

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 December 1982

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION TIME

HONEYMOON URANIUM PROJECT

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the Premier has given his complete endorsement to the future of the Roxby Downs project, even though the environmental impact statement has not yet been fully assessed, will he now give a complete endorsement to the Honeymoon project, for which the e.i.s. was approved last year?

In his election policy speech the Premier said that the Roxby Downs project 'can and will go ahead' under a Labor Government. In the *Advertiser* on 29 November he is quoted as saying of the Roxby Downs project:

It's a project which I believe, in the interests of South Australia, should go ahead.

These statements represent a clear endorsement from the Premier of what could become the world's largest uranium mine. They conflict with statements made earlier this year about the project but, nevertheless, the Opposition welcomes the fact that the project now seems assured. However, concern is being expressed about the future of the uranium mine at Honeymoon, which is a much smaller operation than is Roxby Downs but at which the radiological hazard is far easier to contain in that the method of mining is by *in situ* leaching, the hazards of which are far easier to contain than are those of underground mining operations such as the huge mine at Roxby Downs, where there are large—

An honourable member: You said there were no hazards.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No-one has ever said that. What has been said is that the hazards are accommodated in terms of the environmental and radiological clauses in the indenture to an extent which will make it pacesetting in the world scene.

The point I was making was that large quantities of radioactive ore are being mined at Roxby Downs at the moment. In fact, when the Premier went up to look at this 'mirage in the desert' he remarked that he was amazed at the amount of activity that had occurred and was taking place. However, none of these radiological hazards will be present at Honeymoon, because the safest method yet devised of removing uranium ore from the ground is being used, where that process is suitable. The environmental impact statement addressed the question of underground water and it concluded that there is no possibility of any contamination of underground water supplies. All that is required is for the Government to give its approval; the application for the mining licence has been made.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: This is clearly comment.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: All that is required is for the Government to authorise the project to proceed. During the election campaign the Premier also said, when he was confronted with the question about the future of Honeymoon and Beverley, that he would call for the files immediately after the election and make his decision, based on how far those projects had progressed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, has already issued a statement on this matter, the content of which would have been communicated to the Deputy Leader. The statement points out that the

project is still being assessed. According to the proponents, it is anticipated that that assessment will not be available for the Minister's consideration until mid-January. Unlike the case of the Roxby Downs project, we said at the time of the election that we would consider the Honeymoon uranium project when we were in full possession of the facts and assessments, which are not yet available.

BICENTENARY ROAD LEGISLATION

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Minister of Transport indicate whether money has been received from the Federal Government under the Bicentenary Road Development project and whether the Quarry Road link between Tea Tree Gully and Salisbury, as well as the expansion of Golden Grove Road to a four-lane highway, will be part of the work to be carried out using these funds?

Some time prior to the last election there was an announcement in a local newspaper in the Tea Tree Gully area that \$6 400 000 had been set aside out of the Bicentenary Road Development project for the implementation of the Quarry Road project, with a possible completion date of, at least the planning stage, some 18 months. A second stage project was the widening of Golden Grove Road to a four-lane highway between North East and Grenfell Roads. Up to this stage, however, apparently neither the Tea Tree Gully council nor the Salisbury council have received any confirmation about the situation.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: As far as I and the Highways Department are aware, the bicentenary road legislation programme passed in the Senate only yesterday. Whilst we are not fully aware of all the details and any amendments that might have been moved to that legislation, I understand that it has now been passed. At the request of the Commonwealth Minister, the Highways Department is preparing and finalising submissions to be put to the Commonwealth Government on South Australia's six-year programme.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: They already have it.

Mr Ashenden: Obviously the Minister has not caught up with that yet.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The legislation was passed only yesterday, so I think the comments being made are a little unfair, if members expect me to understand all of the legislation involved and the amendments moved. As I have said, the States are finalising the programme to be submitted to the Federal Government, and it is intended to include in South Australia's programme construction of the Quarry Road link duplication of Golden Grove Road between North East Road and Milne Road.

URANIUM

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Honeymoon and Beverley uranium mines are defined as new mines within the terms of the Labor Party's uranium policy, determined at the 1982 Federal Convention? Additions to the A.L.P. uranium policy approved at that convention included the following clause:

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

As I understand that all State branches of the Party are committed to this policy, I ask the Minister whether the Honeymoon and Beverley projects will come within its definition.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I think the honourable member will get the answer to his question in mid January, as already announced, when this matter is determined by Cabinet.

GROVE KINDERGARTEN

Mr MAYES: I direct my question to the Minister of Education and it concerns the Grove Kindergarten, which is situated in Eastwood. With the recent recommendation from the Kindergarten Union regarding the closure of Grove Kindergarten, will the Minister report to the House what stage negotiations have reached with the Kindergarten Union and with the management committee of Grove Kindergarten regarding this recommendation and the possible continuation of the Grove Kindergarten in 1983?

Recently, the Kindergarten Union made a recommendation that the Grove Kindergarten should be closed. Unfortunately, that recommendation was not communicated to the management committee of the Grove Kindergarten until very late this year. In addition, the method of communication, I believe, left a lot to be desired. I am sure that, given the circumstances, the Minister will understand my concern that the recommendation for closure of Grove Kindergarten should be carefully re-examined.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am well aware of the concern of the member for Unley over the Grove Kindergarten, because many of the parents of the children attending that kindergarten live within his electorate. I have received information from the Kindergarten Union board of management and a deputation from the parents and committee of the kindergarten. As a result of the information that was presented to me in my examination and some of the concerns that I have had with the enrolment projections that had been arrived at, I have in fact written to the Kindergarten Union asking it to reconsider its decision at least for one-term.

I have communicated this verbally to the Kindergarten Union and I am also writing today to the Kindergarten Union board of management. I have asked it, in allowing Grove Kindergarten to remain open for at least the first term in 1983, to review certain points. The first is that the projected enrolment figures for 1983 be re-examined against the actual enrolments that occur in term 1 of 1983, including the then updated projections about terms 2 and 3. The second point is to allow consultation and involvement with the parents, with greater regard for the parents to make necessary adjustments for their children's pre-schooling. I must say at this point that, while I appreciate the difficulties facing the Kindergarten Union in that it does not have much experience with the closing down of kindergartens (its work in the past has been the expansion of kindergartens), it did concern me (and I have conveyed this concern to the Kindergarten Union) that its procedures for the closing down of kindergartens did seem rather preemptory, and that the Kindergarten Union could usefully look at longer periods of consultation so that parents are well aware of what is likely to happen and what moves can be made.

The third point is to clarify with the Unley council whether that council is prepared to refurbish the Parkside Kindergarten. Having been made aware of the amenity of the Parkside Kindergarten, it is clear that it needs some considerable refurbishing. While I understand an approach has been made to the Unley council, I can understand the point of view of the parents in that area that they would want some undertaking from the Unley council as to whether or not it proposes to accept that application.

The fourth point is to allow the question of the Parkside affiliated kindergarten to be investigated, looking at all the issues that were raised as matters of concern by parents in that area, that if they are asked to transfer their children from the Grove Kindergarten, when it closes, to the Parkside Kindergarten, what implications that has for them as parents regarding their children going from the K.U. kindergarten to what is really just a K.U. affiliated kindergarten.

I have indicated that to the Kindergarten Union, and I am confident that its board of management will give it the reconsideration I asked for and will look at all these matters in the highlight of what takes place in term 1 if they choose to accept my recommendation on the matter. That will determine what happens with terms 2 and 3 of next year. The whole area of pre-schooling has been a rather tortured one and it needs examination as to what level of resources is made available to the pre-school level of education right across the State as has been picked up by one of the questions received on notice today.

URANIUM

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy now believe that the mining of uranium has been proved safe? In the election policy speech by the Leader of the then Labor Opposition it was said that the Roxby Downs project 'can and will go ahead under a Labor Government'. On the basis of present estimates, Roxby Downs has more than three times the amount of uranium contained in all of Australia's other known uranium deposits. In fact, it is possible that Roxby Downs could become the world's largest uranium mine and, as it now has the endorsement of the Labor Party, I ask the Minister whether that means that the Government has now accepted that it is safe to mine uranium no matter where the mineral is located, as long as environment and safety requirements are met.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am surprised to get that type of question from the honourable member, who is usually very precise and has even been accused on occasions of being somewhat pedantic in framing answers during debate over the years I have known him. For the honourable member to ask me simply whether I now believe that the mining of uranium is safe must be about the most general question asked in this House for decades.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: If you don't know the answer sit down.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: It was my understanding that the honourable member who just gave me an instruction in the House is no longer in that position and that in fact a new Speaker occupies the Chair.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It was certainly my understanding that the question is of importance to the people of South Australia and so, therefore, is the answer. There will be order.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member asked whether the mining of uranium is safe. Apparently the honourable member who asked the question was not listening to the Deputy Leader only a moment ago, because the Deputy Leader outlined to the House such things as hazards which exist in this matter, and he argued that they could be contained. From memory, I believe he stated that 'solution mining was one of the safest', so obviously there are degrees of safety in this matter. Yet, the honourable member has the audacity to ask whether the mining of uranium anywhere is safe. The question is nonsense. The answer is that, in certain circumstances, with proper regulation and other controls, the mining of uranium could be safe. If the honourable member wishes to take the matter further, I am perfectly willing to await his pleasure.

Let us go back to the question of solution mining asked by the Deputy Leader. He said that solution mining is one of the safest techniques. That is a generality also, as was the question directed to me. I suggest that the Deputy Leader is one of the members in this House best placed to have a knowledge of this topic, if he himself was not able

to get it fed to him over the past three years. I wonder whether the Deputy Leader ever had a conversation with Mr Rausch of the Phelps Dodge Corporation. The Deputy Leader would know that he is an important principal of Phelps Dodge in the United States which is one of the largest uranium miners in the world. Mr Rausch told me recently that there are problems with solution mining and that failures do occur. I believe that I am giving information to the honourable member, who asked a rather general question, which will give him food for further thought on this topic.

BROADACRE LAND

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Environment and Planning say what is the position with respect to the future release of broadacre land held by the South Australian Urban Lands Trust in the southern region? The previous Government had indicated that it favoured the release of the Morphett Vale East rural A land over similarly zoned land at Seaford for the next major urban development. The Minister when in Opposition indicated that he would seek a review of this decision in the event of the return of a Labor Government. I am asking the Minister to explain to the House whether such a review is taking place and what his feelings are about which land will be released for the next urban development.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: The short answer is, 'Yes, a review is being undertaken.' I think it is important for the House to realise that, whatever happens, broadacre land in the south is unlikely to be released until the mid to late 1980s whereas, of course, it was originally assumed that one or the other, if not both these areas, would become available for urban subdivision probably this calendar year, but in view of the present condition of the market for urban land that, of course, is not a realistic assumption.

I cannot tell the honourable member or the House at this stage exactly what is likely to happen arising out of the review. What I can indicate is what my concerns are that have led to the request that a review take place and indeed to the original commitment that such a request would go forth. My concern is that any urban subdivision on the fringe of metropolitan Adelaide must proceed in such a way as to ensure that proper servicing of that subdivision occurs. There are areas in my urban electorate now which are only just being sewered and it may never in pure economic terms be able to attract the level of infrastructure which areas closer to the centre of the metropolitan area enjoy. So, whatever happens, the development of either of these areas must proceed with proper servicing.

My concern has always been that, given that the Morphett Vale East area is reasonably adjacent to an area that has some sort of level of servicing, the temptation for whatever Government would be to say, 'Oh, well, that will have to make do. The existing level of servicing in terms of shopping facilities, and so on, indeed perhaps even a transport network, will have to be sufficient to meet the new demand.' There is no way, on the other hand, that one can do that at Seaford. The only way it could possibly proceed would be in terms of developing a sort of mini or satellite Noarlunga regional centre. I guess that one can do the same sort of thing at Morphett Vale East with sufficient commitment. So I am asking for a review of that decision in terms of the ease and capacity to service whatever new urban development occurs.

URANIUM

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy agree that the Premier has breached

the A.L.P.'s State policy on nuclear energy by supporting the Roxby Downs project, or does he now believe that problems associated with the nuclear industry outlined in that policy have been overcome? Less than 12 months ago the South Australian branch of the A.L.P. adopted a firm policy of Opposition to the nuclear cycle which said:

The A.L.P. will not permit the mining, processing or enrichment of uranium until it is satisfied that—

1. the present unresolved economic, social, biological, genetic, environmental and technical problems associated with the mining of uranium and the development of nuclear power have been solved.
2. it is safe to provide uranium to customer countries.

This policy is still part of the A.L.P. State platform. I therefore ask the Minister whether the problems outlined above have been overcome or whether the Premier has breached the policy.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am pleased to note that the honourable member is now taking the trouble to become familiar with the Australian Labor Party's policy on these matters and that apparently she gives some credence to them, as evidenced by the way in which the question has been framed. The honourable member asked whether I believe that I am in breach of the Party's policy: I advise the honourable member and the House that that is a matter for the A.L.P. to determine.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WEST LAKES WATERWAY

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Marine say what is the length and number of concrete blocks to be replaced along the waterway at West Lakes, and can he give details of the programme of replacement? During the Budget Estimates Committees on 21 September 1982 (page 39 of *Hansard*) I asked the following questions:

What were the reasons for the fretting away of concrete bricks around the waterway at West Lakes? I have sighted the breaking away of many of these concrete bricks. Can the Minister inform me how many metres or kilometres of concrete bricks have been replaced around the waterway at West Lakes? Is the programme for replacement complete? If not, what is the future programme for the replacement of these concrete bricks? What has been the overall cost or costs involved in this programme and over how many years? Who was the manufacturer responsible and what recovery, if any, was made by the department from these people who manufacture the bricks?

