 Spaniards and 397 South Africans. The tradesmen included 608 bricklayers, 228 joiners, 404 painters and decorators, 361 plumbers and gas fitters along with 36 tilers, 26 stonemasons and 213 other skilled construction workers,' he said.

There was also a high number of metal tradesmen with 706 fitters and turners, 823 motor mechanics and 451 electrical mechanics.

That is the situation. Australia House and the Federal Government are encouraging tradesmen, from the United Kingdom in the main, to come to Australia, when they know darned well that there is no work here for them. Those people then have to live on unemployment benefits without any thought whatsoever of obtaining a job.

Before the dinner adjournment, I referred to the various jobs that had been lost in my district. Clyde Engineering last week put off 12 skilled tradesmen because of the mismanagement of the Federal Government. That company has been renovating and rebuilding locomotives for the various State Governments and New Zealand. I am reliably advised that it is the attitude and decision not only of the Cain Government that all locomotive work should be done in local workshops to provide employment for Victorians. I totally agree with that. These problems are caused also by the Federal Government, which is the contractual agent for the various States and which is withholding payments for the work that has been done by Clyde Engineering. That company is unable to continue and, if it is not paid by the Federal Government for the work that it has done, it must sack employees.

That company has some thought and feeling for workers, and it has endeavoured to place those skilled tradesmen into other establishments. It has been able to place six boilermakers, who have shipyard experience, with Colan Industries, a Sydney-based company that has now set up in South Australia and is doing a good job in the shipbuilding industry.

Some of the other industries that are vitally affected by unemployment include Kenwood, which has been operating in South Australia for many years and which decided to move the whole of its establishment to New Zealand. What will happen to its workers? They certainly cannot go to New Zealand, so they will be thrown on the labour market and even more skilled tradesmen will be out of work in South Australia. Wunderlich, which manufactures aluminium windows, will not be able to provide work and will have to sack several people in South Australia.

When the Government was elected, it promised 10 000 jobs—1 000 immediately. But what has happened? Unemployment has increased to 7.7 per cent, the highest rate of unemployment for 50 years since the Depression. This is mainly because of Liberal policies, particularly because of the Federal Government, aided and abetted by the South Australian Government.

We now have 46 000-plus unemployed on the books in South Australia looking for work, and there does not appear to be any solution. Earlier this afternoon I heard the Minister of Industrial Affairs criticise my Leader on figures that had been taken out in regard to unemployment in South Australia, particularly in the electorate of Todd. The member for Todd made a totally irrelevant personal explanation. I am sure his constituents will not be happy with his excuse. However, I will refer now to my own electorate. Five postcodes make up the electorate of Price. Some of them overlap. The member for Todd made the point of the overlapping of postcodes in various electorates.

Mr Ashenden: Overlapping of postcodes? You're—

Mr WHITTEN: I do not have time to answer the member for Todd. If he wants to talk to me later I will give him the facts and figures. He cannot falsify figures to me. There are five postcodes in my electorate. Out of those five postcodes (as far as social security is concerned) 2 681 people are unemployed. I do not intend to go right through all those figures. However, percentages have been allocated in that area to a number of constituents in various postcodes.

In the electorate of Price the figures are 50 per cent higher for unemployment than the State average. I can quite understand that. In Price 11.8 per cent are unemployed. I can

understand why only 7.7 per cent is shown by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. We could look at the electorates of Bragg, represented by the Premier, Davenport, represented by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, or that represented by the member for Alexandra. Very few people work in industrial areas there. We can also look at the electorate of Coles, where few people work in industry. The people there are more the executive type and are not applying for unemployment benefits.

One could even look at the electorate represented by the Minister of Mines and Energy. There are few people on the books in those electorates. However, it is in the industrial areas that the great percentage of unemployment is evident. While the State average is only 7.7 per cent, in the industrial areas, such as my electorate we have 11.8 per cent, which is more than 50 per cent higher than the State average. This matter should be concerning the Liberal Government, although I know it believes that it should not worry about Labor-held districts, as that is not where it gets its votes.

I now refer to Johnsons Tannery at Mount Barker. The reduction of 100 jobs in a small township like Mount Barker spells the deathknell for that town. Downright underhand means and methods were taken by Metro Meat to sack those workers. They were working away merrily at 4 p.m. on Friday without any thought of being sacked or being told that they would be on the dole the next day. The *Sunday Mail* contained a photograph of the notice put on a gate for the lighter-up, the one who comes in to get things ready for the next day. The note, addressed to Barry, evidently the man who did the lighting-up, stated:

Don't start the tannery. The tannery is completely closed.

Your pay will be ready for you at 8 a.m. on Monday.

Please give me a ring at the weekend—Ron Trout.

That is the sign that was put up on the gate and the reason why I have been so upset. I have told the Minister many times that he has no thoughts and no realisation about industrial relations. Unfortunately, that is the situation in regard to many employers in this State. They look upon workers as a means to an end as a way of making a great profit. They have no thought; they are immoral in their thoughts.

Mr Hemmings: Dishonest.

Mr WHITTEN: How much more immoral can one get than dishonest? That is the situation; one has only to think of some of the people who were employed at Johnson Leather Company for 30 years. An article in the press stated:

'It was bloody vicious and cruel!' Hugh Meldrum was in no mood to mince words—he had just lost his job at the tannery.

That gentleman is 58 years of age and worked for 27 years at that tannery, yet the only notice he received was when he was sacked and told he would get no more pay. All he was told was that out of the goodness of the company's heart he would be given a week's pay in lieu. It is not pay in lieu: it is a week's pay that the company is required to give if it sacks a person on the spot. The award provision provides that a worker must be given a week's pay; however, Johnson Leather apparently thought that it was something generous, but that is not the case. To use the words that Hugh Meldrum used, that is 'bloody cruel'.

There is no way that the company can tell those people that they should go down to O'Sullivan Beach or Port Noarlunga and that they will find jobs down there; those people cannot travel 20 miles each day, and the company knows that darned well. There would be no jobs for them if they did go there. It was said that they interviewed 27 people and that they were considering the applications of those prepared to travel that distance, although I do not think there will be any of those people employed there. I am also concerned what will happen to the hides.

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

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. In supporting the motion I join with other members in expressing my sympathy to the families following the passing away of four former members of Parliament. I refer to Sir John McLeay, who served in both State and Federal Parliaments and also in local government; the Hon. Cyril Hutchens, a former member for the District of Hindmarsh, and a former Minister of Works and Deputy Premier of South Australia; and the Hon. Norman Makin, O.A., who passed away on 20 July at the very fine age of 93, when many people throughout Australia felt that they had lost a very true and dear friend. Norman served this nation in many high offices with great distinction. He was a notable South Australian with a very impressive record indeed and he will be sadly missed by all.

Finally, I extend my sympathy to the family of our friend and colleague, the Hon. Jim Dunford. Jim was elected to the Legislative Council on the very same day as I was elected to this House after having served as Secretaries of our respective trade unions for similar periods. Jim is greatly missed. I support other honourable members in the remarks that they have made in this debate and I extend my condolences to the families of our late colleagues.

Also, I take the opportunity to congratulate the member for Mitcham, who won the recent by-election held for that district. I support the remarks made by the member for Price concerning the fact that, with the assistance of the Labor Party, the winners of seats such as Mitcham can be dictated which shows that the Labor Party will win back many more seats at the next State election. I think it is certain that, now that support from the Liberal Party has been withdrawn from the member for Semaphore, the Labor Party will win the seat of Semaphore comfortably at the next State election. It is unfortunate for the member for Semaphore that he is no longer going to get the support of the Liberal Party.

I think that we would have won that seat, anyway, even if the Liberal Party had decided to support him. My support of the Governor's Speech does not signify that I agree with many of the sentiments expressed by that honourable gentleman in that Speech. I found it to be quite an uninspiring document that we were unfortunate enough to have to sit and listen to on the occasion of the opening of this session of Parliament.

It seems that the Government was quite content to pat itself on the back in that opening address. It also seems that the Government is quite content to sit back and make all the excuses in the world and blame everyone else for the economic problems confronting the South Australian community. The Government talks about its concern for the international and Australian economic climates, the effects of the United Nations, the European economic down-turn, and the uncertainty of power supplies in New South Wales. It also criticised large wage increases, the lack of follow-on rainfalls in the northern areas of the State, frosts in the southern areas, the dumping of New Zealand sawn timber on the Australian market, and the effect that the spell of cold weather is having on our vegetable crops. The full effect on citrus is still being assessed, whilst there have been some problems in the fruit canning industry and a small surplus of wine grapes.

I congratulate the member for Mallee on his stand today in support of the plight of farmers. I saw the member being interviewed for television today and I watched it on the television news tonight.

The Hon. W. A. Rodda: It's serious.

Mr ABBOTT: It is serious. The Labor Party recognises the seriousness of that situation. I sincerely hope that we receive sufficient rains to boost the requirements and needs of farmers. I also make the point that it is a pity that the member for Mallee does not support the Aboriginal community within his electorate in the same way that he supports the farmers.

Mr Lewis: But I do.

Mr ABBOTT: I am not too sure whether the member for Mallee has. There has been a problem at the Point McLeay reserve for many years now. If that community had the support of its local member, I think that it would go a long way towards solving that problem. I hope that the member for Mallee will look at that problem very soon and see whether he can assist in overcoming that problem.

However, despite all these economic difficulties, the Government claims that key economic indicators continue to show that the South Australian economy is faring better than that in other States. It also claims that, although unemployment has risen nationally by 27.5 per cent over the past year, the rise in South Australia has been only 3 per cent, and that employment in the State's manufacturing industry has increased by four times the national average over the past 12 months. I wonder what those thousands of people who are presently unemployed and who have been retrenched or sacked from their employment in the past week would think if they read that statement.

When commenting on the loss of hundreds of jobs in several industries in the past few days, the Minister of Industrial Affairs defended the Government's handling of the State's economy and then blamed everyone else except his Government and the Fraser Government. Instead of introducing policies aimed at regenerating employment opportunities and boosting the overall rate of economic growth, which would increase job opportunities to ensure that inroads are made on the record levels of unemployment, the Government blames everyone else but itself.

As at May 1982, the total level of unemployment in this State was 47 100, which 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 a national rate of 6.6 per cent and, with the spate of recent job losses, the rate in South Australia would now be about 8 per cent or more. That is a shocking record and an utter disgrace to the community of South Australia. For 29 consecutive months, from January 1980 onwards, this State has had the highest unemployment rate of any mainland State, yet this Government fought the last State election on stopping the job rot. It has failed, and failed miserably in finding jobs for the South Australian work force.

