

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 17 August 1982

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

PETITION: MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

A petition signed by 491 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide extra funds to the Mount Gambier Hospital to enable sufficient nursing staff to be employed was presented by the Hon. J. D. Wright.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: CASINO

Petitions signed by 2 676 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Federal Government to set up a committee to study the social effects of gambling, reject the proposals currently before the House to legalise casino gambling in South Australia, and establish a select committee on casino operations in this State were presented by the Hons. D. C. Brown and J. D. Wright, and Mr Russack.

Petitions received.

ABERFOYLE PARK HIGH SCHOOL

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

Aberfoyle Park High School.

Ordered that report be printed.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—The Development Plan.

By the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. J. W. Olsen)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Fisheries Act, 1971-1980—Regulations—Lobster Pot Allocation Formula.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

GAS SUPPLIES

In reply to the **Hon. R. G. PAYNE** (21 July).

The **Hon. E. R. GOLDSWORTHY**: Consumers are charged for the total amount of energy contained in the gas which they have used over the previous two-month period. The charge made is calculated by multiplying the volume of gas consumed according to their gas meter, by the average calorific value of the gas supplied for the last two months.

This average is derived from tests performed each working day by Government inspectors at the laboratories of the Chemistry Division, Department of Services and Supply, in accordance with the requirements of the Gas Act, 1924-1980. At the end of each billing cycle the appropriate calorific value (MJ factor) is used to determine consumers' accounts. Thus there is continual monitoring and adjustment to ensure that the appropriate calorific value, or energy content per volume of gas, is applied in line with variations in gas value which may occur.

The heating value of natural gas as supplied to gas consumers will decrease when ethane and other constituents which contribute to the heating value are removed. However, as explained above, the charge made by the South Australian Gas Company for gas is determined by the volume of gas consumed and the heating value of that gas. Consequently, there will be no increased cost to gas consumers as a result of changing heating value.

SHEEP CARCASSES

In reply to **Mr WHITTEN** (23 March).

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON**: The Department of Marine and Harbors, in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of Health, Animal Quarantine Service, will in future ensure that the masters of livestock vessels leaving South Australian ports are instructed that carcasses are to be dumped only outside Australian territorial waters (12 miles), where there are offshore currents and, prior to dumping, all carcasses are to be slashed both in the chest and abdominal cavities. Section 44A of the Quarantine Act prohibits the removal of goods (including animals) from an overseas vessel without the authority of a quarantine officer. This removal includes dumping of carcasses in territorial waters.

The Department of Marine and Harbors regulations under the Harbors Act have been reviewed, but you will appreciate that such an offence is difficult to prove, as evidence of the dumping is generally unavailable due to the lack of witnesses and positive identification of the carcass. I appreciate the concern expressed by the seaside councils at the necessity and cost of having to remove dead sheep, and I will investigate whether a reimbursement of actual costs of removal of sheep carcasses from beaches could be initiated with seaside councils where reasonable evidence exists that the carcasses were from a vessel operating from a port in South Australia. As a result of publicity of the *Khalij Express* activities and the active circulation of the new Commonwealth quarantine requirements, the future dumping of carcasses in territorial waters is likely to occur only on rare occasions.

In reply to **Mr PETERSON** (1 April).

The **Hon. M. M. WILSON**: The Department of Marine and Harbors in conjunction with the Commonwealth Department of Health—Animal Quarantine Service will in future ensure that the masters of livestock vessels leaving South Australian ports are instructed that carcasses are to be dumped only outside Australian territorial waters (12 miles), where there are offshore currents, and prior to dumping all carcasses are to be slashed both in the chest and abdominal cavities. Section 44A of the Quarantine Act prohibits the removal of goods (including animals) from an overseas vessel without the authority of a quarantine officer. This removal includes dumping of carcasses in territorial waters.

The Department of Marine and Harbors regulations under the Harbors Act have been reviewed, but you will appreciate that such an offence is difficult to prove, as evidence of the dumping is generally unavailable due to the lack of witnesses

and positive identification of the carcass. I appreciate the concern expressed by the seaside councils at the necessity and cost of having to remove dead sheep, and I will investigate whether a reimbursement of actual costs of removal of sheep carcasses from beaches could be initiated with seaside council where reasonable evidence exists that the carcasses were from a vessel operating from a port in South Australia. As a result of publicity of the *Khalij Express* activities and the active circulation of the new Commonwealth quarantine requirements, the future dumping of carcasses in territorial waters is likely to occur only on rare occasions.

CLASS 4 LICENCE

In reply to Mr HAMILTON (20 July).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON:

1. A class 4 licence entitles the holder to ride a motorcycle the engine capacity of which exceeds 250 cc's. A 4a licence entitles the holder to ride a motorcycle the capacity of which does not exceed 250 cc's.
2. The various classes of licence and a description of each appears on the driver's licence. Reference is also made to the two classes of motorcycle licence on both the application for a learner's permit and in the booklet 'Before you Drive in South Australia'.
3. All motorcycles that are to be registered, for road use, must be fitted with a compliance plate. There are no other restrictions on a retailer as to whom a motorcycle may be sold.
4. I have contacted the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce seeking their co-operation in circularising their members to at least advise their customers of the need to hold a particular class of licence dependent upon the cubic capacity of the motorcycle that the customer wishes to purchase.

TRAMS

In reply to the Hon. R. G. PAYNE (18 June).

The Hon. M. M. WILSON:

1. The State Transport Authority does not knowingly carry passengers on unsafe trams.
2. Very few faults experienced render a tram unsafe. Hot boxes have the potential of being an unsafe condition if a tram so affected was to continue in service at full unrestricted speed. However, when a hot box is reported, trams are removed from service immediately upon their return to Adelaide.
3. An investigation of your complaint found no evidence of a breach of the policy regarding the operation of unsafe trams.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions I indicate that any questions that would normally go to the Minister of Mines and Energy will go to the honourable Premier.

RIVERLAND FRUIT PRODUCTS CO-OPERATIVE

Mr BANNON: Can the Premier say what ceiling has been placed by the Government on accumulated losses by Riverland Fruit Products Co-operative before a decision would have to be made as to whether operations would be wound up? It has been reported that accumulated losses of

the cannery have grown to \$22 000 000 since the receiver-managers were appointed in 1980. In the first four months of this year commercial bills totalling \$11 000 000 have been issued, which is an increase from \$4 500 000. I understand they have an effective interest rate of 24 per cent. The various bills have been rescheduled to expire on the same day, 31 December 1982.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Obviously, there is a great deal that the Leader of the Opposition does not know. For one thing, they are not all bills and the rate is not 24 per cent. Let me deal with the general principle that the Leader has talked about. First, it is not a question of the Government's putting on a ceiling. The Government is very conscious indeed of its responsibility to the people of the Riverland, not only to those people who are growers in the Riverland, but also to the people who are working in the cannery. A commitment has been given by the Government to maintain the operations of that cannery until the end of the next fruit season. It was essential that that commitment be given, in spite of the fact that receivers were appointed to the Riverland cannery, because of the enormous social and financial disruption that would occur in that area if such a commitment were not given and if, in fact, the cannery were not to continue to operate over that period at the very least.

In that time the receivers have continued their management and the cannery continues to attract a loss, but I put to the Leader that one of the reasons is that there has been a disastrous downturn in the canned fruits industry since our commitment for the first year was given. This is totally outside the Government's control. Obviously (nevertheless in spite of that very sad fact) the Government feels constrained to honour its commitments, and it will continue to do so. The situation will again be reviewed at the end of the next fruit season, and we will take the appropriate decisions as to further relief or further measures that will help the whole Riverland industry. At present, there is very little we can do about the canned fruit downturn generally.

The Hon. J. D. Wright: Are you saying that will be in about May?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: As the honourable member would well know, the canned fruit season ends at the end of May or the beginning of June next year. Let me go into a little bit of the history. Without going into too much detail, I would remind honourable members opposite that it was their Government's decision in 1977 to expand the operations of the cannery, in an effort to have it function viably, because it was making a loss and was in desperate trouble. It was their Government's decision to remedy that problem by expanding the operation. When we first came to office, we found that the expansion into general products was a *fait accompli*, and we were prepared to accept at that stage that there was some chance of the cannery trading out of its difficulties; in other words, of continuing to break even, and indeed, to move into a profitable situation.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: That was the decision of the Premier of that time.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: After all, that was the whole basis of the restructuring that took place then, the purchasing of the general products loan, and the installation of that line in the cannery. It has become quite apparent since that time that there was no way that that solution was going to work. All that has happened in that time is that the operation which was consistently losing money has become compounded; the loss has become compounded, because by doubling up the size of the operation the unprofitable situation has also been doubled. It is a most unfortunate situation and will impact on the Budget. As I have already announced to honourable members, a considerable sum will be taken out of the surplus on recurrent account (which we

managed to achieve at the end of the last financial year) and it is because of that outstanding commitment that we will not be able to use those sums that we have saved in good management for other purposes. Nevertheless, we have given a commitment to the people of the Riverland and we intend to abide by it.

OFF-ROAD RECREATIONAL PARKS

Mr OSWALD: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning explain to the House how the recently announced off-road recreational vehicle parks will work and the reasons behind the formation of those parks?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: I am very much aware of the interest of the member for Morphett in this particular matter.

An honourable member: Why?

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: It is because the member for Morphett on one occasion brought to me a deputation of people who were concerned about the problems associated with off-road vehicles in sensitive areas and also because he has done a great deal, in co-operation with private enterprise, in looking at the possibility of establishing these parks around the State. To answer the honourable member opposite, the member for Morphett is to be commended for the interest he has shown in this measure. Having answered that question, let me now answer the question asked by the member for Morphett. The State Government has been concerned for some time about damage being caused to sensitive areas by off-road vehicles, and only recently we announced plans for setting aside special off-road recreational parks for vehicles in those areas.

A number of areas are being looked at now. They include areas near Gillman, private land at Virginia, land at Moana, south of Adelaide, and other areas near Whyalla, Port Augusta, and on Yorke Peninsula. These areas are to be set aside in conjunction with private enterprise and the Government. I may say that we are very keen, wherever possible, to use the expertise of private enterprise in this particular matter. I am very pleased that a number of people have come forward with suggestions about being involved in these areas for this purpose. A comprehensive report and a review of the off-road vehicles situation was carried out by my department last year. The review concluded that the level of off-road vehicle use and its impact have decreased somewhat since 1975 but that localised environmental degradation is occurring, particularly on areas near the coast, near Adelaide, and on Yorke Peninsula.

Likewise, erosion problems are occurring and the Government feels strongly that corrective action is necessary. The report came down with a number of recommendations. I have taken those to Cabinet and they have been adopted. As a result, some \$35 000 will be spent almost immediately in fencing off areas that have been recognised as being sensitive areas affected by off-road vehicles. That will happen almost immediately and the establishment of other parks will take place before the end of this year. The matter has a high priority and that is why the Government intends taking action in this matter immediately. Again, I thank the member for Morphett for his interest and concern about this matter and I assure the House that the Government recognises its responsibility and is taking urgent action.

AMDEL

The Hon. J. D. WRIGHT: Will the Premier confirm the date when the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories will move from its present location in Thebarton, and what

provisions will be made to clean up the present site afterwards? Also, will he say whether the remaining radioactive material still buried at the site will be removed, and, if so, where it will be deposited?

The Premier should be well aware that there is considerable community concern amongst Thebarton residents in my district about the continued operations of Amdel, and I support my constituents in wanting to get Amdel moved out of an inner city residential area. It has been confirmed that Amdel will be shifting, but residents have asked me whether radioactive material buried there will be shifted, and, if so, where it will be deposited. I have also been asked by residents about the proposed use of the Thebarton land after Amdel has been relocated.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I must say that I have found the continuing and very great interest that has been taken since this Government came to office in the affairs of Amdel by members of the Opposition, both State and Federal, quite remarkable, because those members were very silent indeed about the activities of Amdel while members opposite were in a position to do something, if anything was necessary, about the matter.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Oh—

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: When the honourable member who is interjecting was in the Ministry I do not think we heard anything about Amdel and its operations at Thebarton. As for Mr Scott, a member of the House of Representatives, I do not think I heard him mention anything about Amdel before he got into that House.

Amdel has been operating at Thebarton perfectly safely for very many years, including during the time of the former Labor Government, which, despite its so-called policy (and no-one is quite sure what that is) on uranium and radioactivity, did absolutely nothing to deal with any of the problems that the Labor Party now says are so vital and of such great concern to its constituents. This Government has done far more than the former Labor Government ever considered doing. We have taken Radium Hill and reconstructed and reworked the site and mines, and made them safe. In fact, it was work that we found when we came to office was long overdue. It had been totally ignored, in spite of reports by the former Government. We have recently purchased the site of the Port Pirie tailings dam, and preliminary work will be done on that dam in the relatively near future. A long-term plan of rehabilitation to eventually cover the dam and rehabilitate it completely has already been devised.

Mr Keneally: Do you think it will be safe?

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: Yes. For the honourable member's benefit, it certainly will be safe. But, why did not the honourable member speak up during the term of the former Government when his own people were on the front bench and in Cabinet? We did not hear from him then.

The Amdel pit has been the subject of negotiations between Government departments and Amdel. It is true that the decision has been made to relocate Amdel at Technology Park. It is not yet possible to give a precise date to the honourable member, although I can tell him that a committee has been set up consisting of officers from the Department of Mines and Energy, from the Department of Trade and Industry and the Health Commission. I again ask members opposite why they did nothing about radiation protection, for instance, when they were in office. Again, that initiative has been taken by this Government.

Officers of the Health Commission concerned with radiation protection will be meeting with officers of the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of Trade and Industry in order to decide what should best be done with the Amdel pit and how it can be dealt with safely without any fear of risk to surrounding residents. I have no

doubt that the low-grade waste that exists there will be dealt with very effectively indeed. I repeat that, as soon as I know what date has been set, I will let the honourable gentleman know. At present no date has been set because negotiations and investigations are still proceeding. Nevertheless, the pit will be bought by the Department of Mines and Energy and will be treated appropriately, in the same way that this Government has dealt with the Radium Hill and Port Pirie tailings dam problem. We do not in any way resile from our responsibilities to look after these problems as they arise. They are fears and concerns that I believe have been greatly exaggerated by Opposition members for political purposes, but the fact remains that they are of concern and should be dealt with. We do not talk about it: we go ahead and get on with the job.

PRIMARY SCHOOL STAFFING

Mr RANDALL: Will the Minister of Education clarify for the House the Government's intention in relation to the staffing of its primary schools in this State? Last week in this House I raised, during my contribution to the grievance debate, some questions relating to the circulation in schools in my district of a proposed new formula that is supposed to be the new staffing formula for next year. I use the example of a 300-student primary school. The formula is determined by the number of students (referred to as 's') being equal to 1.6 plus 'e' (which is the number of enrolments for the area) divided by 22.5 plus 'e' (which is the number of enrolments in the years three to seven).

That formula apparently was a means by which next year's staffing numbers were to be determined. It appears that that formula is not correct, hence my question. The other reason for my question is that last week a lot of publicity was given to recently announced A.T.F. figures. The concern I have is that that publicity has placed a slur particularly on our primary schools and in fact on all South Australian public schools. I believe that the whole mess needs to be clarified, and I should be pleased if the Minister would do so.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I thank the honourable member for his perceptive comment on the state of South Australia's education. I share his concern. The honourable member, along with the members for Todd, Newland and Mawson, contributes a considerable amount of good towards our policy discussions, and I thank him for that.

Mr Keneally: What about Brighton?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I notice that the honourable member is laughing, but it is an indication that the interest of Government members is more than ephemeral and not what honourable members opposite call Dorothy Dixers. I include also the member for Brighton. I am pleased that members opposite have noticed the contributions that he makes to education debates. They are really remarkable.

The honourable member has raised a number of issues, not the least of which is the fact that largely as a result of the Institute of Teachers information, or misinformation, being peddled around schools, a fear has arisen that the formula for staffing schools in 1983 will be changed. The formula that will be used is that which has been used by the Education Department for the past five or six years. It is the formula that the previous Minister brought in, and I have never indicated that that would be changed. There was some confidential discussion at senior officer level between the Personnel Branch of the Education Department and the Institute of Teachers. There was never any indication that the three formulae, and not simply the one to which

the honourable member referred, would be considered and that ultimately one of them would be put to the Minister.

I was interested to hear yesterday evening, in the course of the debate, that a memorandum had been submitted to me by Dr Mayfield—a memorandum which never came across my desk but which was part of that departmental consideration. So, the information that I gave to the House, namely, that the Minister had not envisaged any change to the formula is, I insist, quite correct. As a result, the 1982 formula will be applied for 1983. Of course, the honourable member will be well aware that over the weekend the Treasurer made available to the Education Department a very generous sum of up to \$2 000 000, with which we would be able to do several things. One was to accede to requests made to me, the Treasurer and the Deputy Premier over the past few weeks by the Institute of Teachers, the Primary Principals Association, and the Parents Association to staff our schools on the September anticipated figures rather than the February figures on which the schools were staffed this year.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: The principals were very helpful, too.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: They were extremely helpful and co-operative and very constructive with their criticisms. However, the amazing thing was that, having made that announcement, it was greeted with very faint praise by the President of the Institute of Teachers, who in fact had been party to the discussions over the preceding two or three weeks and who in fact had been living in some anticipation that the requests would be met—

An honourable member: He is the acting President.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: He is the President, to all intents and purposes. The present President is away overseas attending an educational conference for one month. As I have said, I was amazed to think that a \$2 000 000 allocation of funds should be met so grudgingly by the institute which, in fact, had solicited assistance on behalf of the teaching profession, assistance which the—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: They couldn't get any results out of you—they had to go to the Premier.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: When the honourable member says that the deputation went to the Treasurer, is he inferring that individual Ministries handle the Treasury of South Australia, rather than its being a collective affair?

The Hon. R. G. Payne: No.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That is the direct inference that one can draw. In fact, the deputation came to see the Minister, who invited the Budget Review Committee to attend that session, and, of course, the Treasury subsequently learned of the Treasurer's decision only two or three days ago. So, the honourable member can see where the channel of decision-making really is in South Australia at the moment—it is with the Treasurer, that is where it properly rests, as the honourable member would be the first to admit.

The decision to make available an additional \$2 000 000 means that there will be less disruption to classes between the beginning and the end of the 1983 school year. In addition, the teacher-student ratios, already leading Australia, will be maintained. Another bonus, of course, is that there will be a considerable number of additional long-term and short-term contract appointments as well as permanent appointments made available for graduates and others applying for positions within the South Australian Education Department.

For anyone who wishes to complain and be cynical about shallow motives, let me simply reiterate that these are moves that have been requested, solicited, by the educational community of South Australia for the past several weeks at least, and we have acceded to requests after careful consideration of the State's Budget.

The honourable member also asked for some information, or for an opinion (I am not allowed to give an opinion, Mr Speaker, but I will certainly offer personal comment) about the Australian Teachers Federation survey into the educational conditions within the whole of Australia released only last week. It is interesting that last Wednesday an advertisement appeared in the State press to the effect that South Australia was lagging behind the rest of Australia.

I might add that that advertisement was worth approximately \$5 000, but all that it could do was single out two areas where South Australia is lagging behind. One area concerned the fact that South Australia had far more classes of over 30 students at Matriculation level than had any other State in Australia. That is true, but let me put that into perspective. The number of classes in South Australia with over 30 students is nine, which means that, compared with the rest of Australia, we have double the average incidence of classes with over 30 students: but what a nit-picking figure to worry about!

Mr Lynn Arnold: What about the number over 25?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: I am pleased that the honourable member has mentioned that, because in that respect South Australia comes out far better in that respect; we are 50 per cent better than the rest of Australia. If the honourable member cares to listen to the figures which we were pleased to extract from that A.T.F. survey released last Friday, he will realise that South Australia is currently leading the rest of Australia on many counts. Incidentally, when I asked the acting President of the Institute of Teachers for his comments on the survey I was greeted by the response that, as he did not have a micro-fiche reader, he had not been able to analyse them. So, the department is slightly ahead. The figures indicated that in regard to junior primary sizes we have an average of 22.7 students per teacher (the national average is 24.6). For primary we have 26 students per teacher, the national average being 27.

In secondary we have 21.3, and the national average is 25.6. In years 11-12, we have 20, the national average being a little less at 19.5, and I acknowledge that. As I said earlier, only nine classes are involved. In relation to the ratios of students to actual classroom teachers, the people who deliver the services to our youngsters, it is remarkable to see that we have one teacher to 24 students in primary schools, whereas the national average is one to 28.7. It would cost literally hundreds of millions of dollars for the rest of Australia to catch up to us. That is the magnitude of the argument when you ask them to come to our level. In secondary schools we have 16.4 students, the national average being 17.6.

We have far more clerical staff for our students than has any other State. We have 108 students to each clerical staff at the primary level compared with 150 in the rest of Australia. We have 87 in secondary compared with the national average of 90 (we are fairly close to the national average there). So it goes on with item after item—

Mr Keneally: So do you.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: If you are bored, I suggest that you are bored as you usually are. You always start yawning when the truth starts coming home. I never receive any comment from the member for Stuart unless the truth is needling away at him. I find that significant. For that reason, I will continue a little longer. In junior primary schools we have only 20 classes with more than 30 students, whereas at the national level there are 2 457 classes with over 30 students. We have only 1.4 per cent of our classes in that category, compared with the national average of 14.1 per cent. In primary, we have 5.3 per cent, compared with a national average of 27.7 per cent with more than 30 students.

So the story goes on, and there is hardly one area where we fall behind the national average or, indeed, where we

are even running second. That highlights the shallow politicising of the S.A.I.T. campaign when it attacks the best State in Australia and places expensive advertisements in the State press at the members' expense in order to line up with what the acting President of the association called the 'all States campaign'. In other words, although the institute voted against—

Mr Hemmings: You enjoyed his support at the last election, didn't you?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: That support was unsolicited, and I did not have to go and buy it like the present Victorian Government went out and offered sweetheart deals that have cost \$300 000 000 in additional salaries in 1982 alone. As I said a few days ago, the Cain Government in 1945 and the Cain Government in 1982 can both thank the Australian Teachers Federation for where it lies, because sweetheart deals were done and the rest of Australia recognises that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. H. ALLISON: We did not do any sweetheart deals; we simply came up with a policy which has largely been kept, and the statistics on the board that show how South Australia has, from third, fourth and fifth position in Australia under the previous Government, come to first position in Australia under the present Government is sufficient evidence of that.

Look what has happened over the last few months. We have had the Keeves Committee of Inquiry saying that we have a superior education system, the Schools Commission Report saying that we have a superior education system, and Professor Tannock, who is currently Chairman of the Schools Commission, acknowledging in Adelaide a few days ago (I did not have the privilege of meeting him) that we have the best education system in Australia. He even said (again, unsolicited) that the Government of South Australia was to be congratulated upon the resources that it was putting into the system. If I had met the gentleman, I am sure that someone would have said that I had asked him to say that.

The most significant comment of all, in my view, has come from the Australian Teachers Federation survey, which was designed to pillory the education systems of Australia and, in the case of South Australia, it has come up showing that we are leading the rest of the nation—a proud position. I simply ask the members opposite who still have the temerity (although I am sure it is tongue in cheek) to criticise the system to do what I am proud to do, and that is to stand up and say that they are delighted that South Australia leads the rest of Australia with its Government school system. The Institute of Teachers should be lining up alongside us to say that it too is proud, and at the same time it should acknowledge that the Treasury has granted, with great magnanimity, an additional sum of up to \$2 000 000 to further enhance the proud position in which the South Australian Government school system stands.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mr ABBOTT: How does the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs propose to deal with the deadlock that now applies between the Pitjantjatjara people and the oil explorers, Hematite? People who believed that the present Government had achieved a positive, constructive and all-embracing set of land rights provisions in its Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act are now wondering whether it was as definitive as all that. When the member for Mitchell asked the Minister about the Government's refusal to release a Crown Law opinion on the Aboriginal claim for compensation for proposed exploration in the Officer Basin, he was told that 'the sort

of claim that has been made by Mr Toyne purportedly on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara people is just so much out of step with reality that it is not worth the company's pursuing it'.

People who have been studying this matter and puzzling over it have put to me (and I now want to put to the Minister) that there has been misrepresentation. It is my firm understanding that the \$2 000 000 figure that has been bandied about was just a talking point in preliminary negotiations, where the figure of \$500 000 was also mentioned. In fact, the figure of \$2 000 000 is fictitious; it was not a firm claim. Hematite's proposal is by way of being a test case for oil exploration on Aboriginal freehold land.

How much should be payable as compensation depends, of course, very much on the type of exploration being undertaken. Where one is looking at minerals, the exploration phase can normally be expected to do very little damage and cause the minimum of upset to the land surface. But where there is oil or petroleum exploration it is, in fact, the exploration rather than the final development stage where the real damage is done. In the present instance we are not talking about mineral exploration. When I am asking what action the Government may be considering, I am asking whether there is to be an amendment to the Act, or perhaps a move for a Full Court challenge on the point whether the law enables 'up front' compensation to be paid.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: As I said last week, and I thought that on that occasion I spelt it out quite clearly for the member for Mitchell—

The Hon. R. G. Payne: No, you didn't.

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: I feel sorry for the member for Mitchell if he is not capable of understanding the realities of the business world. Fundamentally, as I tried to explain to the honourable gentleman previously, either it is a proposition for a mining company to go in under certain conditions or it is not. There is no requirement in the Act to force any company to go to arbitration or to enter into negotiations.

It is understood that \$2 000 000 was sought for and on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara people by their legal adviser, Mr Toyne, as has been quoted; but, whether the sum is \$2 000 000 or \$500 000, if in the case of Hematite it is not a proposition for the company to go in under those conditions there is nothing in the world that can force that company to proceed into that area, enter into negotiations or go to arbitration. I believe that it is quite obvious to everyone in the community that either it is a proposition for any company to proceed or it is not and, if an unrealistic proposal is put forward by the representative of the Pitjantjatjara people, obviously the mining interests, operating on behalf of all people in South Australia, are being held to ransom.

In other words, the mining operations are effectively being thwarted purely by the figure that is being put on, so it is very effectively stopping any development. In my discussions with the Yalata people, held over on the West Coast only about two weeks ago, they spelt out quite clearly that they were not opposed to mining and were not opposed to exploration of their land but they were concerned about protecting their sacred sites and other areas of vital concern to them.

However, at no time did they indicate that they were seeking compensation in advance for damage that had not been done, and that is the fundamental difference between the discussions I have had with the Yalata people regarding the Maralinga lands and the attitude adopted by Mr Toyne on behalf of the Pitjantjatjara people. Until such time as that realisation sinks in with members opposite and representatives of the Pitjantjatjara people, obviously no mining development will take place. In fact, that lack of development will be just as much to the disadvantage of the Pitjantjatjara people as it will be to the rest of South Australia.

KELVINATOR AUSTRALIA

Mr SCHMIDT: Will the Minister of Industrial Affairs indicate what is being done to assist Kelvinator Australia Limited, as it faces obvious difficulties, especially with its room air-conditioning manufacturing facility in South Australia? I have in my constituency a number of people who work at Kelvinator and have done so for many years but, with the recent tightening of the belt, so to speak, and the laying off of certain persons from Kelvinator, concern has been expressed by people still working there as to what is the future for Kelvinator in South Australia.

The Hon. D. C. BROWN: First, I am sure that all members are concerned about the future of Kelvinator. The company is obviously facing a difficult time, as revealed publicly, by the retrenchment of approximately 200 employees. I am delighted, though, to announce, and I compliment the Federal Government on announcing in Canberra this morning, that temporary assistance authority reference has been granted for refrigerated room air-conditioners. Kelvinator Australia Limited is the only manufacturer of refrigerated room air-conditioners in Australia. Therefore, that reference will be directly related to the future of Kelvinator and to what assistance should be given in the short term. In the past three or four weeks, I have made very strong representations to the Commonwealth Minister for Industry and Commerce (Sir Phillip Lynch).

I took to him a document highlighting the changes that had occurred in the industry over the last few months. For instance, imports have increased by 36 per cent in the last year compared with the previous 12 months, whilst at the same time domestic sales of refrigerated air-conditioners have slumped dramatically, particularly in New South Wales, owing to the power uncertainties, and in Victoria and, again, New South Wales because of the economic downturn. Therefore, as the only Australian manufacturer of room air-conditioners, the entire brunt would be borne by Kelvinator, especially if imports of cheaper and perhaps not as well made room air-conditioners were being virtually dumped on the Australian market because of excess capacity overseas.

I am delighted that the Federal Government, particularly Sir Phillip Lynch, has seen the need to make a reference to the temporary assistance authority. That means that T.A.A. must hand down a report to the Federal Government within 45 days and that the Federal Government must make a decision on that report within a further 10 days. Therefore, within the space of the next 55 days we will know what temporary assistance, if any, might be given to Kelvinator to help it through this difficult period.

HOUSING RELIEF SCHEME

Mr HEMMINGS: Can the Premier say how many people have sought crisis relief under the recently announced \$3 500 000 relief scheme and whether the South Australian Housing Trust, which is administering this scheme, has received the necessary forms to process these applications as a matter of priority? Two weeks ago it came to my notice that people contacting the South Australian Housing Trust were being told that the trust had no knowledge of the scheme apart from what it had read in the *Advertiser*. All that it was able to do was take the names and addresses with a promise that within 21 days, when further details were known, these people would be contacted. That statement goes against two Ministerial statements made at the announcement of the scheme. On 22 July the Premier said, in part:

Purchasers who believe they qualify for mortgage crisis relief are advised to contact their own finance provider, or the Housing

Trust's advisory service (telephone 50 0200). These applications will be treated in the same way as the State-sponsored Home Purchasers in Crisis Scheme which has been operating for the last several months.