The former Minister of Marine gave me some details but none concerning the replacement length. Can the Minister now provide me with that information so that I can inform many of those constituents who live adjacent to the waterway about the programme and the number of blocks that will be replaced.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I appreciate the concern expressed by the member for Albert Park, and I recall his directing questions to the Minister during the Estimates Committees earlier this year. The honourable member was good enough to ask me to obtain for him some details of the matter which I now have. In terms of the West Lakes Indenture, during 1976 the Government accepted responsibility for the maintenance of the completed banks of the lake at West Lakes, including certain sections of steep revetment formed by the use of masonry blocks. As the member for Albert Park is aware, many of these blocks, particularly those subject to immersion in the waters of the lake, have deteriorated rapidly and also prematurely.

The Department of Marine and Harbors is keeping the situation under continual observation and has replaced the worst of the affected blocks which have become dangerous. The revetment work formed part of the works undertaken

by contractors to West Lakes Limited in the early days of the project and, in view of certain legal and negotiating complexities which exist, it is not appropriate for me to comment at this time on any actions which may be taken. However, I assure the honourable member that this matter is being actively pursued by the Department of Marine and Harbors. When further information becomes available, I will be happy to make it available to the honourable member.

URANIUM ENRICHMENT PLANT

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Does the Minister of Mines and Energy still totally reject the idea of a uranium enrichment plant being built anywhere in South Australia? If so, why has the Government asked the Uranium Enrichment Committee to answer a series of questions so that firm decisions can be made about the future of any uranium enrichment plant in this State? In December 1979, during a press conference in Adelaide given by representatives of the Urenco-Centec consortium, proceedings were interrupted in a most improper manner by a person purporting to represent the A.L.P., the Trades and Labor Council and the Campaign Against Nuclear Energy.

The Hon. H. Allison: That's an unholy trinity!

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Typical of the style. The person handed to representatives of Urenco-Centec a document signed by these three organisations, which said, in part:

We understand the organisations totally reject the idea of an enrichment plant being built anywhere in South Australia as the processes connected with the nuclear fuel cycle and the mining, development and export of uranium have not been proven safe. We shall apply all means in our power to prevent such a plant being built, with due respect to the law.

Last month representatives of Urenco-Centec were again in Adelaide for discussions with the present Government, including, I understand, the Minister of Mines and Energy. After those discussions the Premier issued a press statement, which said, in part:

I have asked the Uranium Enrichment Committee to answer a series of questions so that the Government can get an accurate picture of the state of the proposed project, and the cost to the taxpayer, so that firm decisions can be made.

As Labor Party policy for some years has been firmly against the development of a uranium enrichment plant, I now ask the Minister to outline the questions the committee has been asked, and say whether he expects the answers to lead to any change in that well-reported and circulated A.L.P. policy?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I think the honourable member asked whether I totally reject uranium enrichment conversion—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: In the first part of the question, yes.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: To this stage (and I take it the question is asked of me in my present capacity as Minister of Mines and Energy), I have not been asked to accept or reject any such project. That is the answer to the question. The honourable member went on to say that some person purporting to represent the A.L.P., the T.L.C. and CANE made statements or issued a paper at a certain gathering.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: That was only the padding to the question.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I realise that. I do not believe that that added anything to the question at all. If I were asked, perhaps I could probably advise the House that I have seen members in this place purporting to represent themselves and other people on occasions in the public eye. I do not think there is any other answer the honourable member needs. I am not called upon at this stage to accept

or totally reject, but when I am asked to do so then of course the honourable member will get the answer to his question.

FRANKLIN BELOW GORDON DAM

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Can the Minister of Environment and Planning say whether the Government has a policy in relation to the south-west of Tasmania and the flooding and damming of the Franklin River and, if so, what is that policy? As all members—

Mr EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I ask whether this has anything to do with the business of this House or of the State and whether or not the question is relevant, because I do not believe it has any bearing on this State.

The SPEAKER: I rule that the question is relevant because it is a matter which has been widely canvassed in not just the national press but also in the local press. Certainly, if it was a matter of fine detail (and I shall be listening carefully), that may be different. As it stands at the moment I rule that the question is relevant.

Mr EVANS: I rise on a further point of order, Sir. I take it from your ruling that a general question on anything canvassed in the press, whether or not it has anything to do with this State or not (in other words, it could be something to do with another country and be totally unrelated to this State), would be accepted, knowing of course that this State has no control over the situation and it is of no interest as far as the people are concerned by direct legislation that could be effected through this House on such a subject. I seek clarification on that for the future.

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member's question verges on the impertinent and I am inclined not to reply at all. The honourable member is a very experienced member (probably the second most experienced member in the House), so he would have been aware at all stages that I meant no such thing. Of course, I did not mean that anything that appeared in the newspaper would be relevant. I will judge, with my advisers, what is relevant. The extraordinary list and litany read out by the honourable member was really a very good attempt at a try on, but it did not work. The simple answer is, 'No'.

Mr EVANS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I read nothing and I had nothing to read from.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Where are we?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is all right, Ted, I will get to that in a minute.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth does not need any help with his question.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: He needs it elsewhere.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: It is only the Opposition's time that is being wasted. I ask this question because recent reports that we have all read in the press have indicated, first, that the south-west area of Tasmania has now been placed on the World Heritage list and as such we in South Australia, as citizens of Australia, have an obligation in that regard; secondly, and more importantly, I heard on a lunch time radio report that a citizen of South Australia (and I note that the member for Fisher is not present to hear the link-up), one Mr Davison, was arrested this morning on the Franklin River. As a result, I think that all South Australian's are entitled to know and in fact are entitled to have their Government express a view about its attitude to the damming of the Franklin River and the fact that it has been put on the World Heritage list and should therefore be saved, to

use Mr Davison's words, 'so that all of our children can have the opportunity of experiencing this.'

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I thank you, Mr Speaker, and my colleague, the member for Elizabeth, for giving me the opportunity to address myself briefly to this matter. As the member for Fisher would know, one of my responsibilities will be to attend meetings of Ministers for the Environment, Ministers of Nature Conservation, and possibly Ministers for Planning from the various States. I am not sure but the member for Fisher's colleague, sitting two seats from him, might be able to explain to the House how frequently Ministers of Environment, Planning, and so on, meet from the various States.

I would be very surprised if in the coming year this matter was not placed on the agenda of those various meetings, which I will be attending on behalf of every member present and indeed on behalf of all the citizens of South Australia. On those occasions when it will be necessary for me to address myself to this item on the agenda I will be speaking up most vigorously for the policy that has been espoused by the Federal Labor Party. I certainly oppose what the Tasmanian Government proposes to do. I am aware that, as a State Minister of Environment, there is little that I can do beyond advocacy in the press and the opportunity to address myself to this question at meetings of CONCOM and other similar meetings. On those occasions I will certainly do so.

URANIUM

Mr EVANS: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy explain why the Government is drawing a distinction between uranium mined at Roxby Downs and that mined at Beverley, by giving its support to mining at one deposit but not the other?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am not sure what the honourable member means. The Roxby Downs venture is

Mr Ashenden: A simple question for a simple person!

The Hon. R.J. PAYNE: One of the things one learns in this House, of course, is that some people are not able to accept a change in their status when it occurs. The honourable member who has just interjected does not seem to realise that he is now on the Opposition benches, and, if there was any weight in what he said previously, there is very little in it now from his viewpoint. I have been asked why, if Roxby Downs is a proposition for the mining of uranium in South Australia, I do not then come out to support Beverley. First, contrary to what the previous Liberal Government Minister of Mines and Energy was saying, the proposition in relation to Beverley is not yet at a stage where I ought to be called on to make any such decision.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: It's the same stage as Roxby Downs.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member who has just interjected knows full well that what I am saying is correct. The e.i.s. in relation to Beverley is still extant in the community and further finalisation in the matter is yet to come.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In relation to Roxby Downs, I understand—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: The honourable member is certainly having some second thoughts about Roxby Downs, or Olympic Dam (call it what you will), now that he no longer occupies the position which he did in the previous Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. I have been calling order to the persistent interjections by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not want to move to the next step, but I will do so if necessary.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I can understand the Deputy Leader of the Opposition not wanting to hear what he has been hearing for the past couple of minutes. It is only a few weeks since members were assured, and the whole public of South Australia was assured, by the honourable member that everything in relation to Roxby Downs was lovely; there were not any hassles; there were no hold-ups; it should be a *fait accompli* and it should be under way, and so on. However, today we have heard him make some rather different comments on two or three occasions in relation to that, simply to try to make a political point. We are aware of what the honourable member is trying to do, with the assistance of his colleagues. There is really no question to answer in relation to this matter. The situation at Beverley is totally different in terms of the time-frame and in terms of the proposed activity.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN BOOK

Mr TRAINER: Will the Premier inform the House whether all the copies of the current edition of the *South Australian Book* have been distributed? If not, how many copies remain and what on earth does the Government plan to do with them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Members who were in the previous Parliament will recall that 110 000 copies of the *South Australian Book* were produced at a cost to the taxpayer of around \$155 000 just before the election and were to be distributed to all year 7 students in South Australia. It was a very interesting propaganda exercise on behalf of the then Government, and an indication of the sort of waste that was going on. Since coming to office we find that 50 000 copies of this booklet are still stored at Netley. Since 6 November they have gone out of date. For a start, the front page has on it a picture of the former Premier and a message from him, and there are various other contact points throughout the booklet.

I have been advised that to replace the front cover will cost approximately \$30 000. This is completely unjustified. A number of other suggestions have been made, ranging from neatly ripping out the front page, to stamping across the former Premier's picture 'Obsolete'. However, when one looks at the cost of this extravagant exercise undertaken by the former Government, I do not think it is justified in not ensuring that the book is used in some way. Consequently, we are going to produce a loose insert that will explain simply that the Government has changed and giving new contact names of people showing an interest in South Australia. I think it is worth adding that a last minute decision by the former Premier to change his photograph because he was not satisfied with the one that was going through the presses, cost nearly \$2 000.

As for the future, I am going to take a closer look at the sort of promotional material that is produced and how it is targeted, so that we do not get into such an outrageous and extravagant exercise as this. Also, I will be looking closely at the text of the books. Apparently, there are a number of errors and omissions in the book. I do not know if it is in the current edition that certain railway lines and transport routes have been omitted. As an example of what could happen, the House might be interested in a response from the Department of Agriculture. The letter states:

For example, page 53 shows a cow being hand-milked in a dairy whose facilities do not meet elementary current licensing standards. This style of operation went out of commercial dairying 40 years ago—the picture hardly conveys an impression of the advanced agricultural technology which we are attempting to promote.

Similarly, page 49 shows bagged oats and bagged barley. Whilst a bagging plant at Port Adelaide provides a useful supplementary outlet for a minor part of our cereal harvest, commercial field production has long been handled in bulk. If these illustrations are intended to support the paragraphs on seed production, it is by no means apparent from the captions or the photographs.

One or two other complaints appear in regard to maps. The letter states:

For example, the North-west of the State can hardly be described as 'light grazing land', southern Eyre Peninsula is not a great national park, and the high rainfall areas are not confined to Kangaroo Island and the South-East.

That highlights the sort of unreal propaganda exercise embarked upon by the previous Government at the taxpayers' expense before the last election. We will have no more of that.

VIETNAMESE MATRICULATION EXAM

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I congratulate the Minister of Education and his wife on their recent acquisition of another set of twins and congratulate him on his own personal contribution to solving the problem of declining enrolments. However, the question I ask is an extremely serious one. Is the Minister completely satisfied that the allegations of cheating and improper conduct surrounding the recent Matriculation exam in the Vietnamese language are, to quote the Chairman of the Public Examinations Board, 'unfounded'? This matter has been canvassed in the media, and stems from allegations made by a Mr Ly Van Luong, a part-time contract teacher in Vietnamese. Mr Ly has alleged that students had prior knowledge of the Matriculation paper. The Chairman of the P.E.B. has stated that a police investigation into this matter has shown the allegations to be 'unfounded'.

Educationists are saying that a full-scale investigation into this matter is required by the Minister, for it is not just a police investigation into alleged bribery that is required, but an inquiry into the place of the Vietnamese culture fitting into the Australian environment. I have a copy of a letter from the Principal of the Parks Community Education Centre to the Regional Director of Education, Central Western Region. I make the point that I have had no contact, either oral or written, with either of these gentlemen. The letter is dated 24 November 1982, the day that the Matriculation examination in Vietnamese was held.

I wish to quote the letter. It is a form AD3 from the Education Department of South Australia, from the Parks Community Education Centre. It is from the Principal, Mr P.T. Tierney, and is to the Regional Director of Education, Central Western Region. The subject is 'Alleged misconduct relating to the P.E.B. Matriculation Vietnamese examination', and the letter states:

At regular intervals during this year Mr Ly Van Luong (a part-time contract teacher in this school) has made allegations of improper conduct relating to the P.E.B. Matriculation subject Vietnamese. As a result of these allegations I contacted Mr Roger Fordham, of the Indo-Chinese Refugee Association, and D. Robert Kelly, of Flinders University, who is involved with the Vietnamese curriculum group. I felt reassured after these contacts, but Mr Ly was still concerned. On 16 November Mr Ly came to see me, and to state that he had reason to believe he knew what was on the Matriculation examination paper.