The SPEAKER: Order! The level of audible conversation is too high.

Mr ABBOTT: On South Australia's future, the Minister of Industrial Affairs called for the people to get off their backsides and get out and sell. A report in the *Sunday Mail* quotes the Minister as saying, amongst other things:

There is as much responsibility on the general work force as there is on management to ensure high productivity and quality to increase competitiveness. Also, consumers should be spending rather than holding back. Just because the Opposition Leader is preaching pessimism people should not over react and stop spending. They should maintain their normal buying. Mr Brown said the Opposition Leader (Mr Bannon) was the greatest propagator of gloom and pessimism which was purely for political purposes, but a pessimistic line can be self-defeating if people over react and stop their normal spending . . .

The Minister has a short memory indeed. In the Mitcham by-election, the Labor Party's campaign was 'Buy South Australian'. If the Minister would go about his duties and preach that slogan, it would go a long way towards helping resolve the economic crisis that we are currently experiencing.

For the Minister to appeal to the people to spend normally and stop holding back is an insult to the community of South Australia. I do not know how people can stop their normal spending: people have to eat, buy their normal food and clothing and support their children attending school, and the like. For the Minister to make that kind of statement is completely wrong and unfair. The Minister does not recognise that there are hundreds and thousands of workers who today have fortunately retained their job but have been transferred to lesser paid skills. I know hundreds of workers who have suffered in this kind of way.

The only choice they had was to accept a job in a lower paid classification. If they did not accept a transfer of that nature it was out the gate—there was no job at all. I have spoken to literally hundreds of those workers who have lost between \$10 and \$20 a week, yet here we have the Minister of Industrial Affairs appealing to the people to spend normally, and saying that they should maintain their normal buying. It is ridiculous and unfair for the Minister to appeal to people in that way.

Mr Lewis: What about the remand centre? Tell us something about that.

Mr ABBOTT: If the honourable member is interested in the remand centre, I might raise that subject a little later. I do not think that it is of very much concern to him—perhaps he would be concerned about it if we put it in Mallee, but that is not likely.

The Government says that the abolition of death and gift duties, and the implementation of major land tax exemptions and stamp duty remissions on home purchases have contributed to reducing the level of State taxation to the lowest level of any State except Queensland. Whilst that may be so, the Government says nothing about the massive increases in more than 100 State charges including essentials such as electricity, water, sewerage, and hospital charges, and bus, tram and train fares. The list goes on and on. This is clearly a system of backdoor taxation that hits the ordinary family hardest.

It also seems that the Government is not satisfied with South Australia's having fewer industrial disputes than do other States. It does admit, however, that loss of productivity through industrial disputation continues to be significantly less in South Australia than it is in any other State. A report recommending a comprehensive review of the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act having been received, legislation will be introduced to enhance South Australian industrial relations and to protect the rights of the individual within the work force. It will be interesting to see what measures the Government introduces. They will probably upset this State's excellent industrial record established by the former Labor Government.

I want now to refer to an article that appeared in the *Australian* on Monday 12 July reporting Bob Hawke, the Federal Opposition spokesman on Industrial Relations, Employment and Youth Affairs. He speaks in the article about the hideous social problems related to unemployment, as follows:

Mr Hawke said there can be little doubt that unemployment is one of the most hideous social and economic problems confronting the Australian community. 'During the latter half of the 1970s we have experienced the highest rates of unemployment since the depression years of the 1930s. At present, about 450 000 Australians are officially recorded as unemployed and the number will undoubtedly pass 500 000 by the end of 1982.'

There is not much future in the area of employment opportunity for the Australian work force whilst the present State and Federal Governments maintain existing policies. The article continues:

In addition, between 350 000 and 450 000 Australians have been forced into a state of 'hidden' unemployment since the mid-1970s, having withdrawn from or declined to enter a job market

which offers few employment prospects. A further 200 000 people may also have been forced into part-time employment or self-employment as a result of a lack of full-time job opportunities.

In other words, close to a million Australians may be being prevented from obtaining adequate employment because of the lack of appropriate job opportunities. The numerical magnitude of unemployment is made even more alarming by the prolonged nature of the current unemployment experience. The average period of joblessness is currently about 30 weeks and 140 000 Australians have now been out of work for at least six months.

The burden of unemployment, while affecting an increased section of the Australian labour force, continues to be perniciously concentrated on certain disadvantaged groups—migrants, females, the young, those with few skills or educational qualifications and older workers. Employment opportunities have increased at an average yearly rate of only 1 per cent during the latter half of the 1970s, nowhere near enough to cater for the increasing number of people coming on to the labour market. Moreover, almost half the growth in jobs has been in the part-time area.

While long-term structural factors such as the decline in traditional manufacturing jobs and the impact of new forms of technological change have been important influences, the regressive nature of Government policies must bear much of the responsibility for our current unemployment position. The Fraser Government has pursued a misguided policy strategy of giving priority to fighting inflation by deliberately suppressing the level of economic activity and attempting to restrain growth in real wages.

The Government has reduced expenditure in the manpower and training area by about 40 per cent in real terms since 1975-76, while unemployment has risen by over 50 per cent. It has steadfastly refused to implement programmes which create additional employment opportunities for those out of work, and has done little to improve the availability of training opportunities for a labour force confronted with the need to adapt to changing skill demands.

Unlike the Fraser Government, the A.L.P. is totally committed to working towards the restoration and maintenance of full employment in Australia. This will be a major policy priority of the next Labor Government.

In the article, Mr Hawke then goes on to talk about the overall planning framework aimed at generating employment opportunities and achieving a more skilled and adaptable labour work force.

The main theme I wish to discuss relates to my shadow portfolio and concerns poverty. It is something that, during the affluent times of the 1960s, tended to be swept under the mat as a subject for national debate. Poverty received serious thought in the early 1970s with the Henderson Commission and some real action during the period of the Labor Government from 1972 to 1975. Since that time it has been ignored by policy makers at the national level, who have been in a position to do something about it. I suppose whether one feels disposed to talk or think about poverty depends on one's political philosophy and understanding of the problem.

There are still plenty of people who do not realise that real poverty exists in Australia today. They see any debate about poverty as little more than an attempt to dress up in emotional terms inequalities in the distribution of income. That inequality is something they do not care about, either because they are not sufficiently perceptive to realise that there are severe and fundamental inequalities in the opportunities enjoyed by Australians, or simply because they are not concerned about social justice anyway. The facts of the matter are that many people are forced to go without some of the essentials of what is, by Australian standards, the most frugal life. Poverty is not having shelter, not having enough clothes, not having enough to eat and, if you do have shelter, not being able to afford enough energy for heating, cooking or lighting.

The people we would describe in Australia as poor might not be starving and dispossessed in the Third World image of poverty, but they may be malnourished and cold, and a growing number of people are homeless. It may be felt that I am being a little melodramatic, but the facts are that emergency relief is becoming a way of life for a growing number of people because their pensions and benefits are

totally inadequate. A discussion of poverty should not be confined purely to people's needs for the essentials to maintain life. Poverty also means things such as lack of opportunity for children and lack of dignity for the aged. It affects a far greater range of people than the narrow group who do not have adequate food, shelter, clothing, and warmth.

The policy-maker wants to measure poverty so that he can see its extent. He wants to use the measure to identify groups of special concern, to calculate poverty gaps, that is, the difference between the incomes of various groups and the recognised poverty line, and as the basis for setting the structure and rates of pensions, benefits, or allowances. Unfortunately, poverty is a very precise concept for very imprecise conditions. The standard measure of poverty in Australia has been the Henderson poverty line, based on the Melbourne basic wage plus child endowment for a wife at home and two children. To allow for the different needs of the family types, Henderson used relativities calculated from the 1954 family budget standard of the Community Council of Greater New York, which provided information on average requirements for good nutrition, using studies of actual family purchases.

Since 1979, the poverty line has been adjusted, first, as a proportion of the average weekly earnings and, more lately, as a percentage of seasonally adjusted household disposable income per head. That measure has been criticised because of the inappropriateness of the 1954 New York relativities, and because the original poverty line had been based on the basic wage which had for many years not been adjusted according to the needs of a family, but rather according to industry's capacity to pay.

The updates have been distorted because the original measure was a before-tax measure, and the updates have been made according to pre-tax indicators. Inability to put precise numbers on it should not stop us from doing something about it. Henderson came to some important broad conclusions after the Australian Bureau of Statistics had carried out a national survey of incomes in August 1973. More than 10 per cent of income units, whether individuals or families, were below the poverty line, and another 8 per cent was less than 20 per cent above that line, meaning that nearly one-fifth of the population was living either in poverty or at risk of poverty.

I read with some interest a letter to the Editor of the *Advertiser* by the Executive Officer of the South Australian Council of Social Service, dated 24 July 1982, referring to people surviving on welfare. It stated:

The new package of investment allowances and tax concessions to industry (the *Advertiser*, 20 July 1982) represents the latest attempt by the Federal Government to convince Australians that a simple equation links private sector growth on the one hand, and reduced unemployment, higher disposable incomes, and adequate social welfare provisions on the other. With a long experience of trying to assist the 180 000 or so South Australians living in, or near, poverty, the member organisations of the South Australian Council of Social Service are becoming exasperated at the obvious inability of this equation to fulfil its promises. Unemployment in Australia is climbing persistently towards the 500 000 mark, and the Government appears to have resigned itself to reaching this total. In South Australia, the June unemployment rate was 7.5 per cent—well above the national average of 6.7 per cent.

While real wages have increased over recent years, any benefits of such increases have been wholly or largely negated for many families by massive rises in the cost of housing, health insurance, public utilities and other essentials.

The burden of personal income tax has shifted away from those people on above-average weekly earnings to the majority below.

For the growing numbers of people attempting to survive on welfare payments, the outlook is bleaker than ever. The minor tinkering of selected welfare payments in successive Commonwealth Budgets can do nothing to disguise the fact that married pensioners without dependants are the only social security recipients to receive an income significantly above the poverty line.

Welfare agencies are reporting a surge in demand for emergency relief.

SACOSS believes that if the Federal Government is to retain any credibility as a proponent of social justice it must balance its dubious policy of trying to stimulate an investment-led recovery by an immediate and sustained redistribution of wealth to those low-income groups which need it most.

The council rejects the notion that this redistribution can only be achieved if the average individual taxpayer is prepared to finance it.

Personal income taxation need not be the sole or principal method of paying for the welfare system. There are several under-used or untried avenues of revenue-raising open to the Government, but it has yet to demonstrate the political will to explore them.