The Minister of Housing said, in part, on the same day:

The scheme would be used to complement the State Government's existing Home Purchasers in Crisis Scheme. Households facing crisis situations which did not comply with the criteria of the new scheme would continue to be considered by the Home Purchasers in Crisis Review Committee for assistance under the existing scheme.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am not quite certain of the point of the honourable member's question. He seems to be nit-picking to some extent, but I will take this opportunity to give him some information if he desires it. It is a matter of record that the honourable gentleman has, on several occasions, claimed that Housing Trust officers and members of the Housing Trust do not know anything about the scheme and that they have been less than helpful when approached by members of the public desiring assistance. Officers of the Housing Trust strongly and strenuously deny that.

They have been given clear guidelines relating to the scheme, and they have been asked to take, and indeed they have taken, the names and addresses of all inquirers. They have been told that they will be provided with full details of the scheme as soon as details become available, and there is no question but that everyone who has inquired has been dealt with in a most sympathetic and effective way by Housing Trust officers. It ill behoves the honourable member to cast any reflection whatever on those people in the Housing Trust who are doing the best they can to help the honourable member's constituents and the constituents of every other member of the House. He knows full well what the situation is. There is a total of \$3 500 000, and there are two schemes, the Home Purchasers in Crisis Scheme having been in operation for some time.

Mr Hemmings: Only 15 people have been approved.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has had the opportunity to ask his question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I thought that he was taking up my next point, Mr Speaker. I was about to say that only a very small number of people have taken advantage of that scheme, because it is literally a Home Purchasers in Crisis Scheme and, as I have said in this House before, financial institutions throughout South Australia have been very sympathetic in their treatment of people in difficulties. I understand that only 15 people have been assisted under that scheme, and this assistance has been given because of their extremely difficult position. There has been some more misrepresentation by the honourable gentleman and his Leader about the mortgage and rent relief scheme announced by the Commonwealth Government on 18 March. It is quite clear that details of that scheme were not received by the South Australian Government until 29 July.

The total of \$3 000 000 which was mentioned then will be evenly divided between assistance to home buyers in difficulties and to people in difficulties with home rentals. Both groups have been faced with rising costs because of increasing interest rates and obviously any scheme to help home purchasers in difficulty because of increased interest rates must be extended to help those people who are having difficulty with rents, which have been increased because of interest rates. The whole point of the scheme is to ensure that assistance is made available to those people who are most in need. The guidelines being established for the commencement of the scheme will be kept under close scrutiny to make sure that the money is used to relieve cases of genuine hardship.

The whole nub of the scheme, as the honourable member knows, is that home mortgage repayments or rents will be

subsidised to the extent of up to \$20 a week for those people who can show extreme hardship in meeting repayments. I believe it is a valuable scheme indeed. It is one which, for some reason, has not pleased the honourable member or his colleagues opposite, largely because it has removed from them a source of criticism. I believe the people who are in difficulty (and I know there are quite a number of them) should continue to apply for advice to the Housing Trust. I am confident that their inquiries will be treated with great consideration and concern and that every help and assistance will be given to them as soon as the full details of their situation is known.

SCOUTS AND GUIDES ACCOMMODATION

Mr GLAZBROOK: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning indicate when something can be done about finding a suitable headquarters site for the scouts and girl guides associations at Flagstaff Hill? In the Flagstaff Hill environment there are approximately 150 boys and 50 girls involved in scouting and guiding. There is also a large waiting list for membership. For many years this very worthwhile group has been looking for a suitable home in which to conduct its activities. Some sites had previously brought objections from residents because of the close proximity to houses and because of fears associated with such a development, for example, parking, noise and traffic volume. Parents and children alike in Flagstaff Hill are most anxious that headquarters be established to enable the work of youth in Flagstaff Hill to proceed in regard to scouting and guiding and are looking for constructive encouragement from the Minister.

The Hon. D. C. WOTTON: The member for Brighton has been involved in a search for a new site for those facilities at Flagstaff Hill for a considerable time. I am also aware of the concern of the local community to find an appropriate site for the Flagstaff Hill guides and scouts associations. I am pleased to be able to inform the member for Brighton that I have now given approval to those associations to build their headquarters on a new site close to Flagstaff Hill Primary School; in fact, just behind the school. This follows some urgent representations that I received after a consent use application for a site considered earlier was refused.

The final details are yet to be decided but the new site would be about half a hectare, immediately behind Flagstaff Hill Primary School in Craigmare Estate. I am led to believe that it will be an excellent site for that facility. I shall have further discussions with the National Parks and Wildlife Service as to the exact siting of the headquarters together with the provision of an appropriate and suitable access road from Blacks Road because, as the member for Brighton would know, this is essential in regard to the establishment of the building.

This whole situation has been improved tremendously as a result of a community effort to find a suitable site for the headquarters. As I mentioned earlier, the community has been concerned about this for some time, and people have gone out of their way to assist wherever they can to find a suitable area, and they are to be commended for the work that they have done.

Now that the headquarters site has been finalised, I am sure it will prove to be a tremendous boost for the 180 young people in the Flagstaff Hill area, the constituents of the member for Brighton, and for those who belong to the scouting and guiding movement. I know that the member for Brighton recognises the importance of the site's blending in with the environment, which, of course, is very much in line with the scouting and guides' overall philosophy. I am

pleased that we have been able to approve of this particular site and I know that it will be of much benefit to the member for Brighton's constituents.

changing his attitude toward that, if indeed he had to change his attitude; perhaps he has always supported him. I will review it for him.

LECTURER'S SCHOOL VISITS

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Will the Minister of Education reconsider the ban that has been put on Mr G. Partington of the Flinders University School of Education concerning visits to schools where students of his are undertaking teaching practice?

I am advised that Mr Partington, who is a lecturer of the Flinders University School of Education, has been told at least at one school, that he may not visit students of his who are doing teaching practice. Indeed, I note that in the August issue of the bulletin of the *South Australian Council for Educational Standards* the following quotation from a letter that he is said to have written to the principal of one of those schools involved:

I feel some sorrow that a person of your experience [that is, the principal] should so have reacted to my public activities concerning educational standards. You may or may not know that I have served as a headmaster as well as a teacher and as inspector of schools, so that I have some knowledge from the inside of the problems which face principals in contemporary conditions. Every opinion I have expressed on educational questions may indeed be mistaken—

I interpose here to say that, admittedly, there would be substantial debate about many of his opinions—

although at present I am in the dark as to just what in my writings or lectures you take such violent exception. In any case I would have hoped that you would have taken issue directly with me rather than allow derogatory comments to be made by your staff about me to my students, who, after all, are entirely innocent of complicity in any opinions I hold.

I am advised that this matter has already been drawn to the attention of the Minister and that is why I am asking my question for a reconsideration of this matter. I am also advised that the opinion has been conveyed to Mr Partington, by officers of the department, that products of his course may be in trouble getting employment if university staff take his critical line.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: In response to the final comment that the honourable member made, I would say that products of any university or the South Australian College of Advanced Education would be employed within the Education Department on merit, certainly not by using any other criterion. I was a little surprised about the honourable member's reference to the comment of Professor Partington that the matter should have been taken up with him rather than through any other channel. That has applied in this instance, too, because I point out that the honourable member's comments across the floor of the House are the first intimation that I have had (by that I mean personally—I may have something somewhere in the pipeline). I certainly have not personally viewed any requests from Professor Partington to the effect that he may be permitted to enter into South Australian schools. Therefore, I will review the matter and will make sure that correspondence comes before me. In some ways I am a little surprised that the honourable member chooses to raise this issue, because the side of education that the gentleman strongly espouses is very supportive of the maintenance of standards in education, with regard to the main thread of education into the 1980s, and the emphasis in core curricula of the importance of the communication skills, English, mathematics and the sciences.

These are subjects which I found as Minister to have been relatively neglected when I came to office. In fact, the emphasis was rather the other way, towards a broadening of school curricula and a diminution of what we now call the core curricula. I thank the honourable member for

SCALE FISH LICENCES

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Fisheries explain the Government's policy on the introduction of transferability of scale fish licences and, if so, can he explain the time schedule proposed for such introduction?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: Negotiations with the representatives of the fishing industry on transferability of licences has been in process for some time. I have communicated directly and officers of my department have had discussions with representatives of AFIC to try to determine the various criteria that ought to apply in establishing transferability of licences in the fishery. I understand that the last such meeting between departmental officers and members of the industry was about 6 August. As a result of that meeting many criteria have been recommended to me and I intend to take that proposal to Cabinet soon for consideration. It is extremely important in resolving transferability that adequate consideration is given to effort in the industry to ensure that those in the industry, elderly people who may not have given maximum effort in the transfer of those licences with no entitlement to younger people through necessity and willpower, have taken on a greater capacity and the resource is placed at some risk. Therefore the discussions to date have centred on meeting the requirements of transferability but at the same time ensuring that the Government's policy of ensuring that a reduction of effort in the industry is maintained.

I will be pleased to make available to the honourable member as soon as the criteria have been finally determined a copy of same but I would expect that they will be operative by mid-September.

HOTEL SOCIAL CLUBS

Mr MAX BROWN: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say whether his department or he has given any thought to the existence of so-called hotel social clubs and the role they are currently playing in our society and whether any more factors are being considered to alter the current regulations to exclude them from the right to function as social clubs? The Minister may remember that I raised this matter during the debate on the allowance of charitable organisations to be exempt from the 2 per cent turnover tax and the Minister may also recall that by way of interjection he suggested that the Government would look into the matter following the obtaining of a report. It has always been my opinion that such social clubs were never envisaged when the current legislation was enacted. I would appreciate hearing the Government's attitude towards this matter.

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: I certainly would not be party to any moves to do away with hotel social clubs which, as I understand it, are groups of people who meet together for common enjoyment. Certainly I would not want to be party to doing away with them. What does concern me and the Government, and, as I understand it the member for Whyalla, is the method by which hotel social clubs accrue the profits coming from lotteries run in the hotels. It will be recalled that lotteries run in hotels are supposed to be distributed for charitable purposes. I have found that there are many alarming reports coming in that the definition of 'charitable purposes' is wide indeed.

Mr Max Brown: It is very lax.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 12 August. Page 459.)

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: Yes, it is lax. It is a matter of great concern how these proceeds are being distributed, especially under that category where hotel social clubs are included and, not only that, but also under another category called 'miscellaneous', which gives rise to even more concern. The Government regards it as a matter of great concern and a few weeks ago I appointed a working party almost concurrently with the passage of that legislation to advise me on various methods of trying to overcome the problem.

Mr Slater: Who is on that working party?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: It is chaired by the Director of Recreation and Sport, and it has representatives from Community Welfare and the Hotels Association on it, but I cannot remember the whole complement. As soon as it reports and the Government has considered its recommendations I will let the member for Whyalla know.

At 3.6 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

RACING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill provides for an amendment to the Racing Act, 1976-1981, relating to the licensing of off-course bookmakers in Port Pirie. In considering this question, the Government has been impressed by the weight of local opinion which overwhelmingly supports the retention of licensed off-course bookmakers in Port Pirie. Indeed, it is difficult to find any opposition to this proposal within Port Pirie.

While the Government believes that the existence of such premises is an anomaly in this State, and in logical terms they should not have been permitted to continue after 1948, the fact remains that they have been in operation, with a break during the war years, for nearly 50 years. Indeed, they have become almost an institution in Port Pirie.

It is clear that they provide significant local employment opportunities; they cater for very small as well as very large bets; they are well distributed in the town; they offer a unique attraction for locals and tourists; they appear to present no discernible social problems; and the bookmakers themselves are seen as strong supporters of local charities and sport. Significantly, there appears to be no or very little illegal 'S.P. bookmaking' in Port Pirie, but this situation would certainly cease if the premises were to be closed. Accordingly, this Bill amends the Racing Act to enable the Betting Control Board to continue to license off-course bookmakers, in Port Pirie only, for an indefinite period. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 105 of the principal Act which provides for the registration of betting premises at Port Pirie. The clause amends the section by striking out subsection (2) which provides that premises shall not be registered or their registration renewed after the thirty-first day of January 1983.

Mr SLATER secured the adjournment of the debate.

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): This is the traditional Supply Bill that is introduced prior to the bringing down of the State Budget, and the Premier has indicated that it is anticipated that this Bill will secure supply until the end of November, by which time the Appropriation Bill is expected to be completed and assented to. At this juncture I do not intend to say very much more than simply pose a question to the Premier, based on that statement made in the second reading explanation of the Supply Bill. When does the Premier plan to bring down his State Budget?

Yesterday, on hearing suggestions that there could be some delay in the presentation of the State Budget, I issued a press release in which I called on the Premier to state what the date would be. I pointed out that a by-election is to be held in the seat of Florey on 4 September. That campaign will be very short, and the voters of Florey will not have much opportunity to consider the issues of the day, but, most importantly, unless the Budget is presented in time for it to be seen and analysed, those people will be voting pretty much in the dark on the Government's record. It would seem to me that it is in the interests of those people that they are aware of precisely what the Premier intends in his financial planning for at least the six months or so until the next election is due. The Premier has already made some references to this.

I thought it was rather strange that the response to my press statement and call for a date was the Premier's statement that a date had been fixed, it was a definite and firm date, but we could not be told. In the case of the Federal Budget, which is due for presentation this evening, we have known for some considerable time, in fact for some months, what Treasurer Howard had in mind as the date on which his Budget would be presented.

What is the problem with the Premier's telling us that today? I suggest that the Premier would be showing good faith in doing so. There is no particular reason of confidentiality for not announcing the date on which the Budget is to be presented. At this stage we do not want to know its contents: that can come at the time of presentation, and it is quite proper that that should occur. If the date has been fixed (and, in fact, it was stated quite definitely on behalf of the Premier), let us have it, and let the voters in the by-election that is about to commence know what they can expect.

If the Budget is not to be presented until after 4 September, we would understand that the Premier does not want it included in the considerations for the by-election. That would be a pretty cynical position for him to take, and perhaps he may have some reason that he could explain. If the Budget is to be presented before that date, let the Premier announce the date. If the Premier is not prepared to do that, I would like to know why he believes that there is some merit in keeping this date confidential. What is the difference between the Premier at the State level and his Federal counterpart? The answer could well be that there are problems with the Premier's Budget that he had not foreseen, which means that he will not be able to meet his deadline and that he does not want to have anything committed on the record. But I believe that, particularly this year, first in view of the fact that a State election is imminent in the next few months at least and, secondly, that this by-election will be held, we should know when the Budget will be presented. I hope that in his response the Premier will cease being coy and let us know when that will be.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): In debating this matter this afternoon and in regard to the extra \$300 000 000 that I believe is being provided by the legislation, I want to make some initial comments about the rabbit that was pulled out of the hat on Sunday. In making these comments, I want to repeat the statement that I made last night on *Nationwide*, namely, that I commend the Government for deciding to make available this money to address the anomaly that takes place when declining enrolments can be linked with increased class sizes, due to the way in which the staffing formulae work. I also wish to commend the Government for its decision to realise, belatedly, that September enrolments, not the February enrolment figures, are the appropriate figures on which to organise primary school staffing.

I commend the Government for both those decisions, but I make the point that they are very much belated, because the arguments about both those propositions have for some considerable time been put to the Minister of Education and Cabinet. Indeed, in giving that commendation, I wonder why all the arguments that were put in regard to those points were met with such a political response. Indeed, that is precisely what happened. For the weeks prior to last Sunday, we had the most amazing diatribes entered into not only by the Minister in this place but also by his Ministerial and back-bench colleagues—members who sought to put the most Draconian and Machiavellian motives on certain groups in the community.

Indeed, if one were to believe a skerrick of what was said about the Institute of Teachers, for example, one would have to marvel that the institute has not overtaken the world with a proposition containing some hideous ideology, because the institute was likened almost surely to such scare-mongering tactics that we have seen in years gone by from other quarters. I hope that members will not forget the responses that have been given in weeks gone by. When figures are cited by certain community groups, such as the Institute of Teachers, by me as shadow spokesman for education and by other people about the fact that there are some things about which we can be very pleased in regard to class size situations in South Australia (I made that very point in the House last week), we can indeed take pleasure in some of the ratios that we see.

However, that should not be used to gloss over those areas where we are not in quite the same advantageous position, nor should it be used to gloss over the relative change from the 1980 situation to that in 1982. When some of those areas were highlighted, the response was indeed dramatic. On 22 July, in response to certain contentions, the Minister of Education sweepingly labelled them as being blatantly untrue. He then went on in a flurry of activity that day, working himself up into quite a lather, and chose to refer to incidents that he alleged had taken place in Victoria in regard to the relationship between the various teacher organisations and the Australian Labor Party in that State.

The Minister finished up by saying that the aim of those who are partaking in an education campaign at present in this State is prostitution to the highest bidder—that was the phrase. The Minister also said that there was a great deal of political merit in responding to the highest bidder. Of course, we did not pick up that second phrase at the time to be of any significance, but it has had significance. On the one hand, the Minister says there is prostitution to the highest bidder, and on the other hand he is Machiavellian enough to see that there is political merit in that. I would suggest that last Sunday was an indication of that: the Minister decided that there was political merit in responding.

Last week also the Minister commented on the propositions put in the A.T.F. survey, saying that they were totally

inaccurate. The sweeping nature of the Minister's statement should naturally cause concern, because he has acknowledged today in this House that there are some areas where that statement, just on semantic terms, would not hold up. But, such a studied approach was not to be the case. They were totally inaccurate. I believe, rather unfortunately, that the scenario being entertained by the Minister and the Government was something like the following: they believed that they could bash the teachers of this State with a view to obtaining some sympathy from the community in an anti-teacher alliance. It is true that some viewpoints in the community are quite antagonistic to teachers for one reason or another, rightly or wrongly.

They hoped to form some coalition, I imagine, based upon building on those viewpoints, hoping that that group would come to the Government and say, 'Fantastic! Tremendous! We will join you in your attack on the teaching community.'

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: A coalition of the ignorant.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: A coalition of the ignorant, precisely.

The SPEAKER: Will the honourable member be able to advise the Chair on how this relates to the debate, which is in relation to Supply?

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It relates to the \$2 000 000 announced on Sunday to be available for staffing, which will take effect from the start of term 3. That is the point I am making. It is in response to propositions that have been put to the Government for some considerable time. I am commenting on the manner in which those representations were dealt with, the first response and now the later response. That is the proposition that was put but, unfortunately for the Government, I believe, it found what survey information has shown right throughout the country, namely, that parents and the community are concerned about the level of resources available to education and about budgetary provisions for those areas, and they fear any propositions to cut back those budgetary provisions. Clearly, that relates to the money being made available now.

An abrupt about-face had to be entered into and the political merit of the argument became very important. The Minister's response on 22 July became more important, and \$2 000 000 was found. The year in which it has been found is interesting. One would like to know exactly how it was found and where it has come from, but that matter will be followed through in the appropriate examination of the financial affairs of this Government.

The argument that was put is true: there is this anomaly. The Minister has accepted that and I give credit for that acceptance, but I made the point at the weekend and again yesterday that, if that point really was to be accepted, what should have followed on that was an alteration of the formula for the staffing of schools so that this element would be taken into account to minimise the dislocation to the students in the schools so affected. The initial response to that was that it would not really be appropriate, because that would be quite a massive undertaking, but I asked a question last week about the review that is under way at present.

I asked why a simple memorandum could not be addressed to the Acting Director-General from the Minister saying, 'In this matter that you are at present examining, the staffing formula, please take into it this other element that we have now accepted and concede to be the point.' The response that I got then was that I would have to bide my time and wait until the Budget was brought down. The Minister's answer was:

I regret to inform the honourable member that he will have to wait a little longer until the Budget is revealed before any specific announcements are made on that issue.

It is rather unfortunate that that is wrong on two counts. He should have said that I would have to wait until I got the *Sunday Mail* last Sunday.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is right. He should have also said that I would have to wait until he made his comment in the House today. I clearly stated that the memorandum from the Acting Director-General of Education to the Minister of Education was dated 2 July. Today in this House the Minister responded, commenting on my repeating of the statement last night on *Nationwide*, and said that it had not come before him. Surely he should have told us that last week. The Minister could have responded to my statement about the review of staffing by saying, 'I frankly have to tell the shadow Minister that it has not come before me. The fact that it is addressed to me is irrelevant. The fact that it is dated 2 July is irrelevant, because it has not come before me. A month and three days after it was dated it has not come before me.'

That was not the answer that we got then. It was the answer that we got today, but it still does not answer the point of why it could not be taken into account with that review. It is certainly true that any review of staffing formulae is a major exercise. It involves the entertaining of a great many opinions, the need to apply any draft formula to a wide number of possible staffing situations, and I am not trying to underestimate the work involved or the way in which that work would be increased by the incorporation of this element.

I merely make the point that, if the Government has conceded the point, as it says it has done, that is not something that is unique to the 1983 school year. It will be something that will apply and be relevant to a certain category of schools in the 1984, 1985 and 1986 school years, because we can be relatively reassured that the declining enrolment situation will take place for those years. It is quite reasonable to have asked that, rather than have a supplementary funding, funding supplementary to the formulae, it be built into the formulae, since the situation in which it will apply will be a four-year situation.

The Minister, in response to that contention, proposed, quite reasonably, that there was more flexibility to be found by not incorporating it into the formula. That is not an unreasonable response. Certainly, we want to make sure that any examination of any area of government should keep an element of flexibility in it, but a review entertains that possibility. I am not saying that for the 1983 year it should have excluded the possibility of such funding being supplementary to the formulae, because I do not believe that a proper review of the formulae will see them ready for 1983 anyway, so it would have to be supplementary for that year. All that was asked was that, if it were incorporated in that review, the formulae that apply to the following years will have it built in. The very existence of formulae indicates and acknowledges that there has to be something stable, something that can be known in advance.

That is what formulae are supposed to be. They are supposed to take the caprice out of a situation and bring in the areas of what can be estimated. I repeat my request that that be re-examined and that the review that is under way look at that element and its possible introduction into the formula. Regarding the other point that has been made, namely, change to the September enrolments, again I commend that. It is a pity that it has taken so long for that to be recognised, but it is quite correct that serious disruption can take place for students in this State if we do not have September enrolments in the primary area, because either you allow classes to get too large later in the year, when that has a more deleterious impact on the students, or you rearrange staffing within the school, dislocating the class

structure with poor benefits to the students, likewise late in the school year.

I do not believe that either is acceptable, and now neither the education community nor the Minister agrees that either of them is acceptable. Of course, one of the impacts is that for term three of this year those schools that may have had displacement staff because of certain enrolment problems will get temporary access to that money that is made available. Again, that point is commended, because there are a great many schools in that category. The money involves 100 positions, fewer than a quarter of the positions that will be reduced in the Education Department in the coming year, the statement being made that pupil-teacher ratios will be exactly maintained, translated into the staffing situation, resulting in some 470 fewer positions being needed next year. The \$2 000 000 decision is really giving back 100 of those positions but still believing that 370 of the positions should be kept away from education. To that extent I repeat what I said last week, namely, that the sentiment of the Schools Commission in its analysis of the coming triennium and all the problems facing the coming triennium was that we should take advantage of the hiatus in enrolments to address special needs that still exist within the education sector.

I should like briefly to comment on a number of other areas that have budgetary significance but, before doing that, I make one quick comment. Earlier this session, the member for Henley Beach made some comments about the advertising campaign on education at present being undertaken by the Institute of Teachers. In a number of speeches and comments in this House, he linked it to this Machiavellian campaign between the institute and the Labor Party. In a most astounding statement on 29 July, he said:

I am pleased to report to the House that I understand that the executive (that is, the executive of the Institute of Teachers) has backed down to the extent that its motions have changed and it is no longer making a financial commitment to the A.L.P.

What utter rot! The Institute of Teachers has not made a financial commitment to the A.L.P.

An honourable member: Not yet.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: It has never done so. Therefore, it is quite erroneous to suggest that it is no longer doing so, because it never started to do so.

Mr Trainer: The beating your wife type of argument.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: Absolutely. Such funds were not sought and were not proffered. I can only repeat the sentiment expressed in my Address in Reply speech, namely, that I hope that the education debate that we will enter into before the election will be of a higher calibre than that sort of suggestion and innuendo.

Another point which I must refute and which has an impact on the funding available for building programmes within the State was made on 20 July by the member for Mawson. The honourable member, when commenting on the holding school situation, talked about the visits of certain people to the Coorara Primary School, which is a holding school, and said that it was a sham, on behalf of the A.L.P., to choose this school, implying that perhaps we are concerned only about certain significant schools in the State, namely, those that by coincidence happen to fit into certain marginal, Government-held electorates. That was the implication of that.

I would like to know, if that is the case, why I, as the shadow Minister, should have spent, for example, so much time visiting the holding school in the electorate of my colleague, the member for Napier, looking at a situation there. Am I concerned that this marginal Liberal electorate will fall to the Labor Party? Am I concerned, for example, at the holding school in my own electorate? Am I concerned

for political reasons about the holding schools that exist in other parts of this State, and indeed in the electorate of my colleague, the member for Baudin? The comment was not relevant to those particular visits at all. They choose to be ignored. I know the member for Mawson knows it to be the case, because we shared the platform at a meeting at Coorara Primary School. I think we would both agree that it was a very worthwhile meeting. The honourable member is aware of the comments that I made about the other holding schools in the system, and I do not believe that he can stand in this House and say that I attempted to make cheap political capital at that meeting at the expense of other holding schools that may perchance be in electorates less marginal than the one to which he was referring.

I refer also to certain financial information that has been supplied by the Minister of Education in response to various Questions on Notice that I have asked regarding financial expenditure proposed in the year ahead and how it relates to figures for which I have asked in the years gone by. One can see by the analysis being introduced by my question that we can have an overview of how things have changed over a five-year period. That brings me to the point that I believe should be built into financial planning at the State Government level, namely, the concept of triennial planning.

One of the major problems facing schools, and indeed many sectors in all areas of government, is the 'last week of June syndrome', when people with a budgetary allocation that they have not, for one reason or another, been able to spend, say 'We must spend it quickly, so that we do not lose the equivalent follow-on allocation in the following financial year.' This is not a criticism of the present Government any more than it is a criticism of any other Government, because it is a fact of life that has been going on for a long time. It is a very poor way of handling resources not to have some safeguards built in so that we can avoid that panic spending in the last weeks of the financial year.

The problem is that bodies that have the allocation fear two things: first, that they will lose the money altogether if they do not have it spent by 30 June and, secondly, that if they do not spend it by 30 June the following year's allocation will be based on what they actually spent in that financial year, not on the sum which they had allocated to them but which for one reason or another they may not have been able to spend. I appreciate that it is not within the power of a State Government to fund Government activities triennially: that is not within our power because we do not have the same degree of control over the financial resources available to us as does Federal Government. However, surely we should be able to plan triennially, so that we can say in various areas of Government endeavour that, all other things being equal, and with the following presumptions being made about anticipated income, this is how we would envisage the money being spent over that period of time.

That should allow for carry-overs between one financial year and another and avoid what I believe is a significant waste that results from the sudden spending of money towards the end of the financial year. This would also enable more stability and a better quality of resource management to occur if those spending money could structure a programme which lasted for three years and on which they would have some guarantee that it would be reasonably sure of being met.

I hope that that suggestion will be taken up. It is important. I recently had pointed out to me by some staff whom I met at one college of the Department of Technical and Further Education that one of the colleges of that department apparently, towards the end of the financial year, suddenly found itself in possession of a mini computer. Apparently, it had not been requested. It found itself in possession of it because some money had been left over. They were apparently told,

'So, do not waste it, do not see it disappear—spend it! It may well be that it is highly appropriate for that piece of equipment to have been bought. It may well fill a useful place in that facility's administration and educational programme. However, the point made was that it was not planned for or solicited—it just arrived. So, if any benefit does come from it, it will be quite fortuitous. In regard to the five-year analysis which I believe will be quite useful for members in this place in examination of the Budget that is due to come up, we can see that some interesting things have been happening.

In answer to Questions on Notice today which I received I find that the printing costs, the publication budget, in the Education Department and the Department of Technical and Further Education has been languishing. I will not incorporate the figures in *Hansard* because they will be available in answers to Questions on Notice at the back of the next weekly addition.

However, in 1977-78 \$104 000 was spent by the Department of Technical and Further Education, whereas in 1981-82 (presumably preliminary figures) \$92 000 only was spent—quite a significant reduction in absolute and real terms. Likewise, the money spent in the Education Department in these areas was \$886 375 in 1977-78 and, although there has been an increase by 1981-82 to some \$983 000, that increase of \$100 000 over a five-year period certainly does not take account of the inflation in that area over that period. Indeed, it barely takes account of about 15 months worth of inflation over that five-year period. So, the significant impact of that area has declined. So, it means that fewer support and curriculum materials are being supplied to people in both those sectors. The inflated amount of those moneys is being allocated to other sectors of the education Budget, possibly even outside it.

I wish to make one final point. I repeat a comment that I made last week, as I have not yet had a response from the Minister. I asked that he receive a deputation concerning school buses around a Mid North school. Last week I asked that the Minister respond to my correspondence on the matter and when he would receive the deputation, as there was considerable concern amongst the community. A week later, I have not yet received that response, and I again ask the Minister please to respond to my request. Indeed, I ask that the Minister respond favourably, so that the deputation will be entertained by him.

Mr HEMMING (Napier): I would like to make my contribution in this debate in relation to the amount of money that has been made available to the Department for Community Welfare, not only in further funding to help those people in extreme poverty but also to provide additional officers to serve in that area. Last week in the Address in Reply debate I expressed concern that one senior member on the Government side, namely, the Minister of Agriculture, felt that it was quite amusing when I was dealing with a question of poverty. He thought that it was rather amusing that someone should come to me for assistance in regard to electricity and water bills because she was not able to get any money from D.C.W. I mentioned last week that the roles have been reversed and that D.C.W. was no longer able to assist people in need. It was referring people to members of Parliament, who then referred them to charitable institutions. It crossed my mind when Parliament commenced today that you, Mr Speaker, always read the prayer and refer to working towards the true welfare of the people of this State. It is fairly obvious that the Minister of Agriculture is not really concerned about the poor people of this State: he is only worried about the vested interests that support his Party and him as a Minister in this Government. I believe that that is a crying shame.