He further alleged that there was a conspiracy aimed at discrediting him because he refused to become party to a number of corrupt practices associated with the subject. As evidence supporting his allegation he deposited with me a signed statement dated 16 November 1982—

eight days before the matriculation examination—in which he wrote what he understood would be the English and Vietnamese essay questions in the examination. He also tape recorded a series of allegations.

I have a copy of that tape recording. Continuing:

He further provided me with a statement in Vietnamese detailing these allegations and promised a translation which I have not yet received. I locked all the material in the school safe and it has remained there until today. When put alongside the Matriculation examination paper, I believe there are sufficient grounds to warrant an investigation. The matter is further exacerbated by a report of the allegations being contained (so I believe) in the Vietnamese language newspapers.

I have a translation of that article in Vietnamese language newspapers. It continues:

There have been threats of physical violence made in relation to this issue and certainly Mr Ly is fearful for his safety. I believe the matter is very serious and needs urgent and effective action.

The letter is signed by P.T. Tierney, Principal, and it is noted by the Regional Office, Central Western Region, on 24 November 1982. I want to make clear, as I have previously said that I have had no contact with Mr Tierney on this matter. I have copies of two documents lodged in the Principal's safe. They are both similar and contain Mr Ly's predictions of the English and Vietnamese essay questions from the exam. The predictions were based on oral evidence and obviously are not meant to be word perfect. One of the documents from which I will quote is entitled 'Parks Community Education Centre, 16 November 1982—Vietnamese Essay and English Essay Topic'. These are the predictions:

- (1) Describe and discuss the characteristics and the role of Vietnamese woman.
- (2) Describe one of the festivals in Vietnam and say if you will celebrate it in the same way in Australia.
- (3) Describe one of the interesting places that you have visited in Vietnam.
- (4) Describe one of the main religions in Vietnam.

The questions on the English essay section of the Matriculation paper are as follows:

Question 2 [which relates to question 1 I have just read out]. Summarise the role of the woman in a Vietnamese family in the 1970s.

Question 4 [which would relate to question 2 in the predictions]. Is the celebration of the Vietnamese Lunar New Year in Australia very different from the ones in Vietnam?

Question 1 [which would relate to question 4 in the predictions]. What, in your opinion, are the teachings of the main religions in Vietnam?

Question 3 is the only question that does not have a marked similarity to those predicted by Mr Ly and is as follows:

Describe and discuss the Vietnamese ways of life.

As yet, I have been unable to have the Vietnamese essay questions translated but I hope to have that information in the near future. I understand, however, that Mr Ly predicted that one of the questions would come from a famous Vietnamese narrative poem of 3 500 lines. That in itself would be unremarkable, but what is of significance is that I believe that Mr Ly predicted, on prior information given to him, that the question would come from lines 39 to 66 of that poem. If that is what has occurred, and I understand it to be so, it cannot be a coincidence and adds further fuel for a Ministerial inquiry into a very serious matter.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: First, I thank the honourable member for his congratulations to my wife and me, and I inform members that my wife and children are doing very well. The matter raised by the honourable member is indeed a very serious one. It is particularly serious for two reasons. It is the first allegation of its kind concerning the operations of the Public Examinations Board, which up to now has had a history free of serious allegations of this nature, for which it is to be commended and which is indicative of the manner in which that board has worked. Secondly, it is serious because of some subsidiary allegations that have

been made concerning the Vietnamese people in South Australia. It is a matter of some concern to me as Minister and to the Public Examinations Board that some grossly unfair assertions have been made about members of that community, and there is no justification for those assertions.

The matter was drawn to my attention by the Director-General of Education on the day on which that letter referred to was written. The Director-General and I discussed this matter. I also had discussions with the Secretary of the Public Examinations Board, because any allegations that would cast doubt on an exam run by the P.E.B. are serious not only for the exam itself but also for the status of all exams run by that board. At that stage, given the information provided to me, it seemed that there was a reasonable chance that the allegations may in fact be true. Therefore, I fully supported the intention of the P.E.B. to seek a police examination of this matter.

I also indicated that I supported its decision (as a separate authority, it was the board's prerogative) to call another examination. Indeed, another examination was actually called: I believe that it was to be held on 1 December. At the same time, the Government realised that, regardless of what may have happened regarding the police investigation, this may be unnecessary because the police investigation might reveal that the allegations were unfounded, but the Government did not think that the report would come back from the police early enough to affect the decision whether or not a second examination should be called.

In fact, the police investigated the matter very promptly and thoroughly, and the report forwarded to me by the Public Examinations Board indicated quite clearly that the allegations were unfounded. That report is the property of the Public Examinations Board. I know that requests have been made to the board to release that report, but the board has not done so. Indeed, I have supported that because of the nature of certain things contained in that report.

It is a matter of some concern that certain processes that took place in setting this exam could perhaps be modified in future years. I am advised that the Public Examinations Board will be doing that, indicating not necessarily that there were in fact things that went wrong but that the incident left open the question of doubt in one or two areas. I repeat the point that the police examination removed any suspicion of cheating to which the board, the examiner or anyone supervising the exams may have been an accomplice. From my reading of the police report, I am satisfied with that, and I support the Public Examinations Board in its recommendations on this matter. If the honourable member wishes, I could make the police report available to him for his private consultation, but I reiterate that it is not considered appropriate for that to be publicly released.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Water Resources give details of current water storages in metropolitan reservoirs?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased to be able to give details of the present water storages in the metropolitan reservoirs. The total storage capacity of those reservoirs is 207 440 megalitres, and the actual storage as at 14 December 1982 was 117 296 megalitres, which is 57 per cent of the total capacity, whereas at the same time last year it was 83 per cent, so we are down somewhat compared to last year. Details of the major metropolitan storages are as follows: Mount Bold reservoir, 23 910 megalitres (52 per cent of its capacity); Happy Valley reservoir, 11 966 megalitres (94 per cent); Clarendon Weir, 310 megalitres (97 per cent); Millbrook reservoir, 14 326 megalitres (87 per cent); Kangaroo

Creek reservoir, 10 904 megalitres (45 per cent); Hope Valley reservoir, 3 001 megalitres (86 per cent); Little Para reservoir, 10 640 (51 per cent); Barossa reservoir, 4 173 megalitres (93 per cent); South Para reservoir, 24 894 megalitres (49 per cent); and Myponga reservoir, 12 906 megalitres (48 per cent). I repeat that the storage currently held is 57 per cent of the total capacity of the metropolitan reservoirs.

O'BAHN SYSTEM

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Will the Minister of Transport give an undertaking that the O'Bahn bus system to the north-eastern suburbs will be continued and completed on schedule by 1986 and, if it is not, what is now the scheduled completion date?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: We made quite clear in our policy statement prior to the election that the Government would take no action that would jeopardise the commencement of the O'Bahn transport system from Tea Tree Plaza to the city. At present the matter is being reviewed by the Government, as we said we would do, to assure members of the community that they would receive value for the money being spent on this project, and that is where the matter rests at the moment. I have made several inspections of the work that is being undertaken. We also indicated that we would honour the contracts that had been let and I understand that about \$10 300 000 has already been spent and that a further \$10 000 000 approximately is to be let out in contract work.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: When do you expect the review to be finished?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I cannot say when that review will be finished but hopefully it will be soon, because I appreciate the urgency of the further ongoing work that is necessary.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: GAS PRICE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It has come to my attention that I have been misrepresented by the Hon. Mr Gilfillan in another place in relation to negotiations for gas prices in South Australia as a result of an arbitrator's decision. It has come to my attention that a statement has been made along the lines that I reached an agreement with the Cooper Basin producers which immediately increased the price of gas by 80 per cent, resulting thereafter in a series of other price increases.

That is a clear misrepresentation of the situation to the point of being a complete falsehood. The facts are that arbitration procedures were entered into in relation to gas prices in South Australia in terms of the contracts which were negotiated by the previous Labor Administration whereby if agreement between the producers and the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, which is charged with the negotiations, is not reached arbitration is then invoked. If agreement cannot be reached in relation to the appointment of an arbitrator the appointment is made by a Supreme Court judge. In the event, agreement could not be reached and Her Honour Judge Mitchell appointed an arbitrator from Queensland, who heard evidence from both the Pipelines Authority, on behalf of the consumers of South Australia, and the producers. It was the arbitrator and not I, as is alleged, who awarded an 80 per cent increase in gas price, and that increase in terms of those contracts is retrospective

to 1 January. In this case the arbitration was retrospective to 1 January 1981.

Members know that I have been critical of the weaknesses in the provisions of those contracts, but I did not negotiate the price, and to suggest that as a result of my negotiations there was an 80 per cent increase is clearly false. When this arbitration procedure was concluded and we knew that an 80 per cent increase had been awarded, I did enter, along with the Pipelines Authority, into negotiations with the producers to ameliorate the effects of this arbitration, and in fact we instituted proceedings in a court to have the arbitration thrown out. During the period leading up to the hearing in the court we negotiated a very considerable amelioration of the 80 per cent increase, so that in fact the 80 per cent would not apply from 1 January but would be halved. That saved gas consumers in this State \$16 000 000 during that period. For the Hon. Mr Gilfillan to allege that it was as a result of my negotiations that there was an 80 per cent increase is entirely false. The Consumers Association sought to misrepresent me in precisely the same way in the *Teachers Journal* I noticed. I also point out that those negotiations to ameliorate that price increase were conducted with the major consumers in South Australia and, of course, the agreement finally had to be reached between the Government, the Pipelines Authority and the producers. It ill behoves members in another place, or indeed anywhere, to misrepresent the facts so blatantly as has occurred on this occasion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PORT PIRIE COLLEGE

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: In yesterday's *News*, under the heading 'Pirie deputation on college', the following statement was made in relation to the Mayor of Port Pirie leading a deputation to the Minister of Education:

Mr Jones disclosed this after the Chief Secretary, Mr Keneally, announced the new Port Pirie college would be the next complex built in South Australia. Mr Keneally said he had been authorised by Mr Arnold to make the announcement at the college's annual presentation night.

I attended the annual presentation evening, and I was authorised by the Minister to advise the people present that the priority that had existed prior to 1979 would be returned to the Port Pirie Community College and that the decision was not dependent upon whether or not B.H.A.S. expanded or contracted its operations at Port Pirie. I was authorised to tell the meeting that the people of Port Pirie and the area were entitled to a new facility in their own right and that that right did not depend upon the activities of the major industry in the area.

I am aware that the confusion could have occurred but there is no reason for the people of Port Pirie to believe the report in yesterday's *News*. What I said was that as the local member for the area I was disappointed and frustrated after four or five years of trying to achieve priority for the Port Pirie college that at this stage there had been no activities in relation to the construction of the facility and that as the local member for the area I would be doing my best to ensure that the Port Pirie college was the next D.F.E. facility constructed in South Australia.

I made that statement as the local member. It is a statement that I strongly believe in, and I will be making representations to the Minister. At no time did I say that the Minister had agreed that it would be the next facility. Of course, as Chief Secretary, I was not in a position to make that statement for the Minister. I hope that I have now cleared up the

matter for my constituents in Port Pirie who may have been misled by the statement that appeared in yesterday's *News*.

At 3.15 p.m. the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move Notice of Motion: Other Business No. 2 forthwith.

I seek the suspension because I believe that this matter will not wait until the House reassembles. The Government has made it clear that it intends to rise tomorrow for the Christmas break. The purpose of the motion is for the introduction of a Bill to freeze levels of remuneration throughout 1983; and for other purposes. In fact, the legislation will freeze remuneration for members of Parliament, for the private sector and the public sector.

It should be quite clear to all members that this legislation simply will not wait, because time will have passed us by and it probably will be quite useless to introduce this legislation some month next year when the Government sees fit to call us together again. In fact, it is not yet clear just when the Government intends to call us together again. This is a pressing matter. If South Australia is to become part of the national scene in relation to coming to terms with a wage freeze it must do something immediately. The other States are moving in this direction and South Australia is the only State that has not given a clear lead in relation to this matter.

I do not think that anyone can deny that, if this matter is to be aired and debated, it must be done now, because it will not wait until next year. If the Government believes that its business is more pressing, the Opposition would be perfectly satisfied with an undertaking that it will allow us to debate this legislation next week. However, that is highly unlikely. If the Government is going to deny us a chance to debate this legislation, I simply point out that it is of major importance. There is nothing more pressing in South Australia at the moment than the need to do something about a wage freeze in this State. Some leadership must be shown to ameliorate the disastrous situation that the Premier has indicated is occurring with his Budget and to the economy generally.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier is talking about next year's Budget, his Budget for the year after, and about the dire situation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable Deputy is straying, after a delightful start to his innings.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I apologise for that, Mr Speaker. The Premier led me down that path with his interjection. There is nothing more pressing in South Australia at the moment than the need to come to grips with the down-turn in the South Australian economy. One way we can do that is to initiate a wage pause. As I have said, every other State in the Commonwealth, except South Australia, has embarked in a positive way along this track. South Australia is singularly lacking in leadership.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: What's Western Australia done?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well, similar legislation-

The SPEAKER: Order! That is out of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: At the moment, similar legislation is being contemplated in the Commonwealth Parliament. That simply highlights the urgency that surrounds this matter. We have been left at the post, but let us hope that we can catch up a bit by proceeding with this legislation this afternoon. South Australia's competitive situation is clearly in jeopardy. Not only will we be left behind, but the economy of this State will deteriorate in relation to the rest of Australia. That cannot wait to be remedied until perhaps March next year, or whenever the Government seeks to call the House together again.