Housing has a significant effect on poverty. People who rent from private landlords are the poorest group, and that situation has not changed. I will say more about housing later. Nearly three-quarters of people below the poverty line were not in the work force. With record unemployment and staggering hidden unemployment, such as those forced into early retirement, the number and proportion of people who are not in the work force and below the poverty line has probably increased significantly. Supporting mothers are the largest proportion of the very poor. That was a clear example of how poverty lines are useful for identifying groups which are of particular concern.

Fewer aged people were found to be very poor than might have been expected considering they are not in the work force; that is because a large number of aged people are home owners. The groups with the biggest gaps between their income and the poverty line are the large families on wages on or just above the poverty line. This group has probably suffered the most from the gradual erosion of the family allowance, at least until partial relief was granted to large families with the last Federal Budget.

These groups are still those at greatest risk of poverty in our society. One obvious group has become more prominent and that is the unemployed. Unemployment is a gradually impoverishing condition. A person who is retrenched uses his savings and any outstanding holiday pay in the period when he waits for his first social security cheque. At some stage his money runs out and he cannot meet all of his outstanding commitments—whether they be electricity bills or hire purchase payments on a washing machine. Rent or mortgage payments are usually the point of greatest crisis. Home buyers with any more than the most modest liabilities are likely to lose their houses if they are unemployed for long periods. Gradually the cupboards in the kitchen are emptied of food; clothes wear out and become more and more difficult to replace. If they have growing children to keep in clothes and shoes, life is even more of a nightmare.

I ask members to spare a thought for the people and their families who have lost their jobs because of closures like Johnson's tannery or the people retrenched from Kelvinators and Dulux recently. The Leader of the Opposition has already quoted a long list of employers who have had to sack portions of their work force recently. There are many other smaller operators that we do not read or hear about through press reports and the like. I know of quite a number, particularly amongst the paper collecting manufacturers. Hinze Paper Manufacturers have recently had to retrench a handful of their employees. This is worrying a lot of charitable organisations such as Apex which have been receiving something like \$1 000 per annum by way of support. Many of these organisations are going to really feel the pinch in the future. The economic situation, however, is having more effect on the level of poverty than are continuing additions to unemployment. Recession means deprivation. The vulnerable groups are families on low incomes stricken by increases in the cost of living, the real value of their wages having been depleted by partial wage indexation and cut further by the cessation of tax indexation.

Pensioners have to cope with increases in the cost of living and with double digit inflation; twice yearly indexation sees them falling a long way behind before they get any relief. They have not had a real increase in their income for many years. The means test has not been relaxed to compensate for the erosion of the real value of any other income that they may have. Nor has the tax-free threshold been raised, so that pensioners with a quite small amount of other income face a marginal tax burden of 32c in the dollar. That tax is dragging them back towards the poverty line when their life savings have given them a bit of extra income which they need and which the Government cannot afford to pay them.

For all people on low incomes we can look at the cost of health care. If a family goes a single dollar over the limit for eligibility for a health care card or for a pensioner health benefit card it costs them another \$10 for health insurance which is a substantial proportion of their income and a great burden upon those people.

At present, there are a number of areas where the Federal Government is taking action, and instead of giving people every chance of living a reasonably comfortable life, it is dragging them back towards the poverty line. Nowhere is this more evident than in the area of housing. The South Australian Housing Trust's waiting list is now well above the 20 000 mark. Cuts in the real value of grants from the Commonwealth for public housing have meant that yearly additions to the trust's housing stock have been somewhat lower recently than they were in the mid-1970s. Rising costs and pressure on the trust to maintain what ever level of expansion is possible in the face of these enormous waiting lists have meant that rents have had to be put up at every available opportunity. Pensioners are finding that a substantial proportion of any increase in their benefit is absorbed by a subsequent increase in the cost of their accommodation.

The Housing Trust has been less able to respond to all the needs of severely disadvantaged groups, in particular homeless youths. An article in last Saturday's *Advertiser* reported Mrs Pichler, the co-ordinator of the Noarlunga Family Services Board's youth accommodation programme, as saying that homeless teenagers are sleeping in St Vincent De Paul clothing bins, under bridges, on bus seats and on the beaches in the Noarlunga area. That is something about which the Government should be going to extraordinary lengths to do something.

The sharp increase in both building costs and interest rates has meant that many people who previously might have been prospective home buyers are forced to remain in the rental market. This extra demand for rental housing has allowed many landlords, in what is a seller's market, to put up rents dramatically. Interest rate increases have also affected the rental market directly. Many landlords must cover the cost of finance for the houses that they are letting and will put up their rents accordingly when any interest rate increase occurs.

Mr Mathwin: What about the unfair Landlord and Tenants Act that the Labor Party introduced?

Mr ABBOTT: I agree with the member for Glenelg that the new Act is an excellent Act. Interest rates are getting to the point where a significant number of people are losing their homes. They may not be being thrown out by the bank or the building society, but they know that they will not be able to keep meeting the payments and sell before the situation is taken out of their hands. When that happens, they must find rented accommodation, which can often be almost as expensive as their mortgage payments. An ordinary Australian family with no hope of buying its own home will always live on the other side of affluence. The member for Mallee would not know what that meant.

What kinds of answers are there to these housing problems which are adding too much to the level of poverty in our community? The first priority is to make the Federal Government do something about the interest rate spiral. A gram of prevention is worth a kilo of cure. The Prime Minister's tight money policy, supposedly intended to bring down inflation (which it has not done) requires high interest rates, and the Treasury has not been backward in going into the market to push those interest rates up. A less contracting policy would help not only the home buyer and the rental market but also the economy generally. The other way in which the Federal Government can take the pressure off the rental market, and hence reduce the level of deprivation and poverty, is by increasing the level of grants for public housing.

The Tonkin Government does not have a record of championing South Australia's interests in its dealing with the Federal Government. Except for a little concerned posturing, interest rate increases go uncensured. Obtaining funds for public housing is not a top priority for this State Government at Premiers' Conferences. The Federal Government's inaction in the areas of social security and tax reform are not commented on. These things are probably to be expected, as they share a common philosophy and similar priorities.

In this State we have seen cuts in almost every area, in both staff and spending, not excluding community welfare. At the same time, we have seen massive increases in State charges. In effect, we are paying the Government more and receiving less. Part of that is the ideology motivated by mismanagement which sees Government workers under-utilised while private contractors perform the work that Government workers were employed to do. Every South Australian must bear the burden of these extra costs. The people who are struggling will be effected more.

An increase in the cost of essential items makes up a greater proportion of the budget of a person on a low income. These are not just increases in charges. They represent a whole new approach that will reduce the living standards of people on low incomes. It is a commitment to the user-pays principle which means that eventually all subsidies to people on low incomes will be wiped out. We saw the beginnings of this process very early in the Government's term with the abolition of succession duties and land tax on principal places of residence. That took an enormous chunk out of the State's revenue-raising capacity and, with the consequent increases in State charges, it has meant a shift in the charging burden from people of prosperity to people with few or no assets at all.

There is little doubt that both State and Federal Liberal Government's are today pursuing policies that will add to the level of poverty and deprivation within our community. As people are not interested in pursuing some ideologically-based theoretical notion of economic efficiency at the expense of all human considerations, I am sure that many of the Tonkin Government's actions are as unpopular as they are unnecessary. I do not share its sense of priorities and I do not believe that the majority of South Australian's do, either.

In conclusion, I appeal to the Government to support my action in writing to the Federal Treasurer asking him to increase all benefits in the next Federal Budget. I refer to pensioner benefits, unemployment benefits, and so on. In a press release that I issued today, I called on the State Government to support my campaign to convince the Federal Government to increase unemployment benefits in next month's Budget. Statistics from the Australian Council of Social Service indicate that single, unemployed people over 18 years of age are being forced to survive on an income \$33 a week below the accepted poverty line.

Mr Lewis: My mother saves money on her age pension.

Mr ABBOTT: The member for Mallee would not know what it is like to exist anywhere near the poverty line. He has no experience at all of living at that level. I do not believe the member for Mallee has any thought or concern for these people whatsoever.

Unemployed adults receive only \$58.10 a week, but ACOSS says that independent adults need more than \$91.10 a week just to keep themselves out of the poverty lines. Worst hit are single unemployed people under 18 who are living away from home and who are forced to survive on a paltry \$36 a week, which is \$55.10 below the poverty line. How a young person living away from home can survive on that kind of income is beyond me, and surely it must be beyond the member for Glenelg and the member for Mallee.

It is not surprising that social workers are now getting reports of increased youth homelessness. It is not only single people who are suffering. With an unemployed breadwinner in the family, a married couple with three children is forced to survive at a level \$24.60 below the official poverty line. The recent spate of retrenchments and dismissals in South Australia is putting more people on to that benefit. We are talking about people who want to work, and it is not their fault that they are not working and do not have jobs.

Mr Lewis: There are a lot of stumps where I come from. They could come and pick the stumps, but they—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mallee will assist by being quiet.

Mr ABBOTT: It is not their fault or their family's fault. Even if the State Government refuses to bring in job creation schemes to give these people jobs, it should still join me in my appeal to the Federal Treasurer to increase unemployment benefits to a realistic level. No-one in Australia, the so-called lucky country, should be forced to live below the poverty line.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I was pleased to hear His Excellency, Sir Donald Dunstan, present his first Opening Speech to Parliament. I commend him for that, and particularly for the manner and prestigious way in which he carried out his duties. I note, too, the death of former members of this House, another place, and Federal Parliament, and I offer my condolences to the families and friends of those late members. I am sure all honourable members would support that.

Tonight I wish to raise a couple of points as I have done in past speeches in the Address in Reply debate, when I have made mention of outstanding sporting achievements by my constituents, although honourable members would know already that I am talking about the latest Davis Cup team member, John Fitzgerald. I raise that matter although I can see that you, Mr Speaker, are watching me and wondering what that has to do with His Excellency's Speech.

I raise this matter because nowhere in the Speech is reference made to additional moneys being spent on sporting facilities. The other sportsman who deserves mention is Mr David Lukin, who has qualified for the Commonwealth Games in weightlifting. In order to put his achievements in some sort of perspective, I indicate to honourable members that he is able to lift 460 lb, the equivalent of one 44-gallon drum of petrol, from the ground and hold it above his head. That example gives some idea of the strength of that young man. Needless to say, he will be a strong boy when he grows up. I offer my congratulations to both those young athletes and wish them well in their sporting endeavours.

The main issue which I wish to raise this evening was featured in the *Advertiser* on 17 July headed 'Boom or Doom: the Coffin Bay question'. Indeed, this is a complex question and no-one can underestimate its complexity and

the will of all parties to try to reach some sort of satisfactory conclusion.