In dealing with poverty, I will refer at considerable length to a study put out by SACOSS which was entitled 'Living on the edge' and which concluded that 2 800 000 people in Australia are on or well below the poverty line. That is a shocking state of affairs. When I migrated to this country in 1964, Australia was ranked fifth in the world living standards. Today we have two graphs to compare—one relating to the United Nations standard and the other the O.E.C.D. standard. Both show that we are about eighteenth in world living standards. This country is supposed to possess all the resources available to mankind—the so-called lucky country. Yet, in something like 20 years we have slipped from fifth down to eighteenth. The survey quoted some rather startling figures which I will read at length and for which I make no apology.

However, before I do so, I will quote to the House what our Minister for Social Security said in regard to that survey. He said that it was grossly exaggerated, that nothing like 2 800 000 people are on the poverty line, and that the figure is only 1 000 000. Even if that is correct, for a Minister for Social Security to say that one in 15 Australians is living on or below the poverty line suggests that he does not deserve to hold that portfolio. A Minister of the Crown, who is supposed to be concerned with people's existence, has said that he is perfectly happy that 1 000 000 Australians are struggling to survive, and that that is all right and acceptable to the Federal Government. Going by the remarks that the Minister of Agriculture made last week, it is quite obvious that this Government is now in a position to accept that a fair proportion of our population should be on the poverty line.

The Government's attitude is that it will not worry about such people, that they are not its real concern. Fortunately, though, members on this side of the House consider it to be a real problem. In regard to the study the Minister for Social Security stated:

'It failed to take into account that many poor people may have assets that enable them to live quite reasonably.' He said many aged pensioners owned homes. 'It is silly to count them as being in poverty,' he said. But he said certain groups such as single parents and the unemployed were in serious trouble.

That is fair enough, and I go along with what the Minister said about the unemployed and single parents. But the Minister was saying, in effect, that if one owns his own home then one does not deserve to be included in the category of those who are in poverty. The Minister fails to understand that, although a person may own a home, there may be no food in it, because pensions and unemployment benefits in this country are so miserably low that they cannot help people. Further, sickness benefits are so miserably low that they cannot help those in real need.

It was pleasing to note that Australian Labor Party members in Canberra condemned what the Minister said, as did Professor Henderson, who brought down a report in 1975. When that report was released in 1975, there was a Federal Labor Government in Canberra, and it was intended that something should be done about people in real poverty. However, since 1975, the Fraser Government has been in office and there has been literally nothing done. The benefit for single unemployed people has not risen at all; those people are still expected to survive on \$36 a week, which is just not on. In the *Advertiser* of 12 August, Professor Henderson was reported as follows:

Professor Henderson said there was overwhelming evidence that poverty was increasing. While it was true that some people on the poverty line owned homes, they had little in liquid assets, such as food.

The Government did not appear to have acted very reasonably since his report was published in 1975. 'This Government has said it is concerned with inflation, and everything else comes later,' Professor Henderson said.

That illustrates the stark truth of the attitude of the Federal Government concerning the unemployed, the aged, and those who are struggling to survive. It is also the attitude of the South Australian Government, because it supports the Fraser Government right down the line. When the Budget is brought down in two or three weeks time I think we will find that, despite the promises made in the Governor's Speech little or nothing extra will be allocated to the Department for Community Welfare to help those in real need.

What is poverty? Everyone has his own view of what poverty is. Despite what Senator Chaney might think, the Australian Council of Social Service survey has been accepted by most people as being a follow-on of the Henderson inquiry. It has proved beyond doubt that poverty has increased by 20 per cent since the Henderson Report was produced in 1975. I hope that the Government has a copy of the findings of the survey. The findings (page 11) state:

It is sometimes said that poverty does not exist in Australia. In India the beggars in the street constantly confront the traveller with the issue of abject poverty. In Australia there are few beggars or striking signs of poverty. Indeed Australia is portrayed as the 'lucky country' and a country that can pride itself on 'mateship'.

Yet despite this image it is estimated that up to 2 000 000 people are living below the 'austere' poverty line first developed by the poverty inquiry in 1975; and another 800 000 people are living below 120 per cent of this benchmark.

The frequent comparison of poverty in Australia to that of the underdeveloped countries is misleading. To use another's words 'poverty (like wealth) is a comparative term. As such it cannot sensibly be removed from the context in which people live'.

Starvation is a stark aspect of poverty but research in the 'advanced' Western countries also highlights the higher infant mortality and shorter life expectancy of the poor. Other research shows the higher incidence of suicide, child abuse and family breakdown caused by the stress of living on low incomes and/or being unemployed.

The isolation of the poor from the society in which they live is compounded by a range of factors such as: lack of leisure activities, not being able to send their children on school outings, always having to buy 'specials' at the local supermarket, suffering a discontinuity of medical care, no security of tenure of employment or accommodation, not having an adequate place to play or study, having to rely on friends, relatives or welfare agencies for additional support, having to use second-hand clothes.

If one visits the jumble sales and the trash and treasure markets in the metropolitan area, and compares them with those of, say, five or six years ago, one realises that a large proportion of people going to those places now go there not to buy a little ornament or a pot plant, but to buy second-hand clothing for their children: we are being reduced to being a nation of people who must rely on others handouts. I know this to be true in my own electorate.

Of course, the Minister of Agriculture would not know anything about it; he has always led a sheltered, wealthy life. You look at me, Sir, with your eyebrows raised, but the Minister of Agriculture went on record as ridiculing what I was trying to do in this House for people in poverty, and therefore, so long as we are both in this House, I will never let him forget what he did last week. The findings of the survey continue as follows:

While most of us will experience some of these restrictions at some time, the poor will face a high proportion all the time. Life becomes the grim reality of juggling to make ends meet on a day-to-day basis—with no safety valves for unexpected needs and often with no end in sight to their present situation.

The full impact of the ongoing nitty-gritty restrictions of living on a low income and being forced to choose between essentials such as paying the rent or for food, compound and often result in a poorer mental and physical health of the families and the deterioration of family relationships. Poverty cannot be dismissed as something intangible and outside the province of Australian society.

That is what the study says about poverty in Australia. As a result of an article in the *News* which gave some prominence to statements that I have made in this House, I received telephone calls from people who were concerned and wanted to offer assistance. One woman told me that, knowing what

poverty was all about, she agreed with what I had said and acknowledged that something should be done. She condemned Senator Chaney for saying that this poverty problem was exaggerated, and she told me that her husband was one of the fortunate ones to be working, although he was on a low income, and that when he came home from work he often queried why she had not prepared a meal for herself as well as for him.

She made the excuse that she had felt hungry earlier and did not want anything at present, but she told me that that they could often afford only one meal and that, as her husband was the breadwinner, he should have that meal. That is the kind of poverty being shown up in this survey but, of course, Government members would not see that was being a real problem. Their attitude is that we do not have to worry about those kinds of things and that if we ignore them they will go away. One of the major findings in the report states at page 14:

Living below, or near, the poverty line at best describes a 'hand to mouth' and often crisis situation. While those currently living below and up to 120 per cent of the Henderson poverty line must be regarded with absolute priority, those with income less than 150 per cent of the poverty line should also be regarded as 'struggling' and sometimes in need.

If we accept that (and I certainly accept that as a major finding) that 2 800 000 comes somewhere close to the 4 000 000, and we are now coming dangerously close to one-third of the population of this country who cannot meet their day-to-day basic needs. Those people cannot afford to pay for luxuries like sending their children on a school outing or encouraging them to join a local sporting club or to engage in extra curricula activities, which cost money. In my own area the local sporting clubs, whether they play soccer, Australian rules, or anything else, have noticed a real decline in the number of young people prepared to play sport, and that is not because of laziness: it is because they cannot afford to pay the fees.

Can one imagine what it would be like for a parent having to tell a child, 'No, you can't join the local soccer team, because it'll cost 60 cents a week and we can't afford to pay it'? That is another aspect of poverty that has not been covered by this report, but it is something of which Government members should take note, because I sometimes believe that they are too complacent in their attitude towards poverty.

Recently our Prime Minister and our Treasurer were saying that those of us receiving inflated salaries—and I would be the first to agree that that is what they are—should set a precedent and show restraint. That is all very well, and I would be the last to argue that members of Parliament should receive salary increases willy nilly but, when people are struggling to make ends meet and the Prime Minister (who is not only a millionaire but receives a salary of about \$120 000 a year) says 'If we can tighten our belts, you can do the same,' can they be blamed for not swallowing such statements? I do not swallow that type of rubbish, and I am sure that those 2 800 000 recognised in this report will not swallow it, either. Another major finding in the report states:

The current levels of Commonwealth pensions, benefits, allowances and other income support are not adequate. Lone parent families, the unemployed, low income families with dependent children, and low income persons renting in the private market are the worst off.

Literally nothing is being done to help those people. Nothing has been forthcoming from the Federal Government since it took office in 1975. In fact, there has been a dramatic downturn in the benefits available to those people. The people fortunate enough to be working are taxed at the highest level of any country in the world, and the Government is prepared to give that taxation money to investors

coming here, promoting the resource development boom at the expense of the people living in this country. The third point raised in the report is as follows:

Lack of income is the prime cause of the difficulty faced by the families. Priority rests on increasing the current levels of pensions, benefits, allowances and other income support.

I have already covered that matter, and literally nothing has been done. We have had promises, and nothing but promises, from the Federal Government. The next major finding states:

Primary emphasis in any Government housing policy should be placed on extending access to public rental housing and increasing (and extending) the supplementary rent allowance for all low income persons renting in the private market.

We all know exactly how much the Fraser Government has given to the States for public rental housing. In fact, I think the Premier acknowledged that in a no-confidence motion which we moved some weeks ago. In fact, what the States are now getting from the Commonwealth is actually less than the sum they are paying back to the Federal Government in interest repayments. In effect, the Federal Government has washed its hands entirely of public rental housing. I do not often give credit to this Government, and I do not necessarily agree with the way it has done this (in fact, it has forced the Housing Trust to use expensive money) but at least an attempt has been made to make up the shortfall, and, as I say, a certain amount of credit for that is due to this State Government. Another major finding states:

Over half the families in the study were forced to defer major health care because of cost.

I do not have to quote from the report, because I remember vividly that, when I first came to this country, some people who went to a chemist with two or three prescriptions had to ask the chemist which prescription they should take out because they could not afford to pay for three prescriptions. The chemist would look at the prescriptions and say, 'If you don't have the money for all three, take this one.' That was health in 1964.

In 1972 there was a real attempt to make available health care to everyone in this country, irrespective of the income on which they existed. That move was completely blocked by both the A.M.A. and the Senate. The end result was something better than the original schemes but still not the best. As a result, in 1975 the scheme was completely demolished. Now we have an exact replica of what happened in 1964. Some chemists in my district are giving prescriptions to people on time payment so that those people can buy the medicines that they need for themselves and their children.

We also know that some people who hold a white medical card are refusing to go to the doctor because they know that they cannot meet the cost of prescriptions for medicines and drugs. That brings me back to my original point. Some time ago, if a person found that he could not pay \$5 or \$6 to a chemist for prescriptions, he could seek help from the Department for Community Welfare. The department would say, 'Go and pay the \$6, bring us the receipt, and we will reimburse you.' That does not happen now. The department has been starved of so much money that it cannot do that.

I know that many of my colleagues put their hands into their own pockets and pay those prescription fees, because that is the easy way out and because we are fed up referring people to Government agencies which will ultimately tell them that there is nothing that they can do. That is a brief example of the poverty that exists in this State and this country. I would like to think that the Premier, as well as giving us copies of that great magazine—

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

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN (Premier and Treasurer): We have heard two speeches which I found quite interesting. First, we heard from the member for Salisbury, who gave us the most convincing exhibition of sour grapes that we have seen for a long time. He did it very eloquently, I will give him credit for that, but nevertheless it was sour grapes. However, the honourable member was able to smile, and he should have smiled, because he was talking rubbish. I guess it all lines up with the remarks that the honourable member and his Leader made when the Government's initiatives to maintain class sizes were announced at the weekend. Suddenly, something which had become a matter of great importance and a matter of great need—indeed, an absolutely fundamental thing in the best interests of education—suddenly became a political move. Really, the honourable gentleman's performance does him less than justice.

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I was interested to note that, while the member for Salisbury was speaking, the member for Elizabeth was in the House and sitting behind him. I cannot help but wonder whether there might not be a new front man, a new contender for the leadership. We shall see. The representations that the honourable member said had been made to the Minister of Education for some time had certainly been made, but certainly not for a considerable time: they came forward in relatively recent times.

I might say that the Primary Principals Association and its executive were extraordinarily helpful in putting these requests in a clear and concise form to Government members. I am very grateful to them for taking that trouble. Rather than embarking on any sort of confrontational approach, they took the reasonable, rational and eminently sensible approach of putting their case to the Government and, indeed, we were very pleased to be able to help, because without any doubt the welfare of our children is most important to us.

I would refute quite bluntly and categorically one other comment that the honourable gentleman made, and that is that we are antagonistic to teachers. As a Party and as individual members of this Parliament, we have the greatest respect for members of the teaching profession. But it is a fact that members of the S.A.I.T. executive have come under increasing criticism from members of the institute and the teaching profession in recent times.

There was initially a wage claim of up to 38 per cent, which the President called an ambit claim, but many teachers in the community were very distressed to think that (I am very conscious of the remarks made by the member for Napier, and I will mention wage restraint in respect to his very humane speech) at a time when wage restraint is generally recognised as being of critical importance to the future of this State the Institute of Teachers made a claim for a salary increase of 38 per cent. Some members of the teaching profession are still absolutely irate at such a heartless, unfeeling and poorly timed move.

Then there were the outrageous claims by the executive of the Institute of Teachers about the activities of Enterprise Australia, an organisation which is highly regarded in other States and in South Australia not only by members of employer groups but also by members of the trade union movement generally. The remarks that were made—

Mr Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. D. O. TONKIN: I am outlining the reasons why teachers are currently criticising members of the S.A.I.T. executive. The remarks that were made were totally without foundation and were in the worst possible taste. Some teachers have telephoned me and my colleagues to dissociate themselves from those remarks.

Finally, there is the present campaign to which the Minister of Education referred in Question Time. The institute has

attempted to associate South Australia with a general campaign that is being waged Australia wide by the Federation of Teachers, which in fact is denigrating the efforts of its members in South Australia who have greatly contributed to the achievement of the very high standards that South Australia now enjoys in education. Some teachers in South Australia bitterly resent the attitude that is being adopted not so much by the Australian Federation of Teachers but by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which is taking advantage of an Australia-wide campaign to denigrate the standard of education in South Australia.

I certainly believe that there is every reason for teachers to feel disappointed and dissatisfied with the activities of the S.A.I.T. executive. I feel sure that the present executive does not accurately reflect the true attitudes of the great majority of teachers.

The member for Napier spent his time in this debate speaking about poverty and the poverty line and referring to the very real difficulties of those people who, for one reason or another, are living below that poverty line. I freely admit that the problem does exist. Anyone in today's society knows that it does exist, that there is great difficulty indeed. Having accepted that that problem is very bad, I suggest that the member and other members of his Party try to do something positive about the matter.

I can only suggest that he and his Party put their whole-hearted weight and support behind the efforts of this Government in its determination to create new jobs by expanding industry and getting on with our mineral resource developments so that we can create jobs and let those people who can work have the opportunity to work, so that we can create jobs and become self sufficient: in other words, allow people to have jobs and not rely on hand-outs, which are a band-aid at any time. We are looking for a permanent and full-time solution to the problem and that means the creation of jobs that are productive and then the needs of those people who cannot work, because of age or infirmity, and the needs of others can be met as more money is generated in our society.

I also urge the honourable gentlemen and his colleagues to urge wage restraint. I mean that generally. Then, again, we can have more people in work. People can be employed. Companies will not be put out of business or severely restricted in their activities by the impact of excessive wage claims. If the member did that, we would have more people in work, more productivity, and perhaps we would become more competitive overseas and sell more of our products there. Then we could create more jobs for those people who need them and we could afford to help those people who need help.

I say to the member that his feelings do him great credit but his solution to the problem, when he could only talk about hand-outs, did him no credit. We should tackle the basic problem and create employment and prosperity and look after those people who cannot do so themselves when we can afford to do so. Regarding the Leader of the Opposition, I think he has been in this place for long enough to know that the impact on the State Budget of the Federal Budget can sometimes be quite marked. There are details of the Federal Budget that have to be examined carefully and put into the context of the State Budget before it is introduced. The State Budget will be introduced when I am satisfied that it is ready.

Bill read a second time.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for consideration of the Bill.

That is your cue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the Leader of the Opposition will be exercising his right to speak for 30 minutes?

Mr BANNON (Leader of the Opposition): I certainly will. I thank the Premier for his well spent out cue.

The Hon. D. O. Tonkin: I am always ready to help and be of assistance.

Mr BANNON: After he has heard what I say we may not be so friendly but I am glad we began on this basis. Four days ago the Premier chose the relatively friendly atmosphere of the Liberal Party's State Council to attempt to put forward a defence of his Government's record in office. He has not been too keen to do that in this place, nor has he been ready to take up my challenge to debate the important economic issues directly, and openly, before the public of South Australia, but it seems that the Party faithful were becoming restive and demanding. They wanted some signs of life from North Terrace, and the Premier felt he had to oblige. A lot of what he said does not deserve to be dignified with a reply. Some of it, such as the claims he makes for himself as a competent manager of the State's finances, can be dealt with when the House has the Government's Budget before it. The Premier is maintaining his coyness about the exact date of presentation of that document.

Of course, in that speech there were the usual excursions into fantasy and blatant misrepresentations when it came to the question of our alternative policies. If he has something worth while to say, or some pertinent questions to raise, then I will deal with it, and I will answer those questions. If his attempts at denigration are an indication that he would like to debate those policies with me, and there in that debate tell us what he plans to do beyond making excuses, then let us have that debate. Any time he wants to come out from behind the cover of a closed Party meeting I will be happy to accommodate him, but until then the nonsense he puts forward about the Australian Labor Party and its policies will be accorded the contempt it so completely deserves.

There are, however, some odd references in his apologia to the Party faithful, and some half truths that do need to be put straight. For example, we are served up some contorted logic about the State's unemployment rate, which in effect says that after three years in office nothing has been achieved, because there is no mention of the fact of 31 consecutive months with the highest unemployment rate on mainland Australia. Indeed, for 23 of those months we had the highest rate in Australia. There was no mention of the fact that, at July 1982, 6 100 more South Australians were looking for work than during the same period three years ago. That is an increase over that three-year period of 15.4 per cent. Where is the usual reference to employment? Members opposite will recall that at their crisis Party meeting at Lyndoch in July 1981, which was called when it became apparent that the Government's prescriptions were failing, the Premier predicted that by the time of the next election unemployment would have been reduced by 2 per cent. Until that was realised, he told them, 'Our response to every mention of unemployment must be in terms of new employment.'

That strategy has been abandoned, and the reasons are fairly obvious. From June 1979 to June 1982 employment in South Australia grew at the lowest rate of any State on mainland Australia. Our growth rate was less than one-tenth of the national rate. That talk about employment has been abandoned because it just does not hold up. Then again, reference is made to the level of investment in this State—an echo of earlier occasions when the bulky list of projects was flashed before the cameras. Now, we welcome investments. Heaven knows what our situation would be if

those projects were not either in place or committed, but we particularly welcome it because in large part a Labor Government was in office when those investment decisions and commitments were made.

We have analysed that list previously and I am surprised that the Premier keeps trotting out the same tired old lines that they are initiatives of his Government. At least 20 per cent of that investment total is a result of public sector investment, so often the target of attack by the Premier, but suddenly very welcome when he needs to boost his figures. Almost half of the projects were planned or started under a Labor Government.

Much has also been made of the Government's abolition of a few taxes. The people have been spared \$150 000 000, we are told, although with no indication of how that figure was arrived at. But how much extra have South Australians paid through 'back-door taxation', through State charges having been raised well beyond the level needed to cover inflation? While on the subject of costs to the taxpayer, there is in his speech an odd reference to the Riverland cannery which is described as a 'shadowy monument to the Labor Government'. It is interesting the Premier also in response to a question talked about that expansion being a *fait accompli* and said that there is no way that that solution would work. He said losses were compounded by doubling the capacity of the cannery.

That is not how it was described in October 1979 when he had the opportunity to open the extensions of the cannery. The Premier is reported then as saying that this would give a great boost to the local economy, that it would give local growers a golden opportunity. He went on to say:

The cannery board and the staff have steered it to what I am confident will be a new era of prosperity.

He paid a tribute to the co-operative members who, in 1976, had realised the cannery was threatened with closure. They had approached the then State Labor Government for assistance. His speech continues:

They told their story to the then State Government, which commissioned the South Australian Development Corporation to try and arrest the economic decline of the Riverland region. I acknowledge the former Government's prompt action over this matter. With the entry of the S.A.D.C. tough and at times unpopular decisions had to be made, but they were taken with the long-term interests of the Riverland community in mind.

He then went on to talk about the new era of prosperity and the success these rationalisations would result in. On the same occasion the Chairman of the cannery board, Mr Jack Howe, said that the involvement of the State Labor Government and the S.A.D.C. undoubtedly saved the industry in South Australia from collapse. Now it is a 'shadowy monument' and one might add that this Government has poured more money into the cannery than was ever contemplated by the Labor Government. According to a report in the *Advertiser* of last Saturday, the Government now appears to be backing the venture to the tune of \$22 000 000.

Then, finally, there are the reasons (according to the Premier) for the parlous state of the South Australian economy. The problems, he tells us, are imported—they are international, they affect everyone and there is no way that South Australia can avoid them. As evidence for this excuse he quotes a long passage from a speech by Prime Minister Fraser which was itself an attempt by Mr Fraser to excuse the pathetic performance of his Liberal Government in Canberra. But what is not said is that it is more than a matter of South Australia's simply suffering along with the rest of the nation. What is not said is that on every key indicator we are faring much worse than the other States. For the three years of this Government we have been performing below the national average. None of that is said, no reference in his speech to the Party faithful. Instead we are given the increasingly familiar tour of Western economies

as the Premier washes his hands of responsibility for what goes on in this State. It all sounds a bit hollow, given the Premier's past performance, particularly in Opposition. Even as late as November last year he was putting an exactly opposite view. On 24 November, with considerable fanfare, he launched the strategy paper prepared by the State Development Council. On that occasion he said:

I have heard it said that our destiny is determined outside the State and therefore we might as well hang up the 'Gone fishing' sign. Well, it is true that our economy is interlocked with that of the rest of the nation and from there to that of the world. We do feel the ebb and flow of those pressures and we can be pinched quite sharply by Federal attitudes and policies. But within that overall context there is much we can do to help ourselves. How we see our challenges, how we react to them, and whether we find success is very much a matter of attitude.

That was 24 November last year, a very different tune from what he told the Liberal Council a few days ago. How have the Premier and the Government reacted? Well, we could be forgiven for feeling the 'Gone fishing' sign has been well and truly put out. If it is a matter of attitude, then Heaven help South Australia, because this Government has given up. It is simply rushing about looking for places that are worse off so that it feels a bit easier about what it has not done here. Government members must really be asking themselves why they are bothering. If the State role is as insignificant as the Premier would now have us believe, why have State Governments at all?

No doubt as we get closer to an election we can expect to hear more reports from every corner of the globe and have the views of increasingly obscure economists related to us. That is the logic of what the Premier is saying. As the election approaches we will also see the Premier and his Government try to establish claims to some symbols of success that can be put before the electorate as a measure of their term in office.

But what I and my Party find particularly distasteful is that after years of inveighing about what has been done and what was being planned by the Labor Government throughout the last decade, the Premier now wants to claim for himself the credit for projects and achievements which are directly the result of the work done during those years. Nowhere is this illustrated more starkly than in the Premier's sudden conversion over the question of an international hotel in Victoria Square. This project was constantly criticised and attacked by the Premier and his Party when in Opposition. For them it was a subject for derision, and they did their best to scare off potential developers by publicly casting doubt on its viability. The Premier, when Leader of the Opposition, said bluntly that there was no need for an international hotel in this city; it was 'a pie in the sky' project. People will be reminded of this when the opening of this hotel takes place later. In July 1977 in this House the Premier said:

The international hotel in Victoria Square should in future be referred to as the 'Hans Christian Andersen Hotel' as it appears to be just another one of the Premier's fairy tales.

Then in November 1978 he said plans for the hotel were absurd. That hotel is now becoming a reality, with the same consortium and on the conditions and on the site negotiated with the previous Government. It is fantasy that the Premier took so much time with what he is claiming as a symbol of the achievements of his Government.

Now, after doing his best to ensure that this State did not get the benefit of that development—after constantly trying to dissuade investors from making a commitment to the Victoria Square project—he wants us to accept that somehow that fine hotel that we are now seeing take shape was all his own idea. The Premier is also fond of explaining the concept of lead times, usually to excuse why one of his predictions of imminent prosperity has not proved correct.

I think we all remember his clear exposition to Kevin Crease during a radio interview. In answer to the specific question 'How much longer is it going to take?' the Premier replied:

It is going to take a little while longer yet, Kevin, and I can remember talking to you on this programme, or a similar one, about 18 months ago, and you said to me, 'How long can you keep on talking about lead times and saying it is going to take a little time?' I said at that stage, as I recall, 'As long as it is necessary to get through the lead times'. Now we are 18 months further through the lead times.

Let us try and approach it a little more seriously, because, despite that ludicrous response from the Premier, his own strictures about lead times are very soon ignored when it comes to claiming credit for projects which have taken years to come to fruition.

The Stony Point liquids project did not just happen. It was always seen as part of the Cooper Basin development story. Its timing owed more to world prices for oil and l.p.g. than to anything the present Minister of Mines and Energy had to offer. The Cooper Basin itself—a development that has been progressing steadily for 20 years—was only recently discovered by the Liberal Party.

Mr Ashenden: Tell us about Redcliff.

Mr BANNON: Yes, the honourable member can continue knocking and attacking Redcliff and our attempts to get a petro-chemical plant. Indeed, he can keep up that negative approach, because he is very much part of the people of the 1970s, the Opposition of the 1970s which is presiding in this interregnum at the moment. The sooner he and his friends are out, the better for this State, I suggest.

Without doubt, the Cooper Basin offers the best resource development project in Australia. It is crucial to the future of this State—just as the Santos Act in 1979 was crucial to the orderly development of the Cooper Basin itself. And what was the Premier's record on that occasion? He used it to give a display of some of his most distasteful hyperbole, some of the worst attacks on this State by any Opposition leader.

Since then we have seen the Bond Corporation jump clear when it needed cash. That was what the Hon. Hugh Hudson predicted—that was the reason for the Act, and thanks to that Act South Australia has not suffered by those financial changes that have taken place in the Cooper Basin. If the present Premier had had his way, we would have been left exposed and totally vulnerable. Yet now he wants those exciting developments to be regarded as an exclusive achievement of his Government.

There are other examples. The Minister of Industrial Affairs has embraced the idea of Technology Park with a commitment that does him credit, but it was a concept which was being actively considered at the time of the last election. The Deputy Premier makes Ministerial statements in this place about our fortunate position in regard to power generation, but power stations are not built in three years—they are not even planned in so short a time.

Indeed, the power plant projects of the previous Government, major investments in this State and in its future, were left off the list of investments produced before the last election by the Opposition. It did not want to know about them. It did not suit it to talk about the role of public sector investment. Now, 50 per cent of investment projects the Government is claiming credit for are public sector projects and include that very project that was omitted. That is the sort of dishonesty that we are seeing from that side. The fact that we are now so well placed is a result of imaginative planning which goes back to the time of the previous Government and back to the Hon. Tom Playford himself. It has been claimed now by the current Government and the Minister as their sole and special achievement.

But perhaps the most regrettable piece of hypocrisy on the part of the Premier relates to his sudden discovery that

the lifestyle, the environment, the quality of life in South Australia, is a real underlying strength in our community that both serves to give South Australians a real sense of pride in their State and is a powerful weapon in attracting tourism, development, and investment: lifestyle, quality of life, the artistic and cultural environment in which this State has been developing. Indeed, that intangible but very powerful feature of South Australia is displayed prominently in the glossy publication of which the Government has just printed over 100 000 copies to distribute to voters through their children at school.

The booklet contains the Premier's photo in the front, and is to be distributed a few months before an election. We can examine the contents of that booklet. The lifestyle it describes is a legacy of the Dunstan Government. It exists because, for so many years, the State had a Government which took care to identify and nurture the distinctively South Australian environment and lifestyle. That was sneered at and derided by the Premier and his Government when they sat on this side of the House, yet now they cannot do enough to associate themselves with it.

South Australia's pride and confidence in its own achievements can certainly be a powerful weapon in promoting our State. However, the Premier's problem is that in his new guise he is simply not credible. Having spent years trying to tear down what was being done, he expects now to be believed when he puts forward what he has so strenuously attacked. This Government very shortly will face an election. If the speech given by the Premier to his Party last weekend is any guide, it will face that election with no new policies and no fresh ideas. Instead, it will give vent to its negative obsessions with the 1970s. Unfortunately for South Australia, the Premier has never really recovered from his four years in the shadow of an incomparably better politician and a much finer Leader, and a Government that was getting on with the job. The remedies he has proposed during his term are the negative prescriptions that he harped on for all those unsuccessful years. He is backed by equally negative Ministers. The Deputy Premier and the Minister for Industrial Affairs prefer to do nothing rather than accept the merit of an idea put forward from their opponents. Any time anything is proposed in a positive sense they are the first to jump forward and attack.