We hear the Premier frequently saying that businesses are closing down, that we have a collapse in the manufacturing sector and that one of the major causes for that collapse is the escalation in wages and salaries. The Premier has added fuel to that—

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

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: Is that 10 minutes?

The SPEAKER: I beg the honourable member's pardon. I have been misled by the timing device; the member has until 3.19.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I thought it was the quickest 10 minutes that I have ever had.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It was just a question of the clock playing up.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We have heard the Premier say that there is nothing less than a collapse in the manufacturing industry in South Australia.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Along with the clock.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that the clock has collapsed, and we know that the Government has collapsed. One of the most significant factors behind that collapse as described by the Premier has been the escalation in wages over the past two or three years. If anyone should be giving a lead to the State in relation to that it is the Premier. A wage pause would stem what has become an alarming wage spiral in Australia and, in this case, in South Australia. A wage pause would also enable the Premier to come to grips with his budgetary problems in relation to the Public Service.

On the one hand, the Premier is searching around in an attempt to come to grips with his budgetary difficulties; on the other hand, he is not prepared to take the action that his Labor colleagues interstate have taken. They have rather enthusiastically endorsed this measure because they know that it will help them with their Budgets. However, the Premier is not prepared to act in that regard and I think we all know the reason for that. This House is owed more than the circumstance that the Premier is powerless to act in his own right. The Premier is having talks with employers and he says that he is having talks with the unions to see whether he can achieve some consensus.

We should not be thrashing around looking for a consensus; we should be receiving clear leadership from the Premier and the Government in relation to a wage freeze. It is high time that we got that leadership. We know perfectly well what the answer is from those two quarters. The employers made clear right from the start that they support the wage freeze with no catch-up. That has been made perfectly clear. The unions' attitude is also perfectly clear; they oppose it. However, the Premier, in the guise of having consultations, has suggested that he will get some consensus from those consultations. Of course, that is quite impossible. The Premier should be riding in on top of all this and telling everyone what his Government will do. I seek to give the Premier that opportunity by raising this matter this afternoon.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Deputy Leader is debating the issue before us, not the motion that we should suspend Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I disallow the point of order. I think the Deputy Leader is just within bounds.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The plain fact—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has now expired. I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Sir.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): The Government does not intend to accept this motion, much to the amazement of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I do not think that it is necessary for me to indulge in a speech similar to those that came from this side of the House in these circumstances in the past. I appreciate the reasons of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for moving this motion. A more charitable aspect would relate to the remarks he made about the need for urgent action to be taken. I would remind the House that we have an opportunity to debate this issue by way of an urgency motion, there is always recourse to a no-confidence motion of which courteous notice has been given. But this manner of trying to get it before the House, springing it on in the way he did, he knew very well would be unacceptable and would be opposed.

However, I think there is a second aspect which is far more grave, and the main reason why it should be refused. I certainly would not want to take refuge in the procedural customs of the House. If indeed there was more to this motion, then we could consider it. In fact, it is part of what I see as the Opposition's attempt to undermine a community process that is taking place, the implications of which are profound for the economic future of South Australia, which I believe is totally unacceptable. This motion, and the Bill that it seeks to introduce, are not an attempt to further the process of debate or to get decisions made by this Parliament or in this community. On the contrary, this is an attempt to continue the process of undermining what the Government has attempted to achieve. I know that it has become suddenly very fashionable to decry the process of consultation. I know that it is regarded, in some quarters anyway, as a sign of weakness if one attempts to bring the community together in a unified approach to a problem of dimensions that go well beyond this State.

I do not accept that view, and I think it is a pitiful attempt to continue the politicking and grandstanding that is going on and must be resisted. It is about time the Opposition got behind South Australians, and the South Australian community and its interest, instead of indulging in this exercise. It is about time that the Opposition recognised that leadership in this community depends on people having the guts to get out there and confront and talk face to face with those whose support is needed to make solutions work. If that is not done, and if that position is not taken, then we will not succeed in overcoming our economic problems. Later today I will be having a further series of discussions—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier will resume his seat. I believe that the honourable Premier has now transgressed and is debating the merits of the matter, and I ask him to come back to the issue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the point that has been made. It is a very fine line to be drawn, but I am suggesting, in my remarks, that the opposition of the Government is not because we wish to avoid debate on this

matter. As I have already explained, other recourses can be taken by the Opposition and, indeed, one of those already have been taken, with abysmal effects as far as the Opposition is concerned and with a disruptive effect as far as the people in the community are concerned. The Opposition has tried that sort of thing, but that is not the way to get this issue canvassed, and as such we are certainly going to resist it.

I will not move on to explain, as I had intended (because I appreciate your point, Mr Speaker), what we are going to do, what leadership is being displayed, and what our position is. That we will be announcing in due course, but I simply make the point that this sledge-hammer attempt to try to coerce this House into undermining the effort that is being made by a Government that has only just been elected is absolutely pitiful. It is about time members of the Opposition adjusted to the fact that on 6 November people made a decision, that that decision has them sitting there, and that they had better come to terms with that in this place. We refuse leave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Sir, I request that the comment the Minister of Housing just made be withdrawn forthwith and that he apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Todd will turn himself towards the Chair and in a moment rise and tell me what remarks he is complaining of, that will help me.

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable Minister indicated that the member for Todd was a fool, and that is the remark that I wish him to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Order! We have had a discussion. Again, it is a thin line as to whether or not it is unparliamentary. I think it is probably not unparliamentary, as I have heard an awful lot worse. Nevertheless, the honourable member for Todd is obviously upset and I will ask the Minister of Housing, if he did call him a fool, to withdraw it, please.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I just called over to the Opposition, 'You always were a fool,' and if the member for Todd identified himself with that accusation—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am asking the Minister whether he did use the word and whether he is prepared to withdraw it.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I will withdraw it, and insert 'Silly person.'

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is, 'That the motion be agreed to.' For the question say, 'Aye'; against, 'No'. There being a dissentient voice, there must be a division. Ring the bells.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Mrs Adamson, Messrs Allison, P.B. Arnold, Ashenden, Baker, Becker, Blacker, D.C. Brown, Chapman, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Lewis, Mathwin, Meier, Oswald, Rodda, Wilson, and Wotton.

Noes (24)—Mr Abbott, Mrs Appleby, Messrs Lynn Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS BILL

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to approve and provide for carrying out an agreement entered into between the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Aus-

tralia and the Premiers of the States of New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia with respect to the Murray River and other waters; to repeal the River Murray Waters Act, 1935-1971; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to present this Bill, which is the culmination of initiatives undertaken by the Hon. Des Corcoran when Minister of Works in a former Labor Administration. The purpose of the Bill is to ratify a new River Murray Waters Agreement between the Governments of the Commonwealth and of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria. By 1973 the Government of the day recognised that attempts to achieve improved mutually beneficial management of the Murray River by effecting minor amendments to the existing agreement or by the adoption of agreed informal practices, especially in respect of increasing water quality problems, was no longer appropriate. On the advice of Mr Corcoran the then Premier, Mr Don Dunstan, called for a meeting of Heads of Government to address the problem. Such a meeting was held in March 1973, when a working group was established to completely review the existing agreement.

A steering committee of responsible Ministers received the recommendation of the working group in 1975. These recommendations proposed that the River Murray Commission be given additional powers to take account of a range of matters concerned with water quality in its management of the river. The four Governments involved agreed that, pending further consideration of the agreement, the commission should generally operate as if it had the proposed additional powers. The commission was also asked to review the agreement to determine necessary amendments to improve its operation. The first draft of a revised agreement was submitted by the commission in May 1978. Negotiations between the Governments on the principles of a new agreement were then commenced. It is pleasing to note that these negotiations were continued by the previous Government and that the negotiations reached fruition in October 1981, when a meeting of Heads of Government agreed on the matters to be included.

The agreement appended to this Bill is in accordance with the principles accepted at that meeting and endorsed by this Government. The Bill therefore is the same as that introduced by my predecessor before Parliament was prorogued. When considering the fact that it is now nine years since Mr Corcoran first proposed the negotiation of a new River Murray Waters Agreement, it is of interest to note the history of the establishment of the first such agreement. I seek leave to have the remainder of the explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Remainder of Explanation

The first formal negotiations between the States in respect of the management of the Murray River commenced with a convention in 1863. Attempts to come to some mutually acceptable and beneficial agreement between 1863 and 1906 were, however, singularly unsuccessful. During that period there were three conventions, three conferences of Premiers, one convention proposed which did not eventuate, mountains of correspondence generated, three royal commissions (one in each of the three States), and an agreement signed by the three Premiers in 1906, in relation to the locking of the river and the allocation of water, which was never ratified by any of the State Parliaments.

Between 1906 and 1913, negotiations between the States continued mainly through correspondence, and Victoria established yet another royal commission. Finally, in July

1913, the basis for a formal agreement, just 50 years after the first convention called for that purpose, was accepted. The River Murray Waters Agreement was signed by the Prime Minister and the three Premiers on 9 September 1914 and ratified by the four Parliaments in 1915. This agreement established a works programme and a formula for cost sharing, established a water-sharing formula, including an entitlement for South Australia, confirmed the rights of New South Wales and Victoria to use the water in their tributaries, and created the River Murray Commission with narrow powers to implement the water-sharing provisions.

Notwithstanding the limited powers accorded the commission, much was achieved over the following 60 years. Between 1922 and 1939, 13 locks were constructed on the river (six within South Australia) and the Murray mouth barrages were completed in 1940. The new agreement, which this Bill seeks to ratify, is a great improvement on the former agreement. The most significant additions, particularly for South Australia, are the new initiatives included in Part IV which set out provisions for water quality accounting and control. The principal initiatives in this Part provide power for the Commission to:

- consider any or all relevant water management objectives, including water quality, in the investigation, planning and operation of works;
- monitor water quality;
- co-ordinate studies concerning water quality in the River Murray;
- recommend water quality standards for adoption by the States;
- make recommendations to any Government agency or tribunal on any matter which may affect the quantity or quality of River Murray waters;
- make representations to any Government agency concerning any proposal which may significantly affect the flow, use, control or quality of River Murray waters;
- have regard to the possible effects of its decisions on any river or water management objectives when exercising its powers under the agreement.

The new agreement, therefore, for the first time, requires the commission to take account of water quality in its management of the Murray River. To South Australia this is a major advance. The ability to set and work towards water quality objectives will enable this State to proceed with confidence with its internal programmes for the better management and use of its water resources. In the long term the combination of commission and State water quality management should enhance the quality of Murray River water in South Australia to the benefit of all users. In the context of the long and difficult negotiations, commencing in 1863 and more recently in 1973, and of the acceptance by the Commonwealth and the three States of this greatly improved agreement, it is most gratifying to submit this Bill for consideration by the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the Act to come into operation on proclamation. Clause 3 contains the interpretative provisions required for the purpose of the ratifying Act. Clause 4 provides that the Act binds the Crown. Clause 5 provides for approval of the agreement. Clauses 6, 7 and 8 provide for the appointment and conditions of office of the South Australian Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner. Clause 9 empowers the commission to exercise the powers conferred by the agreement and enables the Supreme Court to make orders for the enforcement of decisions and orders of the commission.

Clause 10 enables the Commissioners and authorised persons to enter land for the purposes of the agreement. Clause 11 authorises the construction, maintenance, operation and control in South Australia of the works contemplated by the agreement and the carrying out of operations contem-

plated by the agreement. Clause 12 authorises and requires the Minister to carry out the obligations of the State under the agreement. It also authorises other contracting Governments and constructing authorities to carry out works and operations contemplated by the agreement in South Australia. Clause 13 confers a power of compulsory acquisition for purposes related to the agreement. Clause 14 empowers the Governor to grant interests in or over Crown lands for the purposes of the agreement. Clause 15 empowers the charging of tolls in respect of boats passing through locks.

Clause 16 provides for the payments required of the State under the agreement to be made out of moneys provided by Parliament. Clause 17 exempts works carried out under the agreement and property held for those works from State taxation. Clause 18 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 19 provides for the laying of reports before Parliament. Clause 20 confers jurisdiction on the Supreme Court in respect of the commission. Clause 21 makes malicious damage of works constructed under the agreement an indictable offence, punishable by up to 10 years imprisonment. Clause 22 is a regulation-making power. Clause 23 provides for the repeal of the present River Murray Waters Act and contains a transitional provision in respect of the present Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 14 December. Page 121.)

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): The Opposition supports the Bill, which is purely a routine matter to enable consumers to have access to buying liquor through bottle shops, in accordance with late night trading provisions that apply to other shops immediately before Christmas. It is simply a procedural matter, and we are happy for the Bill to be passed with the utmost speed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr BECKER: I rise on a point of order. I do not have a copy of the Bill on file.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Copies will be distributed to members as soon as they are available.

Mr BECKER: I move:

That progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Before that is done, I understand that copies are becoming fully available. Does the member wish to proceed?