When I say the will of all Parties, perhaps that is a little misleading because at present we seem to have two groups fighting one another rather than working in a conciliatory way. I think I should go back to the late 1960s, when this issue first began. Coffin Bay, as many honourable members know (because I know many honourable members and Ministers have been there), is a pleasant holiday resort 40 kilometres west of Port Lincoln. It has excellent and safe boating waters with excellent fishing grounds. That has been the main attraction of this peaceful little pleasure resort.

However, in 1972 that was changed in a permanent way. Going back one step further to 1969, the District Council of Lincoln, which controls the area in which the Coffin Bay township is located, was concerned that the boundaries of Coffin Bay were not sufficient for future development of that town. I think it is fair to say that at that time there was grazing land right around the bay. It was, and still is, natural bushland. It was a relatively inaccessible area until B.H.P. built a bitumen road to its sand mine and development of the town took place.

In order to protect the town, the council attempted to have additional areas gazetted as township areas on 19 December, 1969. At that time this potential problem was identified and action was taken to rectify the situation. The reason for that was that the Coffin Bay township as proclaimed did not have sufficient area for a golf course, water supply, effluent system, cemetery, increased rubbish tipping and so on, all of the amenities that are usually available in a town. That is the reason why the request was made and the gazettal took place.

Some three years later (and to this day one does not know how) that area was gazetted as a conservation park. The district council and local bodies were not consulted: it was just done. Here we have one gazettal overriding another without any consultation whatever with the people involved. It is around that point that the whole crisis situation that has developed revolves. If that had not occurred and some common sense and a rational approach had applied at that time, the confrontations occurring now would be non-existent.

Nevertheless, that did occur. It was at that time that the district council made further attempts to secure additional land for Coffin Bay. I think it fair to say that those attempts, whilst formal ones through the district council, were not as forceful as they perhaps could have been, because people believed that there was additional property around the Coffin Bay township that could be utilised as an adjunct to the bay. In late 1975 and early 1976 the whole scene started to change, because an agreement was reached between Mr Andrew Peacock, then, I think, Minister for the Environment, and the then State Minister, Mr Simmons, for the acquisition of the Coffin Bay peninsula for the ultimate purpose of converting it to a national park. Finance was arranged. Some \$255 000 was supplied by the State Government and \$26 975 by the Commonwealth Government. That money was used to acquire the property. The original intention was to dedicate that property as a national park.

The local people (being a progress association), the local councillor, and the district council still insisted on trying to acquire extra land for the bay. They then tried to negotiate on the basis of the area of roads that existed on the Coffin Bay Peninsula property—an estimated 490 acres of land. The local residents believed that, if they could trade off the area for the roads and park, and have an area adjacent to the township, that would suffice. So, this hassle has continued and has now reached the situation where there is some compromise in the position of land for a golf course. That

land was partly acquired and partly donated from the acquired block known as the Coffin Bay Peninsula.

All this brings us back to the situation of where the Coffin Bay township stands, where I stand, and where we, as members of Parliament, stand on an issue which is becoming so touchy. The real problem is that the Coffin Bay township is proposed to be landlocked by national parks. We have the Minister of Lands saying that he does not believe that the area should be dedicated as a national park until reasonable and adequate provision is made for expansion of a township in the future. I believe that he is doing the right thing in that respect. On the other hand, the Minister of Environment and Planning is saying that no-one has ever undedicated a national park, for it looks as though that is the logical answer to the problem, that is, a small section of Kellidie Bay Conservation Park (the area immediately adjacent to the township) being undedicated. So, we have one Minister deadlocked on one line of action and another Minister deadlocked on another line of action.

Mr Mathwin: Did you see the letter in the paper yesterday or today in relation to this matter?

Mr BLACKER: I have not seen the letter of the past two days, although I have seen the letters of the days before. The other problem in which the Minister of Environment finds himself is that he is also the Minister of Planning. How one can ever reconcile the two portfolios in a dilemma such as this, I do not know. The Minister, on the one hand, has to be a loser and, on the other hand, a winner. If the Minister succumbs to the pressures of the Department of Environment, he is directly contravening the directions, requirements or guidelines of the Planning Department.

Surely it is the Planning Department's responsibility to see that any community within this State has reasonable and proper planning provisions. So, the Minister cannot win; he loses in either the planning side or the national park side.

The Minister of Health and Minister of Tourism has been inadvertently dragged into this matter, because her colleague has used the tourism portfolio as a reason to dedicate the national park. Most of the local people will say that it is necessary to use the Minister of Tourism to get the township moving and to get the water supply and health requirements caught up. So, we have the Minister of Tourism and Minister of Health caught up in a dilemma because, on the one hand, she has an obligation to see that the town is covered with satisfactory health requirements (in this instance, it is a reticulated water supply) and, on the other hand, there is the tourism component.

I do not believe that there is a conflict of interest on the tourist side, because I think that the township and the national park go hand in hand in a tourist venture. However, where the Minister of Health really has a say and where the local residents are calling on her for her support relates to the health risk at Coffin Bay which, potentially, is very serious.

For nearly four years the district council has asked the Engineering and Water Supply Department to take regular water samples from bores at Coffin Bay in order to test the level of e coli. The presence of e coli in certain bores is far above World Health Organisation levels. So, there is a potential risk in terms of health, as e coli has been identified as being of human origin. So, the problem is quite serious.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BLACKER: The e.coli count, as I have mentioned, is of a potentially serious nature. It is for that reason that future subdivision within the township of Coffin Bay has been refused. Some people have been saying in the press that there are plenty of blocks available at Coffin Bay, and

I think there are blocks available there, but they cannot be subdivided to provide for housing allotments because there is no water supply; therefore, there is a potential health risk. Again, we are in a catch 22 situation: on the one hand, people are saying that there are plenty of housing blocks; on the other hand, the department is saying that those blocks cannot be subdivided because there is a potential health risk.

Recently, a new committee of the Nature Conservation Council has been established in the Port Lincoln area. That council hit the headlines in the local paper with a report under the heading, 'Bay Park Proposal Sparks Protest', stating, in part:

Conservationists have expressed shock about proposals to resume part of the Kellidie Bay Conservation Park to provide facilities for Coffin Bay township.

It could hardly be called a shock proposal, because I have correspondence dating back to 1974 relating to it. So, it has been going on for about eight years. The report states:

This and related issues proved the catalyst for a group of concerned local people who last week formed the Southern Eyre Peninsula Nature Conservation Society. Its immediate aims are to prevent any changes to the park's boundaries and to press for an end to delays in dedicating the Coffin Bay Peninsula as a national park.

The Chairman of the society's steering committee, Mr John Glasson, said to 'undedicate' any conservation park, particularly one as unique as this, would damage its role, set a dangerous precedent and draw the condemnation of reasonable people from throughout Australia and the world. He said the District Council of Lincoln and a small group of Coffin Bay residents had for some years applied various tactics in an effort to persuade the State Government to release areas of both the conservation park and the proposed national park which adjoined the township. These pressures had been intensifying, Mr Glasson said.

I shall return to that later, because Mr Glasson has presented me with a petition which he believes indicates the will and the wish of many people in the area. This action is another point that worries me. It is a renewed attempt within the conservation movement or the national parks and wildlife groups that just happened to occur when the Minister was on his honeymoon. I raise that sequence of events because it has been my experience that incidents such as this occur either at a change of Minister (such as when the Ministry was changed in the previous Government from the Hon. Don Simmons to the Hon. Des Corcoran), or at a change of Government (when the Ministry changed from the Hon. Des Corcoran to the present Minister), or on another occasion when the present Minister was out of the State.

On this occasion, the Minister was on his honeymoon. I believe that the sequence of events is too coincidental to be ignored. The implications certainly need further investigation. Be that as it may, I would like to read into *Hansard* the petition presented to me (and I believe that a similar petition has been presented to the district council), because there has been a reaction from the community in this regard. The petition is headed 'To the Hon. Peter Blacker, member for Flinders', and states:

The humble petition of the undersigned citizens sheweth: that the Coffin Bay Peninsula has not been dedicated as a national park.

We all know that: it is a statement of fact and something with which no-one would disagree. The petition further states:

Some call on lands, now part of the Kellidie Bay Conservation Park, has been made by the District Council of Lincoln for township development.

I believe that that is a fair request. This matter has been going on since 1973-74. It further states:

Your petitioners therefore pray that you will:

1. Give your support to the undersigned in order to obtain the dedication of the Coffin Bay Peninsula as a national park.

No-one would like to see that park dedicated as a national park more than I would. I do not believe there is one person in the community who would disagree with that request, because it is fair, reasonable and proper, if the basic requirements of the Coffin Bay township have been provided for in the first instance. The petition further states:

2. Support the concept of dedication of the land for conservation purposes for all people for all time.

In general principle, I think most people would agree with that. However, anyone who makes such a bold and bland statement must think through the consequences of the series of events which have occurred at Coffin Bay. No-one predicted that they would happen. If the Government departments had acted responsibly and informed the district council so that alternative arrangements could have been made at that time before the lands were dedicated as national parks, the hassle would never have arisen. However, it has arisen, and therefore we must question the wisdom of dedicating willy-nilly any land to national parks irrespective of the consequences on any other section of the community. The petition further states:

3. In line with this concept, act to prevent the 'un-dedication' of Kellidie Bay Conservation Park, or any other conservation park.

I have already explained that that point is the nub of the matter. That petition was presented to me by Mr John Glasson whom I know quite well and who I believe was acting in extremely good faith. I do not question the sincerity of his actions. I asked John to come in, sit down and talk about the problem that we are facing. I asked him what he would do in this situation. I think it is fair to say that John Glasson (who I believe is a laboratory technician or pathologist at the Port Lincoln Hospital laboratory) would fully understand the health risks that accrue.

When I explained to John the history of this series of events and showed him much of the correspondence on the matter, he realised that the problem is far more deep seated than he or anyone else who is now writing to newspapers envisaged in the first instance. I asked him, 'What would your answer be?' and he said, 'Look, we have to sit at the table and talk about the matter. We have to obtain a report from the E. & W.S. Department on how a reticulated water supply system could be provided for Coffin Bay.' I believe that that report has been undertaken.

We all know that if such a system is provided for Coffin Bay it has to be situated on national park land. There is no basin underneath the township that is not already polluted, so the water has to come from an area to be acquired or from a conservation park. The balance tanks required for such a reticulated system have to be located on an area dedicated as conservation park. There is all of this hysteria about undedication, but really it is a case of practicalities. Do we allow Coffin Bay to be provided with normal services that any town should be given? That is the obvious and logical conclusion. In so doing we run into the dilemma that nobody has ever undedicated a national park. That is the dilemma driving the factions apart and into corners.