South Australia has had a unique opportunity over the past few years to see two very different approaches to the management of our State's economy. In 1979, after nearly 10 years of Labor Government, the electorate decided to try the formulae offered by the Liberal Party. That experiment has failed. It is time to make a fresh start to ensure that the economic problems of the 1980s do not overwhelm us, that we can develop the underlying strengths of our economy and our community to face the challenge.

The period in Opposition has been valuable to the Labor Party, and it is a pity that some members on the other side have not had that experience. It is certainly not something we welcomed or wished for, but we have used it to reassess our programmes and performance when in government, to observe and analyse the Tonkin experiment, and finally to formulate new policies for South Australia in the 1980s. South Australia now needs a new direction. It needs a Government with positive policies, prepared to take responsibility for South Australia's development, and not wash its hands of having anything to do with the situation. It does not need yesterday's Opposition, with its negative obsessions with the past, that it has been forced to live with for the last three years. Fortunately for South Australia, I suggest that the Fraser and Tonkin policies, while destructive and while in their cumulative effect extremely damaging to this State, have not yet brought the economy to its knees. The underlying strengths of our economy and, most importantly,

our South Australian community, are still available and still there to be used as a basis for recovery and inspiration.

My Party is now ready and eager to return to office and constructively get on with the job of restoring our economy and rebuilding our community, ensuring that the Government of South Australia takes up its responsibility to work with and develop this great community of ours and not repeat the bad experimentation of the last three years or the hostile negative obsessions of the present Government. We are ready to do the job and we would welcome the Premier's announcing at any time the date of the election so that we can get to the people with those policies, get elected, and get on with that job.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): Having listened to the speech by the Leader of the Opposition, I must say that I am glad that I am not one of his members. That was probably one of the most pathetic efforts one could ever have heard, as far as a speech is concerned; it raised the same old hackneyed points which the Leader has been making time and again and which the Government has many times shown to be so demonstrably false. If he wishes to continue to delude himself and his members, so be it. As a member in a key seat, I very much look forward to the coming election, because members opposite will see that this State will never again fall for the delusion of the Dunstan years.

I do not intend to spend any more time on the Leader's remarks, because they have been dealt with so many times before. I refer now to an issue which is vitally important within my electorate, namely, education. There are over 25 educational institutions in my electorate, and I therefore want to compliment the Government on the action it has taken in relation to providing additional funding for schools. The Opposition, of course, has linked itself inextricably with the extreme left of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I have been staggered by the contact I am receiving in my office from the teaching profession, from teachers who both live and teach in my electorate, expressing extreme concern about the political activities of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. However, I have noted that when they contact me they speak not about the institute: they tend to speak very much indeed about the present President of the institute, Ms Leonie Ebert, who is well known for her extreme left-wing, radical ideas. There is a very real danger that she will be the President of the institute who will see the institute split.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: It is noticeable that members opposite who are laughing are also those on the extreme left of the Labor Party; it is noticeable that they are reacting as one would expect, because they do not like to accept that the teaching profession, as a whole, is not behind the political campaign presently being waged.

Teachers are professionals, and because of that they appreciate the Government's taking steps for the benefit of education. They are only too well aware of the manipulation that has been going on between Leonie Ebert and the left-wing radicals of the S.A.I.T. and the left-wing of the Australian Labor Party. Members opposite, of course, would be getting contact only from their own supporters, but let me refer to the way in which the so-called professional Acting President of the Institute of Teachers accepts the steps taken by the Government.

There is little doubt that schools (and I am now referring to professional staff within schools) and school councils have very responsibly made representations to their members of Parliament. Certainly, the teaching profession and the school councils within my electorate have approached me on a number of occasions, pointing out to me areas where they believe the Government could provide additional

assistance. Over the past few months, I have been very pleased indeed to be able to make representations to the Minister of Education, pointing out to him that there could be disadvantages if the formulae are rigidly adhered to appropos the reducing numbers in State schools. The Minister has acknowledged that this is a fact and that, if one uses the formula and finds, for example, that 30 children are to leave a school (they would obviously not all leave from one class) and a teacher is removed, it would result in a complete restructuring of that school with serious disadvantages not only to the professional staff but also to the children.

Therefore, the Government has provided additional funding to ensure that no teachers will be transferred and that schools will be able to maintain the class structure system they presently have. I attended a school council meeting in my electorate last night. As I came through the door I received an incredible response from the school councillors who, unlike the Institute of Teachers and the Labor Party, which only criticises, condemns and damns what the Government has done, said that the Government's providing additional funding was a magnificent step. I refer to how the Acting President of S.A.I.T. (Mr Gregory) greeted this announcement, and I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* of 16 August.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: The article, headed 'Schools will get \$2 000 000 to retain class sizes', states, in part:

The S.A.I.T. Acting President, Mr J. F. Gregory, and the Opposition spokesman on education, Mr Arnold—

and I do not think that the fact they are mentioned together is a coincidence; obviously, they would have worked out their statement together—

welcomed the announcement, but said it contained a strong political element to diffuse the education debate before the next election.

The article further states:

Mr Gregory said he saw the Government's action as a 'fairly shallow political device to quieten teachers.'

In other words, rather than saying, 'That is marvellous. We have been looking for this additional funding; thank you for the money. We will certainly ensure that the schools are advised of this, and we will work together to make sure that the best is achieved as far as education is concerned,' both the shadow spokesman for education and Mr Gregory have politicised the whole thing.

There is no doubt that the S.A.I.T. executive has been excessively selective in the figures that it has used, and a further article in the *Advertiser* states:

The Acting President of the S.A.I.T., Mr J. F. Gregory, said: 'We're interested in eliminating undesirable areas, not prattling about what we're best at. Sure, we're best in a whole lot of areas but that doesn't let us off the hook.'

At least that slip-up by Mr Gregory acknowledges that South Australia has the best education system in all Australia.

Mr Whitten: You inherited it.

Mr ASHENDEN: I do not deny that the present Government inherited a good system, but members opposite should be honest and acknowledge the fact that the present Government is spending more money on education in real terms than the previous Government spent during its last few years in office. The percentage of the budget spent is greater and, despite the fact that there are declining enrolments, the amount of money spent on education in real terms since the present Government was elected is higher than it was previously. Spending on education has been increasing in real terms, whereas during the last two years of the Labor Government's Administration spending on education was decreased in real terms. In the article reference is then made to the fact that pupil-teacher ratios were misleading. They are not misleading, because the pupil-

teacher ratios used to calculate the number of teachers to pupils in South Australia are identical to the methods used interstate: South Australia comes out No. 1 with a four students per teacher better ratio. The article in the *Advertiser* further states:

The processor of the national survey questionnaires, Professor R. S. Northcote, of the South Australian Institute of Technology's computing school, said the survey, which was compiled in May and June, was reliable . . . But he said it must be used responsibly. Misleading statements could be made over figures that were statistically insignificant.

That is the greatest condemnation of all with regard to the selective quoting which Mr Gregory makes and, undoubtedly, if Ms Ebert had been asked, she would have said exactly the same. Is it any wonder that teachers are contacting my office expressing very real concern about the direction that their institute is taking?

Mr Keneally interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I would be happy to provide that information for the honourable member, but it is certainly—

Mr Keneally: How many teachers have come to your office?

Mr ASHENDEN: I would say certainly over 10, and the number who have telephoned me is certainly many more than that. The reason for that, of course, is that since my election I have shown a genuine concern for educational matters, and those teachers who are sincerely concerned with education are very worried indeed about the direction that the institute is taking. They fear greatly that the institute will end up the same as the Victorian Teachers Federation and the New South Wales Teachers Federation, which are communist-led unions.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD (Salisbury): I want to speak on some other matters this afternoon, but I cannot really allow all the comments made by the previous speaker to pass without some note. May I refer the honourable member to my Address in Reply speech and to my second reading speech on the Supply Bill that we are presently debating with regard to certain facts that I am certain will enlighten him. Suffice to say at this point that the member for Todd indicated that there must have been contact between the Institute of Teachers and me prior to the *Advertiser* press report: I can categorically say that that is not the case. The *Advertiser's* education writer telephoned me independently on Sunday, as soon as the Minister had completed his press conference, but in fact I was not using Sunday as a day of business because it happened to be my wife's birthday, and I had better things to do on such a pleasurable day than to be at some secret meeting, such as that which the Government is convinced always takes place (its attitude on that score is absolutely unbelievable), although I cannot see what is wrong, anyway, with different groups in society discussing the matter.

If there is something wrong with that, the member for Todd is criticising his own Minister for the discussions which he has had with the Institute of Teachers on many occasions and from which came joint statements.

I suggest that he look at the situation last year, for example, to see the number of joint statements that were issued by the Institute of Teachers and the Minister of Education. I am told by electors in Todd that the present member for Todd, the acting member for Todd, sees himself as being the alternative Minister of Education and that that is why he has this high interest in schools in his area. I am intrigued at the way in which he is looking forward to the next election, as he says.

Mr Trainer: It is like a turkey wanting Christmas to come early.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: I am reminded by my colleague the member for Ascot Park that it is something like a turkey

looking for an early Christmas. I wanted this afternoon to refer not to an education matter but to something that is derived from my capacity as the local member concerned about a serious problem facing people in my district, namely, the problem of housing and interest rates. I have spoken many times about this in this Chamber and in my district. I am very reassured by the dedicated work being done by my colleague the shadow Minister of Housing and by the Leader of the Opposition trying to speak out on behalf of the home owners of this country as they try to preserve that great Australian dream.

I also commend the efforts of a constituent of mine, Mr John Knight, who is reported in today's *News* with regard to a petition which he has been organising and on which he says he has more than 8 000 signatures of people protesting against spiralling housing interest rates. The article notes the support given to his efforts by Neal Blewett, the member for Bonython, Mick Young, the member for Port Adelaide, Terry Hemmings, the shadow Minister of Housing and myself, as the member for Salisbury. I appreciate the acknowledgment of the support that we have been giving, but it has been done out of interest for the local people who are facing a housing problem.

I commend to all members of this place the work of Mr Knight and his efforts not only in organising petitions but also in organising public meetings and rallies. He has no personal interest in this matter; there is no personal profit to him. However, right from the outset of this campaign he has shown that he is genuinely and seriously concerned about the impact that spiralling interest rates were having in this country not just on housing loans but right across the board on so many other aspects of life.

Mr Knight has organised many petitions, one of which I tabled on the first day of this session and which contained 1 022 signatures. I am due to table another petition containing 1 000 signatures. He has also organised three public meetings in the northern areas and has organised a rally in the Salisbury area that was designed to highlight this important issue. Mr Knight went to Canberra to try to meet with the Prime Minister but finally only got through to the Federal Treasurer. I believe that efforts such as his have contributed to those measures, small though they be, about which we have heard to date from the Federal Government. They would not have taken place had it not been for the groundswell of the activity that people such as John Knight have been pursuing.

The housing problem is indeed desperate. On Saturday I was called to the house of some of my constituents to discuss a number of problems related to their desperate financial circumstances. I suppose the Government would see this as being another Machiavellian plot. Really, it was a front for the Institute of Teachers and this fellow was the go between.

An honourable member: That's where it happens.

Mr LYNN ARNOLD: That is right: it was one of these secret meetings at a private address where we go in over the back fence. I am being whimsical because honestly this Government sometimes leaves us no other choice but to find their response to so many issues as being laughable. This couple signed up for a house in late 1977 and took out a \$28 000 mortgage with a building society.

Since then—from 1977 to 1982—they have paid nearly \$19 000 in monthly repayments. For three or four months they were behind in their payments because the man of the house, the breadwinner, was without a job. They now find, as of 30 June, after receiving a statement from the building society (and remember that they borrowed \$28 000 and repaid \$19 000) that the account for their mortgage totals \$31 708. They are nearly \$4 000 worse off than when they first walked into the place and having paid \$19 000. That

couple is desperately trying to keep a home, but they told me on Saturday that they fear that the dream is just too far away and is slipping further day by day.

Mathematics like that just do not work out, and that is the point that we have been trying to make. I wish that we could hear more comments from the other side about just how important the problem is. Precious few members opposite seem to feel and understand what that means. I have looked into the interest rate problem and have taken out figures in regard to the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank. From the Savings Bank 1981 annual report, we find that interest received by the bank has increased and presumably accounts for most of the \$22 900 000 increase in the bank's income, which increased to \$131 000 000. Interest paid out by the bank to depositors increased by \$15 400 000. In other words, the argument that the bank charged more interest on its home loans and various other loans in order to become more competitive in the market place resulted in a \$7 500 000 extra payment to the bank by people who have loans, because the bank paid out only \$15 000 000 of that to depositors.

The bank would have had three options in regard to what it did with that extra \$7 500 000 that it received over and above the extra increased interest costs on depositors accounts. It could have lowered interest on home and rural loans, and a 1 per cent decrease would have reduced bank income by \$5 800 000. In other words, it could have given a 1 per cent reduction on home loans. It could have paid still more to depositors, or it could have taken the extra as profit. In the event, the accounts seem to show that it took \$3 000 000 of that as profit, the rest being absorbed in bank costs.

Interest received on housing loans by the State Bank increased by \$4 100 000, and interest paid out on deposits increased by \$5 400 000. Interest paid out on funds for housing made available to the bank increased by \$2 300 000. Therefore, the total interest increases on the two categories was \$7 700 000. The conclusion is that loans made available for housing appear to have been financed entirely by advances for housing made available to the bank, and these advances appear to have cost the bank an extra \$2 300 000 to service by means of interest charges, yet the bank received an extra \$4 100 000 in interest from home buyers. The discrepancy of \$1 800 000 is equivalent to about .5 per cent in the interest rate on home loans.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Randall): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I join this debate this afternoon to express my concern as a member of Parliament and also as one who believes that we should maintain a good standard in the quality of patient care in our Government institutions. Over the past few weeks it has been my unfortunate task as a parent to have to visit the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Northfield Wards annexe. When I first visited the spinal injuries unit at Northfield, I cannot say that I was amazed or staggered: I was absolutely disgusted at the condition of the unit in which spinal injury patients are cared for.

On Sunday afternoon, whilst visiting the ward, I noticed several cobwebs in the windows, ants on the ward floor in which patients were residing, and plaster that had come off the walls in many areas. The ceiling was peeling and, at one stage, a large black spider appeared on the ceiling. Unfortunately, it was too high for me to get at. Can honourable members imagine a patient who, through unfortunate circumstances, suffers spinal injuries and is transferred from Royal Adelaide Hospital to this Northfield unit where several patients, whom I know personally, must lie on their back because of their injuries? They look up at the ceiling, which

is a dirty cream colour. Certainly, I have not yet ascertained when it was last painted, but it is certainly a blight on any Government and, indeed, all Governments that have administered this area of health services.

This Northfield ward comes under the direction of Royal Adelaide Hospital, but there can be no excuse whatever for maintaining a Royal Adelaide Hospital unit in this condition when the hospital enjoys world recognition. The Spinal Injuries Unit is one of the best in the Southern Hemisphere and is well recognised in the Western world. Yet, when patients are removed from Royal Adelaide Hospital for rehabilitation, their new accommodation must be one of the most depressing sights that anyone could see. Of course, the shock comes to parents and relatives of patients because they wonder about the extent of the injuries to their loved ones, but they would wonder more why people have been placed in such atrocious conditions.

Therefore, I make a strong and impassioned plea to the Government: it is no good merely painting the corridors of the unit following an expose on one of the television stations. The whole unit must be painted and repaired now. It is understandable that patients learning to manage a wheelchair for the first time will bump into walls and cause damage. For that reason, one should erect material to prevent damage to the walls, and on some corners that has been done. However, there is no excuse for allowing deterioration of the plaster to continue, for allowing ants in unit wards or for allowing cobwebs in the windows, and certainly, there is no excuse for allowing spiders to be present in wards.

Over the past years discussions have been held about what is going to happen to this Royal Adelaide Hospital annex. A transfer to Queen Elizabeth Hospital was suggested, but there is not enough room or accommodation at that hospital, so such a transfer would be out of the question. Another suggestion was a transfer of the unit to Glenside. What a shocking thought it is to put such patients at Glenside.

I feel sorry for those patients who are at Glenside in view of the problems and conditions which they have experienced and under which they have had to live for many years. At least Glenside has been upgraded through the expenditure by the former Government of millions of dollars in order to provide what I consider to be as good a standard of geriatric and psychiatric accommodation as I saw anywhere on my overseas study trip last year. However, to transfer spinal injury patients to Glenside would be the last straw for these people, particularly in regard to their rehabilitation.

Only one other suitable unit is available immediately, that is, the Julia Farr Centre, and the Health Commission, if it wanted to and if it was willing, could lease some of the 200 beds to provide reasonable residential accommodation. The facilities for rehabilitation, apart from physiotherapy of course are not there. It needs a gymnasium and a hydrotherapy pool. Those facilities are already at Northfield and are of an excellent standard.

It comes down to the problem that someone somewhere must make a decision. It should be made right now. There is no excuse for delaying it and the work will cost a considerable amount of money. In the short term the interior of this unit and the neurology unit should be demolished and rebuilt. I do not know what the cost would be but I do not think that any taxpayer would complain at the cost to redevelop and rebuild the accommodation, because at Northfield there are certain pluses.

It is an excellent environment for rehabilitation and is in an excellent location, with large grounds. There is a basketball court and there are ovals that could be further improved and upgraded. The paraplegics and quadriplegics are using that area for sporting and recreation purposes, but a lot of work needs to be done. The whole area should be further upgraded to provide excellent sport and exercise grounds

for these people. It still does not overcome the current situation, which I can only describe as atrocious. I feel horribly ashamed to think that this position has existed for so many years.

I spoke to one visitor there on Sunday who was in a wheelchair and he said, 'You should have seen it seven years ago. It is 100 per cent compared to what it was.' If that is the case, there is no excuse for allowing the position to continue. I do not know what is behind the Health Commission's motive in allowing this, but I know that the staff spend considerable time counselling patients and reassuring them that they have not just been dumped there and forgotten. The treatment that they receive is excellent, but to put people in these appalling conditions is something that should be exposed to all concerned in this State.

Every member should go and look at the position and check on what I saw and experienced. I certainly would not want that to befall on any relative of any member of this House or on any other person in this State. I am so appalled that I make a strong and passionate plea to the Government, the Health Commission, and the Minister to decide in the next few days what they will do so that we can give an assurance to all involved, including the staff, because they have to work in these atrocious conditions. They have had to put up with patchwork improvements to cover up and create an impression that something is being done. The situation is far from good enough. It is disgraceful. I hope that a decision can be made this financial year, within days, and the whole situation rectified within the next 12 months.

Mr ABBOTT (Spence): In my contribution I will refer to the disappointment felt by many people in South Australia about certain remarks by the Premier when he delivered a speech to the State Council of the Liberal Party last Friday night. The Premier was reported as saying that the State Budget, due next month, would not be a pre-election bonanza and that it would contain disappointments, in view of the enormous demands in the areas of community welfare, prisons, health, local government, agriculture, housing, and transport. A report stated:

While it was recognised that all those important areas demanded enormous funds, there will inevitably be disappointments, the Premier said.

That has come as a great shock to the thousands in crisis situations who seek Government assistance of one form or another. It is an enormous set-back for the growing number who are living on or below the poverty line. According to the report just released by the Australian Council of Social Service, 2 830 000 in Australia are living in poverty.

The poor are growing rapidly in number, with more than one Australian in six, or an estimated 2 830 000, now living in poverty. That, Sir, is an absolute disgrace, and cannot be tolerated. That figure is more than 1 000 000 above that estimated six years ago on the basis of Professor Henderson's inquiry into poverty, and it behoves the Premier to do much more than say that community welfare, health, housing and transport inevitably will be disappointed in their application for funds. I am sure that the people of South Australia will react to those comments and this situation at the next election.

This Government places little value and regard on welfare agencies, yet the need for them has more than doubled. Well established welfare agencies are closing down because their resources are inadequate to provide money or food vouchers to poor people who go to charitable organisations for assistance. People in trouble hate asking for hand-outs, but too often it is the only way to stop their families from going hungry, to avoid eviction orders, electricity disconnection, or having their gas supply cut off.

To show the hardship that some people are suffering, I refer to a letter written to Senator Don Grimes by a widow with one child who lives at Rostrevor. This woman criticises the Minister for Social Security over his statements in respect of the ACOSS report on poverty. A copy of that letter was sent to me. It is dated 11 August 1982 and states, in part:

Dear Senator Grimes,

I am writing to ask you, as shadow Minister for Social Security, to question in the strongest possible terms Senator Chaney's statements made today, in respect of the ACOSS Report on poverty, also released today, and if at all possible to do so before or during the Budget debate. I apologise for not going through the usual channels, but there is no time, and the matter is one of vital importance.

I believe the report to be both responsible and accurate, and its findings bear out the experience of social workers throughout the country. Even were its findings exaggerated, the fact that Senator Chaney can accept with equanimity that even 1 000 000 Australians are currently living in poverty is disgusting. However, ACOSS has, in preparing its figures, included the hidden poor, and given a much truer picture than that which can be deduced from the statistics used by Senator Chaney.

The poor include not only the unemployed, both under and over 18, but anyone on a social security pension who is paying private rental, or those who are trying to make mortgage repayments; many one-income families renting privately, or trying to pay off a mortgage; some two-income families, where both the income earners are on a low wage, and being penalised by the high cost of health care, rent or mortgage repayments, child care, private transport, and by the low taxable income threshold; invalid pensioners with special needs—many forced to live in institutions because they cannot afford the capital cost needed to enable them to live in the community; many age pensioners whose only income is the pension, and who are paying rent, or who live in aged accommodation where all but a few dollars of their pension is taken from them in payment (and I know of one nursing home at least where they have to pay for milk and toilet rolls out of what is left!).

Later, the letter continues:

I am a widow with one child left at home. I pay a moderate rent—\$42 per week. My total income, including supplementary allowance, is \$98.15 a week, plus \$3.50 a week family allowance. So I have a total of \$101.65 per week, and after my rent is paid, there is \$59.65 left for every single mortal thing we need. My daughter is growing rapidly, and already eats more than I do, although she is only 10. Her feet are already mis-shapen from wearing second-hand shoes. But I am determined that her education and general health shall not suffer, so I see that she has a cooked breakfast, and a good lunch to take to school—the canteen prices are out of our reach. I pay for all school outings, and keep her dressed in school uniform, either by making it, or buying it second-hand. I hire a TV set, so that she can keep up with the many instructive programmes which are now an integral part of modern life, spend money on fares for weekend outings, buy books, sometimes new, but mostly second-hand, and art and craft materials for her. Then there is money to find for Brownies and for other clubs. However hard I try, I cannot afford private music lessons for her, although her school music teacher recognises her talent. And how long I can go on managing the rest, I just don't know. The TV will have to go in November, when the contract expires. I only manage now by cutting back on everything which does not affect my daughter's health and schooling. I use no heating at home, except while she is dressing in the morning, and in the early evening until she goes to bed. We shower only twice a week, to save hot water. I eat one meal a day, at night, with her. Only occasionally do I have a sandwich for breakfast or lunch. I beg fruit from friends, and sometimes even from strangers, if I see fruit trees in their gardens. While my daughter watches free films on Saturdays, I search the rubbish bins in the theatre and park for returnable cans—the money helps with the bus fares. I do not buy sanitary towels, but use rags and wash them, as my grandmother used to. I wash clothes by hand, and take sheets and towels to the launderette, because I cannot afford to have my washing machine repaired.

The ACOSS Report has clearly spelled out the social cost of poverty. You, as a politician, must be aware of the political dangers. I know that the money for the required increases must come from somewhere, and I am not simplistic enough to believe that the proper enforcement of existing tax laws would supply enough revenue for them. I also know that under a Liberal Government, whose driving force is the profit motive, there is no real hope of social justice. But unless the Opposition acts now to help the poor, the cost to the country of retrieving the situation by the time we once again have an A.L.P. Government, will give

that Government a handicap such as no Australian Government has had to carry since the 1930s.

The increasing number of unemployed is an indication of the continuing failure of the Government's economic policy, but the numbers of low income earners supporting families, whose incomes are inadequate, is also increasing with falling real wages for this sector of the community. Despite the evidence of increasing poverty presented by academic groups, non-government agencies, and social workers, the Government continues to resist all attempts to assist the poor and the disadvantaged. It is time the Government showed more interest in relieving the plight of the poor than in denigrating them in a discriminatory and racist way. There are too many children in this country whose futures are being blighted by the Government's negative policies.

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

Mr RANDALL (Henley Beach): I wish to spend the short time available to me in touching on a few points. I share the concern of the honourable member who has just spoken regarding the plight of some people in our community because, like him, from time to time I have people entering the office to talk and express concern about the problems they face. I, too, spend time sitting in people's homes listening to the details of the family crises they face, and I spend time on the phone during weekends counselling people, endeavouring to help them overcome the crisis situations in which many find themselves. I agree that unemployment puts great pressure on families, particularly when commitments have been made; later, when those families no longer have a breadwinner, they have to reshuffle their budgets. Like all members of this House, I am concerned that we endeavour to help these people.

I guess the difference between the Parties is that the Liberal Party believes in attacking it from a different angle. Whereas one might argue for increased welfare money to be allocated in a budget, my argument is that that increased welfare money can be afforded in a budget only if increased money is flowing into the community. Of course, this means a creation of jobs, employment opportunities and overall money flowing into our State. That is why it is heartening to see recently announced in this House increased numbers of people coming into South Australia. The migration gain is there and, instead of people migrating from South Australia, they are at last coming back. I am pleased to see that, along with other statistical information, there is a trend to return to the State, and this will mean a change to South Australia's future. I believe that we are at the beginning.

I would like to spend some time talking about my own electorate in the western region of the city. Over the past 10 to 15 years the western suburbs have missed out in many areas of Government services, particularly in the redevelopment of its schools. This area has now started to see an interest being paid to it by Government departments in redeveloping the inner metropolitan area. The District of Henley Beach has both the old and the new and has much vacant land available that can be developed for the benefit of the community, which will no doubt boost the building industry. I have seen a slow trend by private landowners and market gardeners selling out and a subdivision of blocks taking place with the beginning of building new homes in the area.

I have also seen with great joy the Housing Trust buying large slabs of land for redevelopment. One major project that is about to get under way in my electorate will provide a significant number of homes for people needing Housing Trust assistance. As most honourable members of Parliament who represent the western suburbs know, when a constituent walks into an office looking for help in the Housing Trust

area, the only way in which members can help them is to advise them to shift to the other side of town or to more remote parts of Adelaide because the waiting list for Housing Trust accommodation is much shorter in those areas than in the western suburbs, where it is about four years.

Research that I have conducted leads me to believe that people who are now finding Housing Trust accommodation in the western suburbs have had to wait up to four years to get that limited accommodation. The trend is that, having done the planning and bought the land, the trust can now start building in that area. That will allay some of the social needs in the area and will certainly help people who would like to stay on the western side of town to do so. No doubt the member for Albert Park well knows the situation, because he is fortunate enough to have Housing Trust developments taking place in his own electorate and people who wanted to stay on this side of the city are able to move to that area.

I also believe that private enterprise has a role to play in this area of development. From time to time I have stressed the need—not for the Housing Trust because I believe that it is beginning to grapple with the problems of elderly accommodation—for private developers to start building accommodation for elderly people who own their homes. Many elderly people own homes in the older areas of my electorate and they have lived in those homes all their lives. However, it involves one person living in a three-bedroom home. Those people are now finding in the latter years of their life that it is difficult to maintain that home as far as painting and gardening are concerned. I believe that when alternative accommodation is provided or offered to them in the same area these people will then accept that accommodation and that, after selling their home, they will buy a small unit, which could be in a village of units, similar to what the Woodville council is doing in one of its areas, and similar to what other councils are doing. I believe that this could be done successfully in my own electorate and that it would facilitate those people who want to stay on the western side of the city to enjoy the fresh air and the easy access to the beach and city.

We have some great facilities to offer on that side of town. I know that many of the older people are reluctant to go from their homes, and rightly so. Many have sentimental attachments as well. If we can offer an incentive to move, so that they do not have to worry about telephone bills, council rates or a garden, they will be encouraged to go into a life-care village. Someone else will do the worrying for them in those centres. If we offer them 24-hour nursing at the press of a button, that is another care off their mind. Although they can live in their unit and still have their independence and prepare their own meals, they realise that they are not alone. If they need care they can merely press a button. These incentives cause people to move.

There are in my electorate pockets of older people who live day in and day out confined to their three-bedroomed homes watching television or pottering around the garden and doing the little that they can without having much contact with the community around them. If they are able to move into a life-care centre, where people relate to each other and where activities can be arranged for elderly people together, that is another incentive that would encourage them to think about selling their home.

My last area of concern in regard to redevelopment relates to the foreshore at Henley and Grange. Over the years many people have bought up old homes for no reason other than investment. The Henley and Grange council has from time to time tried to encourage the redevelopment of the area. The homes are run down and attract meagre rents, and the people who are paying those low rentals often have a lifestyle that is totally unacceptable to the community around them. They are having an impact in that area. In that sort of

accommodation they are not solving problems but rather creating them. I believe that some of those people would be better served finding accommodation at the same rate with Housing Trust assistance.

Redevelopment needs to take place through a major developer buying up older homes that are sitting there either vacant or being misused, and bulldozing them. I am sure that some major accommodation development could take place in that area, and I hope to help the local council achieve that. I am sure that our new planning regulations and directions will achieve it. I hope that the Government has given incentives for developers to look at the area and think about developing it.

Mr WHITTEN (Price): It was indeed refreshing to hear the last two Government members expressing concern, as we have been doing on this side for some time.

Mr Hemmings: We must have stirred them up.