Mr BECKER: I appreciate that, Mr Chairman, because I have not had an opportunity to look at what impact this will have on licensed premises in my electorate. I am quite sure that they would like to have the opportunity to be concerned about this.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! A copy of this Bill was given to the shadow Minister on the basis that the Bill would be brought on for debate. It is true to say that there was a shortage of copies for all members. This has now been rectified and the situation is that the Bill will be debated. The shadow Minister was obviously in a position to carry on with the debate and, as far as the Government is concerned, the Bill is now in Committee.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. Are you refusing to take a motion from a member of the House? The member for Hanson clearly indicated his desire that progress be reported. The motion was not

sought to be seconded. You did, and I accept, indicate that there was possibly another course of action but I strongly suggest that a motion properly put by a member should at least be received by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The position is quite clear as far as the Chair is concerned. We do not require a seconder to the motion that was moved by the member for Hanson and, if the Committee remembers correctly, when the member for Hanson moved the motion I explained the position regarding copies of the Bill. After copies became available I asked the honourable member whether he wanted to proceed with his motion. So there is no point of order, and again I would ask the honourable member whether he wishes to proceed with his motion.

Mr BECKER: Yes, Mr Chairman.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 14 December. Page 121.)

The SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Mitcham I would remind the House that this is his maiden speech and I would ask that the normal courtesy be extended.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I support the motion. I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the Speaker on his attaining that office. He was in fact a lecturer of mine in a course of commercial law at the University of Adelaide. He did a fine job there and I can see that he is going to do a fine job in teaching me here.

I should also acknowledge the contribution of the two former members for Mitcham. I also thank the staff of Parliament who have helped me so much during the settling-in period and, of course, my greatest thanks go to the people who supported and worked for me in the Mitcham campaign.

I did intend to address my remarks to the Governor's Speech, because I believe that the Governor's Speech should show the way ahead for next year. However, on reading the document I found that it contained nothing but generalities, with no perspective of where we are going. I therefore thought that it would be appropriate if I talked about the challenges ahead.

Fifty years ago, Steve Dunks was elected as the member for Mitcham. In his maiden speech, in April 1933, Mr Dunks spoke about survival. He talked about unemployment running at 30 per cent. He blamed the Federal Government for inadequate assistance, which at that stage was \$2 000 000. He talked about the fear of revolution. He blamed machinery for taking away jobs from the workers. He moved that we should scrap labour-saving devices. He suggested increased hours and decreased wages. He suggested movement back to the farm. Have times really changed? It all sounds so familiar, but that was 50 years ago and I ask: Where is all the new thinking coming from? Perhaps the lack of thinking about what we are facing is a lack of understanding of what are the causes of the dilemma we are in. Perhaps we should understand a little about the world around us. There have been many explanations for the world recession. The explanation that I find most compelling is the one about the financial structure of the world. It started back in the days of the Vietnam war and has gathered momentum over a period of time. We in the Western world have provided goods and services on credit to under-developed countries for many years. We have never made them pay the price and, of course, the banks and financial institutions of the world have borne that debt until they have said, 'No more,' and as soon as the financial institutions of the world say

that, as soon as they cut off the lines of credit, it means that we do not sell our goods in the same way as we have done previously.

There has been a breakdown in the international financial structure with the consequent effect on world trade, and we all know that Australia's problems revolve around this. Our exports to under-developed countries have been affected. This has led to a down-turn in domestic production. We have been affected through our reliance on supply of raw materials and, of course, this has been compounded by the drought situation.

All major countries in the world are affected. There is 14 per cent unemployment in the United Kingdom, 13 per cent in Canada, 18 per cent in Honolulu (where I was recently) and 10 per cent in the United States. Even in Japan, which prided itself on having a less than 2 per cent unemployment rate, it is now running at 4 per cent and the structure is cracking. Until the financial structure of the world is redeemed, Australia can expect no improvement in its trading situation, and the rest of the world and we will have to go through a rationalisation period. Anyone who believes that it is going to stop in 1983 is dreaming, because I cannot see the rationalisation of that debt, and I cannot see that the countries will write off \$60 billion worth of debt and say, 'It was a bad dream. We will now support international trade again.'

Of course, in Australia we will have to pay the price for our indiscretions. We have succeeded in achieving mediocrity in traded goods on the international market. So many of the goods that we sell, even some of the things in which we pride ourselves, are not up to standard. There have been meat scandals. Wool that we sell has had impediments. There is a whole range of goods that we sell to which we have not paid proper attention in terms of quality. We have priced ourselves out of world markets, and we have had an inordinate dependence on primary exports, particularly unprocessed minerals.

So where do the solutions lie? They lie in the reversal of all three things. Perhaps the wage freeze is not the right solution in terms of options, but realistically it is the only one that will work as a chance to unify Australians.

Australians want a lead. There are many people who say either that their children or that their father cannot get a job and that they are willing to take less, but unless politicians can give them some means of making such sacrifices we will meander on as we are doing at the moment, particularly in South Australia. In a previous maiden speech, reference was made to putting up trade barriers. Of course, our trade barriers have added to the fundamental problem that we have. Evidence last financial year indicates that unemployment was over 6 per cent and that there was an increase in wages of 17 per cent compared with a 10 per cent increase in the cost of living. Everyone has his hand out wanting more.

What can the State do in regard to national problems? We have heard the noises made about consultation. It is important that the Premier understand one fundamental point, namely, that if 100 people are asked to give a solution to the way out of the current economic crisis those people will give 100 different answers. A solution cannot be achieved by consultation: someone must take the lead, otherwise there will be 100 ideas and the problem will not be solved.

Industrial relations is the key area. The A.L.P. prides itself on being very close to the worker. The potential is there, but it will never be met. They are controlled by their own inadequacies and are frightened of doing something constructive. A classic example is that of the Builders Labourers Union. I am sure that my colleagues and many members opposite know that the Builders Labourers Union is one of the most destructive union forces seen in this country for many years. What did the Labor Government

do as part of its process of improving industrial relations? It withdrew from the Commonwealth case. What sort of lead is that? Is that not condoning the industrial violence perpetuated by the people in that union? How can the Labor Party say that it is going to provide the right solution when it cannot even offer the lead to its own people whom they deem as being close to them.

The 1970s was a time when we needed new directions and a time when we knew that our employment base was fragile and that jobs were becoming more important. During those 10 years the Labor Government did nothing about employment; it did nothing to attract industry or to change the economic base, and it did nothing to support the people of South Australia. The Labor Government may have had a few chalk marks put on the board in terms of social changes, some of which I applaud, but the fundamental question of jobs was sadly missed out. In fact, the Labor Party has done a disservice to South Australia.

I am pleased that, as a result of a question, the Premier put on record very early in the piece the jobless figures. I believe that the figure is 8.4 per cent. Of course, in accordance with the election promises made we would expect to see that figure improve. I presume that in three years time we will be placing on record just how well the Premier has done in that regard.

Whilst I might be critical of Labor Administrations, the Liberal Party is not blameless in this sphere. On the national scene the Liberal Government has presided over a massive increase and escalation in wages and has failed to find the solutions. The Liberal Party has concentrated far too much on mining booms rather than on the realities of the domestic market; it has failed to come to grips with protection. These are challenges which must be met in the Federal sphere, and we in South Australia must also push for them. It can be said that neither Party has done overly well during the past 10 years.

I am pleased to see that the Premier is talking about co-operation and consensus. However, if one tears the word 'consensus' apart and takes it as two components, one finds the word 'con' which in Australian colloquial means a trick, and 'sensus'—or 'census', which means a collection; thus, consensus can be a series of tricks, with nothing ever achieved. The challenge before us is exciting. The change in attitude must come from within the South Australian and Australian communities, and the Government and the Opposition must both play a key role. In regard to the A.L.P., a new attitude is needed to volunteerism, which it is attempting to destroy, and a real appreciation is needed of the role of profits in a healthy, competitive environment (let me add that it is not the profitable firms that are laying off employees), and a stimulation of self and co-operative achievement. For our part we need to rethink the role of management and labour to promote closer working relations.

Besides attacking all these areas on the economic front at the national level, these are things that we can do in South Australia and perhaps give the rest of the country a lead.

Finally, I want to thank the people of Mitcham for their confidence. I pledge myself to serve the electorate and the Parliament in the highest possible tradition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Unley, I would remind the House that this will be the honourable member's maiden speech, and I would hope that it will be treated accordingly.

Mr MAYES (Unley): First, I congratulate the Speaker on his election to that high office. I am confident that he will perform that task with great skill, care and command. I also had the privilege of having the Speaker as a lecturer in commercial law, as did the member for Mitcham. I enjoyed his lectures and look forward to serving in this House with the Speaker, and I am sure that it will be an equally successful

combination. I support the motion before the House. I would like to add my congratulations to my new colleagues who have joined me in the House of Assembly, and I look forward to serving with them over the next three years. It would be fair to say that all the political pundits suggested that I should not be in this place to represent the electorate of Unley. However, I am pleased to say that I am here and that I am going to stay here. My primary goal will be to represent the people of Unley as effectively as I can. My door will always be open to the people of the District of Unley, and I look forward to serving them with all the skill I can muster.

Unley is a diverse and unique electorate and is a very colourful and important one in terms of electorates in South Australia. It has a diverse cross-section of the community and an important part to play as an inner suburban electorate. It would be remiss of me not to pay some tribute to the former member for Unley who represented that electorate in this House for nearly 21 years. Gil Langley entered Parliament in 1962 and served his electorate with great distinction. He is known throughout Unley for his care and honesty. He has always been prepared to help and has always given help freely without any question or obligation.

I am pleased to say that not only did Gil Langley support me but also he became a close friend of mine during the campaign. He gave me absolute and total support without any qualification. An indication of Gil Langley's commitment and dedication as a member, and now as a former member, of Parliament is clearly exhibited in the fact that he is still prepared to help those people in Unley who need his support and assistance and still today he is involved in issues involving people in the Unley area.

I believe that Gil Langley has made a great contribution to politics in both Unley and South Australia over the last 20 years, and I am sure that he will always be remembered for his wit, for his ability to turn the other cheek whenever other people put him under the hammer and for his honesty and dedication as a political figure. Gil Langley established the Labor Party in Unley, and he maintained an active interest in and active support for the Labor Party through those years.

I would like also to commend Jean Langley for her tireless role in support of Gil Langley as the local member in the campaigns that have been waged over the years. She is full of energy and is always prepared to help at any time, whether delivering newsletters, letter-boxing, preparing food for campaign workers or offering support and advice to both Gil and me over the years we have been involved in campaigning in Unley. It is true to say that without Jean Langley's support I doubt whether I would be here representing the District of Unley today, and I am sure that without her help Gil Langley would have lacked the support and strength needed during his campaigns over the years.

Finally, I thank the campaign workers in Unley for the support and assistance they have given and, in addition, those people in the trade union movement who have given me their undying support and A.L.P. workers generally during the campaign. It was a vigorous hard-fought campaign but I think on the day we certainly won in all aspects, whether it be through press, publicity or campaigning, and certainly the end result, the magnificent victory of 2 000 votes as a clear majority, gave a clear indication to me that the people of Unley were prepared to trust me and support the A.L.P. and the issues we had presented to them.

I would like now to turn my attention to several issues that I believe are of importance to the whole South Australian community. The first point I would like to consider is the question of small government. We heard much from the Opposition benches when they were in Government about the evils of big government and the wonders of small gov-

ernment. I think it is a use of jargon that has been overplayed and few people have carefully examined its meaning. I ask whether we have big government. Only four of 24 comparable countries in the O.E.C.D. spend less in the public sector than Australia spends in the public sector. Those four countries are Greece, Spain, Turkey and Iceland, and I think that in itself answers this question. South Australia does not have big government. South Australia spends less on its public sector than the other States of comparable size in Australia spend. For example, we spend 23.4 per cent on the public sector, Western Australia spends 25 per cent and Tasmania nearly 30 per cent, so that in comparison it can be said that we do not have big government in this State.

A deeper question is why we should pursue small government. What are the benefits for this State and this country in having small government? The former Premier in his election announcements prior to the September election of 1979 made a great play of the benefits of small government. He indicated that small government meant growth, job creation and economic prosperity. He promised jobs being transferred from the public sector to the private sector. We know that that experiment has failed. It does not work, it did not work in the 1930s, and it is not working today. It is time we carefully examined the propaganda put out for small government.

We can see from the philosophy that was followed that the transference of jobs from the public sector to the private sector did not occur; in fact, unemployment grew over that period. The real question then is whether small government (and the philosophy of small government) is about creating employment or whether it is really about the transfer of wealth, that is, the transfer of wealth from the poor to the rich in the community, from the wage-earner to the wealthy.

I believe the evidence suggests that in fact there is a process of transferring wealth. If we look at the figures of taxation collection and the expenditure for both the Federal and the State Governments, a direct relationship can be seen in the transfer of wealth from the poor to the wealthy. Commonwealth receipts have risen from \$29 000 000 000 in 1979-80 to \$35 000 000 000 in 1980-81, which is an increase of 18.6 per cent. The Government itself estimates that receipts will rise again in 1981-82 to \$40 000 000 000, which is an increase of 15.8 per cent. These figures are contained in the Budget papers. The State Government revenues tell the same story. In 1978-79 there was a rise of 8.3 per cent, in 1979-80 the rise was 9.4 per cent and in 1980-81 it was 10.5 per cent, so the revenue of the Governments in this country are increasing. It is interesting to see how that expenditure is being allocated to the community.