I believe that people on one side or the other have taken up the matter with political Parties. Certain undertakings have been given. I believe it is necessary for the conservationists, the townspeople, the district clerk and the political Parties to sit down and have a round-table discussion on how to resolve this deadlock. Unless somebody gives and takes, it will never be resolved; it will go on *ad infinitum*. The Coffin Bay people will be denied a water supply and septic services, because another area must be involved. No further subdivision can be permitted in the town as it has been outlawed because of health risks. The present basin on which Coffin Bay township is situated is already polluted

and showing e.coli counts in some of the bores. It is quite a dilemma.

It is fair to say that even the District Council of Lincoln was lulled into a false sense of security when it received a letter from Mr Jack Richards, the Manager of the Eyre/Yorke region of the Department of Lands in the Land Resource Management Division. The letter is dated 10 July 1980 and talks about the original dedication of that section of the park which was noted in the *Gazette* on page 2090 of 18 December 1969. At the end, in referring to the national park and the dedicated land in question, the letter states:

These areas can be added to or diminished with the authority of the controlling bodies.

That point was accepted in good faith but was never complied with, and it is causing the problem today. How do we resolve the situation? Do we let it go on *ad infinitum*? I do not think we can.

A consultative committee has been set up by the Minister to consider the question. The District Council of Lincoln attempted to put its viewpoint to the committee. I have had various reports on the conduct of that meeting. Some of those reports I would question; people complained to me that they did not have the right of a fair hearing. I note also that a circular was sent around by Mr Cordes, Community Liaison Officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. It is a nine-page document and refers to measures leading up to the present dilemma. I also note that many parts of the saga have been left out.

I also note that I get a mention in reference to deputations which I have accompanied to the Minister of Lands on various occasions on behalf of the Progress Association and the District Council of Lincoln. I refer to that document because, from my own knowledge, the reference tendered as information to members of the consultative committee is, in itself, not complete.

If the information provided by the department is not complete, how can those members of the consultative committee make a fair and rational judgment? When that consultative committee was first formed and I was at the inaugural meeting or reception held at Boston House in order to launch the committee, I raised some points with the Director at the time and pointed out to him that this had been a long and protracted argument about a very complex problem. I asked him to make sure that it was studied carefully and in its full and proper context. However, I do not believe that that has actually happened. To verify what I have said concerning water quality at Coffin Bay, I shall refer to a letter dated 22 December 1980, a circular-type letter to ratepayers. Headed 'Re: water quality Coffin Bay', it states:

As you are no doubt aware the quality of bore water within Coffin Bay has been a matter of contention for some time. Regular testing procedures carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of various water bores during this period have constantly revealed unsatisfactory levels of bacteria. E coli is the bacteria of main concern. The bacteria is of human origin and council is convinced that the e coli is gaining access to water bores via effluent overflow from the soakage areas of septic tanks. The soil strata in Coffin Bay is ideal for this type of soakage.

The opportunity is now at hand to either install a reticulated water scheme to properties, fed from near-by natural springs, at an approximate cost of \$880 000, or to set up a common effluent drainage system, at a cost of approximately \$1 250 000.

The letter contains a little more detail. I think we all appreciate that, ideally, the town should have both a reticulated water supply system and a common effluent scheme.

I have received many letters since 1973 up to within the last few weeks that I could refer to *ad infinitum*. I want to refer to a letter that was recently sent to the Minister of Lands and also the Minister of Environment because I believe it presents a very balanced assessment of the situation.

I shall not mention names, but shall quote the context of the letter. The letter states:

I am writing in my private capacity and the options I put forward—I put directly to you to prevent any political or public distortion of them. It seems that a consensus is being reached by all parties that (a) Coffin Bay township is restricted in its long-term expansion potential; (b) that the town may occupy its presently available land as early as in 40 years time; (c) now is the time for the State Government to decide its long-term policies for the development of Coffin Bay. The approximate 40 hectares—

I want to emphasise the phrase 'the approximate 40 hectares', as it illustrates the fact that no-one has ever measured the area of land in question; it is a mere fly speck when one considers the area of 31 000 hectares which comprise the conservation park and the proposed conservation park. The letter states:

The appropriate 40 hectares that the District Council of Lincoln is seeking from the Kellidie Bay Conservation Park is prime housing development area and would serve the needs of the community for some time, as well as consolidating the township area, although I believe it would be in the communities best interest to have this area retained by the Crown under the control of the Minister of Lands until it is required for development.

I can appreciate the political problems of undedicating a conservation park, but I outline below a package that I believe the 'public' would be foolish not to accept.

(a) The Government should purchase sections Fa and Fhe, hundred of Lake Wangary (old section numbers). The purchase can be justified on the following grounds:

- (1) to provide for the regeneration of scrub and Sheoak country;
- (2) to provide an ideal area for the controlling grazing of the 'Coffin Bay ponies';
- (3) to provide an area for a Engineering and Water Supply water reserve to protect the catchment area for township water supply;
- (4) to provide easy public access to a stable area of the park for tourist picnic, recreation, horse and wildlife viewing.
- (5) to provide for the BHP mining area and to accommodate a controlled rubbish dump and road fill area for the township outside of the water catchment area, you may require some council input to this purchase, but bear in mind council has already spent a large amount of money in the township and in the provision of an airstrip outside the park.
- (6) the major and continual problems of managing a farm that is surrounded by national parks, pine forest and E. & W.S. reserve presents an on-going conflict of land use.

B. The Kellidie Bay Conservation Park should be undedicated and a 40 hectare area laid aside for eventual township purposes.

C. One park called the Coffin Bay National Park should be dedicated which would include the former Kellidie Bay Conservation Park, the newly acquired area and the Coffin Bay Peninsula area.

D. A total management plan should be drawn up, defining the different areas of the park and also the separate levels of management required for each area, that is;

1. fenced area of Kellidie Bay;
2. part section Fa, for regeneration;
3. part section Fa and Fbe, being public access areas;
4. part section Fa and Fbe, being controlled dump and BHP sand mine;
5. part section Fa—restricted pony area, for the retention of Coffin Bay ponies;
6. part section Fa—E. & W.S. water catchment;
7. some of sand areas of peninsula—limited access;
8. presently used coastal areas—continued access;
9. beach areas—unrestricted boat access;
10. Aboriginal sites—total protection.

As you would no doubt point out, a plan such as this would cost a considerable amount, but in the long term would create one of the best and most diverse national parks in Australia. With a commonsense management plan placing conservation, public usage, protection of national State and heritage alongside each other in a multi-use enlarged park that takes care of and enhances the township, at the same time satisfying the wider community.

The potential impact of a park like this on the community, public awareness and on the Coffin Bay township could be tremendous and have a very positive influence in the future.

As you can see, I believe that the 'Coffin Bay Issues' need be considered in total, not in a piecemeal way, and I trust that the points that I have raised may be of some assistance to you.

I believe that is a very practical and realistic approach to a quite serious dilemma confronting the people of today. I could mention a number of issues that as yet have not been totally brought into the picture. For example, abalone divers have approached me, because they normally travel through the Coffin Bay Peninsula area to launch their boats.

When this land was first acquired those divers were to be excluded from the peninsula. They wanted an assurance that they would be allowed to go down there to continue their livelihood, to be able to take their boats through the peninsula area and continue their fishing. The same situation applies to lobster fishermen who anchor their boats at Avoid Bay and travel by four-wheel drive vehicles. There are many other answers. No-one has really satisfactorily come up with an answer to the situation in relation to the BHP sand mine and the lease associated with it.

The BHP company spent countless hundreds of thousands of dollars, if not millions of dollars, to develop a railway line down there. Admittedly it is not being used to any large degree, but sand from the considerable sand mine is used as flux for blast furnaces. The structure and infrastructure is set up there to be used. Only a small portion of the sand has been carted out, but there is potential for sand to be supplied for thousands of years should it be required.

The Engineering and Water Supply Department watershed area has not really been defined. It is marked on maps as a watershed area. Who has done anything constructive about it? No-one has really done anything about the Coffin Bay ponies. National parks officers have been doing their level best to remove the Coffin Bay ponies from the peninsula. Three successive Minister have advertised for someone to take the ponies away, and three successive Ministers did not know that such action was being taken. Of course, I refer to the Hon. Don Simmons, the Hon. Des Corcoran and the present Minister, the Hon. David Wotton. These are actions that have been taken in the management of the programme to date which have created public animosity between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the community.

The water supply problem, which I believe is the most crucial, has not been resolved; the effluent problem, which also is most crucial, has not been resolved; and the rubbish tip problem has not been resolved. The rubble pits that are required for the Coffin Bay development have not been provided for.

You, Mr Deputy Speaker, would know of some of the difficulties. To make things worse, I refer to the antipathy affecting relations between the National Parks and Wildlife Service and the community. They seem to be driven further and further apart. Just about everyone I know who has had some contact on this problem is not against national parks; they want the area dedicated. All they want is fair and reasonable provision made to be for Coffin Bay township in future years.

Mr Evans: They want common sense to prevail.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, a commonsense approach is what we are after in regard to a practical problem that is not necessarily a philosophic problem. I have spent much of my time on the Coffin Bay issue. I have believed it necessary, because the question has obviously been brought to a head in a way which could cause unfortunate consequences to occur. The credibility of people could be damaged and all sorts of other side issues could develop. If it comes to a showdown, then it is obvious to me that part of the Kellidie Bay Conservation Park has to be undedicated in order that reasonable provision can be made for Coffin Bay township.

As I have mentioned, that does cause problems in terms of park management, but we should look back to how that problem occurred, why it occurred and, if we are going to sheet home the blame to anyone, let it rest on those people

who made that bad judgment at that time. I will leave that subject there, although doubtless it will come up again. I make a call for the Ministers concerned, the Premier and Opposition members who have been contacted on this matter, to arrange a round the table conference so that common sense may prevail on this issue. If I can assist in bringing those people together, I will have achieved a worthy objective.

Mr HEMMINGS: I draw your attention to the state of the House, Mr Speaker.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BLACKER: I now refer to the reference by His Excellency to legislation concerning the holding of a referendum on daylight saving. As honourable members would be aware, I come from the western part of South Australia where daylight saving affects residents far more than in the eastern part of the State. I have requested the Premier that, in drafting the referendum, a series of alternative questions be asked rather than a straight 'Yes' or 'No'. I think that we would all appreciate that the problems are complex and the issues cannot be readily appreciated by people who live in the eastern part of the State.

Mr Becker: What will a referendum achieve?