Mr WHITTEN: No. I believe the last two speakers were genuine, particularly the member for Hanson when he related his comments to older people who are perhaps in dire circumstances. I never thought I would hear the member for Henley Beach speak as a socialist, but tonight he spoke a lot of sense. I do not wish to relate my comments to industrial matters, housing, interest rates, poverty, unemployment, or the plight of the aged. I wish to relate my remarks to something in my electorate which causes me a great deal of concern and which has been brought home to me by a headline in this afternoon's press. The article relates to Mr Graham Inns, the Director of Tourism. Under the heading 'South Australia needs man-made attraction', the article states:

These views are held by Graham Inns, Director of the Department of Tourism, following a departmental survey of South Australian tourist attractions.

A few months ago the Minister of Environment and Planning visited Port Adelaide and inspected the old bond store, after which it was hoped that things would really happen. The old bond store is a very historic place and the Minister assured some people that it would be made available for a function to be held in Port Adelaide at the end of the year. I refer to what is known as Circa 1900, which is a function that was to be organised by the Port Adelaide Primary School Council. In a screed that the council issued it was described as follows:

Circa 1900 is a week-long celebration of the history of Port Adelaide in the 1900s, an environmental happening and re-enactment and recreation of the spirit of 1900.

On 20 April 1982 the Port Adelaide Primary School Council was advised to make application for funding and was assured that it would receive funding of \$13 000 to enable the council to pay some salaries, the cost of the stage in the old bond store, to make good the old bond store, and to provide toilet facilities and so on. I think this matter should be related to the comments made by Mr Inns, particularly in view of the action that the Government took recently when it bought the vessel *Falie*, which we have been told is a ketch, although I do not believe it is. In any event, I support the buying of the *Falie*, because it is a part of the history of Port Adelaide.

The Port Adelaide Primary School is a school that has been established for 105 years; it wishes to identify with the port and also to take part in the sesqui-centenary celebrations (for which the *Falie* has been bought). Some of the things that were planned were as follows: people would become involved in a variety of activities at whatever level they wished; it would attempt to bring together and publicise the various artistic, cultural and community groups under a common theme, and the school community interaction would be a constant feature. It was believed that the festival

would bring together many people and would involve the community together with the schools in the area, including the Port Adelaide Primary School. The Port Adelaide Primary School was very keen that the event take place. However, unfortunately, after forwarding details of the amounts for which it required funding, the application was declined. It might be of interest to members of the House if I outline the details of the things for which they required funding. A total amount of \$13 250 (which it fully expected to obtain) was required: \$3 000 was required for the salary and living allowance of a co-ordinating director; \$500 for a designer; \$450 for pianist fees; \$250 for choreography fees; \$500 for visiting artists; and \$1 000 for bands. Also, there were various amounts for advertising in the printed media, on radio and on television. Following the submission of those details the council received a letter last week from Len Amadio, Director of the Department for the Arts, addressed to the Principal, which stated:

Further to your application for assistance to the Arts Grants Advisory Committee, I regret to advise that the committee has been unable to recommend a grant towards your project during the first funding period of the 1982-83 financial year.

I point out that it will be of no use to make funding available after the end of the year, because this was something that was to take place at the end of this year, something which was to involve the entire community. It was to last a week; it was to have commenced with a procession; there were to be trading tables; and a musical production called 'Half a Sixpence' was to have taken place every night. The letter continues:

A large number of applications were received this year and in view of the relatively limited funds available, it was unavoidable that some would be precluded from receiving assistance.

The committee will again be inviting applications in September for projects initiated in the first six months of 1983. The committee has asked me to express its appreciation for your interest and to thank you for the application forwarded for consideration.

Yours sincerely, L. L. Amadio, Director.

I appeal to the Minister to further consider this matter. I believe it means a lot to the people of Port Adelaide, particularly those people who have worked so very hard to enable this function to take place. I received a letter the other day which states:

The rejection by the Arts Grants Advisory Committee of a grant for Circa 1900, has severely disrupted plans for the festival in December. It has meant:

- (1) That several important artistic projects involving both children and the community may not go ahead as there will be no money for tutor fees and/or materials.
- (2) The construction of a stage for *Half a Sixpence* [that is the stage production] has had to be halted as no money is available.
- (3) Professional artists of international standing will not now be engaged.
- (4) The day-to-day administrative costs of such a festival are enormous over a long period of time.

That was a great shock to the school council and all others involved. They have done a lot of work in the old bond store. They cleaned it out and I do not know how many hundredweight of pigeon manure was removed. They have really cleaned it out and they have done a good job.

I stress that the Port Adelaide school council is in dire need of funding to enable it to carry on with this project. It has received assistance from the Historical Society, from commerce in Port Adelaide and from companies such as Elders G.M., which has been established in Port Adelaide for as long as Port Adelaide has existed. They were all quite prepared to assist. However, without Government funding there is no way that this project can continue. I stress that funding is urgently required. I appeal to the Minister of Arts to urgently consider this matter so that it can begin in the near future. I hope that my plea does not fall on deaf ears.

Mr SCHMIDT (Mawson): I wish to refer to some earlier comments in this House about education. I am somewhat surprised by comments from the Opposition's shadow spokesman for education who espoused the fact that we should be looking at establishing a set formula for the staffing of our schools. On earlier occasions the very same member has referred to the fact that this Government has been far too stringent in adhering to the existing formula which, as we all know, was established by the previous Government.

Naturally enough, of course, because this Government took the initiative in providing some additional \$2 000 000 towards the staffing problem, the member for Salisbury suddenly thinks he had better do something. His Party cannot totally accept what this Government has done and it cannot give credit where credit is due. Therefore, it has turned to other areas where it can nit pick and chip away at other areas in which it believes the Government is not doing a proper job.

The member for Salisbury has come up with the idea that we should establish a set formula to encompass all schools across the spectrum. I support the expenditure of \$2 000 000 that the State Government has made available to the Education Department for further staffing because it will allow an independent assessment of the various needs throughout the South Australian region. If one looks at the outer metropolitan area in particular, which is an area I serve and serve happily, one notices quite readily that the staffing—

Dr Billard: And well.

Mr SCHMIDT: And well, thank you very much. As I have visited schools, and I make a habit of doing that several times a year, I have noticed that the formula applying across the State does not necessarily advantage outer metropolitan areas. Those areas require some special attention.

As the Minister indicated earlier this afternoon in Question Time, he met various members from the back bench, the members for Henley Beach, Todd and me. We stressed to him on numerous occasions that, as a Government, we needed to look carefully at the problem of understaffing in outer metropolitan areas. If we were to adopt the idea advanced by the shadow Minister that we again set a basic formula to encompass all schools throughout the State, we would again run into the problem that we have now where on the face of it it looks well applied but, in specific areas, the growing areas, it does not work.

The money being allocated will surely do much to alleviate the problem in those outer metropolitan areas. I know of several primary schools in my own area which had classes of over 30 students per teacher. It is interesting to examine the A.T.F. figures which recently came out and which show that South Australia now fares much better than do many other Australian States in respect of student-teacher ratios, particularly in average class sizes. In the junior primary school sector, South Australia has an average of 22.7 and the Australian average is 24.6. In the primary area, we have an average of 26 compared with an Australian average of 27. That is one area in which we have already started to take some sort of initiative.

The member for Salisbury referred earlier to the suggestion that the South Australian Institute of Teachers was, by innuendo, trying to foster amongst its members the notion that they should support an A.L.P. Government. It is no secret that the executive of S.A.I.T., particularly those members under the control of Leonie Ebert, would do all in their power to convince their members to do so. I refer to the S.A.I.T. *Teachers Journal* of 2 June 1982 at page 24. A report says that there is an A.L.P. Government in Victoria and implies that, under a Liberal Government, education has no hope whatever. The report states:

The simple fact is that conservative Governments are at best reluctant providers of education for the common people. Private schools are their natural habitat.

I refer to the era of Gough Whitlam who, as all members know, was a Labor Prime Minister. He provided an incredible increase in spending towards the private school sector. If my memory serves me correctly, he increased spending in 1974 from \$6 000 000 to \$36 000 000 and, if that is not giving to the private sector, I do not know what is.

Yet we are told that, under an A.L.P. Government, the Government school sector would get priority over the private sector, when in fact the complete opposite has happened. The report continues:

Under an A.L.P. Government we can be pretty confident that things would be better.

I refer to the situation here under the A.L.P. Government in 1976 when it chopped in half the school purposes grants. Schools were totally dependent on this grant from the State Government. A base figure and a per capita figure were taken, and the schools budgeted for what they needed, and the Government then said, 'Stiff, you will get only half the allocation to which you are entitled.' Where does that leave the schools?

This Government increased the grant and restored 100 per cent funding in the 1981-82 Budget, yet the Opposition says we do nothing for education. I refer to the basic figures on spending. In 1976-77 under a Labor Government primary school spending in South Australia was the fifth highest in Australia.

In 1980-81, under a Liberal Government (and we were told in the *Teachers Journal* that education does not stand a chance under a Liberal Government), this State was the highest spender on primary school teaching in the whole of Australia. Surely members opposite have enough nous to recognise that, if we increase funding and if South Australia is recognised by independent authorities, the A.T.F. and the Schools Commission, as being the highest spender on primary school education, that is not just politics or a Liberal Government saying that it is the best spender on education. That is an independent authority, the Schools Commission, recognising what this Government has given to education funding in this State, yet we are told by the S.A.I.T. executive that we cannot get that sort of increase from a Liberal Government.

We ought to also consider the secondary sector. We recognise that we have not been able to do everything possible there, and I am sure that the previous Government would have said the same thing and that it could not do it all at once, but we have progressively increased education funding since we have come to office. The figures show that in 1974-75 the then A.L.P. Government spent \$221 000 000 on education in this State. In 1980-81, under a Liberal Government, we spent \$490 000 000 on education and in the Budget last year, 1981-82, we allocated (and we know that we have gone beyond that Budget allocation) an amount of \$507 000 000 for education.

I again emphasise that one need not be convinced by the tactics of S.A.I.T. and the Opposition that education cannot fare well under a Liberal Government. The student to staff ratios have improved under a Liberal Government in both the primary and secondary sectors. The ratio of students to ancillary staff is very interesting. In the primary school sector, there are 108 students per ancillary staff member, and the Australian average is 150. In the secondary sector, we are slightly under, and I am sure that we would look at that matter.

I again stress that I think that, from here on, we, as a State Government, should look at the indexation of school grants. We have increased school grants since we came to office, we have improved the teacher ratios, and we have

now taken steps to further improve the staffing situation in outer metropolitan areas. I would sincerely hope that that is where attention will be given, particularly in my own area, I may say, but the next step is for the State Government to look very seriously at the possibility of indexing school grants so that in future years schools may be able to plan ahead correctly, knowing that they will have those costs met.

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

Mr CRAFTER (Norwood): I take this opportunity to speak briefly about the need for more vigilance on the part of the Government with respect to prices for consumer goods in this State, particularly those items that are essential in daily living. There have been, under both the Fraser and Tonkin Governments, substantial increases in the costs of essential commodities. This has been brought about by a relaxation of controls that have hitherto been brought into effect by price control machinery at both Federal and State levels, machinery that these Governments have taken so much glee in dismantling.

I want to bring to the attention of the House a very practical example that was shown to me by a consumer and constituent who watches prices, not only in this State but from State to State. It was pointed out that Foodland stores, as part of the 'Advance Australia' campaign (and I believe that a number of other stores have joined in) and under the slogan of 'Give them heaps', was advertising particular consumer items at a specially reduced price.

The examples given to me were from the Melbourne *Sun* of Tuesday 27 July where, in two separate advertisements, Kraft cheese and John West asparagus were advertised, the cheese at \$1.39 per 500-gram package and the asparagus at 99c for a 340-gram can. In the *Advertiser* on the following day the same goods were offered to consumers in this State, once again under the 'Advance Australia' logo and under the slogan 'Give them heaps', and we see there that the Foodland stores in this State were offering the same package of cheese for \$1.75 and the same can of asparagus spears for \$1.35.

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

Mr CRAFTER: Before the dinner adjournment I was explaining to the House the difference in the price of two items for sale in a particular supermarket chain in Victoria and in this State. I pointed out that there is a substantial difference in the cost of these items, asparagus being 36.6 per cent more expensive and cheese 26 per cent more expensive in this State than in Victoria. These two items are goods which are Australian produce and the aim of the 'Advance Australia—Give them heaps' campaign is to promote Australian made goods.

I would be interested to hear some explanation from the Minister of Consumer Affairs in this State as to why South Australian consumers pay substantially more for these goods sold in this State during this campaign. It is not as I may have thought, and other members may think, a matter of freight charges, because there are other items for sale in this supermarket chain which vary in price by only a small margin in this State in comparison to other States. It has been put to me that the policies of this Government, and in particular the way in which prices are established in this State, have allowed this supermarket chain to charge additional prices in this State. I would like to see that statement denied or explained by the Minister, because it is most unfair that consumers in this State have to subsidise concessions given to consumers in other States. Further, it casts a slur on Australian made goods and on campaigns such as the 'Advance Australia' campaign.

I realise that there has already been substantial criticism of the 'Advance Australia' campaign, and of the marketing of the symbol involved, which I understand is now a marketable commodity that is being used by many commercial organisations for profit. I think that that is a most unfortunate development. However, I think that that is only to be expected, given the Governments that we have federally and in this State at this time.

I want to mention briefly a number of other areas where consumers have had to pay substantially more for basic commodities in this State under the present Liberal Government. If any member heard the A.B.C. programme *AM* this morning, he would have heard a comparison being made between the prices of some staple goods such as bread, milk and petrol, and would have noticed that South Australians were disadvantaged by that comparison because we have to pay more for these goods than is paid in a number of the other States.

Bread is a symbol of a basic commodity for a family in this country. A 680-gram loaf of sliced bread could be purchased in 1979, on average, for 60c in this State. In 1980 that price rose to 63c and in 1981 to 70c. At present, a consumer pays 82c for a loaf of bread in this State. Bread has been traditionally subject to price control in this State. There has been a substantial relaxation of price control in respect of the price consumers pay for bread in this State. If an average family uses five loaves of bread a week that costs an extra \$1.10 a week for bread. During the period of the current Government that has amounted to an additional \$57 a year in increased bread costs for a family.

Indeed, I suggest that that is a conservative estimate. I want to look at costs more directly in the control of Government, such as electricity, water rates and bus fares. In a typical all-electric home in 1978 it is estimated (and these are statistics taken from official returns) that electricity cost \$243 for the year. In 1980 the cost was \$280; in 1981 there was a substantial jump to \$388; and it is estimated that this year the cost will be in excess of \$400 for the purchase of electricity. Again, electricity is a basic commodity. On my calculations the family must find an additional \$157 to purchase electricity under this Government.

Water rates, to take a typical home without the need to purchase excess water, cost \$173 in 1979, in 1980 it cost \$197; in 1981 the cost was \$238; and in 1982 it was \$294. This represents an increase of \$121 to purchase water for a typical Adelaide home. Bus fares have increased from 40c in 1979 to 70c this year. For a family using the bus to go to and from work each day, and working on an average fare, the cost would be an additional \$150 a year. I suggest once again that that is a very conservative estimate.

We could go through other areas and refer to the price of beer, the working man's drink. Its cost has risen substantially, again as a result of a very lax price control system in this State. Of course, housing interest rates have gone up markedly, as we know, and this is an area in which the State Government has demonstrated that it can bring down some controls, as it has with building societies. Adding this small package of basic commodities together, one finds that an additional \$1 656 a year is required.

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

Mr GLAZBROOK (Brighton): Yesterday I had a surprise visit in my electoral office from two young men looking for a constituent of mine who had given my address as a place where they might have possibly met up with him at a certain time. This gentleman has taken it on himself to act as a self-motivated and self-styled social worker, working particularly in the Brighton electorate. He is a self-expressed or confessed 'born-again Christian'. He had led a life of 30

years in crime and criminal involvement and he now feels that he has something to repay to society by trying to help young people avoid the path of life that he had taken at such an early age. In his desire to do this, this person has perhaps been frustrated rather more than normal people simply because people eye him with a great deal of suspicion and certainly a lot of caution.

This man has on several occasions told me that his belief in doing this is borne out by the fact that he knows crime: he has been deeply involved in crime and, therefore, can recognise the symptoms in young people far more readily than perhaps can those who are qualified social workers. The two gentlemen to whom I have referred, when they saw me yesterday, said they were scared about coming in the front door because they had never talked to a member of Parliament before. I asked them in, and we had a cup of coffee together. In the ensuing conversation I asked them what they thought society should be doing to help them.

Perhaps in raising that question with them it would be opportune for me to explain their background, as they explained it to me. They were both Victorian-born young people who had been living in South Australia for six months, and both had been a product of family break-ups and, in one case, a child bashing incident earlier in life.

These two young people had encountered the social welfare system in every possible manner and had been pushed from pillar to post, from refuge to refuge, and from agency to agency. Both these young people had had a very difficult time basically, because, as they admit now, they were difficult children. Both these young people admitted that they had spent up to two or three years inside goals and that they had absconded on several occasions. Both admitted to various types of crime, from assault and battery to robbery. One of the young people admitted to me that in Victoria his major crime had been a break-in where he had stolen an amount of \$10 000, and that he had spent that money on a fast car and good clothes. Yet, he stood before me with a torn old blanket over his shoulders and nothing at all in his pockets.

I asked him again, 'What do you think society owes you?' He turned to me and said, 'I suppose I am to blame. I suppose that I should be the first person to make some retribution for what I have done to society, but I do not know what.' I then asked him, 'Well, where are you living?' He said, 'In a hostel.' When I asked how many people like him were in the hostel he told me, 'Well, there is a great number, there must be thousands.'

On hearing this I said to him, 'But where are they? Where do they live? Where do they stay?' In reply, he said, 'Well, around the place.' I then asked him, 'Can you tell me exactly?', and he could not. I asked him again, 'If you were a member of Parliament or in a position where you could do something for people, what would you do? What would be the first act that you would take to help rectify the situation?' He looked at me, looked up in the air and said, 'I really do not know. I really do not know what the answer is.' When I asked his friend the same question, he said, 'I am not sure.' This young man did not know whether or not it was more important to have a job first. When I asked him 'What sort of job could you do,' this young person said, 'Well, I do not really know. I am really quite illiterate.' I then asked, 'How about going back to school?' He replied, 'I could not really do that because I do not fit in.'

When I asked, 'When you were inside, did you take any educational lessons?' he told me, 'No, that is old hat. I really do not want to do that, but I need a job.' I said, 'What sort of job?' He replied, 'I would like to be an electrician.' I told him that before he could become an electrician he really needed to have some education. He replied, 'I realise that, but I spent most of my time trying to see how I could get

into gaol.' I then asked him, 'What do you mean "trying to get into gaol"?' and he said, 'Well, I feel safe there.' When I asked what he does when he is in gaol, he said, 'I spend all my time thinking about how I can get out.'

So, it seems that we have a misunderstanding of some of the problems that these people have and of what they experience. Many of us fail to grasp some of the real implications of what people are going through.

Admittedly, there are some major problems in family breakdowns. I saw some figures the other day which indicated that in this State there are something like 180 breakdowns in families per week, which of course must add greatly to the number of social problems that we already have in this State. It certainly does not help the offspring of those family break-ups. Because of the inherent social problems that exist, some people in the community are saying to themselves, 'Look, I have taken the wrong path in life; I want to try to put something back into society. What can I do?'

We as a society are too frightened too often of these people, because we see them as some sort of ogres, and we are sometimes terrified to talk to them. I must admit that that is the first time I have had such people walk into my office to discuss their problems. I left them feeling totally frustrated, not knowing exactly what I could do to help two people who realised that they were having problems, wanted to do something about it, but did not want to take the action necessary to rectify their problems.

They had lost totally their purpose in life. They had lost the initiative, and they went from one problem to another, from one drug to another. They admitted that they had been on drugs, that they drank heavily, and did everything that we believe is socially wrong. They knew that they were doing wrong, but they could not get off the band wagon. They thought that they could go to one of the dry-out centres as they had done in Victoria. That worked for a while, and they came out and went to look for a job. They were unskilled, uneducated, illiterate, and no-one wanted them. There were not available the types of occupation for which they were looking, yet they did not want to take the remedial treatment necessary through some form of education to help them on the right path.

It struck me that we, as members of Parliament, need to get out more among these people to understand some of their problems. I admit that I had failed to do that. Certainly, yesterday I had brought home to me that unless we understand their problems more fully, and unless we bring ourselves back to their level, it will be very difficult for us to understand and implement the methods necessary to put them on the road to recovery.

Mr HEMMINGS (Napier): I was quite encouraged by the final remarks of the member for Brighton when he said, in effect, that he was not aware of the problems facing the ordinary people in this State. That is a frank admission, and I congratulate him for making it. It is also rather pertinent that the Minister for Agriculture is here tonight because, as I said earlier today, he is one person on the Government side who is not only unaware of what is happening with people who are living in poverty but he does not care a damn about them.

In my Address in Reply speech, I made a comment that I had studied the speeches in the Address in Reply and Budget debates over the last three years and had ascertained that people on this side had made at least two speeches dealing with the problems of unemployment, poverty, housing and other matters affecting ordinary people in this State. However, only one person on the other side, the member for Hanson, had made a major speech on that problem. I have been encouraged to find, since I made those comments in the Address in Reply debate, that the word has got to

the Government back-benchers that they should be saying something about the ordinary people and about poverty. I am encouraged that they are at least doing that now. The member for Brighton has highlighted that concern. I am sure that it is a genuine concern: I would not say that it is a false concern.

Earlier this afternoon I talked about the ACOSS survey that was debunked by the Minister for Social Security, Senator Chaney, as being completely false and exaggerated. I said at that time that it was supported by the Minister of Agriculture, because he was obviously not aware of the problems.

In the time allotted to me in this grievance debate I want to continue to refer to the ACOSS Report. I hope that members opposite will listen carefully to my comments and I would advise them to obtain a copy of the report. On page 59 of the report, under the heading 'Living on a low budget', the following statement is made:

One family described their life as managing an 'existence', not really a life.

That is an awful thing for a person to say. Those people in the community who are married and who have children like to achieve a full family life, but there are those who can describe their life as merely an existence. We ought to understand the plight of such people, and we should attempt to make the rest of the community aware of it. The report continues:

But what does this mean. Are the poor in Australia just lacking 'the luxuries' of life; is their plight caused by bad management and failure to save for a 'rainy day'? It also examines their ability to draw up and manage budgets and the financial and/or legal difficulties they faced. . . .

One general comment however should be made at the outset. The various items of family expenditure cannot be treated in isolation from one another. When families have too little money, every bill paid means a shortage of funds elsewhere. It is the accumulation of necessary expenditure on a low income which causes families financial difficulties . . . while one family may run into debt because money had been spent on food, another family may have paid bills at the expense of health care.

It is the total combination of these factors which determines the 'life style' and wellbeing of such persons. Other more intangible needs, such as the worry and stress of 'making ends meet' or the lack of 'discretionary money' for birthday or Christmas presents, cannot be quantified but are just as real.

That is a fairly stark outline of the survey's findings. Children in a low income family see their mates at school getting birthday presents, but when their birthdays come along they do not receive presents and they ask their parents why. Similarly, at Christmas time there are all the advertisements about Christmas fare and the things that one should buy, but those people in low income families cannot participate, and the children in such families wonder why that is the case. This type of thing produces juvenile delinquency problems and the problem of children leaving home as soon as they can, joining the 6 000 or so other homeless youths in Adelaide today.

They are the sorts of problems which arise through poverty, but they have not been highlighted in this report. Unless this Parliament and the Federal Parliament recognise that there is real poverty, that we are not the lucky country any more, and that something needs to be done urgently, this situation will continue. Already we have a situation in which children have grown up in this environment, have attempted to obtain work without success, and have married and produced their own children. They will progress along the line with their children receiving less than they did.

Unless we recognise the early warning signs in relation to our society we are only fooling ourselves. At the moment the people who are disenchanted with society are writing slogans on walls. However, it will not stop at slogans on walls. Eventually, the people who have been deprived since 1975 and who are being deprived even more as the years

progress will say that they have had enough. They will not be able to differentiate between the Liberal Party or the Labor Party. They will dismiss both sides as being incompetent and not able to deliver the goods. When that situation occurs we will see something far worse than what happened in the United Kingdom in Brixton or Liverpool. It will happen here.

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

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I appreciate the opportunity to say one or two things about my electorate in this debate. In relation to the member for Napier's comments, we are all concerned about the plight of those members of society who could be classed as being underprivileged and who are in very difficult circumstances. In a diverse electorate such as mine, like the member for Napier, I have areas which are deprived and which suffer greatly for a number of reasons, some of which are related to the geographic location in which people find themselves.

Tonight I will highlight one problem faced by my constituents, and I refer to the different rates that apply in relation to electricity consumption. Most members would be aware that for a long time an Act has operated in South Australia which permits the Treasurer to subsidise the cost of electricity at Adelaide plus 10. However, recently there was an extension of the electrical undertakings under the control of the State Government and various instrumentalities linked to the State Government.

I believe that has created a number of anomalies. In the Far North of the State at the new township of Marla, at Marree and Kingoonya a different rate applies for certain categories than that which applies at Coober Pedy. If one compares the rate with Cowell, which is an average town on Eyre Peninsula, one finds that there is a considerable difference in the charges. Most of us regard electricity as a basic necessity of life. Many of the people living in my electorate have had to make a considerable contribution just to have electricity connected to their properties.

I know of cases where people have had to pay more than \$20 000 just to get their property connected to the electricity supply. Most people would regard the right to be connected to electricity as beyond question. I refer to a schedule of charges that has been provided to me. Certainly, I do not cast any aspersions on the organisations that run these installations, because at least in some places people are receiving electricity.

However, I am concerned at what appear to be grave anomalies. I refer to Marla Bore, Marree and Kingoonya where, for the first 80 kilowatts per quarter, persons are charged 13.48c. That is basically the standard charge throughout the three areas. However, when one looks at the charge for additional consumption in the sixth category one finds that at Marla Bore, Marree and Kingoonya, the charge is 20c a kilowatt hour. At Coober Pedy the charge is 11.6c and at Cowell it is 5.98c, a considerable difference.

I realise that it is more expensive to provide electricity in those areas, but we have come to a stage where, if we subsidise buses running on the streets of Adelaide and patrons of the Festival Theatre, then all persons in South Australia, wherever they might live, should be paying for electricity on exactly the same basis. We can no longer accept even the 10 per cent surcharge that applies, because that creates enough anomalies in itself.

I know of a case involving neighbours, where one person is connected directly to the Electricity Trust supply and does not pay the 10 per cent surcharge, yet his neighbour through the fence—perhaps one or two kilometres away—who is supplied by the district council operating as an agent of the trust, pays the 10 per cent surcharge. That is bad

enough in itself, but the charges to which I have referred in these schedules greatly concern me.

I have received complaints from constituents at Marree expressing grave concern at the amount that they have had to pay. Most people would be aware that in the past Australian National Railways provided electricity at Kingoonya and Marree. It was obvious that, as it had employees and equipment in those locations, it could subsidise the supply of electricity. However, as Australian National is no longer in a position to supply that electricity, it is now supplied by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust. I do not blame the trust, but I am perturbed about the scale of charges that now applies.

I suppose that the scale was supplied by the Electricity Trust, which worked out the costs involved, but in the case of Marla Bore the charges which are to apply to the major consumer are such that he will have to provide his own electricity. At present he has a reasonably large generating capacity and he will have to operate his own generating plant, because he can provide electricity far more cheaply than he will be able to purchase it from the trust because of the equipment that will be installed. That will affect the whole undertaking. Unless he is in a position to supply his own electricity, it will have a serious effect on his commercial viability. That in itself is a serious matter, because this constituent has supplied an excellent facility to serve the travelling public. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* three tables which I have indicated to you earlier, Sir, and which are of a purely statistical nature.

Leave granted.

COWELL ELECTRIC SUPPLY CO LTD TARIFF SCHEDULE

Tariffs will apply for electricity used after the first normal reading after 1.6.82

Domestic—Tariff M	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 80 kWhs per quarter	13.48
(2) The next 220 kWhs per quarter	8.30
(3) The next 2 700 kWhs per quarter	6.38
(4) Additional Consumption	7.08

General Purpose—Tariff S	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 450 kWhs per quarter	16.61
(2) The next 3 000 kWhs per quarter	13.53
(3) The next 4 500 kWhs per quarter	9.49
(4) The next 150 000 kWhs per quarter	7.83
(5) The next 750 000 kWhs per quarter	6.22
(6) Additional Consumption	5.98

C.E.S. (COOBER PEDY DIVISION) CO LTD TARIFF SCHEDULE

Tariffs will apply for electricity used after the first normal reading after 1.7.82

Domestic—Tarrif M	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 80 kWhs per quarter	13.48
(2) The next 220 kWhs per quarter	8.30
(3) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	6.38
(4) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	7.00
(5) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	9.86
(6) Additional Consumption	11.60

General Purpose—Tariff S	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 450 kWhs per quarter	16.61
(2) The next 3 000 kWhs per quarter	13.53
(3) The next 4 500 kWhs per quarter	9.49
(4) The next 150 000 kWhs per quarter	9.86
(5) Additional Consumption	11.60

O.A.C.D.T. ELECTRICITY SUPPLY
TARIFF SCHEDULE

Tariffs will apply for electricity used after the first normal reading after 1.7.82

Domestic—Tariff M	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 80 kWhs per quarter	13.48
(2) The next 220 kWhs per quarter	8.30
(3) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	6.38
(4) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	11.60
(5) The next 1 000 kWhs per quarter	15.00
(6) Additional Consumption	20.00

General Purpose—Tariff S	Cents/kWh
(1) The 1st 450 kWhs per quarter	16.61
(2) The next 3 000 kWhs per quarter	13.53
(3) The next 4 500 kWhs per quarter	9.49
(4) The next 10 000 kWhs per quarter	11.60
(5) The next 35 000 kWhs per quarter	15.00
(6) Additional Consumption	20.00

Mr GUNN: I appreciate the decision of the House, because this matter has been causing me concern for a long time. I also am concerned that it has taken a considerable time to reach agreement so that the people in the Northern Flinders Ranges can receive electricity. In my view, there has been enough discussion and consideration, and it is time to start building the power lines so that Wilpena can be connected to three-phase power. The nonsense has gone on for long enough, and in one of the most attractive tourist spots in South Australia it is still not possible to connect the caravan park, because the generating capacity is not there.