The Federal Government has cut health and welfare services. Since 1975 expenditure on defence has increased by 20 per cent, and that allows for inflation. Expenditure on public education has fallen by 20 per cent, and expenditure on private education has risen by 35 per cent. Funding for welfare housing has been slashed by 65 per cent. Subsidies to industry and the mining sector have increased dramatically.

South Australia tells the same story. State spending on education, health and welfare fell by 48 per cent, when the former Government was in office, in 1979-80 and by 43 per cent in 1981-82. At the same time, incentives to industry increased by 630 per cent. State Government assistance to industry amounted to \$12 000 000 in direct grants and \$12 000 000 in loans during 1980. It is clear to me, and I believe it is clear from the evidence that I have pointed to, that in fact small government is about the transfer of wealth from the poor to the wealthy.

This transfer of wealth has brought about a movement of both assets and community facilities from those least well-off sections of the community to the most well-off

sections of the community. Small government in itself also means a deterioration in services which again hits those least able to buffer themselves against such cuts. Examples of this are many and frequent in South Australia, particularly over the past three years of the Liberal Government. The South Australian experience can be seen as a model, in my view, of the way a Government should not act. We should not cut services in areas such as those involving the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Public Buildings Department, the Highways Department, Marine and Harbors Department, housing, health, education and even national parks.

In September 1982, the former Premier claimed to have cut 4 500 jobs from the public sector. In one year, from June 1980 to March 1981, the Public Buildings Department lost 14 per cent of its daily-paid staff and 8 per cent from staff appointed positions. In 1981 the State Budget cut \$44 000 000 from Government building programmes. Of course, that has a direct impact on the quality of lifestyle of our community as a whole, affecting schools, hospitals and other important public institutions.

In addition to those cuts we can see that not only was the capital works programme cut but also the recurrent expenditure programme. I refer to the *Advertiser* of 16 August 1981, as follows:

The 1981 State Budget, which cut \$44 000 000 from Government building programmes, was described by the Executive Director of the Master Builders' Association as disastrous for the building industry in South Australia. He said the industry was already on its knees and the Budget decisions would mean further unemployment.

I think the evidence clearly indicates that those statements by the Executive Director of the Master Builders' Association have come home to roost. Those truths are encapsulated by what is being seen in the unemployment figures. It is another example of an attitude to small government, short sightedness, and a lack of ability to see this State's future and how it is affected by Government planning.

In addition, the 1981 Budget saw a cut of \$22 000 000 in recurrent expenditure. Family day-care funding was cut and staff employed in the national parks was cut, to the detriment of various areas of national parks, including the fire service, where one-third of the staff available for fire-fighting duties was removed. School assistants hours were cut. Between 1979 and 1981 admissions rose by 2 per cent in public hospitals, yet staff numbers were reduced by some 4 per cent.

In the housing area we saw dramatic cuts not only to the building programme but also to the quality of services provided by the South Australian Housing Trust. The housing industry is one of the key South Australian sectors. In 1979-80 the volume of public housing built fell by 26 per cent. Other forms of public construction fell and private housing rose only slightly, by 6 per cent. Over the same period 5 500 jobs were lost in the South Australian construction industry. Again, the message is loud and clear: we have a cut-back in public sector activity, and we have a growth in unemployment. If we look at the whole picture we can see that during that same period there was a massive increase in the waiting list for South Australian Housing Trust homes. The number of homeless increased, but the former Government proceeded down the negative path of reducing expenditure in the housing and construction area.

I think that the evidence is overwhelming and that decision in itself is damning of the former Government's policy. The public sector plays an important and productive part in the State's economy. I refer to the State Development Council's document 'South Australia—a strategy for the future', which was prepared for the former Government. At page 36 it states:

Deficit funding of public works can, if properly planned, provide a solution to temporary unemployment problems as well as creating an environment conducive to future expansion of the private sector.

The people who were advising the former Government were in fact advising against its policies.

I refer to a very important statement by one of the more eminent academics in this State which highlights the role of the private and public sectors. Mr Hugh Stretton, a lecturer in history at the University of Adelaide, I think sums up the whole position of how public and private sector interrelate, as follows:

A private company mines public gas, sends it through a public pipeline to another private gas company which, however, has a public franchise, which sends it this time through a private pipe to a private brickworks, where it is united with public electricity and private clay to make bricks which go by private truck on public roads to a private building contractor who is building public housing on public lands, to be sold to a private citizen with a first mortgage from a private bank and a second mortgage from a public housing agency.

That sums up the complex interrelationship between the public and private sectors. Of course, that was recognised back in the 1920s by the pre-Keynesian economists, but it seems to have been ignored by the former Government over the past three years.

If one looks at South Australia's experience over the past three years one could not venture a guess as to how the former Government made its decisions in relation to the allocation of work from the public to the private sector. However, I suggest that some of the examples in themselves relate a telling story about the decisions reached. I could refer to many examples, but I will not go into them in great detail. I refer to the Engineering and Water Supply Department water filtration programme at Little Para, the water contract, and the salinity control in the Murray River. These are examples of work that could have been performed and should have been performed by the E. & W.S. Department, but it was given out and led to people standing idle in that department at great cost to the community as a whole.

In April 1981, \$10 000 000 worth of Highways Department machinery was sold for \$580 000. Again, that resulted in idle workmen in the workshops of that department, idle tradesmen, engineers, labourers and draftsmen. I refer also to air-conditioning provided by the Public Buildings Department and the cost of maintenance in relation to the private sector versus the public sector. The costing figures per hour for maintenance are quite dramatic in their own right and in themselves give a clear picture of the stupidity of allocating work that has been adequately and efficiently performed by the Public Buildings Department. The air-conditioning maintenance cost charged per hour by the Public Buildings Department is \$13.50 (based on 1981 figures); a private contractor charged \$30.50 per hour. The P.B.D. charged between \$3 000 and \$5 000 for a bearing refit of centrifugal chillers; a private contractor charged \$20 000. That is a clear example where the public purse was drained purely for a philosophical view without much logic or substance to support it.

The Highways Department contract for 51 kilometres of the Stuart Highway was in the vicinity of \$75 000 per kilometre; the quote from a private contractor was \$100 000 per kilometre. Therefore, 51 kilometres at an extra \$25 000 per kilometre was allocated to a private contractor. Once again, that is a telling example of the stupidity of the decisions made by the former Government. Not only did we have the additional cost; in addition, machinery had to stand idle and men with these skills who have traditionally performed these tasks with a great degree of merit and skill over past years were also left idle. The Public Accounts Committee identified 950 surplus positions in the Engineering and Water Supply Department and 500 in the Public

Buildings Department of skilled tradespeople who were stood aside because of the former Government's philosophy.

This type of decision making went so far as to be acknowledged by the Ombudsman in his 1981-82 report. I will refer briefly to that report and the passages contained therein because I think it is important to place this on public record. Not everyone has an opportunity to see the Ombudsman's Report; therefore, I think it is certainly worth recording. The watch dog over community fair play comments about how staff reductions have affected Government services. On page 8 of his report he states:

It could be claimed that the staffing of the public sector is a policy matter, and not the business of the Ombudsman. In one respect this is true. However, specific instances of maladministration are my concern, and where the root cause of these is found to be unreasonable shortages of staff or resources, I propose to comment and to criticise. Where staffing affects the efficiency of an organisation, as complaints to me have proved, the Ombudsman has a role to play. I firmly believe that if a Government establishes a function, it must ensure that sufficient resources are allocated to administer that function properly. It seems shortsighted of a Government to save money today when it may cost three times as much tomorrow to solve a problem. This could well be the case in many areas of the Public Service because of Government cutbacks. These trends suggest that the bodies responsible for staffing and organisation of the public sector will have to take these matters into account in their development of advice to Government.

That is a clear back-hander to the policies which were developed by the former Government from the person who is appointed to assess fair play in this community.

Small government, as I understand it, is not about economic recovery; it is about the redistribution of wealth. The average taxpayer with two children is now paying 241 per cent more tax than in 1975-76, while his income has gone up by only 88 per cent. That information is from Eric Ristrom, of the Australian Taxpayers Association. More than 2 000 000 taxpayers will be paying 46c in the dollar in the coming year. In 1975-76, 13 per cent of income went in indirect taxes. In 1982, that figure will be as high as 16 per cent.

Since coming to power, the Fraser Government has introduced 40 major tax concessions; only two of those concessions will be of direct benefit to the working people of this country. I think that in itself is a damning comment on the way in which the Fraser Government has approached this policy of small government and the way in which it has participated in the redistribution of wealth. Professor Matthews (whom I am sure one of my colleagues in this House will know of, having had to study his many texts over the years) sums up the entire taxation system in this country by stating:

The taxation system has become a major instrument for the redistribution of income and wealth in favour of the rich.

Professor Matthews could hardly be called a person in the left of politics in Australia. He would certainly be in the conservative framework, in my experience (and I have certainly read a lot of his texts), and when such a statement comes from someone who has had a fairly conservative background, that would appear to be a very damning comment upon the Fraser Government's philosophy towards taxation in this country.

Not only have we been paying more (and that redistribution has been going to the wealthy), but the former Tonkin Government, as well as the Fraser Government, has entertained a major cut-back in the social wage, the wage that affects everyone: the cost of health, the cost of living in this community, the essentials of life. There has been a \$22 per week cut on the wage and salary earner in the social wage. That has occurred since 1975. In addition to paying more taxes and having those taxes redistributed away from those wage and salary earners, there is less going to those people

in the way of community facilities because health costs and other like costs have been added to their daily living expenses.

It is little wonder that the community, during the last State election, identified the Liberals as supporting the rich, and identified the Labor Party as a Party that cared. The Liberal Party was seen in its true light, and thank heavens the public was discerning enough and had the ability to realise the philosophies that were being enunciated by the Liberal Party. What the Liberal Party is really about is the redistribution of wealth. It is interesting to note the Leader of the Opposition's comments in the *Advertiser* of 11 December under the heading, 'Liberals "the enemy"; and Labor "cared"', which states:

Liberal Party polls taken before and during the State election campaign had shown the Party as 'the enemy of all but the rich', the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Olsen, said last night.

It is amazing that it becomes such an enlightening statement from the Leader. It is something that most people in the community began to realise since the Fraser Government came into power in 1975: in fact the Liberal Party is about caring for one group only, that group being a very small section of the community: the rich. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for providing me with that quote.

Where does the Labor Party go in Government in providing community services and in regard to Government policy? It is important to look at the period of the Fraser Government and the period of the former Tonkin Government to make some clear and defined statement as to what Labor must do when in Government. We certainly received a very warm welcome. On the day we had our first Caucus meeting, we were welcomed by the news that Simpson Pope, Kelvinator and Bridgestone were retrenching staff. I know that those decisions were held over as our welcoming mat when we came to government. On the Friday prior to the election, I was informed by a friend who works at Simpson Pope that there would be a decision in the following week to retrench staff. This was a deliberate political trick to avoid embarrassment to the then Government. Is it surprising then that the community is becoming cynical about politicians and promises based on the Fraser Government's performance and the former Tonkin Government's performance?

We can go through the promises that Fraser made in 1975: tax indexation, Medibank, and many others, all of them broken. The Labor Government has an onus on it to destroy the cynicism in the community towards politicians and politics. If we support the democratic process of government then we have a role to play in maintaining honesty and good government. I believe that the Fraser Government has lowered the esteem of politics in this country. It has been said that it has been lowered into the gutter. The democratic system of government will flounder and wallow if we do not exhibit clear policies, policies which continue to support the majority of the community, not policies that favour a small section of the community at the expense of the majority.

The Labor Government in this State must maintain and improve community services, encourage employment in the public and private sectors and generate economic activity in the public sector so that the benefits flow to the whole community, including the private sector. It will achieve this by a process of consultation with the sectors involved, not by decree from North Terrace.

In my former job I saw how decree from North Terrace led to destruction, lack of confidence and no leadership, contrary to what the Opposition is saying currently. It is better to consult. It is important and essential to consult to achieve good government. 'Consult' is the operative word and must be played out by the parties concerned, especially the Government.

I turn now to one of the most important topics which has been placed before the House and which currently is being debated in the community. I refer to the so-called wage pause or wage freeze which has been so strongly heralded by the press and opponents on the other side of the House. The press has waged an extraordinary campaign to secure a wage freeze or pause and seems to be claiming it as the answer to our current economic problems. There are many quotes that one could draw, and I have collected some 50 or so out of the *Advertiser* and *News* alone over the last three or four weeks—all claiming that a wage freeze or wage pause is the answer to our economic problems. For one single string to our economic bow to try to answer these problems is not the answer, and there are plenty of examples to show that that is true throughout the world. It has been tried before. It was tried in the 1930s and has been tried in many countries throughout the world over the past 50 years. I am amazed that we have been caught by the same simple answer when so much evidence is available to indicate that it does not work. The *Advertiser* editorial of 10 December took on the Premier and his approach to the wage freeze proposals. It states:

In his search for a consensus, he is in danger of ignoring the consensus that exists already over the need to take urgent action to redress the severe economic problems facing Australia.