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member for Hanson asks what a referendum will achieve. I think it is necessary to indicate to the Government of the day just how people are affected by the daylight saving issue.

Mr Becker: We will have a no-win situation with part of the State voting 'yes' and part voting 'no'.

Mr BLACKER: Then, hopefully, we will get some rational appreciation of each other's problems. I appreciate what the member for Hanson says, namely, that we will get into a no-win situation where part of the State will vote 'Yes' and part of it will vote 'No'. That is something with which the Government of the day will have to deal. I ask that, when the matter goes before the people, a series of alternative questions should be put up, one being whether the period of daylight saving should be restricted to school holiday periods. Most of the complaints that I receive about daylight saving involve schoolchildren having to get to school buses before the sun is up, and, in other cases, getting off school buses after the sun is down.

There is also the problem of small children travelling long distances, boarding school buses at 7.10 a.m., which becomes a real hassle not only for the children but also for the parents. I think that this is something about which the people of this State have been quite biased in forcing this type of measure on the wider section of the community.

Another point which I believe is more than a compromise and a very realistic approach to the problem is to shift the time meridian by which South Australian time is determined. We would all realise that the time meridian by which central standard time is set is on the eastern side of the Victorian border. In other words, it is not even in South Australia. If we were to use the time meridian that was relative to the centre of the State, or at least relevant to Adelaide, we would find that the impact of daylight saving on those people in the West of the State would be far less severe, and it would be a reasonable and rational approach.

I know that in past years this concept has been vigorously opposed by the business community, which states that, if the time lapse between Eastern Standard Time and Central Standard Time was more than half an hour, it would seriously affect business relationships and interstate trade. I question that because, with modern technology and gadgetry that exist today, most business is done on telexes and by electronic means. Therefore, the time lapse between the two States is irrelevant.

I say that because we still trade conveniently with Western Australia yet, if one takes into account the daylight saving time lag and the meridian time lag between the two States,

plus the flexitime of workers in each of the States, I think that there is only one hour and 20 minutes during the day when one could telephone and expect to find someone in an office in the other State. So, these things that used once to apply no longer apply today. I think that this is a fair and reasonable approach. Honourable members would know that the Local Government Association has given its support to this concept, because at least it is fair and reasonable to all concerned.

On Tuesday morning I was pleased to be present at the annual meeting of the United Farmers and Stockowners Association, as were a number of members of this Parliament. I listened with interest to the address given by the then President, Mr Ralph Jones. I would like to quote part of his address, because it is relevant and concerns our farming community. It refers to the position in which we find ourselves. Under the heading 'State of Agriculture in Australia', it states:

The latest B.A.E. estimates indicate the index of real net value of rural production declined 26 per cent in 1980-81, with a further fall of 13 per cent for 1981-82, the farm rate of inflation over the most recent 12 month period being 50 per cent higher than the c.p.i.

In 1982 wages in West Germany increased by 4 per cent to 4.5 per cent; Japan by 6 per cent, and in the U.K. by single figures. In the U.S.A., Ford and General-Motors' employees accepted for the next 30 months wages with a 3 per cent rise per year and eliminated nine personal holidays.

Australia, during that time, has had shorter hours and wage rises, giving an all over average rise of 15 per cent against 3.6 per cent by our trading partners.

Twenty years ago Japan earned one-third per capita compared to Australia; today Japanese earn more per capita. G.D.P. in Japan and Singapore has increased 7.5 per cent per year. In Australia it has risen by 2.5 per cent in the same time.

Over the last 25 years, Australia has had a current account trade deficit. Over the last six years, Australia has gone into debt to the tune of \$16.5 billion—one-third of that in the last year alone. That is \$1 000 extra debt over the last six years for every one of us.

If this inflow of capital was for productive assets or to build business that would increase our export earnings, then not so bad. However, this is not the case, as part of the inflow is speculative or aimed at taking over existing businesses or simply to pay the housekeeping bills for the non-trading sector.

O.E.C.D. estimates the trade deficit for 1983 at \$5 000 million for Australia. Australia is going into debt as a nation to maintain an unearned standard of living.

Part of the problem is our present industrial relations climate arising from the fact that there are no restraining mechanisms for the extremists in our midst. Most Australians know we have industrial problems, and know what the problem is, but there are no real mechanisms by which it can be addressed.

In this country only 20 per cent of the people work on jobs making goods for export or in competition with imports; 5 per cent in highly protected industries; 35 per cent on the Government payroll, supported by taxes, and the rest in service industries not export productive.

The question is how to convince 80 per cent that their jobs and their standard of living depend on our success in meeting international customers' needs for primary produce and minerals—at a price, the world is prepared to pay, and at a price, that allows us to stay in business.

Australia, as a nation, must move out of the dreamland of 'have now and pay later', use its resources, and realise that shorter hours and wage increases do not give greater production—only increased costs.

The President then goes on to sum up his remarks. I believe that those statements are quite relevant, because the bulk of our agricultural community are exporters, and it is that export sector of the community on which we rely quite heavily.

I also note that in some figures that recently came out in a booklet issued by the National Farmers' Federation it is stated that 'agriculture is a growing industry', that 'agriculture grows food' and that 'agriculture exports help Australia grow'. I believe that those points on growth are most relevant. The booklet goes on to say:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics estimates that there are 171 000 professional farms in Australia, mostly family-owned enterprises. Australian farmers are today recognised as among the most efficient in the world. The average Australian farmer produces sufficient food for 70 people, compared to 59 fed by the average American farmer and 19 by the average West European primary producer.

In terms of efficiency, our primary producers lead the way throughout the world. The other point which needs to be recognised and which is so easily passed over is that the agricultural industry has a tremendous potential for employment. It is reasonable to say on this occasion, when employment is in a very serious situation throughout this State and the nation, that there is further potential within the agricultural industry for additional employment. The National Farmers Federation booklet, *The Story of Farming*, refers to 'Partners in progress', and further states:

Hundreds of thousands of Australians are engaged in producing the materials needed for farming—such as tractors, machinery, fertiliser, chemicals, fuel and so on. Hundreds of thousands more Australians are engaged in some aspect of processing and marketing agricultural produce. Grain, beef, wool, sheepmeat and many other rural products have to be transported, processed into consumer products, packaged, marketed or exported overseas.

Employment: Agriculture in Australia directly creates 1 000 000 jobs. Altogether, agriculture provides employment for more than 3 000 000 Australians.

That is a very significant figure indeed. The booklet then goes on to deal with other matters, but I think that those figures should be mentioned, because many of us in the community and those not directly involved too easily lose sight of the real problem, particularly for exporting industries. We have to compete on a cost effective basis.

A few weeks ago I was talking with an exporter, discussing export problems. He referred to a friend of his who was involved in exporting to countries to our north. The exporter was dealing in melons, which I thought rather an unusual commodity. Evidently, the container of melons, as it was being transhipped, not having been packed correctly, had to be totally unloaded and repacked, each individual melon being packed into a box, and each box being repacked into the container. The agent complained quite bitterly that the total job—and one could imagine the number of man hours involved—cost \$9.95. My friend, who was up there at the time, said that he could not get a person to open the door of the container for \$9.95. That is the cost competitive problem that is faced by Australian producers and exporters.

When the live sheep export trade commenced a few years ago, the sheep were fed hay. A number of producers in my area were paid \$1.20 a bale for their hay. To earn that \$1.20 the farmer had to provide the land and the machinery, grow the hay throughout the year, maintain the farm, and pay his rates and taxes, all for \$1.20 a bale. The cost for taking the bale off the rail truck on the wharf and putting it on board the boat was \$10. The producer was paid \$1.20 for 12 months work in growing the hay and delivering it to the waterside, and waterside costs at that time were more than eight times production costs. I wonder whether those people ever ask now why the live shippers do not use hay. That is the reason: they have priced themselves out of employment in that case. It is widely known that the use of pellets and manufactured products has taken over. Time has slipped away from me, but I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, and I look forward to hearing the member for Napier take his turn in the debate.

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I am pleased to join in this debate and support the motion. I wish to join those comments already made by members on both sides of the House in mentioning former members of this House, the Legislative Council, and the Federal Parliament who have died in recent months. I join with them in the tributes they have

paid to the service that those men have rendered to the State in their respective responsibilities as legislators.

I also take this opportunity to welcome to this House the member for Mitcham, and I congratulate her on her election. I also welcome to this Parliament the Hon. Mr Feleppa, who succeeded the late James Dunford as a member of the Legislative Council. I join with all other members in wishing Mr Feleppa well in his duties in this Parliament on behalf of the people of this State. He is the first Italian-born person to become a member of the South Australian Parliament.

I listened to the Governor's Speech with great interest. The Speech is an important constitutional function that takes place at the beginning of each Parliamentary session. I must say that I was disappointed that the Governor was asked by the Government to make that Speech, because I believe that it contained too much political comment and resume. It was a substantial departure from the Speeches that I have heard in recent years and perhaps it establishes an unwise precedent in regard to the role of the Governor in Parliamentary process. There has been considerable debate about the role of viceregal representatives in our constitutional system and I believe it is most undesirable that we ask the Governor to enter into the field of Party politics.

I want to refer to some aspects of the Governor's Speech about which I require clarification, and which I believe are inappropriate for inclusion in a Speech of this kind. The Governor's Speech is a very important document for those in our community who are concerned with law making. One of the reasons for my disappointment was that the Speech contains very little reference to the nature of the legislation that we can expect in the coming months. There is much political comment and innuendo in that Speech, with such phrases as:

My Government believes the family is the basic unit of our society and will develop family programmes to overcome conflicts which lead to youth homelessness, truancy and other social problems.

It does not explain how that will be done, whether by budgetary means or by legislation. I would have presumed there would need to be some legislative enactment if that statement is not to be regarded as a hollow political statement. For those reasons, I believe that that type of statement does a disservice to the role of government in the community. A great number of people are concerned about those aspects of the lives of young people in this State, particularly homelessness. In recent years, the Government has announced a number of schemes to provide an assessment of this problem by way of reports, and has suggested programmes and has allocated funds in that regard. I believe that those programmes have not been very successful.

In regard to the 50-house scheme, we see some of the problems that are associated with that approach to the problem of youth homelessness and also in regard to problems of truancy and a general statement of other social problems. If we are to pass laws in this place that will be respected in the community, and if we believe in the maxim that every man is presumed to know the law, we should tell the public at the earliest possible stage what laws this Parliament intends to consider and enact.