The power lines should then be extended through the Flinders Ranges to Blinman so that people on the way can be connected and so that the township of Blinman can have electricity, I hope, at the same rate as every other South Australian enjoys. I suppose that I have more complaints about the cost of electricity than any other member has, and I am most concerned about this matter. I appeal to the Government to give it its immediate consideration, as I regard it as being of top priority.

Many of my constituents suffer a number of difficult situations. Many are not connected to a reliable water supply and must pay very high prices for water. People at Coober Pedy must pay in excess of \$45 per 1 000 gallons. I have not converted that but it is not possible to have that water reticulated. It has to be carted by contractors to the homes at Coober Pedy and, in an area like Coober Pedy, next to electricity, it is absolutely essential to do everything possible to assist the community.

I have areas such as Terowie, which is also facing difficulties. I know that certain action has been taken to slightly improve the situation and that the Minister of Water Resources has a real problem, but it does concern me that he is restricted in the amount of development that the Engineering and Water Supply Department can carry out. However, we do appear to have ample funds for other

projects. I know that it is nice to promote the arts and such things but in my view the time has come to take stock of the situation. Some of these sorts of activities should be curtailed and the money put into bread and butter issues, such as water, power, the provision of adequate roads, and the provision of housing for pensioners and disadvantaged people in country towns. I believe that it is necessary and more important at this stage—

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

Mr SLATER (Gilles): In the Address in Reply debate last week I raised the fact that the Minister of Tourism has been endeavouring to convey to the people of South Australia that there has been a great upsurge in tourism since the Government came to office in September 1979. I quoted figures that showed that South Australia had only improved very marginally. In comparison with some other States, South Australia has fallen behind in obtaining its share of the tourist market. The figures that I used then applied to room occupancy rates, which are made available every quarter by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. I thought it important also to compare the Budget allocation of the various States regarding tourism. The Budget allocations in 1981-82 were as follows:

	\$
Victoria	10 402 758
Queensland	10 112 000
Tasmania	7 805 000
New South Wales	6 834 800
Western Australia	4 622 000
South Australia	3 958 000
Northern Territory	3 447 000
Australian Capital Territory	1 365 800

Members can see that those figures show that South Australia ranks low indeed with regard to its Budget allocation for tourism: it is behind Western Australia, well behind Tasmania, and only slightly in front of the Northern Territory. A good deal of this budget allocation in South Australia has been given to private consultants when work in the areas of advertising, marketing and promotion could very well have been performed in the Department of Tourism.

We have heard from time to time from the Minister about particular proposals and plans for tourism. According to her, they are going to be the answer to the tourist situation in this State. We have heard about Tourism Development Boards, task forces, promotion and advertising campaigns, grants to tourist projects, conferences and overseas trips. However, nothing much has come of any of these activities.

I understand that on Sunday next the task force set up some time ago in relation to the tourist development plan is going to announce the tourism plan for the next five years. We have also heard from the Minister from time to time that loans will be made available to tourist operators. One might ask how operators will qualify for those loans. As a member of the Industries Development Committee I can recall only two or three tourist ventures coming before that committee for consideration and being recommended for approval in the past six months.

It would appear that the proposals made regarding these matters were more promise than performance and more expectation than result. Indeed, many extravagant statements have been made about tourism development, not only by the Minister but by other members on that side of the House. I refer to an article which appeared in the *News* of 20 November 1979. It shows a photograph of a Qantas jumbo jet and underneath states:

In 15 years aircraft could arrive every 12 minutes bringing tourists to South Australia.

That quote is attributed to the member for Brighton, Mr Glazbrook. The article states:

The tourism portfolio is currently held by Mrs Jennifer Adamson who is fully occupied with her health portfolio.

It would appear logical either Glazbrook (when he gains more Parliamentary experience) or Evans will get the tourism crown soon.

Glazbrook managed to impress both sides of the House recently when he discussed tourism in his maiden speech . . .

He said if tourism continued to grow, by the end of 1980 Australia could expect 10 000 000 visitors.

South Australia would receive 10 per cent of this traffic—or 1 000 000 visitors.

This could mean an aircraft arriving every 12 minutes, a coach arriving and departing the central terminal every hour and a train arriving and departing interstate three times a day.

If I have ever heard anything in my life that is a bit of pie in the sky, that is it. It would appear that this is another kite flying exercise by the present Government. Not only did the Minister get into the act but also the member for Brighton who, as I said, in the very early stages of his career made these quite extravagant statements.

Tourism is a highly competitive business, and many farsighted Governments throughout the world have not only given lip service to tourism but, taking the bull by the horns, have taken positive action, realising that tourism is a growth industry and a very important economic asset. It is not new, and it is not a game: it is a hard-headed, computerised, multi-national business controlled by tough businessmen. We need to do a number of things. We have spoken previously about penny ante games; the proposals undertaken by the Government are not good enough if we are going to promote tourism in this State. The States need to get together to pressure the Federal Government to relax its aviation rules. It is no good building facilities for an international airport if it is not fully effective and fully utilised. I have little optimism about the current proposals, plans, policies and strategies of the present Government regarding tourism.

In South Australia we certainly need to improve our performance. We have marginally improved but, in comparison with other States, as I have said, in certain aspects we have gone backwards rather than forward. To improve our performance I believe we need to closely consider the establishment of a tourism commission. Some 18 months ago the Northern Territory very effectively established such a commission. As a consequence, the industry in the Northern Territory has considerably improved. There are some impediments, of course, but it has certainly significantly improved during the past 18 months. As a matter of fact they sell more than \$1 000 000 worth of business a year to South Australians under our nose on the other side of North Terrace. I think that indicates that we need to get it all together; the haphazard bits-and-pieces approach we have had over the past years is certainly not good enough in modern times. Our endeavour to portray Adelaide and South Australia as a relaxed holiday destination may be wrong—people on occasion travel to get away from routine, to find a bit of excitement. Tourism is much more than just looking at scenery. We need something exciting—who knows, perhaps a casino in South Australia. We certainly need to give the place a lift, to honestly sell (perhaps hard sell) the assets we have in South Australia.

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

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): During the Address in Reply debate I raised what I consider to be the most important issue with which I have been involved in my electorate for quite some time—the current unemployment position. That position is worsening, and as late as yesterday it worsened further. I am becoming increasingly concerned about the downturn in the steel industry and the resulting unem-

ployment. I will not be seeking any apologies from the member for Glenelg or anybody else in the House if I deal with the question of unemployment in the steel industry again. I said at that particular time that, like all of our manufacturing industries, the steel industry needed assistance. I say that now as I did before. I further say that it needs certain aid and it needs complete co-operation between a Federal Government (whatever its political colour), the steel industry and the trade union movement. I was more than pleased to see that yesterday the State Minister of Industrial Affairs appeared to change his role in this situation. I will deal with that in a moment.

I have also said that, if our manufacturing industries receive assistance and protection, in return those industries have an obligation. If that obligation is not voluntarily forthcoming, Governments have a responsibility to enforce on the manufacturing industries the need to do several things. I believe those industries need, first, to accept their responsibility to modernise and continually upgrade the techniques and skills in that industry; secondly, to make proper, consistent and worthwhile investments into the industry; and, thirdly, and not necessarily the least of the obligations, they must accept some partnership, if that is deemed necessary, with the Federal Government of the day and perhaps even with the trade union movement.

I can see that the member for Glenelg is about to lapse into one of his usual dizzy spells. I assure him that we are looking positively at the problem, and I make no apologies for what I say. On the one hand, there is the need to assist our manufacturing industries, and in return our manufacturing industries need to react properly in respect of the assistance they are receiving.

I have always believed that an investigation would find that the manufacturing industries of Japan, as an example, are part and parcel of the sort of Government programming I now talk about. Having said that, I express my concern at what I can only call the absolute hypocrisy shown by our State Minister of Industrial Affairs. On 25 July, the *Sunday Mail* contained an article, including a photograph of the Minister, under the heading 'SA's future', as follows:

'Get off your backsides . . . get out and sell!' Get off your backsides! That was the clear blunt message to South Australian firms from Industrial Affairs Minister, Mr Brown, yesterday.

I said in the Address in Reply that the management of B.H.P. Co. Ltd in Whyalla would be very interested to read that decent old blast, as far as it is concerned. To say the least, I was interested to see that, when the Minister finally went to Whyalla and had discussions with the management of B.H.P., he did a complete flip on the whole issue. In the same article, the Minister said:

Also consumers should be spending rather than holding back. Just because the Opposition Leader is preaching pessimism people should not overreact and stop spending.

I would like the Minister or any member of the Government to tell me how 1 300 unemployed people in a city or a community can spend more. I find that a rather interesting remark, and it is something not even Houdini could answer.

As late as yesterday the firm of Titans, a subsidiary of B.H.P., was to retrench 18 of its employees. Would the Minister rush up to Whyalla and tell those people to spend more? One of the difficulties one has with the unemployment problems to which I am referring is to find the light at the end of the tunnel and give people hope for the future. The current Minister is not helping the situation.

I turn briefly to what the Minister was reported in the *Adelaide News* to have said in Whyalla yesterday. As I said earlier, he did a complete flip, a complete about-face. The article, headed 'B.H.P. aid key to Whyalla, says Brown', states:

The State Government wants Federal assistance for B.H.P.'s steel production to protect Whyalla's future.

That was coming from a Government Minister who has said, 'Get off your backsides; get out and sell.' It has come from a Minister who, out of the blue, appears to have got the message fairly loud and clear that some assistance ought to be forthcoming from a Federal Government, whatever political colour it might be. Of course, he still has not grasped the other side of the penny whereby, in considering giving assistance to the manufacturing industry, whether to B.H.P. or anyone else, we must recognise that those companies such as B.H.P. have something to answer for in regard to the problems we are facing. They are not free of blame.

Although I welcome the fact that the Minister has grasped the problem in his teeth at the moment, let him also realise that if assistance or aid is given some obligation has to be put on companies such as B.H.P. to mend their ways in regard to their role in the manufacturing industry. They must not continue to do away with improving manufacturing techniques in order to put money into oil, which is a paying proposition. If they are going to get assistance, they also have an obligation to face up to the fact that they must spend their money wisely, accept new techniques as they come about, and get on with the job of seeing that that financial assistance is spent properly.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): To my knowledge, since the invasion of southern Lebanon by the Israelis has occurred, no comment has been made in this Parliament on the matter. That is quite understandable given that foreign affairs and defence matters are not generally issues about which this Parliament needs to concern itself or about which it has constitutional power. However, the events as they have unfolded over the past few weeks have, in my view, been such an affront to all of us as human beings that I felt it appropriate that someone should get up in this Chamber and say something about it.

Regardless of our policies or political outlook, I do not think that any one of us could have been anything but moved after sitting at home in our lounge rooms watching our television sets and seeing the incredible slaughter of humanity that has gone on in Beirut and what has happened to Palestinian civilians—men, women and children. It seems to me that if it could be an even greater outrage, the devastation that has occurred to Lebanese citizens in Beirut has certainly been equal to that which has occurred to Palestinian civilians living there. I do not think that any individual human being who has seen that film could not have been moved by the sheer madness and carnage that has occurred. I remember seeing a very distressing scene where a women doctor had two babies which were dead and, when asked what she felt about this, she said, 'What do I feel about it? All I can say is that I hope that the Israelis feel more secure now that these two little children have died.'

I do not want to stand here tonight and give a long dissertation about the situation in the Middle East, as I think that we all know of it in general terms, some of us in more specific terms. Possibly we have all taken sides in the past, to a greater or less extent. Personally, I have always been one of those people who has been prepared, until recent years, to give Israel the benefit of the doubt, particularly during those times when the P.L.O. and its various factions were involved in an international reign of terror. Ironically, of course, that reign of terror had to some extent subsided in recent times and the P.L.O. had taken on more of a political character than that of a terrorist organisation.

Having said all that, when one looks at the situation one could well condemn the actions of the P.L.O., as I and

many others did, in involving itself in international terrorism. But it is even more extraordinary in a sense when a Government, recognised by most of the Governments throughout the world (and I am referring to the Israeli Government) carries on in Beirut in a fashion that to me cannot be described as anything else but a terrorist fashion. When one thinks of the use of cluster bombs, phosphorous bombs and these other weapons, what can one call them if they are not to be called weapons of terror? The Israelis are hardly confronting a massive invasion force: the Palestinians, as a military force, have never represented a military threat, as it were, to the survival of Israel as a State.

Mr Mathwin: They are from all different countries, aren't they; they don't all live in Palestine.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: As I understand the situation, originally the Palestinians lived in Palestine, which is now the area that is basically covered by modern Israel. As I have said, I do not want to dwell on the politics of the situation, particularly, but, as one human being, and as a member of this Parliament (and therefore having the opportunity that only 47 of us in this State have to speak in this Chamber), I felt that it was my duty to express my revulsion about what has been going on during the past few weeks in southern Lebanon, and in Beirut particularly. In saying that, it is not as though I am speaking against Israel as a whole. The former Prime Minister of Israel, Mr Rabin, has come out in opposition to the military action, which, he said would solve none of the political problems that the Israelis have with the Palestinians.

The Israeli Opposition has also condemned the invasion. Many people have argued that the invasion will simply remove the more moderate elements from the Palestinian leadership and will disperse extremists to other Arab countries. That will subsequently lead to a return to the type of terrorist activities in which the P.L.O. was involved in earlier years. I will not go on simply to use my full 10 minutes, but I simply wish to make my protest on behalf of, I think, all decent people not only in this country but throughout the world who, after seeing on their television screens night after night the sorts of atrocities in Beirut, are thoroughly sickened by it and wish it would stop.

Mr LANGLEY (Unley): I have pleasure in speaking in this debate tonight. Members opposite must be ashamed at what has happened in the two years since they came to Government.

Mr Mathwin: Three years.

Mr LANGLEY: If it has been three years, I am further ashamed of the Government's performance. I must admit that during the course of that time the people of South Australia made one error, namely, having a Liberal Government in this State. There is no doubt about that as far as I am concerned. If one moves through my district and other districts as other members have done (of course, the member for Henley Beach knows everything and has one great thing in his favour; however, he will not be with us after the next election), one sees—

The Hon. J. R. Olsen: I don't know about that.

Mr LANGLEY: The Chief Secretary will be with us again. He is not a bad fellow and he lives in a reasonable district. He has one thing in his favour. I will not include him in what I have said about some of his colleagues, because he is an ardent worker and is doing a good job. I have nothing against him in any way at all.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg is as bad as the member for Mallee.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: He hasn't spoken in three years.

Mr LANGLEY: The member for Glenelg has not spoken unless it has been to ask a Dorothy Dixier.

Mr Mathwin: I've been ill.

Mr LANGLEY: I am very sorry that the member for Glenelg has been ill. The member for Glenelg is associated with the Glenelg Football Club and I am associated with the Sturt Football Club. I can recall the member for Glenelg, when his Party was in Opposition, asking many questions about McNally. However, I have not heard anything about McNally since the change of Government. Members opposite believe that everything is going all right for the Government. However, I assure members opposite that everything is not going all right with the Government. Recently a document came into my hands entitled 'How prices have risen under Tonkin'. I must be quite frank and say 'Under the Premier'. I will list some of the things that occur during a person's life, including interest rates. When one doorknocks an area, one finds out what is happening. The Minister for Industrial Affairs has doorknocked three houses in three years.

Mr Russack: He doesn't have to.

Mr LANGLEY: That is correct; he does not have to. I will not include the Minister in what I have said about other people. At the moment he is having a little bit of trouble with the P.S.A. I know all about that; my time will come.

Mr Mathwin: He's been doorknocking in your area.

Mr LANGLEY: I am very pleased that he has. I think that the person that members opposite hope will be the next member will doorknock in my district. The Premier has given him leave for one month; he needs leave for six months. The Minister of Industrial Affairs did a great job in Mitcham—one of the greatest jobs of all time. He handed out 'how-to-vote' cards at the Mitcham shopping centre. That is how members opposite win votes. The Minister has never doorknocked a house in his life. I point out to the Minister of Industrial Affairs that the Labor Party was not very happy with me, because I went around and doorknocked in Colonel Light Gardens and obtained another 300 votes, and they won the election. Would I be most disappointed! That is an indication of how much work the Minister of Industrial Affairs did and the Premier: they handed out 'how-to-vote' cards at the Mitcham shopping centre to win votes.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's a remarkable effort!

Mr LANGLEY: It was a remarkable effort! That is how they will win Unley next time—by doing what Paddy shot at.

Mr Mathwin: Would you like me to come out and give you a hand?

Mr LANGLEY: I do not need any hands at all. I will not doorknock the district of the member for Glenelg because I have a high regard for him: he has won his district and good luck to him. You never move them where your candidates cannot win, but the member for Henley Beach and other members opposite will be in a little trouble.

Mr Randall: You are welcome to come to Henley Beach at any time.

Mr LANGLEY: One could run a duck in the area of the member for Davenport. In other areas, one can do exactly the same thing, but the member for Henley Beach may be in a little trouble and should not be too loud. He is a great member of the union department; he loves unions! I turn now to the way in which prices have increased under the Liberals, under the Premier. Under a Labor Government in 1979 interest rates were \$260 a month, but under a Liberal Government they increased in 1980 to \$280, in 1981 to \$304, and in 1982 to \$355, and they will be rising again soon.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: What's your source—the *Herald*?

Mr LANGLEY: I am sure that if the Minister read the *Herald* it would bring him back to the field occasionally.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I read—

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister can read, but he tells more untruths in this House than any member opposite. In 1979, bread cost 60c, in 1980 it was 63c, in 1981 it was 70c, and in 1982 it has increased to 82c. Members opposite who are not already aware of the impact of these increases will soon be aware of them. Certainly, I can assure the Minister of Education, who has just entered the Chamber, that I will not be talking about the Black Forest school tonight.

I must admit that I do enjoy a beer, and the cost of beer in 1979 was 89c but it increased to 96c in 1980, to \$1.10 in 1981, and to \$1.19 in 1982. One of the increases which affects people greatly concerns hospital beds, the charges for which have increased from \$40 in 1979 to \$50 in 1980, to \$85 in 1981, and to \$105 in 1982. This is the result of the efforts of this great Government which promised to keep prices down and do everything right. I do not want to go any further. Electricity is one thing about which I know something, but what has happened to electricity prices during the period of this Government?

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: The Minister may well interject. What about water rates? They were \$173 in 1979, yet in the term of this Government they have increased to \$294 and are increasing all the time. Bus fares have increased from 40c in 1979 to 70c in 1982, under a Government which has been doing all it could to help people. Since it came to office, what has the Government done for pensioners? The former A.L.P. Government gave the people of South Australia and pensioners a reduction of 60 per cent. The concession started at 50 per cent and was increased to 60 per cent. What has this Government done for pensioners since it has been in power—exactly nothing! I remind the Government how prices have increased under the Tonkin Administration, which had one thing in its favour, and I emphasise—

The Hon. D. C. Brown interjecting:

Mr LANGLEY: I wish the Minister would run in Unley and get knocked off. The person who will be member for Unley next time has knocked the Minister off on so many occasions during the course of the Public Service Association proceedings that it does not matter, and the Minister knows it.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: What is his name?

Mr LANGLEY: His name is Kym Mayes. He is well known in the district. He door knocks and goes out with me. The Minister of Industrial Affairs put up something about 6 per cent. He said that there were no frills with it, and he was knocked back. The future member for Unley knocked him back recently in a court case concerning what happened between the Public Service Association and himself when the Minister tried to take over the case. Whatever the Minister may say, the P.S.A. is very strong.

The Hon. D. C. Brown: I'll be meeting him.

Mr LANGLEY: Of course the Minister will be meeting him. He has to meet him. I am pleased that the Minister has been here tonight. It is about time members opposite realised that there are people in this State—

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to take the few minutes that I have to put on record the concern being felt around Glenelg North, and I am sure that the member for Peake will support me on this occasion. I would like to express our concern at the growing incidence of night flights into and out of Adelaide Airport. This problem and the noise associated with it are causing concern to my constituents, and the matter has reached the point where it is about time someone aired that concern in this place so that we can attempt to come to grips with it.

The stage has been reached where we now have six or eight flights a night coming in. As we are all aware, the curfew is supposed to operate from 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. At one stage, at about 4 a.m., we have what is called the 'four o'clock gaggle'. This terminology has not been originated by the constituents as such but is used by the Environment and Security Officer at Adelaide Airport.

The Hon. D. J. Hoggood: The 4 o'clock what?

Mr OSWALD: It is called the 4 o'clock gaggle. At that time there seems to be a concentration of aircraft descending at the airport and awakening local residents.

Mr Slater: Why don't you say that we should shift it to Virginia?

Mr OSWALD: I am pleased that the member has raised that point, because I am probably one of the most vocal in the district about getting Adelaide Airport shifted out to the Northern Plains of Adelaide. I have advocated that for as long as I have been a public spokesman down there, and I will continue to advocate it. I assure the member for Gilles that I will never move from that desire. Instead of trying to push more aircraft into Adelaide Airport, as the member for Gilles has referred to in his press statement recently, I warn members that, if international flights are increased, we will have to be careful that overseas companies do not put pressure on us and want to bring aircraft in at night.

However, I am referring to the problem of the six or eight flights that come in at about 4 a.m. and cause increasing concern to residents who are awakened by them. One aircraft is an Israeli jet, a West Wind 1124. This is based and designed on the U.S. navy jet 1123, which is one of the very noisy versions of executive jet. The engines have been toned down considerably, but I live about 100 yards south of Anzac Highway, a fair way from the airstrip, and it awakened me in Glenelg East, so I know what it does to residents in the Glenelg North area.

I would like to quickly trace the history of the curfews. To the residents who live near the airport a curfew is what the word means—no aircraft. If we go back several years and trace the three stages, the first stage of the curfew was clearly no jets, and that was enforced. Then we moved to stage 2, when there was a general relaxation of the curfew, and I am going to blame both Governments here. I believe that at that stage a Mr Jones was Transport Minister, of A.L.P. persuasion, who introduced stage 2 of the curfew. That stated that only general aviation aircraft with a weight of less than 5 700 kilograms could be permitted. Now we have come to stage 3, and I make no excuses for the people who introduced this rule, which relates to any aircraft except the big jets. I do not agree with that, and it is just not on so far as my constituents in that area are concerned. It means that now there is an almost open sesame situation allowing any kind of aircraft to use the airport at night except the major public transport jets. In my opinion this whole question of the curfew is quite laughable.

What worries me and my constituents is that we are now seeing a softening up process coming to the fore for the relaxation of night flying and the introduction of the Airbus. That matter is causing considerable concern in my district. We are well aware that the State Government, through the Minister of Transport, has been adamant and most forceful in its argument to its Federal counterparts that there will be no relaxation of the curfew. I believe that that message has got through and is being acted upon. Nevertheless, there are still people in the aviation industry who persist in trying to bring about a change in this policy.

A report circulating in my district is causing concern. Released in February of this year, the report is entitled 'Aircraft Noise in Australia—A Survey of Community Reaction', and was issued by the National Acoustics Laboratories. It is report No. 88, and it states that a night flight should

be equated to two day flights. The immediate reaction is, 'What do you mean by that?' At the moment the accepted standard of weighting is that one day flight is equivalent to 16.7 night flights in its impact on the community. To make a change from a 16.7 factor back to a factor of 2 is a drastic drop which I do not believe can pass observation.

Acceptance of this report by Federal aviation authorities will be used as the thin end of the wedge to bring about a change in attitudes so that the night flying of aircraft will become an accepted reality. An attempt is being made clearly to downgrade the importance of night flying as a contributor to noise. Once that has been done, once the importance of night flying noise is downgraded, it will be said that the weighting factor is that one day flight is equivalent to two night flights, we can dispense with this noise problem and move to introduce 24-hour flying.

As the representative for the district, I put on record the fact that we do not accept and will never accept all-night flying coming to Adelaide Airport. The State Government has been supportive, but I would like the Minister, in all his communications with his Federal counterpart, to make those concerned aware that we are aware of this report 88. There is no way, as a matter of policy, that we will accept any part of it or any relaxation of the curfew. We must get that message through to the Federal aviation industry, and I refer to the industry as much as the Department of Aviation, because it is the people within the industry who keep pushing the department for relaxation of the curfew.

One other aspect I raise, on behalf of my constituents, regarding the airport, is the persistence over recent years (and this is also getting worse) of aircraft failing to hold their heading as they take off from the main strip. The planes then fly over homes in Glenelg North instead of holding the aircraft heading for the required five nautical miles which would take them out over the treatment works and sea. This is a breach of aviation regulations and the pilots have been warned on numerous occasions. Many times constituents, as well as myself, have written to the Federal department, bringing the matter to its attention. Warnings are given, but I do not believe they are given firmly enough. We do have regulations regarding flight paths, and aircraft are required to keep to them. I am a private pilot; I know the regulations, and I know that this is a requirement on the part of the pilot in command.

I ask the Minister of Transport also to take that matter up with his Federal counterpart as a matter of urgency to ensure that aircraft taking off in a south-westerly direction from Adelaide Airport are absolutely compelled to hold aircraft headings so that they do not fly over homes. There is no need to fly over homes; there is ample latitude to hold that aircraft heading, to clear the treatment works, and then be out over the sea.

Mrs SOUTHCOTT (Mitcham): Tonight I would like to share a concern of mine in the hope that perhaps some members of the House may have some solution. During the past weekend I visited Port Lincoln and was fortunate enough to visit the showrooms and workshop of Constantia Furniture, a privilege I wish could be enjoyed by all members of the House. However, as this is not likely, I would like to make known to members the presence in South Australia of three master craftsmen who have formed a partnership to keep alive the ancient traditions of fine furniture making.

The partnership was formed 10 years ago when Bernie Koker, cabinet maker, Ken Martin, woodcarver, and Malcolm Averill, finisher and polisher, met by chance and discovered not only that they shared the same ideals but also that their skills were complementary. After a tentative part-time beginning, they chose to change their lifestyles and risk everything to work with wood in the way they had

always longed to do, in the traditions of great masters of the past.

Much research was done at the outset into the techniques and proportions used by the masters of the past classical periods. Their decision to work only in solid wood involved further research and explains their comparative isolation in Port Lincoln, which was chosen for its Mediterranean-type climate which is ideally suited to woodworking. Even so, there are occasions during summer months when high temperatures call a halt to woodworking. Work is then confined to research, maintenance and metal work for customised hardware.

As demand for their work grew, the remoteness of their situation became less of a problem. Clients are now happy to visit Port Lincoln or fly the partners out to them for discussion. They make only individual pieces on a one-off basis. All preparatory work is generally done on a personal level with the client, for whom they occasionally produce perspective drawings in addition to full-scale drawings from which they always work. Making individual pieces in solid wood, never with veneers, requires careful hand selection of the finest timbers. They presently have 15 species of world-class timbers on hand, including Honduras mahogany, Australian walnut, maple, the three main oaks, Australian blackwood, blackbean, satin sycamore, Huon pine, Queensland fiddleback, and other rare types of these species.

Maintaining such a wide selection of timber often entails buying a whole tree. They use a lot of Honduras mahogany, which will be non-existent in 10 or 11 years. New trees are being planted now but it takes 400 to 500 years for the trees to reach maturity. Queensland fiddleback is used to great advantage on drawer fronts. The sheens and patterns created by the woodgrains are untouched by abrasive sandpaper in the finishing process.

The drawers, like all other pieces, are made satin smooth by special tooling. Constantia prefers to use organic hand-rubbed finishes, namely, various combinations of waxes and oils and the traditional French polish and varnishes. Constantia uses natural materials simply because they are best. They do not despise technology; in fact, they use any tool or machine that will do a better or faster job.

Dealing with a material that literally comes alive in the drastic environment of central heating requires carefully engineered joinery and general practice, using the old and proven methods with the best that the 20th century has to offer. Constantia's style is unique. Every finished piece has a contribution from each of the craftsmen and together they have created a style of work that is unique in contemporary practice.

Of the 13 major pieces that they established at the first National Craft Trade Fair most were sold, and their work came to the attention of the National Gallery in Canberra and the Victorian National Gallery, as well as to that of international collectors and a very large public. These men are all full members of the International Guild of Master Craftsmen and have been featured in overseas craft publications.

Having seen the quality of their work, I would have expected that it was worthy of encouragement and pride by the State of South Australia. Indeed, it would make an excellent segment in one of the 'South Australia Great' television advertisements, or even in the new book on South Australia that the Premier is promoting. I would have expected examples of their work to be placed in art galleries and Government houses in Australia and in our embassies overseas, as an example of what is being achieved in South Australia, particularly using Australian timber. Instead, I found that this business, in which the partners have approximately \$250 000 tied up in plant and stock, has not been able to get any assistance from either the Federal or State

Governments, despite the good offices of the member for Flinders and approaches to the Premier.

In fact, they may not be able to survive much longer unless some assistance can be found. The partners have walked a tightrope over the years to keep viable, asking their families to share a frugal way of life, which necessitates the partners working an 80-hour week. Their individual take-home pay averages \$120 a week and, on one occasion when the combined take-home pay for the three families was \$80 for the week, they sought assistance from the Commonwealth, but were advised that they would first have to dissolve their partnership. The problem apparently is that they do not fit into any particular bureaucratic category for assistance. There seems to be continual buck-passing from department to department, with no-one able to decide whether they are art, craft or small business.

The advice from the Department of Trade and Industry was that they should 'swallow their pride and what appears to be an idealistic attitude and set about producing some "bread and butter" lines in order to generate a cash flow. The "bread and butter" lines need not be mass produced cheap furniture but could be simple, stylish kitchen or sun-room-type furniture for which there seems to be a ready market these days.'