I am sure the Premier acknowledges that, but, he is doing his bit in seeking a consensus with the parties concerned. It is important to seek that consensus from the trade union movement, from the employers and the community as a whole. Consensus involves listening and hearing their ideas, not just being caught by what I believe is a clever political ploy, pulled on by the Acting Prime Minister, to achieve victory in Flinders. The editorial further states:

It is worrying, too, that he appears not to accept the philosophy behind the freeze.

What philosophy? All I have read in the press is a general barrage of demands from the press and from the Liberals at the Federal level that there be a wage freeze or pause. There has not been much logic to back it up. It further states:

The Commonwealth has not said what happens at the end of the pause.

They are quoting the Premier and what Mr Anthony said on a television interview. They have not said what happens, because I believe they do not know what happens afterwards. They pulled it out of the hat hoping that it would win the Flinders by-election. It did the trick and now they have to live with it. They have not thought about what happens afterwards. The editorial continues:

Therefore, if we look at the wage freeze and therefore destroy employment prospects, preserving jobs is the purpose of the whole exercise.

I doubt that and I question it. It continues:

While Mr Bannon is pursuing his own line, with an individual approach, it is emerging that different Premiers are interpreting the wage freeze policy differently.

I understand that, because the clear direction given from the Federal Parliament is not that clear at all. It is very much wide open as to what would happen during and after the freeze. No-one has talked about prices, interest rates, oil prices or regulation of interest rates. I have heard the phrase '*ceteris paribus*' 'all other things being equal', but what I have heard from the Federal Government is quite ridiculous. The editorial of 10 December we can see is trying to put pressure on the Premier and his Government to react to something which I believe is ill conceived and poorly devised.

If one has read anything about the debate that led up to the Premiers' plan in 1931 (and I have been fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to study some of the

documents and material that led to that plan), one would see that the same arguments were ventured as well as the same debates. It is almost identical. We could take the *Advertiser* today and compare it with articles in the press of 1929 and 1930. What results came out of that? The campaign then was waged to secure a reduction in real wages. With the current levels of inflation, and compared with the levels of inflation and c.p.i. in 1930, what has been suggested today (a freeze for 12 months) would achieve exactly what the Premiers' plan set out to achieve in the 1930s, namely, a real reduction in wages. To consider that a wage freeze provides the answer to our current problems is engaging in an exercise of grand delusion. It did not achieve it then. It did not achieve it in the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Canada, the United States or New Zealand.

The current problems require a comprehensive package and not an expectation that one section of the community (that is, the working people of Australia) should bear the burden of the Federal Government's mistakes or the mistakes of the former Liberal Government in this State. It is a cleverly constructed campaign to gather up the press and the community with propaganda to win the by-election in Flinders and join in a catch-cry to show that the Federal Government has some leanings towards leadership. It is a desperate attempt to draw attention away from the failings of the Tonkin and Fraser Governments and on to that of the current Governments in power in other States. It is an attempt to draw away from the problems the Federal Government has and put it back on the States. It is a remarkable parallel to the plan put forward in 1930 by Sir Otto Niemeyer. I will quote from a book containing a collection of essays on the 1930 period. One in particular titled, 'The wasted years' was written by Mr David Clark. I will quote exactly what Niemeyer was saying in those years, and one will see the remarkable parallel to which I refer. It states:

As Australia slid quickly into depression our ability to meet interest payments on our overseas borrowing became tenuous. To try to protect the interests of British finance capital a Bank of England team, led by Sir Otto Niemeyer, was despatched to Australia. Niemeyer's analysis was terse: Australia's standard of living was simply 'too high', and a drastic reduction in wage levels of at least 20 per cent was essential to avoid disaster.

We have heard it all, and we are hearing it again in 1982. It is often believed that there were very few, if any, economists who took the pre-Keynesian position of expansionary budget (deficit budget) in a situation of economic recession or depression. That is just not true. If one opens up the papers and documents presented from Cambridge, to Oxford, to Harvard, one will see throughout the academic papers that, in the 1920s and the early 1930s, prior to Keynes' book, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, many economists throughout the world were advocating that the balanced budget theory, the reduction in real wages theory, was bunkum. They strongly supported the theory presented by the Keynes school. However, if one reads the popular press, it would appear that no-one existed with such theories prior to Keynes in 1936.

Let us not be misled by that and let us not be caught by current propaganda. Let us think carefully about other factors that affect our economic situation, such as interest rates, tariffs, growth in our own home markets, and money supply. All of those are important factors that affect our economic situation, not just wages. They are one part of it. Let us not expect one section of the community to bear the brunt. Australia's unemployment has exceeded 500 000 for the first time since 1933.

It is now climbing to 10 per cent. Predictions indicate that it will reach 10 per cent, if not this month certainly in the new year. It is interesting to note that in 1929, at the beginning of the depression, Australia had a measured unemployment level of 10.2 per cent of the work force. So

we can clearly see that there is some similarity, not only from the point of view of the academic analysis but also from the point of view of the situation in regard to unemployment. We have a growing unemployment rate in Australia, and we are again dabbling in the same shortsighted exercises in which we dabbled in 1930, just as a few years ago we fiddled around with a concept of a wage freeze and we looked at the question of price control.

Have we had a wage explosion in this country? That is being popularly voiced throughout the community. Since 1975 average weekly earnings have risen by .73 per cent, that is, after tax, so one can hardly claim that that is a wage explosion. One can hardly claim that that has been the downfall of the Australian economic system. The question is whether the economy would be stronger and unemployment higher if real wages had dropped by an equivalent amount as has occurred in the United States. In the United States there has been an effective 10 per cent to 15 per cent drop in real wages. It is clear from the evidence that it just does not happen that way. In fact we can see that in the United States there has not been a growth in employment at all: there has been a drop in employment, quite a dramatic drop in fact. So, if we look at comparisons, we will see that the situation of comparing Australia and America does not support the argument of a drop in real wages. I refer to statistics available from the American Bureau, as follows:

The empirical answer would have to be 'No'. The U.S. inflation rate is down to 7 per cent and the British to 8, compared with 10 per cent here, but the Australian unemployment rate is only half the British and two-thirds of the American.

So that we have in fact achieved a lower level of unemployment and a mildly high level of inflation. I ask what is better—a few points on the inflation scale and the difference between what was then a 7 per cent unemployment rate and now a 10 per cent unemployment rate. The answer to me is clear: 5 per cent of the work force is far more effectively engaged in employment. That is better for the people concerned and for the whole community. Again, those figures deny the reality of the current philosophy that is being enunciated by the Anthonys and by the press about a wage freeze approach. The whole construction of the 1930s plan was for the wage earner and the unemployed to carry the burden of the readjustment of the mistakes made by the captains of industry and the Government of the day. As in the 1930s, the Federal Government appears to be muddling on rather than trying to solve the problem. It really has not analysed the issues, nor has it quantified the extent of the problem in regard to a whole range of economic factors, including interest rates, money supply and unemployment.

To deal with the current economic problems we require careful consideration of the cost of production. Everyone seems to isolate the cost of production as being wages, but anyone who knows anything about business acumen or business assessment knows that interest rates form a major part of the cost of production, and an economic analysis shows that interest rates determine the rate of return. If a business man cannot make a rate of return on the cost of money, he will not go into a venture, yet we seem to ignore this as a factor affecting the state of the economy. We concentrate on the cost of wages. We have not looked at regulation of interest rates. We are having a crisis in the building industry, and yet the Government still commits itself to this philosophy of letting interest rates find their own level. They will find their own level all right!

We are looking at 20 per cent to 22 per cent in the short-term money market. How can we expect the economy to bear that cost, and how can we expect the home-building industry, the capital works industry, to survive with those sorts of interest rates? Something must be done at that level

as well. What about protection of our local industry? We have had massive imports into South Australia in capital works areas. I remember my colleague the member for Henley Beach mentioning yesterday the amount of imports we have had in capital works. We have skills in this State and we have the expertise to make those goods and yet we go overseas for them.

Then looking at the level of Government activity to maintain economic growth, it is important that a Government must level off those troughs and crests in economic activity in order to maintain what I regard as an essential quality in community life, and that is employment. It is interesting to note in this current campaign the way in which the press, the Federal Government and all those supporters of the current wage-freeze philosophy have ignored the opinion poll which was taken by the *Bulletin* this week in regard to the question of price and wage control. Prior to this campaign being built up for the Flinders by-election, I also heard on the *P.M.* programme on the A.B.C. that a poll was taken regarding price control. It seems to be conveniently ignored by the Federal Government. The Victorian Premier offered the Federal Government price control, but he was ignored, and we have not heard any more about that. In the Morgan Gallup poll four questions were directed to the participants, as follows:

Do you approve or disapprove of a 12-month freeze on wages for everyone?

The result was that 52 per cent approved, 42 per cent disapproved and 6 per cent could not say. We have heard a lot about that particular poll—the majority of the community is in favour of wage control. The second question, which none of us heard about until the *Bulletin* published it this week, was as follows:

In your opinion is a 12-month freeze on wages likely to help reduce unemployment or have no effect on unemployment?

Reduce unemployment, 33 per cent; no effect, 57 per cent. So I think that the community can probably see more clearly and has a better academic background than is evidenced from the Federal Government. The third question was as follows:

Reduce inflation or have no effect on inflation?

Reduce inflation, 40 per cent; no effect, 47 per cent; could not say, 13 per cent. So, again, the community, as it exhibited in the 6 November election here, has a greater power of discernment than has the Federal Government. The fourth question was as follows:

Do you approve or disapprove a 12-month freeze on wages and prices?

This one we have not heard about. Approve, 80 per cent; disapprove, 15 per cent. So an overwhelming majority of the community has given a clear indication that it approves of a wage and price freeze, not just a wage freeze. We can see that the band waggon that has been pushed and the propaganda that has been put out to the community have ignored this aspect of the whole economic question. People in the community are concerned about prices. They are realistic: they know that if we apply a wage freeze their wages are affected. The community as a whole, though, is confronted with increased oil prices, health costs and a whole range of community costs which will affect their quality of life and their living standard and then, as a consequence, the economic activity in this community.

The traditional Keynesian approach would suggest that a cut in real wages will mean a drop in consumer surplus and, therefore, in consumer demand, leading to a downward spiral and a further deepening of the recession. Certainly, in this country we are taught very clearly what Keynesian economics is all about. It seems amazing to me that the current Federal Government seems to be pursuing a plan of monetarism without any regard for the Keynesian type

of theories which have shown (although they have a few bumps and scratches) that they work much better than does the monetarist philosophy followed by Friedman.

I think this has been summed up in an article in the *National Times* of 4 December in which Mr Brian Toohey cites 'The Anorexic Economy', and sums up very clearly what it means to have a cut in real wages. In a very lucid and clear form Mr Toohey states that a cut in real wages for Australia suggests a very clear down-turn in economic activity. I would refer members to that article because it is worth reading. At least one person has come out in the press and heralded the dangers of entertaining a real wages freeze or a real wages cut by itself without looking at a package of arrangements that can in fact stimulate economic growth in this country. The Treasury says that we are faced with a process of negative growth. What an amazing comment to come from the Stonites of the Treasury benches. What is really meant is that we are in for a hell of a time and a down-turn: we are facing, possibility, a depression. However, they still manage to put out such wonderful statements as 'negative growth'.

In regard to a wage-price freeze, as an example we should turn to New Zealand because it has had the Muldoon plan since 22 June 1982. The c.p.i. for the September quarter, the period for which the freeze has been applied, increased by 3.6 per cent. In the same quarter last year it increased by 3.9 per cent, yet there is a wage-price freeze in New Zealand. New Zealand has a wage freeze, but prices seem to manage to escape any controls. There are many examples of the way by which prices can avoid control: goods can be remarked, repackaged, be priced out as specials or have special exemptions attached to them. However, if the workers of this country make a claim for their wages to attract special exemptions one would think that they were going to bring down the whole national economy.

At the end of the September quarter the inflation rate in New Zealand stood at 16.6 per cent, which is 1.2 per cent higher than it was in the previous year, when it was 15.4 per cent. Although a wage and price freeze has been in operation for four or five months, it has had no effect on the c.p.i., but it has had a major effect on unemployment. There has been a massive growth of 7 000 in the unemployment figures from September 1981 to September 1982, the period during which the wage freeze was in operation. The registered unemployment figures, including those with special work subsidies provided through the New Zealand Government, indicate that there was a growth of 12 000 in unemployment.

In particular, the bureau in New Zealand indicated that in the last four months there has been a rapid increase in unemployment. Therefore, in regard to the New Zealand experience, prices have managed to sneak through and increase, wages have been frozen, and unemployment has grown. However, one does not hear that information being presented to the public of Australia by the press. It is important that this information be distributed to the community so that people can be aware of recent examples that are relevant. The conclusion must be drawn that a wage and price freeze by itself is not the answer. It does not have the impact on inflation that is required. It certainly has an impact on employment—it creates unemployment!

We must look carefully at why these philosophies are being presented to us by Mr Anthony, the man who has this very low home interest grant and who claims travel expenses when he is in New Zealand away from his home. It is beyond a joke to expect the wage and salary earners of this community solely to bear the brunt of a wage-price freeze or a wage freeze. It is not radical stuff that I am putting out to honourable members: it is Keynesian type

theory, and it is certainly balanced with a need for humanity and care for fellow workers in the community.