Further, we need to know in more precise detail how the mandate of the Government, which it receives at the election, is to be brought into being by way of legislative enactments and manipulation of the Budget. I think that this document, obviously prepared by the Ministry, lacks that precision that the community should have. I refer to another part of the Governor's Speech where it states:

My Government has continued to pursue its policy of encouraging and maintaining fair trading in the market place and the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs has continued its review of legislation in line with this policy. My Government will

legislate to remove unnecessary restrictions on legitimate business activity.

I think that that is indeed a very contentious statement and one that could be argued with at some length as to its accuracy. More confusing is the following sentence, which goes on to explain that, indeed, legislation will be introduced that will do precisely the opposite to the intention just stated and that is to bring down further regulation on a section of the business community.

I know, and many other members know, of the problems that have been created by deregulation in the area of consumer affairs and of the cutting back of staff and services provided by that department. There are the problems that are associated with the deregulation of auctioneers and the necessity arising for further legislation to be introduced into this Parliament to once again restore some of the laws in respect of that profession.

The taking away of the covenant entrenched in our residential tenancies law which provided protection for people with families seeking rental accommodation is another example. I had representations from a most distressed constituent only last week who was absolutely frustrated by being refused, time after time, accommodation for the reason that she had two children. She was told that by the landlords, one after the other. She sought some assistance from me. I was able to explain to her that that protection was previously in the legislation and was taken out by this Government and that there was indeed a need for that aspect of the Residential Tenancies Act to be reinstated and for that protection to continue to be provided.

I would have thought that, in the present state of rental housing and accommodation generally in this State, those protections are needed now more than ever. We have, indeed, a very contradictory statement contained in the Governor's speech as to Government intention and one that I believe can only cause confusion in the minds of the public. A further statement in the Speech is:

Through reorganisation of the Department of Environment and Planning my Government will pursue its goal of achieving balance between development and conservation in use of the State's cultural and natural resources.

I have read that sentence a number of times and pondered over it. I really cannot come to grips with what it means in terms of possible legislation that will be introduced into this House or programmes on which the Government will embark to bring about what it is trying to say. I believe that that is a further example of what I am saying about the lack of intent in the document on the Government's programme. Further on the Speech states:

My Government established the South Australian Sports Institute in April of this year with the function of co-ordinating the allocation of resources for the development of excellence in sporting activities.

Of course, we all know that that institute was established and, indeed, it has been the subject of a great deal of controversy in the community. I do not know why that needed to be added into the Speech. I am further surprised by the next sentence, which states:

Staff and finance resources will be provided to the Institute during the 1982-83 financial year to enable it to commence its work in this important area.

Of course that was provided for in the allocations that have already been before the House. I would have thought that that was a reference to something in the past, being totally irrelevant to the coming session of Parliament. Further on there is a reference to the Law Reform Committee of South Australia. Indeed, in most Governor's Speeches there is some reference to law reform and the workings of the Law Reform Committee in one way or another, whether referred to directly or not. I may have been looking at their honours the judges who were present when the Governor

was reading his Speech, but I seemed to notice a few wigs bobbing up and down when the Governor said:

My Government intends to introduce Bills to give effect to a number of the reports made by the Law Reform Committee of South Australia.

Indeed, one of the great disappointments for those members of the Judiciary and the profession who work so tirelessly on that committee is that so little of their efforts ever appear in the Statutes of this State. So much of it involves remote areas of the law, or lawyers' law, and does not receive a high priority in the planning of the legislative programme. I was disappointed that the work of that committee was passed off by such a reference, because I would have thought that it was important to mention specifically which reports of the Law Reform Committee it was proposed to bring before the House or that, if it did not involve reports, general areas of the law could be mentioned, because these are not contentious matters usually in terms of Party politics, but they are often contentious in terms of one's interpretation of the law or the role that the law should be playing. So, it is important that there be debate in the community about these matters before they are presented to Parliament.

Of course, the Governor's Speech provides the appropriate opportunity—indeed, the only opportunity apart from press releases which are in the hands of the individual Ministers—to advise the community on legislation to be brought before the House. I think it has been the experience of successive Governments that this is done often just before such legislation is introduced. I would have thought that the Law Reform Committee's work deserved quite substantial attention and advance notice.

Mr HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr CRAFTY: My final comment concerning the content of the Governor's Speech concerns the very brief reference to the Budget and to the Estimates of Expenditure. I think one of the most important roles of a Parliamentarian concerns the assessment of the Budget together with priorities for expenditure. In this case, I believe the Government has attempted some reforms, but in my view those reforms will do nothing in the way of bringing about an improvement in the role of the Parliamentarian, in particular, in the budgeting process.

Mr Gunn: The Labor Party did nothing during the 10 years that it was in Government.

Mr CRAFTY: Perhaps we will soon have an opportunity to bring about some further reforms. I believe that Parliamentarians, particularly back-bench members, are left out of this aspect of Government. I agree with comments that have been made in recent months in various forums around Australia in relation to the need for Budget reviews more than once a year: indeed, certainly half-yearly and perhaps, more appropriately, quarterly. This is a practice which is well established in private enterprise, particularly in large corporations and by Governments in other places around the world.

We have found that the emphasis and thrust of this Government is to review public expenditure and public programmes by means of programme performance criteria. In my view that gives members an opportunity to assess these programmes in monetary terms only. After sitting on numerous Estimates Committees in recent years, I have found that any discussions on policy matters have been restricted and, indeed, are seen as irrelevant. I believe the important function is not just to review financial expenditure and how that expenditure is assessed in terms of accounting procedure and accountability generally but also to ascertain whether the programmes themselves meet the criteria in relation to the services provided to the community and

similar discussions on the effectiveness of that particular policy.

We have never had an opportunity in the Budget debates to talk at some length, for example, about the Government's criteria, the thread that runs through all of its policies, that the user pays. I believe that is a most destructive principle indeed when it is applied to many of our health, education and welfare programmes. We need to have much more information than we have been given about the criteria used by the Government in implementing that much vaunted policy of user pays.

Another area where I believe the Parliamentarian is excluded to the detriment of good government is in the analysis of Commonwealth-State financial relations. I suppose I first experienced frustration in that area during the Budget Estimates Committee hearings last year when we sought information about the Commonwealth-State health agreement and the changes that had been made. We were given very restricted access to information in relation to that most important agreement between the Commonwealth and the State and the resultant effect it will have over many years on the quality, nature and extent of the delivery of health services.

A perhaps more minor matter is the quite fundamental changes in the way that the Commonwealth provides this State with funds for legal aid. Indeed, it is a change that will obviously advantage this State. As a result of the acceptance of a new funding agreement between the Commonwealth and the State, the State was able to make a profit on legal aid. In fact, there was a surplus of money over that which had been budgeted for. As I understand it, that money was paid into Consolidated Revenue, not into the expansion of much needed legal aid services in this State.

I believe that is a further example of the need for a Parliamentary review of Commonwealth-State agreements, particularly those that relate directly to the provision of Government services. As I see it, there is no real scrutiny of decisions taken at Loan Councils and Premiers' Conferences in our system of budgetary review and analysis of the financial programmes of the Government. I realise that there needs to be confidentiality in the formulation of many of these arrangements, but I see no reason why they should not be made public and all the information laid on the table once those agreements have been reached so that they can be scrutinised in the public interest. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon: H. ALLISON (Minister of Education): I move: That the House do now adjourn.

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I would like to take the opportunity during this adjournment debate to comment on a report that has been recently released by the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs entitled 'Evaluation of Post-Arrival Programmes and Services'. The area on which I wish to comment relates to multicultural television and radio. Ever since I entered this House, I have shown an interest in this area and have watched carefully the growing audience and the increased use of the radio network as a medium for consultation and communication between the

various ethnic groups and for various ethnic groups throughout the community.

I have seen the number of people in the community who have been getting involved in the communication network and the many people who have voluntarily learned to operate turntables and microphones and to put together programmes on a voluntary basis in order to communicate with their own communities. I have no hesitation in endorsing such programmes. Therefore, it is interesting to look at the report and see that one of the recommendations to the Government is that in 1982-83 the amount of funding for subsidies for public broadcasting services should be increased to \$650 000.

The Government has accepted that recommendation, and I look forward to seeing its implementation in South Australia and the continued growth of the ethnic broadcasting network as a service to the community. I know that many Italian and Greek people living in my electorate listen with interest to radio segments in their language, especially people confined to the home, including housewives who have some difficulty in communicating with the community at large in the English language. Such people are now offered programmes of music and communication in their own language. This form of media has been used in a most educative way to get important messages across to such people.

The area of multicultural television is new in South Australia. It was unfortunate to see Senator Bolkus politicise this whole issue and try to pre-empt a Government announcement on it. In doing that, Senator Bolkus has forced the issue and forced a decision far too quickly. He could put in jeopardy the multicultural television service that will eventually come to Adelaide. Adelaide needs a multicultural television service, but we deserve a far better service than either Melbourne or Sydney receives. Melbourne and Sydney receive poor service because they have been using channel O, with a frequency range of 52-54 megahertz.

The frequency range adjacent to that is the amateur radio band. The power generated from a television station is of the order of 100 kilowatts, and that power is necessary in Adelaide to cover the area of the Adelaide Plains and from Murray Bridge to Victor Harbor. If channel O was to service the same area with multicultural television the same sort of power would be needed. That would create problems. It would cause interference to amateur radio operators who, as a hobby, communicate with each other around the world. Therefore, pressure would be on the Government to take steps to minimise that interference, as has happened in Sydney and Melbourne. In both those cities the power output was reduced to minimise interference. Once the power was reduced, the signal strength at the receiver in many homes was significantly lessened, causing severe ghosting, loss of colour and what we call a snowy picture. In other words, the service became a second grade one for those people.

If we do the same thing in Adelaide and push, as Senator Bolkus has done, for channel O, we will finish up, because of interference problems, with a second-rate service. I place on record my concern that we get the best multicultural television service for Adelaide. The way we can do that is to use, right from the outset, UHF channel 28. We have the terrain where UHF transmission can be achieved. We can install those transmitters now at a reasonable cost and at a reasonable power rating to cover the Adelaide Plains area with a significant signal strength that will mean that those homes wishing to receive multicultural television will be able to do so at a quality of reception comparable with present television reception.

The other area of concern because of the pressure that Senator Bolkus is exercising to get the Government to make an early decision is that we already have bearer problems coming across from Melbourne and Sydney to Adelaide.

They are problems in bringing the signal from those States to Adelaide. To push again for this service without those bearers being available will put a strain on existing links between local and interstate commercial stations. That needs to be looked at because one of the criticisms of the ethnic service was not only that there was poor signal quality, loss of colour and ghosting but also that on several occasions half-way through a favourite movie was lost in Melbourne because of the loss of a bearer between Sydney and Melbourne.