This completely misses the whole point of their operation and, in any case, would only force them into competition with other manufacturers in a very competitive and precarious business. The advice given to them was to decide whether they are to be manufacturers or purely craftsmen. Surely it should be obvious that they are both.

An approach to the Department for the Arts brought the response that Constantia's particular request is not within its policy guidelines to provide financial assistance. The advice from the Premier was that Constantia should move closer to the major furniture markets in the Eastern States.

There is no shortage of orders. The problem appears to be that the weekly overheads are too high for the current production rate of the three partners. A great deal of their time is taken up in educational roles in the community in Port Lincoln, particularly in demonstrating their skills to young people. The partners have been seeking assistance so that each of the craftsmen may take on a trainee, so that they may impart their unique skills. The trainee relationship envisaged would need careful selection by the masters of suitable young people, but they have encountered the problem of having to accept whoever is allocated by the Commonwealth Employment Service in the way of apprentices.

The apprentice guidelines do not seem appropriate to the type of training that they wish to give, but it appears that assistance can only flow along these lines. The present and former Governments have spent great sums of money in support of the arts and crafts. I refer particularly to the sums of money spent at the Jam Factory with its master craftsmen scheme. Surely, some way can be found to cut red tape and provide this small amount of assistance. Although it is unlikely that there would be a great rise in production in the first two training years, it would come eventually.

Other difficulties are due to the high rate of sales tax to be paid not only on the timber but also on the finished product—up to 30 per cent in some cases. One particular problem is that the sales tax has to be paid on items which are used basically as display and on which there is no way of passing on the sales tax to the purchaser. Additionally, tariffs up to 200 per cent have to be paid on occasions on imported items such as handles, because handles are made in Australia, despite the fact that handles suitable for the furniture cannot be purchased in Australia. In conclusion, I would urge that some assistance be found quickly so that the partnership can continue and so that we in South Aus-

tralia can continue to be the home of three such unusual craftsmen. I hope that the Minister of Fisheries, who recently visited Constantia, will join the member for Flinders and me in interceding on their behalf.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): If the Minister of Agriculture was in the House at the time (and I believe he was) he would have been gratified to notice an interest I showed in a certain portion of his electorate.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: It is a very interesting electorate.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is indeed. I was speaking with my planning hat on when I asked his colleague, the Minister of Environment and Planning, a question on the withdrawal of a portion of interim development control powers from the District Council of Victor Harbor. In view of the fact that I have found the Minister's response totally unsatisfactory, I wish to make further comment in relation to this matter.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Perhaps I will be able to assist you if it's in my district.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It may well be that the Minister may be able to assist me. It is interesting to scan his colleague's words when he stated:

I would have thought (and, in fact, the correspondence that the honourable member has referred to indicates this) that this matter was purely one that was the responsibility of the State Planning Authority. It was the State Planning Authority that made the decision that responsibilities of the council under interim development control should be reduced. It will be entirely in the hands of the State Planning Authority as to when that responsibility is returned to the council. The honourable member has asked a number of questions and has referred to correspondence between the State Planning Authority and the council. It would be improper of me to comment on those communications. However, I will bring down a report for the member opposite, and—

It was at that point that my colleague, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, became technically disorderly. There was a series of interjections which are picked up in *Hansard*, the effect of which obviously was that my colleague, voicing what I was thinking, was stating that the Minister ought to be showing leadership and Ministerial responsibility in this matter. When tempers were cooled, the Minister went on to say:

The Deputy Leader has said that I as Minister should know what is happening in this case. What I am saying is that it is entirely the responsibility of the State Planning Authority, just as it was when the Opposition was in Government. Nothing has changed. It is only proper that the State Planning Authority should have that responsibility. I will seek a report from it on the matters raised, and I will give that report to the honourable member who has asked the question.

The Minister is saying that he knows virtually nothing about it. He is saying that he has no responsibility and, further, that it would be improper for him to comment on the matters which I raised in relation to my question.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Until he gets a report from the authority.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: If the Minister will be patient, he will see that the Minister obviously has advice on this matter already and has had advice before him for quite some time. First, we find that in Part V of the Planning and Development Act (which I guess has not long to run, in view of the notice of motion we received in the House this afternoon), in regard to interim development control, clause 41 (1) states:

On the recommendation of the Authority, the Governor may, from time to time, by regulation, declare that any land specified therein shall be subject to this section.

Clause 41 (4) states:

On the recommendation of the Authority, the Governor may, by subsequent regulation, declare that any land which had been previously declared to be subject to this section shall cease to be subject to this section.

There is no reference to any Minister in that, but who is the Governor? What are his powers? The Governor acts on advice from Cabinet. It is to be assumed that when a proposition concerning the Planning and Development Act is placed before Cabinet it is placed there by the Minister of Environment and Planning, not by the Minister of Agriculture (though he be the local member), not by the Minister of Industrial Affairs, not by the Premier, but by the man in the Cabinet who is supposed to be the expert on these matters, namely, the Minister of Environment and Planning. Therefore, it is a reasonable assumption that the original decision was made by the Governor, on advice from his Ministers, who in turn took advice from the Minister of Environment and Planning.

Of course, it is a long time ago; perhaps the Minister has forgotten those matters which were brought to his attention, on the basis of which he made this recommendation to his colleagues. However, the comments of one of his colleagues in public in relation to these matters are interesting, and they obviously have a bearing on all this. I invite the Minister of Agriculture to turn his mind back to about the third week of July this year when his colleague in another place, Mr Hill (the Minister of Local Government) journeyed to Victor Harbor to farewell Mr Arland—

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: With me.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I am coming to that. Also, Mr Hill was to, as it were, see the councillors back in their positions. Of course, the Minister of Agriculture was there on the spot to witness all of this.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: Did he take the helicopter this time?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: No, I do not think he did; indeed, I think he may have travelled there in a subterranean manner, because there is no reference to the Minister in this report. On the front page of the *Victor Harbor Times* of Wednesday 21 July the Minister was reported as follows:

Following Mr Arland's withdrawal, Mr Hill said the council's elected members and staff now faced the responsibility of providing good local government to the district.

The Government now expected, with confidence, that the council would be able to operate in a positive and constructive manner for the benefit of the community.

Mr Hill said he wanted to 'step aside and let the council conduct its own affairs'.

The community must maintain a deep interest in their local government—that was an essential part of the democratic process, he added.

And the following comment is the kernel of it all. This is the nub:

Mr Hill said a decision on whether to return council's planning and development powers would be made by Minister of Environment and Planning, Mr Wotton, soon after the October elections.

That refers to the October local government elections. So, there it is: a little while ago the Minister of Environment and Planning could not tell me when the controls were to be returned: he said that he had no idea, that he could give me no indication at all, that he had to go off and get advice, that in any event it really had very little at all to do with him, that it was something that went direct from the State Planning Authority to the Government. Yet, here is one of his Ministerial colleagues, in the Minister of Agriculture's electorate saying that the Minister of Environment and Planning would determine the matter, that he could not say exactly when it would be but that it would be sometime after the October elections.

The Hon. W. E. Chapman: Perhaps the Minister of Environment and Planning wanted to be precise in his answer to you.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I think it was the intention of the Minister of Environment and Planning to duck the issue, because that is entirely what has been happening. I first raised this matter because the Minister of Local Gov-

ernment, in another place, ducked the issue. Certainly, he was prepared to table certain documents which, in fact, contained pretty strong language, allegations that are pretty grave, and one would have thought that either Minister would have been prepared to make some comments in relation to this matter, because many people, in effect, have been smirched by what has been said.

A close examination of the documents makes it perfectly clear that the Ombudsman, for one, is commenting on certain actions that have been taken by certain councillors, but the general public does not know that: the general public might well be of the opinion that those councillors received bad advice, that in fact it is the officers of the Council who made mistakes or who were subject to influence or something like that.

A reading of those documents makes it clear that that is not the case and, indeed, certain councillors and their actions are mentioned. However, none of that was read into the record: the matter waited for me to ask my question in the House the other day and, in the process, read from those documents. It was not until then that anyone reading *Hansard*, including the ladies and gentlemen of the Press, had some idea of what those documents contained.

Of course, once placed on the table those documents were available for public scrutiny. As far as I could see, there had been none. Officers in another place suggested, in fact, that very few people had wanted to inspect those documents. I simply ask the Minister to be prepared to face up to his responsibilities in relation to this matter.

I have no desire to stir the pot in relation to what is happening on the South Coast. I join with the Minister of Local Government in hoping that now the intervention period is over the course for local government on the South Coast will be smooth. I am sure the Minister of Agriculture agrees with me and joins with me in that fervent wish. It is necessary that a decision be taken for the restoration of interim development control. That decision will be taken by the Minister of Environment and Planning. It does him no good to suggest that anything other than that is indeed the case.

Mr McRAE (Playford): I have just had the unpleasant duty of listening to a summary of the Federal Budget on the A.B.C. I think one can summarise the whole matter by saying that in addition to monetarism we now have monetarism fiddled with. No-one will get anywhere. It seems to me that the average wage earner, a person earning between \$4 595 and \$19 500, will gain \$6 a week provided that he does not drink or smoke, is lucky enough to avoid a visit, with all due respect to the member for Mitcham, to the chemist (because prescription costs have been drastically increased), and manages to avoid some of the other catastrophes of normal life.

In the very brief time available to me, I will deal with the question of monetarism in its correct context. There can be no doubt that an argument can be constructed which says that the answer to what I believe are the three pressing problems confronting the Australian community, and certainly confronting my electorate, is to be found in straight-out political decisions rather than economics. On the other hand, no less an authority than John Kenneth Galbraith, in a recent landmark statement to the West German weekly news magazine *Der Spiegel*, said that he could suggest an answer in economics itself. Perhaps I will deal with those answers one at a time.

In my electorate there can be no doubt that the most crushing problem is unemployment. In the electorate of Playford, adult unemployment runs well in excess of 10 per cent and juvenile unemployment runs at well over 17 per cent. Those figures are absolutely disastrous. What is more,

there can be no doubt that the inflation rate has continued to increase. Members will recall that when the Fraser Government assumed office in 1975 it made one promise which it appeared to keep until last year, that is, that it would keep inflation down. According to the theories of Milton Friedman it was, by keeping inflation down, that one could get employment up and solve some of the other problems.

What has happened is that inflation has got out of hand again. The situation is a total disaster for the average person in my electorate. We have a disaster on all fronts in relation to unemployment for both adults and juveniles. We have a disaster in relation to costs, and we have a real disaster, a mounting disaster, in relation to interest rates.

My electorate office of recent months has reached the stage where it is rapidly becoming something of a branch agency for the Housing Trust, amongst other things. I am sure my colleagues in outlying suburbs would agree that all our electorate offices are becoming branch offices for the trust and the Department for Community Welfare. We are desperately seeking answers to problems of individual constituents in an *ad hoc* manner.

I know that I am trying to cram a lot into a short space of time, and I will try to drop the pace just a little and concentrate on two approaches to this matter. The first approach is to say that economics has no answer to the sort of problem that now confronts us. Thus, one would bluntly concede that none of the policies of Keynes, Galbraith or Friedman can assist in the current situation. I am informed that Mr Alan Davidson of the *Age* in his comment on the Federal Budget said that really it was admitting, 'We cannot do anything about unemployment and we are not really going to try.' That is a fair enough summary of the situation.

The Hon. R. G. Payne: But that's after maintaining for seven years that they had the situation in hand.

Mr McRAE: Indeed, as my colleague points out, that is after maintaining that Milton Friedman had the answer: by reducing inflation the Governments he was advising would be able to get employment up and keep interest rates down. It seems to me that there are two answers. One is a purely political answer, which gets down to this: am I, as a person, willing to step aside and make room for those people who are badly disadvantaged? I can see that in tonight's Budget (and I rapidly scrawled down the figures) some relief was given to lower income earners in a fairly complex fashion and scaled over a period of months. Relief was also given to families through increasing the family allowance.

My point is this: in my view the answer to the unemployment problem does not lie in the gimmickry of a person like Friedman. The answer lies in keeping taxes up so that governments have money to spend on employment so that employment can be increased. It is about as simple as that, if one cares to put economics aside.

Some people would say—I notice the member for Mallee grins at me—that that is simplistic. Let me say that no less an authority than John Kenneth Galbraith, surely one of the three greatest economists of this century, supports exactly my view. In his comments to *Der Spiegel*, he states:

I believe I am in a luckier situation than my colleague Friedman. My name is mentioned in relation with the past, but with a past that was successful. He stands, on the contrary, for an unsuccessful present.

Milton Friedman's theory, monetarism, bases the management of our complex modern economy on a single tool: monetary policy. And this works, as we already have been able to see on a number of occasions, for example, in Chile, Britain and now in the United States, only at the cost of higher unemployment and unused capacity.

My point is that the whole thrust of monetarism and Milton Friedman's style of economics is to tax the poor to pay for the rich, and that is precisely what is happening and has been happening in this country over the past seven years.

The income equalisation schemes for which the Whitlam Government worked have been destroyed and in their place we have had a series of manoeuvres softened, I will grant, from time to time by some measures such as those to which I have referred in tonight's Budget.

However, on the whole, we have had a situation where, more and more, the poor have been taxed to pay for the rich. Let me conclude by saying that there is a limit to the patience of human beings. You, Sir, I know believe in human dignity, and so do I. I believe that every man has a right to a job. I also believe that only the tiniest minority of the community does not want the opportunity to work. Everyone wants to work to fulfil himself or herself and I believe that, if we cannot work towards this objective in Australia, we are calling upon ourselves a disaster.

The Acting DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE (Mitchell): I want to bring to the attention of the House an area in which I believe that the Minister of Mines and Energy has been derelict in his duty as a Minister and has been in conflict with a law of the State in an Act that has been passed by both this House and the Legislative Council. The Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act of 1981 sets out certain procedures that are supposed to apply in relation to what must take place with respect to entry upon the lands that have been dedicated to the Anangu Pitjantjatjaraku. In particular, it specifically sets out arrangements that relate to mining activity on those lands.

In recent days the Minister of Mines and Energy has made statements in the press about the matter, which is the subject of negotiation between Hematite, a subsidiary of B.H.P., and the Pitjantjatjara Council. The Minister has been on public record in the press and in other forms of the media as saying that, in his view, certain alleged claims by the Pitjantjatjara people are far too excessive and not in accordance with what was envisaged in the Act. I ask members to note that the wording that the Minister used was 'as envisaged in the Act'. He has been at some pains to try to put the Pitjantjatjara people in a very poor light on a matter concerning—

Mr Lewis: No, that's Toyne you're talking about, not the Pitjantjatjara tribe.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The member for Mallee has little direct knowledge of these matters. I think even he would be prepared to agree that I have had some association with this kind of matter over quite a long period. If he will only be patient, I will put to him, based solely on legislation that he supported in this House, the actions of the Minister, and I will ask the honourable member whether the Minister is justified in taking those actions.

Section 24 applies to payments made or to be made or to consideration given or to be given in respect of entry and the carrying out of mining operations on the Pitjantjatjara lands, not being a royalty payment. A separate provision in the Act deals with royalty, and we do not need to concern ourselves with that tonight. We are talking about section 24 of the Act, which sets out the procedure for the very matter on which the Minister has been so vocal.

Mr Lewis: No, that is mining, and we are talking about exploration.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member for Mallee, once again, is exhibiting his ignorance, impatience and complete lack of understanding of this matter. I hope that, if he listens further, he understands the point being made because it is based entirely on the Act. The wording of the Act is:

In respect of the carrying out or proposed carrying out of mining operations on the land.

Those are the words that the member used in his ignorance and impatience to defend the Minister, who he knows is wrong in this matter, because the first step in a matter such as this is to refer to the meaning of the term that we have just been discussing.

What does the Act say about the definition of 'mining operations'? I invite the honourable member who has suddenly become silent to listen a little further. It states that 'mining operations' means operations authorised by or under the Mining Act, 1971-1978 or the Petroleum Act, 1940-1978. Authorised under those two Acts is the definition of mining operations upon the land. The definition in the Mining Act (and a similar one exists in the Petroleum Act) reads:

... means all operations carried on in the course of—
is the honourable member listening now—
prospecting or mining for minerals.

An honourable member: They are not prospecting.

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The honourable member has suddenly gone silent, because he was so keen to show that the Minister had a case based on the fact that they were not actually mining. However, the Act clearly takes into account that more than one activity comes under the definition of 'mining operations', and it specifies the Acts to which we should all go (and there are two—mining or petroleum), and there is the definition. I invite the honourable member to go to the shelves and read, for the first time, this definition. He may then not wish to take the matter further.

If we examine the Act further, why on earth is the Minister saying anything? The Act states, as it ought to state, sensibly in the beginning, that the question that we have just been discussing is a matter for the proponents, the Pitjantjatjara people and a group that approaches them. The Act states that, if they cannot agree, and therefore the Pitjantjatjara Anangu do not issue permission under the Act, the applicant may go to the Minister and ask him to call for arbitration in the matter.

Why is not the Minister following the steps laid down in the Act that he proudly says was one of his crowning achievements in this place? I ask honourable members to consider that. Clearly, it is because he knows that if the matter went to arbitration an arbitrator might well find in favour of the Pitjantjatjara people.

That leads to the second interesting conundrum, as far as I am concerned, in this matter. Where is the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs in this whole scene? The Minister is charged with looking after, standing up for and assisting the welfare of the Aboriginal people of this State, included amongst whom are the Pitjantjatjara Anangu, surely. The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs has not said one word on this whole matter. One would have thought that he would have had consultations with the Minister of Mines and Energy on this matter and reminded him that, although the Minister of Mines and Energy might believe that his responsibility is to the miners, prospectors, or call them what you will, there is more than one side to the question. Yet there has been a deafening silence from the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs on this matter.

An honourable member: How many more have you got?

The Hon. R. G. PAYNE: The Minister has just asked me a question. I ask the Minister why he is not saying in Cabinet to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, 'Well, come on; why aren't you standing up for the Aboriginal people in this matter?' I understand the Minister of Mines and Energy. He claims that it is his job to get on with mining and not to worry about the Aboriginal people, but that is a direct charter of the Minister concerned: the welfare of the Aboriginal people.

As I have demonstrated from a simple reading of the Act, the Minister of Mines and Energy, at the very least, is in error in his determination of the matter. He is not following the steps laid down in the Act that he asked this House to accept when the Bill was passed. If ever a Minister could be said to be in dereliction of his duty, surely that is the case in relation to one of his own Acts, which he was instrumental in putting through this House and which set out simple straight-forward steps. However, when the Minister is given the opportunity to act under that charter, he is not adhering to the very thing which he put to the House and which he asked us to support and pass. It is unfortunate that I do not have more time tonight. You, Sir, may disagree because, as Acting Deputy Speaker, that would be your prerogative. However, I want that drawn to the Minister's attention.

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

The Hon. D. C. BROWN (Minister of Industrial Affairs): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I would like to use my time in this grievance debate to speak on the international airport. I support what has been said by the member for Morphett concerning the curfew. I also urge the Minister of Transport to ensure that it is not extended in any way. There are enough infringements at present that should not be occurring.

I do not claim to be an expert on aircraft, but the information that I am using has been supplied by the Secretary of the Airport Anti-Noise Association, Mr Nick Burrowes. I think it has generally been agreed by members of both the Liberal Party and the Labor Party that he is somewhat of an authority on aircraft and international airports. My submission to the Public Works Standing Committee last year concerned mainly the safety of children attending schools in my electorate that are on the flight path of aircraft coming in to land at the airport. My submissions were also made on behalf of constituents living on the flight path close to the airport.

I have asked several questions in the House concerning safety aspects, although I must say that I was very disappointed with some of the answers that I received from the Minister of Education. I have also spoken to a colleague of mine, the shadow Minister of Education, who has just brought to my attention the time that it takes to get an answer from the Minister of Education on questions relating to the Department of Transport. My colleague asked the following question on 1 December 1981. The Question on Notice asked of the Minister of Education was this:

Has the information indicated in answer to Question on Notice No. 256, tabled in Parliament on 1 December 1981, on the matter of the reduction of the impact of aircraft noise on schools, yet been received from the Commonwealth Department of Transport and, if so, what 'reasonable and practicable steps for providing a solution' have been implemented?

The answer to that question, dated 17 August 1982, which has just been received by my colleague, is as follows:

The Commonwealth Department of Transport has provided the following information in relation to aircraft noise. There is a considerable difference between the noise of landing aircraft and the noise from those which are taking off. The noise on take-off is much more than the noise on landing.

In a one-year period, there were more than five times the number of aircraft coming in to land on flight paths above schools than taking off on such flight paths. New aircraft being acquired are much quieter than those which have been in service for some years. Both major airlines have introduced or will be introducing new aircraft in the new future.

I am concerned about the delay in providing this information. Surely the answer could have been supplied earlier; from 1 December 1981 to 15 August 1982 is a long time when one is asking a question about the safety of children attending schools.

A question asked by the shadow Minister of Transport of the Minister of Transport in December last year about whether a fully-laden 747B would be able to take off, received the following reply:

No, not with a full fuel load... A fully laden 747, as far as fuel is concerned, will not be able to take off from Adelaide airport, but a fully laden 747 S.P., special purpose jet, will be able to do so. As negotiations continue with the airlines to see which airlines will be interested in coming to Adelaide...

I know that this question and the answer were in *Hansard* last December, but I read them out because I am concerned about the safety of constituents and school children living in close proximity to the airport. I see now that apparently Qantas has an idea that is different from that of the Minister of Transport. A report in the *Advertiser* of 29 May states:

Qantas expects to carry an average of more than 650 passengers a week on its Adelaide flights. It expects to average 270 passengers on the non-stop trips to Auckland, and up to 400 on its two non-stop flights to Singapore... It had been thought that Qantas would use its smaller Boeing 747SP on the trans-Tasman route, but the airline has decided to use its 433-passenger 747B on all Adelaide flights.

This concerns me because information that I have before me, supplied by Nick Burrowes, is that for a 747SP short take-off version, the take-off distance is 7 000 feet or 2 132 metres. Mr Burrowes goes on to say that a 747-238B quoted by Qantas has a standard take-off distance of 10 350 feet or 3 150 metres.

Further, it goes on to say that a B747 42-tonne passenger aircraft with 18 tonnes of freight used for topping up, when carrying a full passenger load, will not carry freight with the short runway, at Adelaide Airport which is 8 300 feet in length (2 528 metres). It concerns me that someone is not telling the truth. I do not believe that our Minister of Transport, the Hon. Michael Wilson, would be telling untruths, but I would like him to sort out with the Federal Minister for Transport what are the facts and what planes will land at Adelaide international airport when it becomes operative. Who is telling the truth? What size loads will be taken? Many different statements have been made in the press. I could quote further statements, but I do not have the time.

I refer also to the new site for the terminal recommended by the committee Chairman, Mr Bunde. He recommended that the new site should be shifted, so that it would then be more than 600 metres from the nearest house instead of 350 metres, as in the plan drawn up by the Department of Housing and Construction. The report goes on to state that the noise for these people would be greatly reduced.

I refer now to the evidence given at the second hearing in Adelaide by the member for Adelaide and also the member for Hanson, who made it clear that they thought the committee was virtually a joke. I have read what happened concerning that change of site and the recommendation by Mr Bunde, who was easily gagged by the Federal Liberal Government. It also gagged two A.L.P. members—Ralph Jacobi and Johnnie Scott, the member for Hindmarsh. They could not speak on the matter. It was then decided that they should go ahead with the original plan without any worries about safety or about keeping the noise down.

If I had more time I would tell people what the Premier thought about it. It is interesting to see what he thought about not changing the site. He was not caring a great deal about the people there because he does not live there; he lives about 15 miles on the other side of Adelaide and could not care less about the people who live on the flight path.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): Thank you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker.

Mr Lewis: Do you belong to the Labor Party?

Mr PETERSON: That is an interesting way to start the debate. I realise that interjections are out of order. I do not. I was a member at one stage, despite all the rumors to the contrary. I put in an application to rejoin, but it was rejected, so at the moment I am not. Time has a funny way of changing attitudes: yes, I was; yes, I did apply; and no, I am not. Who knows what the future will bring?

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Semaphore has the call.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir; I need your protection, as tonight the troops are certainly stirred after some of the vigorous debates we have heard this evening. It is nice to see that everyone is alert. Tonight I want to raise a matter about which I have communicated with the Minister of Recreation and Sport and on which I received an answer. I refer to the matter of seating in T.A.B. agencies. As a result of the change in the method of making T.A.B. pay-outs, involving after-race pay-outs, many more people are now spending more time in T.A.B. agencies waiting for race results and for reinvesting dividends.

Mr Slater: Why didn't you talk to me about it?

Mr PETERSON: Perhaps I shall give the shadow Minister the copies of the letters I have received. Correspondence to the Minister originally related to the provision of seats in T.A.B. agencies. On 22 July, I received a reply from the Minister of Recreation and Sport, wherein he stated:

Further to my letter of 18 February 1982 regarding seating arrangements in T.A.B. agencies, I am pleased to advise that the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board has now reviewed this matter in conjunction with other matters relative to race pay-out and it was resolved that seating will be provided where space permits and a genuine customer need can be established. Should you wish to nominate any particular outlets where problems exist, the board will be pleased to investigate the situation.

Working upon that premise that I should investigate the matter and notify the Minister of the needs that exist (and there are three outlets in my electorate), I wrote to the General Manager of the Totalizator Agency Board as follows:

Enclosed are copies of letters related to the matter of seating in T.A.B. agencies.

Included in those letters was the Minister's letter inviting me to let him know where seating is required. My letter continued:

For me to fully assess the need for seating in the agencies in my electorate, that is, Semaphore, Largs Bay and Taperoo, I seek your permission to place a notice in these premises requesting your patrons to inform me whether they consider seating is needed at each agency.

I thought that this was a logical way to continue this matter. Although I am not a patron of T.A.B. agencies, and do not enjoy that involvement in backing horses, I do not hold it against anyone else. I felt that my suggestion was the only way by which I could assess whether the patrons of those T.A.B. agencies need seating. However, I received a letter back from Mr B. F. Smith, General Manager of the Totalizator Agency Board, which stated:

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 4 August 1982 in which you seek permission to ascertain seating requirements in T.A.B. agencies in your electorate. As it is considered that it is the responsibility of the South Australian T.A.B. to determine the necessity for seating in agencies, at the present time our field operations staff are monitoring requirements; therefore, it is unnecessary for you to place notices in the agencies in your electorate.

I find that a little odd. I do not know how the board's officers will assess the need, as surely it is the prerogative

of the customers who use the agencies to register a need if they feel that seating is required. As the board has accepted that seating is needed, I believe that it should be the customer's right to inform the agency that it is needed, and the agency can then assess that need. The pay-out policy has changed, and seating should be provided where it is needed. The only people who really know where it is needed are the patrons. This applies particularly to my electorate, because many of its constituents are older people, who like to rest their legs after they have been walking or standing about for a while. A sincere assessment should be made of this situation.

I realise that time is slipping away, but I would like to make a couple of other points. The first relates to home loans. The Premier spoke, I think today, about the great things that are being done for people who have problems with their home loan repayments. All members of this House have had people attend at their offices and register problems in relation to home loans. I do not believe the problem strongly registered with me until a man who I know is in what I consider to be a well paid job came to me and said that he could not support his home loan any longer, that he must move out of his home and buy cheaper premises so that he can support his children, educate, feed and clothe them and do these sorts of things for his children.

I believe the issue of home loan interest rates is enough to defeat this Government at the next State election, because the present Government has done nothing at all to solve the problem. I believe it is a very important issue for the people of this State. When a man who has what I would call professional status cannot successfully cater for his home loan commitments and must move out of his home into another home and re-establish his family there is something wrong with the system. I will go no further than that because time is running out.

Mr Lewis: You should be writing to the Federal Government about that.

Mr PETERSON: I think there are resources available to State Governments to do something about the problem; for example, the Premier has already told building societies that they cannot increase their interest rates. That has been done. I have only a little time left so I will now move on to tourism, which has been discussed at length in this State. One point was made to me the other day when I was discussing the Fort Glanville set-up with a gentleman.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: A magnificent set-up.

Mr PETERSON: The Minister is here, magnificent! While the Minister is here I will expand on that situation.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: You have two minutes.

Mr PETERSON: I know, I will speak quickly. Fort Glanville has been developed and it is a unique project. It is a unique building with a unique set-up. It has the capacity to be a unique tourist feature.

Mr Slater: If a casino—

Mr PETERSON: I do not think there will be a casino there. One of its problems is that the internal courtyard area is too small for a significant show. In discussions, people from the Woodville council offered to develop the area between Fort Glanville and Military Road as a quadrangle. They also offered to provide men and machinery to develop that area.

I draw to the Minister's attention the fact that they wish to do this. I would like him to take it up as a project to see what can be done to make it happen. It will be the difference between Fort Glanville being a mediocre project and what I believe could be a truly significant tourist feature. If that area can be developed through some co-operation between the Government and the local council (and it is quite willing to do it), I believe everyone will benefit. The Government will benefit, because it will not have to spend as much to

get it done, and the council will benefit because it will have a greater tourist feature in its area.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Russack): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I will use my time to relate to this House some of the statistics that were provided to me today in relation to private rental and the problems of emergency housing that apply in my area. The statistics supplied to me indicate that single parent access to the private rental market requires that they pay, according to average rents for the whole of the metropolitan area, \$93 for a house and \$64 for a flat.

This article goes on to point out that rents have increased 30 per cent in the past year and that real estate agents estimate that there will be a further 30 per cent increase this year. However, and this is the crunch, they acknowledge that people just cannot afford to pay that amount.