That is a cause for concern and illustrates the sort of service we could finish up with in South Australia if we do not aim for the most positive and best service we can get. We need in 1986, the target date aimed for, a service whereby we can be connected by satellite to the rest of Australia and have an uninterrupted service feeding video and film information to this State. One might ask what I am suggesting. I suggest that UHF channel 28 be used. The programme source could be, if we do not have the bearers, video tape machines or film networks, films being imported from interstate and shown in a small studio established in Adelaide.

One of the report recommendations is that the national broadcasting studio should be made available. In fact the recommendation is that the national television studio and transmission facility should be made available to multicultural groups to be used out of hours. For instance, channel 2 in Adelaide does not transmit 24 hours a day. There are many times during the morning hours when the test pattern being transmitted could be replaced by multicultural programmes.

Not only would it begin to be a communication to the community in homes, and to housewives of ethnic origin, but it also could be used for school programmes. For instance, there are many students learning Italian and Greek at school, and there is no better way for a student to comprehend these languages than to watch Italian or Greek movies or programmes originating in such countries to test out their knowledge and understanding of the languages.

The ethnic community interstate has majored in news gathering to such an extent that they have won an award. This proves that people can communicate to advantage and gather news, even though they may not be professionals. It is interesting that at this hour of the night members opposite have been continually harassing members on this side of the House by calling for quorums. Yet, when there is an opportunity for members opposite to be present and put their views and to listen to what is said, there are only one or two sitting on the Opposition benches.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I wish to address myself to a subject that I do not believe has been taken on board by local government. It is one which affects many blind people and people with impaired vision. The problem with trees located on footpaths throughout the metropolitan and country areas and the overhanging branches of trees growing on private property and hanging over on footpaths is quite serious.

Recently, I came across a constituent of mine who is of Italian descent and has tunnel vision. He informed me that on a number of occasions, while walking along the streets in the Seaton area, he has been scratched about the face by these trees with low branches. When one takes note of this problem and looks around the area, one can see that there are many instances where trees are not properly trimmed and one can imagine that a person with limited sight or with tunnel vision could ultimately have a branch poke him in an eye, causing him to lose his sight completely.

I hope the Minister of Local Government will look at this. I brought this matter to the attention of the local press in my area. Whilst this is not the year of the disabled person,

this programme should be ongoing so that we can assist those persons who are disabled in any shape or form.

Mr McRAE: Last year was the year of the disabled persons and this year it is the year of the tree, so you are spot on.

Mr HAMILTON: True. Another matter that concerns me is in relation to correspondence I received from a local constituent in his capacity as a union official. I mentioned last night in part the non-replacement of operators on sick leave with the State Transport Authority bus division. My constituent says:

At present someone is called in by the Marshal or Depot Clerk to fill the resultant vacancy in the roster. The new proposal is to not just operate a run.

A system of stabling at the major depots whereby buses which are close to retirement (commonly known as single trippers or broken shift buses) will be stabled or berthed separately from the straight shift buses. If due to breakdowns the previous night there is a shortage of straight shift buses a broken shift bus will be substituted and the run allocated to the broken shift bus will not operate.

Already maintenance programmes on buses owned by the authority have been extended because insufficient staff have been engaged to cover the longer maintenance time required on the new buses in comparison to the older Swift fleet. This proposal will again reduce the available staff to carry out the necessary work and as a result buses will not be operating and passengers will be left behind.

The effect of a missed run on routes which enjoy a three-minute headway in peak periods may not be very significant. However, what about the routes which in peak period still only have a bus every 20 minutes? In the Albert Park area this applies to routes 29J, 28J, and 28K, to nominate just three.

If the State Transport Authority implements this proposal, it will lose valuable passenger support for its services. I hope that the Minister of Transport will take up the matter, because people in my electorate, through my efforts, have had their bus services upgraded, and I would hate to see anything jeopardise those services. As good as they are at the moment, they are certainly in need of improvement.

Another union official has raised with me a question regarding the Gladstone to Adelaide rail service. He put it to me that I should ask the Minister whether the Minister has withdrawn his Government's objections to the closure of that service. The official believes that its abolition will disadvantage the people who now use it. He believes that the matter should be taken up with all unions within the transport industry that would be affected by the closure. I understand that the Minister has not had discussions with the unions involved, and I hope that he will contact them to inform them of his intention.

At the opening today of the new Woolworth shopping complex at West Lakes, I was interested to notice increasing problems with cars in the area. Over the past 2½ years I have raised this matter many times in this place because of the increasing problems experienced by local residents in ordinary shopping hours, as well as during weekends and on public holidays when football matches are held at Football Park. On public holidays and on football days, I have toured the part of my electorate that is near Football Park and I have observed the attitude of some of the patrons attending the football. I have noticed that many people have parked their cars across residents' driveways, in driveways, and on vacant allotments, clearly showing no concern for other people's property.

I have noticed that people are prepared to park their cars close to intersections, contrary to the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, and I hope that the appropriate authority in the area will hasten the new regulations that are required under the West Lakes indenture legislation to ensure protection for my constituents. Only last year I received correspondence from a constituent who informed me that she lives just off Sportsmans Drive. When the traffic was leaving Football Park after a finals match, a police officer was

directing the traffic; she had to journey two miles further to try to get back to her own home, and it took her about half an hour to achieve that. I raise this question not only because of my constituents, the residents in the area, but because of the problems that could be experienced by emergency services during periods of heavy traffic at the time of the finals matches if the drivers of emergency vehicles were unaware of the route that they should take.

Indeed, one would imagine the hostility that a constituent would feel if an ambulance arrived 15 minutes late, after a spouse or a relative had had a heart attack and if it was too late. As we all know, three minutes after a person has a heart attack or there is loss of blood to the brain, he can either be permanently disabled or he can die. In all seriousness, I hope that the Government, particularly the Minister of Recreation and Sport, will consider this matter to ensure that it is attended to in the interests of the constituents in my district.

Dr BILLARD (Newland): I want to refer to unemployment figures, because of what I believe is a very serious misuse of statistics that has been perpetrated on two occasions by the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader produced figures earlier this year, in a similar manner to the way in which he produced figures in the past few days. Quite frankly, I thought it was a bit of a joke, as did my constituents. The Leader highlighted what he said were the big unemployment suburbs of Adelaide. He did not say where he secured his figures, but I can guess where they came from.

The Leader had blacked out on a map the big unemployment suburbs of Adelaide, and had a press conference to show the public, presumably, where all the unemployment and unemployment growth was concentrated. One of the reasons why we thought it was a big joke was that the suburb that was supposedly worst hit by unemployment, according to the Leader, was Burnside. Other suburbs that were hard hit involved a curious selection—in the north-east in the Districts of Newland and Todd, and in the south-west in the District of Mawson.

The suburb in my district that was selected particularly was Fairview Park. I happened to be door-knocking in that area the following weekend, and I assure members that the residents of Fairview Park were most surprised and incredulous that unemployment could be so high in that suburb, which, in fact, in my district is the best off in regard to employment. Let us look at the figures and see what has really happened in regard to employment in this State. Throughout the 1970s, employment in South Australia increased almost continuously, except that in the 18 months from mid 1975 to the end of 1976, employment decreased. At the change of Government, unemployment continued to increase for a time.

In fact, some members of the House today made statements that are quite false. One member opposite suggested that the current level of unemployment of 7.5 per cent is a record. In fact, it is not a record. The unemployment rate in February 1979 was 8.2 per cent, and that was before the change of Government. In no way can the current levels of unemployment in SA be construed as a record.

It is true that unemployment did continue to increase for a time on the change of Government. It reached a peak of 8.4 per cent in May 1980, and it touched that peak again in January 1981. However, it has not been back to those levels since. Despite of the fact that we now see unemployment levels in other States rising rapidly (for example, the last unemployment figures in New South Wales increased by almost 50 per cent on the levels of the year earlier)—

Mr McRae: What was that percentage?

Dr BILLARD: It increased from 4.4 per cent to 6.3 per cent in New South Wales over the past year. Despite that

rapid increase in unemployment in other States, the level in South Australia has remained below the peak levels, which were reached in May 1980 and January 1981. So, despite the down-turn in unemployment nationally from about 1977 onwards, when the national unemployment figures generally trended downwards, South Australian unemployment continued to climb.

When the change of Government occurred in 1979, it was still climbing. We had the highest unemployment in Australia at the change of Govt and it was some time before that position could be reversed. But it has been reversed. Unemployment in South Australia is below the peak rate of 8.4 per cent, and it is no longer the highest in Australia. That is the position across the whole State.

The figures that were quoted by the Leader of the Opposition are not unemployment figures: they are figures drawn from the Department of Social Security relating to those on unemployment benefits. Members will have to realise that there is a significant difference. There are, from time to time, changes in the rules relating to qualification for unemployment benefits. This introduces steep changes in the numbers that register. There was, for example, some time ago the introduction of a means test which allowed more people to receive benefits while earning extra income on the side. There are, from time to time, other factors which change those figures, so they cannot be extrapolated to say that they mean unemployment.

Secondly, the Leader of the Opposition has selected one suburb within postcodes and claimed in his news releases that that suburb had suffered a certain change in employment levels. Apart from the fact that he has completely ignored the other suburbs in those postcodes, the Leader has in addition ignored the fact that many suburbs, particularly in the north-eastern area, are growing rapidly in population. In particular, the suburb that he chose, namely, St Agnes, has been the centre of some of the most rapid growth in Tea Tree Gully. My colleague indicates that it has almost tripled in population in the past year or two and I can well believe that.

Certainly, the numbers of unemployed in that postcode have not increased by any where near the increase in population. In addition, all the north-eastern suburbs have a rapidly rising teenage population. As they come on to the job market, they will distort the overall job picture, so that the unemployment rate may not change at all, although the totals may well change simply because of the very great increase in the size of the labour force in those areas. That is also happening in the north-eastern suburbs. I quote, for example, the figures for Fairview Park that were singled out by the Leader of the Opposition on the previous occasion as being an area of high unemployment growth.

Between October 1979 and October 1981 the two suburbs within that post code area 5126, namely Fairview Park and Surrey Downs, the numbers on unemployment benefits increased from 87 to 121, which suggests a rapid increase in unemployment. In fact, the number of families on benefits, the number of breadwinners receiving unemployment benefits in that area, declined from 17 to 14 during that period. I think members can obviously see that figures are so small that representing changes as percentages is meaningless. That is true; those figures cannot be used to give an accurate guide to the trends in unemployment within individual suburbs, and their use for that purpose represents a serious misuse of those figures.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members time has expired.

Motion carried.

At 10.26 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 29 July at 2 p.m.