The real estate agents further say that seasonally we have gone through the slowest part of the year and that rents will begin to increase again in about September, which is only one month away. This matter concerns me because of the amount of money that single and sole parents receive from the Department of Social Security. This was highlighted to me only last week when I spoke to a number of business people in my area who told me that they had to tighten up on the amount of credit they were providing to their customers.

These small business people, because of increasing interest rates and the like, have found that they cannot carry these people on credit. I am told that in many cases the people who are owing money to these business people are paying for the previous week's food. Generally, these are disadvantaged people within my constituency. Another example of how these disadvantaged people are being affected was shown only last week when I highlighted the problems that I have seen in my electorate concerning single-parent families and sole parents in particular. It is these people who are battling to try and get their head above water. It is these people to whom I have spoken; I found that, in the case of a sole parent, a woman was crying because her child was continually wanting to go out to various functions and she could not go out.

One woman in particular related to me that she had not been out socially for three years. I find that most disturbing, to say the least. In regard to information received about the housing position in the Woodville area, I am told that the Woodville Information Service in the last quarter averaged 56 to 75 calls a month in relation to housing. Of course, this did not include referrals to the emergency housing organisation.

A profile of six months of Woodville housing indicates that during that period under review 128 households sought housing assistance: 44 per cent were single parents, 29 per cent were singles, 19 per cent were couples with children, and 8 per cent were couples without children. Most households were in receipt of benefits. Also, 45 per cent received income between \$51 and \$100 a week, and 46 per cent were single parents with up to two children. While 52 per cent were unemployed single people, probably receiving the over 18 years rate of benefit of \$58.10, 35 per cent of these people received between \$101 and \$150, and 53 per cent in this bracket were single parents with between three and four children.

I do not know how they survive on that amount. I am amazed at how they cope, pay their rent, provide clothing, footwear, food, and if they are lucky enough, perhaps have some entertainment now and again. The lowest income group were paying almost half their income in rent; that is supporting parents with up to two children and receiving

between \$80.15 and \$98.15 per week were often paying between \$35 and \$50 a week in rent. These rent levels represent the lower end of the rental scale. Current metropolitan rents for flats and houses are between \$45 and \$55 per week for flats and for houses between \$65 and \$85.

Public housing as secure and affordable accommodation is a long way off for those sufficiently informed to apply for it, and these are the ones that many of my colleagues on this side have attempted to bring to the attention of the Government. However, like many other colleagues on this side, last week I was absolutely appalled at the comments made by the Minister of Agriculture when the member for Napier was speaking about the disadvantaged in the community. As has been said, this typifies the attitude of many members opposite.

Regarding another issue that I have raised previously, the question of motorcycle licences for those persons wishing to obtain their first motorcycle, and the matter of class 4A licences, I raised the matter of retailers providing motorcycles above 250 cc without sighting a licence from the purchaser indicating that he was in possession of such a licence. The Minister was kind enough to provide me with an answer and he states in paragraph 4 of the reply I have received today that he contacted the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce, seeking its co-operation in circularising its members to at least advise their customers of the need to hold a particular class of licence, dependent upon the cubic capacity of the motorcycle that the customer wishes to purchase.

I believe that the matter should go a lot further and that it should be compulsory for these retailers to make sure that those persons who are obtaining a larger motorcycle than 250 cc are in possession of a current licence and that they are the persons named on the licence when they attempt to purchase such a motorcycle. It is too late afterwards. I pointed out in this House recently that some youths had purchased motorcycles larger than 250 cc and one had a serious accident that involved considerable expense for his parents.

The other issue that I find somewhat amazing is the question of the bus card anomaly being dropped. I wrote to the Minister of Transport on 3 May, pointing out the need for free travel for a constituent's daughter who was under 16 years of age. The response from the Minister was, in part, that it was suggested that my client's daughter contact her local Department of Social Security office to determine whether it could assist in any way.

It was rather remarkable when I found that the Minister of Community Welfare, on 9 August, had made a public announcement that this bus card anomaly had been dropped. Clearly, I would have expected some response from the Government that it intended to do this, rather than try to make political capital out of the matter without advising my constituent accordingly.

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): The matter I wish to raise tonight relates to a traffic problem at the southernmost end of my electorate in the Marion area immediately adjacent to Westminster College and Marion Primary School. This problem was first brought to my attention in April of last year by residents living in the vicinity of Alison Avenue and Jacob Street, Marion. They approached me to express concern about the traffic hazards existing in that particular area, as there have been several accidents of varying degrees of severity around this location. Following those representations from my constituents, I wrote to the Marion Council in support of the majority of the submission put to me by my constituents, but without success. The Marion Council was unable to agree with the particular solution to this problem proposed by the residents. I understand that the residents also contacted the Minister of Transport and other

local groups regarding their letter of submission, which listed some of the following hazards in that area.

First, Alison Avenue is a particularly narrow street not designed to carry the large volume of traffic it is required to carry. It is required to carry large volumes of traffic because of the number of parents who take their children to Westminster College and Marion Primary School by car and who prefer to use Alison Avenue as a short cut when coming from the south. Secondly, the bend in Alison Avenue near Oakleigh Road is very dangerous as cars swing around the bend at a very fast speed, and generally on the wrong side of the road. By the time they reach the bend they have picked up speed from travelling along the straight stretch.

It was also pointed out that it is particularly difficult for residents who live on the bend in Alison Avenue to safely reverse their cars on to the street as there are several blind-spots which restrict their view of northbound traffic. Residents point out that, if cars are parked along Alison Avenue, particularly in the southern area referred to, there is hardly any room for cars to travel in the opposite direction. The fifth point made in the letter is that many children cycle and walk along Alison Avenue, particularly during peak periods for vehicular traffic. The letter continues:

(6) The majority of Westminster School traffic comes from the southern suburbs and Alison Avenue is used as an entry and exit route morning and night.

(7) A large proportion of students attending Westminster School are driven to school by car. The number of students attending Westminster School has steadily increased over the past few years.

(8) Cars driven along Alison Avenue are generally driven at a speed which would be considered dangerous (no speed restrictions exist apart from those directly in front of Westminster School).

(9) The volume of traffic increases markedly on wet days, further endangering the lives of children walking and riding their bikes along Alison Avenue.

(10) Residents in the southern end of Alison Avenue live in continuous fear of cars careering out of control around the bend injuring their children or damaging their properties. We would point out that, while there have not necessarily been many reports to police of problems in Alison Avenue, residents have had cars careering up their front lawns, hitting guttering and swerving across the road, hitting head on into trees, racing other cars along the 'drag strip' and numerous other 'near-miss' incidents involving both children and cars. We suggest you confirm these claims with residents in the area.

They then suggested various possibilities for closure in that letter. However, the closures that they suggested were not accepted by the council, for various reasons. The comment made by residents after their suggestions were not accepted by the council was along the lines that: 'This is a typical traffic hazard situation about which nothing will be done until someone is actually killed.' I am sure we have all heard that comment made at one time or another about particular intersections.

At 8.30 last Sunday morning I was telephoned by a constituent, David Rusk, one of the people who had originally brought this problem to my attention. He informed me that at 3.30 Sunday morning there had been a car accident on a nearby corner and that the vehicle, after getting completely out of control, ended up on the Billingham property on the corner of Oakleigh Road and Alison Avenue.

The accident had disastrous results for the five young people in the car—the driver was killed outright and the four passengers were injured, two of them with most shocking injuries. The vehicle nearly killed some of the residents of the Billingham home because, had it not been for a very solid gum tree, the vehicle would have plummeted through the wall of that home.

I went to the scene of the accident about 10 o'clock Sunday morning. Many concerned residents had gathered there, along with a couple of councillors from the Marion council. We proceeded to discuss this horrifying accident to see whether there was some way in which a recurrence could be prevented. We tried to find some solution which would

not excessively inconvenience some of the people who might like to use that street as a thoroughfare.

Part of the difficulty lies in the fact that Alison Avenue is a fairly long, straight stretch for most of its length, but at the southern end where the street passes through a particularly pleasant part of the suburb, with tree-lined streets and some very nice houses without fences and with lawns going right down to the edge, the road becomes a couple of S bends. As a result, at locations such as this you get the sort of accidents you do not tend to get in some of the older suburbs that have the streets laid out in a rectilinear grid pattern. Because of these nice S bends, it is tempting to drivers to build up speed on the stretch and test their skill on the S bends, and this is what one assumes happened at 3.30 on Sunday morning with these five young people in the Valiant Charger. Some members may have noticed the rather brief report in the press relating to this accident. However, it would not surprise me if they did not notice the report, because dreadful accidents of this nature are now so common that they normally rate only a paragraph or two unless they are of the most spectacular kind.

Some sort of traffic control is obviously needed in the area because of the long stretch with the tempting S bends at the end. Residents have come up with an alternative suggestion which would block off Alison Avenue further north than was proposed in the original submission that went to the council. That submission was rejected by council because it would have caused some inconvenience to people wishing to use Alison Avenue as a thoroughfare. The suggestion made on Sunday was that the road should be closed a little farther north adjacent to Marion Primary School. This would have additional benefits for the safety of the children attending that school. There have been several near accidents because of children running from the playground to chase footballs and soccer balls and the like, and diving out into the road because there is no fence around the school. Anyone visiting the school will see that, because of the aesthetics of the environment there, it would probably not be desirable to erect a fence.

A public meeting will be held soon at the Marion Primary School to see whether that proposal is acceptable to most of the residents in the area. The proposal seems to present the minimum amount of inconvenience with the maximum amount of safety for the children and residents of the area. If it is acceptable, we will present it to the Marion council and to the Minister of Education. The proposal may well require the Minister of Education to purchase a small section of that road and convert it to a grassed area for the benefit of the school, at the same time blocking off Alison Avenue as a major thoroughfare.

I mention the matter in this forum so that the Minister can receive prior notification of the desire of a large number of residents in the area, and in the hope that he will view their request favourably, so that a loss of life such as that which occurred at 3.30 on Sunday morning will not occur again.

The Hon J. D. WRIGHT (Adelaide): My remarks will be directed to the Minister of Education in the 10 minutes I have allowed to me, and concern the provision of school aid for children who travel by bus to special schools. My attention was drawn to this problem in November 1980 when I received a letter from the Chairman of the Ashford Special School in which he requested that I seek from the Minister of Education special assistance for handicapped children travelling to that special school. In that letter he highlighted several problems in relation to what the school thought was necessary in relation to providing assistance of this nature on some buses and in some special cases. The gentleman who wrote to me on that occasion was Mr G. Clarke, who said:

We are concerned as a school council about the safety of our children travelling on transport to and from school daily. Some of the children have severe behavioural disabilities which cause concern for the safety of themselves and other children. On a particular bus this has taken the form of loud and continuous screaming, biting, kicking and throwing of projectiles at the driver by one student.

Five other children in the bus are epileptic, with one student recently returned to school from hospital with a fractured vertebrae as a result of falling during a seizure in the playground. The concentration of the driver—

and I suppose this is a reality of the situation; it is a matter on which I want to concentrate tonight—

is severely disrupted due to the above disturbances which in turn could lead to a serious accident.

In March of the following year (and I wrote to the Minister in November), I received a letter from the Minister which, in part, states:

At present it is not possible to allocate additional supervisory staff at a time when we are providing a greater range of educational services to handicapped children and also more generous transport assistance than ever before.

I do know whether that is a fact or not; I have not checked it. The letter continues:

In extreme cases it may be necessary to withdraw a service in the interests of the safety of other children but we have not yet contemplated such action.

I am not contemplating such action, either, but the action I am contemplating is for the Government to give serious consideration to providing aid, if not in all cases, certainly in those cases where serious problems are occurring.

I represent a constituent who is the proprietor of Roller Coaster Tours. This constituent's name is Mr Sullivan and he is responsible for the transport of children on the Magill Special School run No. 1. He came to me only yesterday with a report from his driver. I will read from this report as it is absolutely essential that the Minister knows the full facts of what is happening on that run. That report states:

On a June morning of this year a potentially dangerous situation arose. I was travelling behind a slow moving truck on the hill between Uraidla and the Summertown police station. We were moving through thick fog patches and drizzle. Visibility was down to about 40 yards. In the rear view mirror I noticed a car close behind me. Suddenly a fast moving vehicle appeared and commenced to overtake.

The speed this vehicle was travelling at gave me the impression it was going to overtake the three of us. At the same time I saw the lights of a semi-trailer approaching from ahead. I believed a head-on smash was inevitable between the semi-trailer and the overtaking vehicle. Suddenly, without warning and at this critical period of concentration, one of the boys screamed out at the top of his voice, 'Dave, Dave!' Thinking that one of the children had injured himself or was having some kind of attack, I shouted back to ascertain what was wrong. He yelled back, 'Andrew swore.'

This had apparently sent the lads into that state. The report goes on to refer to the following incidents:

2. One of the teenage boys, whilst getting off the bus in Albert Street, Magill, suddenly grasped the tops of two seats, raised himself and lashed out repeatedly with both feet, hitting another lad in the stomach.

3. In June of this year, whilst travelling through heavy traffic along Magill Road, a girl attacked and beat up two of the primary school children. I had to stop the bus and separate her from the others.

4. Fourthly, also in June of this year. We were travelling downhill on the steep, winding section of road between Carey Gully and Balhannah, when one of the girls got out of her seat and fell into the step well. She was only shaken, but due to the nature of the road in this vicinity, I could do nothing to assist until we had travelled a further half a kilometre. I then reached a safe area where I stopped.

5. On 13 June, two injectors failed whilst travelling through Lobethal. I had to leave the bus unattended, with one child on board, to summon assistance.

6. On 30 June, Kensington Special School staff kept the students back late. They were all upset at this change in routine and one girl became hysterical whilst we were climbing the Old Norton Summit Road. The other children became unmanageable and I had to stop the bus and calm them down by talking to them one by one.

7. On 6 July we had a puncture in Murray Street, Magill. One child was frightened because, to him, something strange was happening. Another became hysterical and soon the whole bus was in uproar.

The driver goes on to refer to another six or seven incidents. In fact, he goes right up to incident No. 12, citing examples where children on this bus became quite hysterical and out of control, except in the circumstances where, for two days a week, one of the schools happened to be providing the services of a school aide. I have been informed today that that school aide has also been withdrawn. That lady was there to look after only two of the children that came from that school. Being the kind of person she obviously is, she took it on herself to maintain the good conduct of all the children on the bus.

It has been pointed out to me by both the owner and the driver that, unless something is done, a driver will experience trouble. He is referring only to his own case, but I am referring to circumstances generally applying, because I understand that certainly there is no direct Government policy in regard to supplying school aid to these types of children.

The driver has influenced me to believe, as has the owner of the bus run, that unless something is done and some care is taken and responsibility accepted by the Government in these circumstances, quite clearly some day a driver will run into some trouble. There will be an accident. Unfortunately, children will be injured, as will the driver, and we will all say, 'We are sorry about that'. I have tried to check this matter today but I have not been able to check it thoroughly. I have tried to check what is happening in other States, and I am told that provision is made in other States. In New South Wales, Victoria, West Australia and other States in the Commonwealth of this nation they are able to provide such services and safety for the children, and allow the driver to do the job that he is paid to do, namely, to drive the children. It is not the driver's job to maintain the good order of the children as well.

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

Motion carried.

Bill taken through its remaining stages.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 18 August 1982 at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17 August 1982

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

SALISBURY HIGHWAY INTERSECTION

41. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: What plans are in process for redevelopment on the intersection of Salisbury Highway with Park Terrace and Waterloo Corner Road, when is it anticipated such plans will be put into effect, and what encumbrances exist on surrounding properties as a result of such plans?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Metropolitan Adelaide Road Widening Plan contains provision for the possible widening of the intersection at some time in the future. In this regard, consent of the Commissioner of Highways must be obtained to proposed building work on properties abutting the intersecting roads if the work is proposed to take place on or within 6 metres of the widening strip indicated on that plan.

MUNNO PARA PRIMARY SCHOOL

44. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the estimated cost to build according to the plans as currently envisaged for the solid construction of Munno Para Primary School?

2. What do those plans envisage the solid construction as consisting of?

3. When and in what stages is it proposed to undertake construction?

4. What facilities will be involved in each stage of the construction?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. A solid construction multi-purpose activity hall including a canteen, changerooms and store is currently under construction at the school at the estimated escalated cost of \$225 000. A complete cost estimate for the replacement of the remainder of Munno Para Primary School is not available at this time. Detailed planning has not yet been finalised.

2. Generally, planning for redevelopment anticipates that the existing temporary accommodation would be replaced in appropriate stages by a solid administration/staff area, resource centre and classrooms to an extent which would meet the estimated stable enrolment of the school. Precise planning details are not available at this time.

3. It is hoped that the redevelopment might commence in the 1984-85 financial year.

4. No firm decisions have yet been made at this stage in planning.

COORARA PRIMARY SCHOOL

45. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the estimated cost to build according to the plans as currently envisaged for the solid construction of Coorara Primary School?

2. What do those plans envisage the solid construction as consisting of?

3. When and in what stages is it proposed to undertake construction?

4. What facilities will be involved in each stage of the construction?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The estimated cost as at July 1982 to build a solid structure replacement school for the Coorara Primary School Holding School is \$2 175 000.

2. The eventual solid structure replacement for the Coorara Primary School is planned to include an administration block, library resource centre, canteen and 14 classrooms with their associated facilities. The activity hall is planned to be a concurrent development with the provisions in solid structure previously listed.

3. A programme does not currently exist for the staged redevelopment of the Coorara Primary School.

4. Staged redevelopment will be considered when funds can be made available.

MOANA PRIMARY SCHOOL

46. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What is the estimated cost to build according to the plans as currently envisaged for the solid construction of Moana Primary School?

2. What do those plans envisage the solid construction as consisting of?

3. When and in what stages is it proposed to undertake construction?

4. What facilities will be involved in each stage of the construction?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The provisional allocation to build a solid construction school at Moana for 450 students is \$2 240 000 as at July 1982.

2. The proposed solid construction school includes an administration block, library resource centre, canteen and 16 class spaces with associated facilities. The activity hall would be built simultaneously, but funded under the Capital Works Assistance Scheme.

3. The stages to be undertaken will depend on a review of expected enrolments, the priority of work on a state-wide basis and funds available at the time.

4. This aspect of the Moana Primary School redevelopment has not yet been decided.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOLS

49. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. Are any plans under way to provide for the estimated expansion in the student population in the Surrey Downs and surrounding areas and, if so, what, when and in what stages will such plans be implemented and at what estimated cost?

2. If no plans are under way, why not and what consideration will be given to alleviating the overcrowding that would result at the Heights School in that event?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. There are no present plans to provide new schools at Surrey Downs or nearby areas. Significant urban growth may occur in the Golden Grove Development Area, west of Surrey Downs and to the north of Modbury Heights. In anticipation of this, a site for a new primary school has been identified in this area. Further primary or secondary schools will be provided as needed.

2. According to Departmental projections, no significant increase in enrolments is anticipated to occur in the Surrey Downs area. Total enrolments at Surrey Downs Primary School peaked at 591 in 1979 and have since declined to 557 in (July) 1982. Other primary schools near Surrey Downs

are Banksia Park Primary School and Junior Primary School and Fairview Park Primary School, all of which have lost students in recent years. Enrolments at Redwood Park Primary School, further to the south, are rising, but at a much slower rate than originally anticipated. The designated capacity of this school is 560. At current reduced class sizes of 28 (primary) and 25 (junior primary) the capacity is 458. The temporary use of school buildings by the Redwood Park Child/Parent Centre has reduced this to 380.

PRINTING BUDGET

57. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: What has been the printing budget for each of the past five years of the Publications Sections of the Education Department and the Technical and Further Education Department, respectively?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:
Education Department

Printing and Stationery	Publications \$	\$
1977-78	886 375	N/A
1978-79	887 282	N/A
1979-80	949 930	N/A
1980-81	486 746	426 050
1981-82	470 400	513 870

Department of Technical and Further Education

	Publications/ Printing \$
1977-78	104 000
1978-79	105 000
1979-80	126 000
1980-81	82 000
1981-82	92 000

HARMFUL SUBSTANCES

59. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Health: What controls exist to protect employees and the general public, respectively, from harmful exposure to the following substances:

- (a) 2-acetylaminofluorene (2-AAF);
- (b) 4-aminodiphenyl (4-ADP);
- (c) Benzidine;
- (d) Bis(chloromethyl)ether (BCME);
- (e) 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine (DCB);
- (f) 4-Dimethylaminoazobenzene (Methyl Yellow);
- (g) beta-Naphthylamine (2-NA);
- (h) 4-Nitrobiphenyl (4-NBP);
- (i) N-Nitrosodimethylamine (Dimethylamine);
- (j) beta-Propiolactone (Betaprone);
- (k) Methyl chloromethyl ether (CMME);
- (l) alpha-Naphthylamine (1-NA);
- (m) 4,4'-Methylene bis(2-Chloroaniline) (MOCA);
- (n) Ethyleneimine (EI);
- (o) 1,2' Dibromo-3-Chloropropane (DBCP);
- (p) Asbestos;
- (q) Vinyl Chloride;
- (r) Coke Oven Emissions; and
- (s) Acrylonitrile (AN)?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: One of the substances named (Acrylonitrile) is known to have acute toxic effects, another (N-Nitrosodimethylamine) is normally potentially contaminated with a carcinogen. The rest are all known or suspected cancer causing substances. Asbestos is also known

to have other chronic health effects (asbestosis). Employees are protected by the Regulations under the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, administered by the Minister of Industrial Affairs and Employment. Provisions under the Health Act and the Food and Drugs Act and their Regulations protect the general public. It is intended that more specific legislation for the control of carcinogenic substances under a Controlled Substances Act, will be brought before this House in the foreseeable future.

AIRCRAFT NOISE

61. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Has the information indicated in answer to Question on Notice No. 256, tabled in Parliament on 1 December 1981, on the matter of the reduction of the impact of aircraft noise on schools, yet been received from the Commonwealth Department of Transport and, if so, what 'reasonable and practicable steps for providing a solution' have been implemented?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The Commonwealth Department of Transport has provided the following information in relation to aircraft noise. There is a considerable difference between the noise of landing aircraft and the noise from those which are taking off. The noise on take off is much more than the noise on landing. In a one-year period, there were more than five times the number of aircraft coming in to land on flight paths above schools than taking off on such flight paths. New aircraft being acquired are much quieter than those which have been in service for some years. Both major airlines have introduced or will be introducing new aircraft in the near future.

FIRE BRIGADE BOUNDARIES

62. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Chief Secretary: Have the boundaries of the South Australian Fire Brigade been changed such that all areas of residential subdivision in the electorate of Salisbury are contained within that zone and, if so, when was that done and, if not, when is it proposed to be done?

The Hon. J. W. OLSEN: No. However, action was initiated in June of this year to have this undertaken.

COOBER PEDY WATER

68. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources:

1. Has the Engineering and Water Supply Department found any reliable supply of underground water within a reasonable distance from Coober Pedy?

2. Has the department conducted any surveys or drilling programmes in an attempt to find fresh water in the Coober Pedy area?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: The replies are as follows:

- 1. Yes. However, the quality of the water is poor.
- 2. Investigations in this regard have been conducted by the Department of Mines and Energy on behalf of the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

CONTRACT TEACHERS

70. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: How many full-time equivalent contract appointments have there been in each of the past five years in:

- (a) the primary sector; and
 (b) the secondary sector?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Figures on full-time equivalent appointments are not available. The number of contracts for term 1 for years 1980, 81 and 82 respectively are:

	Primary	Secondary
	520	407
	625	532
	732	715

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

75. **Mr SLATER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Recreation and Sport: What was the total number of employees of the Totalizator Agency Board at 31 December 1981 and at 30 June 1982 and how many were permanent and how many were casual employees?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

No. of Employees	Perman-ent	Casual	*Part-time	Total
As at 31.12.81	80	371	117	568
As at 30.6.82	81	359	117	557

* All metropolitan and country agencies are staffed by a permanent part-time agency officer in addition to casual employees.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

77. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education: Are high schools in the Elizabeth area to be restructured in a manner that will require some or all of the students to travel by bus to their studies where they had not had to do so previously, and if so, will the department make transport or financial resources available to help parents meet some or all of the costs involved and, if not, why not?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: No decision has yet been made to any such restructuring. We are awaiting a report from the local community.

PRINTING EQUIPMENT

86. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What provisions exist in printeries in education facilities to minimise the risk to those operating printing and associated equipment from safety hazards that are known to be generated by those activities in certain circumstances?

2. Which of these provisions relate to the handling of chemicals (and which chemicals are involved)?

3. What specifications apply to design procedures for rooms containing such equipment?

4. How many claims for workers compensation have been lodged by employees of such educational facilities in each of the past five years as a result of injuries or health effects arising from the use of printing and associated equipment?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. (a) For fumes: An *Education Gazette* notice was issued on 4 May 1977 and described the arrangements necessary to minimise risks in both the design and conduct of printing rooms. A full survey is now being undertaken to ascertain the extent to which this notice has been complied with.

(b) For moving parts: All machinery supplied must contain guards which will prevent access to all gears, drives, etc., and, where these guards are easily movable to allow for adjustment of machines, they are fitted with safety switches

to prevent the operation of the machine unless they are closed.

(c) For fire: Flammable liquids should be stored in substantial sealed containers, which are available from various suppliers.

(d) For chemical contact with skin: Adequate protective clothing should be worn and suitable operating procedures adopted to prevent chemical contact with skin.

2. The air extraction facilities previously referred to have been specified to minimise problems related to the handling of chemicals, and schools should have adequate facilities to store flammable liquids. The major chemicals involved with safety and health hazards in printeries are:

- (1) 'blanket wash', which usually contains a mixture of tetrachloroethylene and hydrocarbons.
- (2) 'deglaing fluid', which usually contains methylene chloride.

3. (1) The air extraction specifications currently in use by the Public Buildings Department are for two 200 millimetre diameter (minimum) exhaust fans, which should be located at machine level, and drawing fresh, uncontaminated air past the operator. The extraction equipment should provide for at least 15 air changes per hour.

(2) Flammable liquids should be stored in substantial sealed containers.

4. The Education Department has no statistics to be able to determine how many claims for compensation have been lodged relating specifically to injuries or health effects arising from the use of printing and associated equipment.

87. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. How many—

- (a) primary schools;
- (b) secondary schools;
- (c) community colleges; and
- (d) other educational facilities,

have offset printing equipment to which are connected staff allocations on a part or full-time basis?

2. How many staff in total and full-time equivalents, respectively, are involved?

3. What provision is made for pre-service and inservice training of such staff?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The number of Education Department facilities which have offset printing equipment are:

- (a) Primary schools—5
- (b) High schools—63
- (c) Area schools—7
- (d) Other S.A. Government educational facilities:

The Orphanage

Central Northern Regional Office

Wattle Park Teachers Centre (being taken over by Government Printer)

Northern Regional Office

The Parks Community Centre has a facility on the grounds, but this is operated by the Government Printer.

2. It is estimated up to 85 different operators operating for a range of hours from 5-38 per week.

3. The Education Department has not itself provided training for the operators of offset duplicators, but has insisted that preservice training be supplied by the supplier of the machine. Inservice training of operators has also been carried out by the machine suppliers, and ranges from further training requested by the school, to one-day seminars on printing practices. The suppliers carry out a regular pattern of visits to the school when maintenance is often carried out and advice offered to the operators.

WATER RATES

104. **Mr TRAINER** (on notice) asked the Minister of Water Resources: Are accounts for Engineering and Water Supply Department rates falling due a week sooner than in the corresponding periods of 1977-78 and, if so, why?

The Hon. P. B. ARNOLD: This is the case in some areas. Changes to rate billing patterns occur from time to time, to take into account cash flow, workload scheduling, and the number of accounts being billed each week. This procedure has been in operation since 1978. However, the time allowed for payment of the original account has not altered.

	days/ annum/ teacher
2. Rural schools and schools with Principal 3	
Primary	5.5
Primary, Junior Primary, Special Rural,	
Special	4.2
Area, R-12 schools	3.2
Secondary—up to 200 students	3.0
200-400 students	2.5
over 400 students	2.0

These have not changed in recent years.

3. No fixed proportion has been allocated to professional development activities. Each principal uses his/her own discretion.

TRANSITION EDUCATION

112. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What consideration is being given to the report 'Destinations of TAFE Participants January-June 1981' issued by the Youth Bureau of the Department of Industrial Affairs and Employment?

2. What are the implications of that report for transition education?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. The Department of Technical and Further Education is examining the findings of the report in conjunction with other evaluative data and will use those findings to assist development of its 1983 transition programme.

2. It is too early to determine fully the implications of the report for transition education.

STANDARD GAUGE LINES

117. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the State Transport Authority control rail movements on that portion of the new standard gauge rail line within the Adelaide metropolitan area and if not, who will and what input will the S.T.A. have with that authority with respect to metropolitan rail movements?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The replies are as follows:

(1) Rail movements used exclusively over standard gauge lines will be controlled by Australian National.

(2) The State Transport Authority will control all standard gauge movements when they operate over mixed gauge lines or cross lines owned by the State Transport Authority.

T.R.T. ALLOCATIONS

113. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Education:

1. What has been the T.R.T. allocation to schools within the Eyre region for each of the years 1978 to 1982?

2. What formulae have been used to arrive at that allocation?

3. What proportion of the allocation in each year was available for professional development?

The Hon. H. ALLISON: The replies are as follows:

1. Year	Total
1978-79	Not available
1979-80	1 971
1980-81	2 045
1981-82	2 032

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

120. **Mr LYNN ARNOLD** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Will the Minister give consideration to the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Park Terrace, Salisbury near the turn off to Commercial Road in order that the large number of children and other people crossing at that point will be significantly less at risk from the serious traffic hazard that exists for pedestrians needing to cross that road and, if not, why not?

The Hon. M. M. WILSON: The Highways Department will investigate the need for a pedestrian crossing at the subject location and will provide me with a report in due course. It is anticipated that I will be in a position to write to the honourable member on this matter in late October/early November 1982.