We have a responsibility not to rush into this sort of short-sighted, one armed attack on our economic problems. We have a responsibility to look at the whole question of economic growth and activity within the community. We must look responsibly at the question of unemployment, and that is why I am part of a Labor Government, and proud to be so. I know that we will do something about unemployment, contrary to the former Government, which increased it.

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): First, Mr Deputy Speaker, I congratulate you on your elevation to the position of Chairman of Committees and Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Chair welcomes your support.

Mr MATHWIN: I also congratulate the Speaker on his appointment to the highest office in this Chamber. I believe that the member for Playford will be a good Speaker. I have served on a number of committees with him, and his training as a legal man will also help him in his position. The member for Playford is a fair man, and I am sure that he will fill the position very well.

I take the opportunity to pay a tribute to some of my past colleagues who have retired voluntarily from Parliament. I refer to the former member for Goyder, Keith Russack, who is at present still serving as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, and Mr Boyd Dawkins. The job that they have done over the years has been very worth while. I have lost some other colleagues through the effects of the last election, and I refer to Ivar Schmidt, the previous member for Mawson, and Bob Randall, the previous member for Henley Beach. Those gentlemen did a good job and worked to the best of their ability, which is all that a member of Parliament can do. I also refer to the previous member for Brighton, Dick Glazbrook, who did an excellent job as the member for that district. It is most unfortunate that he did not retain his seat.

His performance as a member of Parliament was exceptional. He always made himself available and helped whenever he was able to do so. Some of the activities that took place during the election campaign were a disgrace. I must stress that what I am saying now in no way reflects on the present member for Brighton, and I dissociate the Labor Party from what I am saying. Some vile handwritten letters containing the former member's name and address were sent to electors. The contents of the letters were too shocking to be read out in this Parliament. That is one of the tricks played on Dick Glazbrook as the member for Brighton during the recent election campaign. I say again that I do not in any way suggest that the present member for Brighton or the Labor Party was responsible for those letters.

I would also like to mention the retirement of a former Premier, Des Corcoran, who was a great friend of mine while he was here and I hope he will remain so. He was helpful to me when I first entered this place as a member of Parliament. He helped me to look through the vast number of Statutes, which are baffling to new members in this place when trying to find some reference in them. Des Corcoran came across and helped me many times, and I always appreciated that. He was a good politician and a hard debater in this place, but he was always as good as his word, which is something to say in politics.

It would be only right and proper for me at this stage to congratulate the electors of Glenelg on their wise choice in re-electing me as their member of Parliament for the sixth time. Governments are supposed to last for three years but the only Government since I entered this Parliament in 1970 that has lasted its full term was the previous Govern-

ment. As members who have been here for some time know, during the 10 years of Dunstan Governments, an election was held about every two years but our Party, of course, went its full term. We all know of the abilities of former Premier Dunstan, one of which was to make political capital and call an election when he thought he was most likely to win and not when it was due.

I am in a nice mood at the moment, so I will congratulate all new members who have entered this place. I think all new members have now made their maiden speeches, which I enjoyed, and I congratulate them on their remarks. Some of them, however, rely a bit too much on theory rather than on practice, and I think the speech I just heard from the new member for Unley showed that he is good on theory and not on practice. Nevertheless, I think the edges will be rounded off him if he stays here for a while and he will learn from experience.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Why didn't you?

Mr MATHWIN: I did not need to, because I am a practical man, and I have had wide experience both here and in other places. If the Chief Secretary is quiet I might give him a mention later on in my speech.

As this is the Address in Reply debate I will refer to the Governor's Speech. The Governor said that for some time South Australia has been facing severe economic problems. At last the Labor Party has realised that this is a fact. When it was in Opposition it said that there were no problems, but now that it is in Government it realises that there are severe economic problems. His Excellency said:

My Government has joined with the Governments of the two other major industrial States, New South Wales and Victoria, in formulating a plan for the immediate revitalisation of the nation's economy.

Before the ink was dry on the paper on which the Speech was written, the present Premier had left high and dry his two Labor colleagues, the Premiers of Victoria and New South Wales, in relation to the wage freeze, and he says that he wants to have a little chat with all South Australians before he makes up his mind on what we are to do about it. In relation to the problems the new Government foresees, His Excellency said:

My Government has already acted to retain over 200 teaching positions that were to be abolished. It has also acted to improve the support for teachers through school assistant positions.

It will be noted that the new Minister of Education has already promised places for further education establishments. These extra teaching positions will cost about \$7 000 000 to \$8 000 000. That is a colossal commitment by the Labor Party for education. In his policy speech the Premier said:

If Labor is elected, there will be 600 more teachers employed in our schools than there would be if the Liberals stayed in office.

He started off by maintaining 200 teaching positions, and he will maintain another 400 before the Government gets much older. Later in his policy speech the Premier said:

We will establish a \$2 000 000 polyclinic at Noarlunga.

This is also most interesting because it is not the first time such a facility has been promised: it has been promised for years. The southern suburbs of Adelaide were neglected during the long, weary 10-year period of socialism which we had in this State and which is now starting for another three years—and of course it will be only three years, but nevertheless it will be uncomfortable and the mess we will have to clear up will be quite considerable; there is no doubt about that. His Excellency also said:

During this session, a number of amendments to the Pay-roll Tax Act will be put before you. These will be designed to ensure that companies established in South Australia remain competitive with those located in other States.

We all know the sorry story about that, and we have already had a Bill introduced. In his policy speech the now Premier said:

Now, a couple of weeks before an election, the Government wants small businesses to believe that the exemption level will be increased—

referring to the Liberal Party—

I don't believe that they can be trusted. A Labor Government will amend the Pay-roll Tax Act to ensure that the exemption level is increased annually in line with estimated wage and salary costs. This will end occasional and one-off rises timed for election dates—

and this is the crux of the matter—

As an initial commitment we will raise the exemption level to \$160 000 and would aim to regularly increase it thereafter to \$250 000 by the end of three years.

The Bill introduced has an exemption level of \$139 000, and yet the Labor Party promised, in order to buy votes—that is what it was all about—to take it to \$160 000 initially. The first promise has been broken. A Bill before the House provides a maximum ceiling of \$139 000. The Governor went on to say:

Tourism will play a key role in the economic development of the State.

By some coincidence, the Government has tied up tourism with the Chief Secretary, who is the Minister responsible for correctional services. Perhaps the Chief Secretary expects the inmates of our institutions to do a bit of touring. Tourism has been bashed around from pillar to post by the Labor Party over the years. Former Premier Dunstan once held the tourism portfolio and at that stage every pamphlet from South Australia had Mr Dunstan on the front cover, smiling, in a safari suit.

Eventually, Mr Dunstan became fed up with tourism and found that he was not doing much with it, so he passed it on to, I think, Glen Broomhill. It has gradually continued down the scale and it is now with the Chief Secretary, the Minister in charge of correctional services. What a tie up—tourism and correctional services! It is marvellous: upgrading tourism by giving it to the Minister responsible for correctional services. As far as I am concerned that is upgrading it. I think it is marvellous. I do not know who thought of it, whether it was a Caucus decision; I suppose it was, or perhaps it could have been left to the Leader to sort out. However, I do not think that the Chief Secretary would be very happy about it even though he comes from the Iron Triangle.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: He's not interjecting.

Mr MATHWIN: I thought the Chief Secretary would have been delighted that I have mentioned him in my speech. It is obvious that he does not want to listen to me. When the Premier explained to the public how things were going to happen he mentioned tourism, as follows:

We view the vigorous development of South Australia's tourism industry—

he did not go on to say 'under a Liberal Government'; he left that bit out—

as a key part of our strategy to reviving our economy.

However, he put it under the same Minister as correctional services. I suppose there is some tie-up between the two.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Both offer accommodation.

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, indeed. In his speech the Premier continued to woo the public of South Australia. He said that Labor would mount an energetic marketing and publicity campaign in Japan and New Zealand, and that his Government would negotiate with airlines to secure a direct Tokyo to Adelaide air link. This came after his Party messed around for 10 long and weary years trying to establish an international airport. Eventually, the Liberals came to power and established an international airport within three years. The Government now wishes to take the kudos for establishing a direct air link with Tokyo.

We heard the former Premier, Mr Dunstan, talk about Tokyo and Japan. Indeed, he wanted to build an international

hotel with Japanese baths and showers as a tourist attraction to enable the Japanese people to enjoy themselves when they came to Adelaide. Why the Japanese people would want to use Japanese baths and showers as a tourist attraction in a different country I will never know. That was one of the great things about the previous Dunstan Government. The Governor also said:

My Government will give strong backing to our resources and mineral developments. The Cooper Basin projects—

That is very interesting. That mining involves uranium, and we know the Premier's and the Labor Party's position in relation to uranium. We know that they are being backed up against the wall by left wing members of the Labor Party and by Trades Hall. We all know where the member for Elizabeth stands in relation to this matter: at least he is honest enough to tell us that he will not have a bar of it.

We have a Premier who performs a neat bit of footwork and goes white whenever anyone mentions uranium. He does not want to give answers, as happened today. We also have a Minister of Mines and Energy who had his back to the wall today when asked three or four questions about uranium. I wonder what the Government will do about uranium. The Government's Labor colleagues in Victoria have introduced a Bill which bars the construction and operation of nuclear reactors and facilities for the usage, storage or disposal of nuclear fuel, the exploration and mining of uranium and thorium, and the possession and sale, transport or disposal of non-medical nuclear material. The Victorian Labor Party has introduced a Bill to ban uranium in that State. I wonder whether the South Australian Labor Party will tie itself to its counterparts, the Victorian Labor Party, in relation to uranium in this State.

The Government has made a certain commitment which is so important that it has been mentioned in the Governor's Speech. Obviously, the Government did not know about the Bill being introduced by the Victorian Labor Party. It will be interesting to see what sort of footwork and shadow boxing goes on in South Australia in relation to nuclear energy when the Government sees the Bill introduced by the Victorian Government to limit nuclear activities in that State.

The Government stressed that it will proceed with work at the Happy Valley water filtration plant and the Morgan filtration plant. That work was passed under the previous Liberal Government, so it was to proceed anyway. Of course, the Government is trying to take some kudos for that. The next part of the Governor's Speech will interest some of my colleagues and those members of Parliament from the forgotten south. It states:

Planning is also under way to fulfil the commitments my Government has made to the communities in Adelaide's north-western and southern suburbs concerning the construction of hospital and clinic facilities . . . Other initiatives will be taken in the fields of transport, the administration of the penal system, and local government.

That is a Government commitment and a Government promise. I must warn some of the new members, particularly the new members for Brighton and Mawson, about Labor Party promises. I can refer to a number of Labor Party promises that might interest those two members. We have heard a number of promises from the Labor Party. In fact, the Governor's Speech refers to the development of the Adelaide railway station. In 1973, Mr Don Dunstan said:

The recommendation that the Adelaide railway station be redeveloped into a shopping mall would be given serious consideration and a study made into the viability of the proposal.

In 1974, former Premier Dunstan also said:

State Cabinet has given the go-ahead for architects to draw up plans for the complete redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station.

Also in 1974:

The State Government plans to build an 8 000-seat entertainment stadium as part of an \$80 000 000 redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station. The Minister of Transport (Mr Virgo) announced yesterday a Cabinet decision to commission Adelaide architects Hassell and Partners to prepare designs. Early suggestions are that the stadium should cater for large indoor pop concerts. . .

Heaven forbid having pop concerts next to this place, because it is bad enough in here. If we have pop concerts next door one can imagine what it would be like. The policy statement continues:

Mr Virgo: Preliminary plans for the 14½-acre site included: an international hotel—

that is another one for the railway station site—

an administration centre for the Railways and State Transport Authority; office accommodation—

I suppose we could all use that. There were shops, restaurants and other commercial facilities. That was in 1974.

Mr Plunkett: What happened to that?

Mr MATHWIN: I am telling members opposite about broken promises, because we had one of the new members, the member for Unley, talking about broken promises. I am just bringing him into line and telling him about the promises that were broken when his Party was in Government. No doubt the member for Albert Park will be striving to get his Minister to do something about the lights at the Football Park stadium.

Mr Plunkett: What did you do in three years?

Mr MATHWIN: His Minister ordered them and left them to rust. The member for Albert Park would know about the railways. Mr Dunstan said that planning would go ahead for the redevelopment of the Adelaide railway station site. It was planned to make the railway station a fully co-ordinated transport interchange, using the most modern technology available, and the services would integrate with train arrivals and departures. That there would be an international hotel, restaurants and shop, and an 8 000-seat stadium was planned for the site. Those are some of the promises made by the previous Labor Government. There are more to come. I think it is only fair that the member for Mawson and the member for Brighton should know about these promises, so that they know what this is all about.

Let us hear what was promised so long ago in the Brighton and Mawson districts. When we met the councils of the southern region, the Labor Party candidates would promise the world and say what they would do. Mr Virgo, during the time of the previous Labor Government, talked about the dial-a-bus service. I do not think members would really want to know too much about that service, but let us talk about the Christie Downs railway line. The previous Labor Government promised the electrification of the railway line. Part of that Government's plan to make the rail more appealing to commuters included the electrification of some cars. Mr Virgo said that it was hoped that the Christie Downs line extension would be electrified by 1975.

He also said that double-decker trains would be operating on the Adelaide to Christie Downs line by July 1975. A double-decker train! The honourable gentleman did not know, of course, that the double-decker train would not go under the bridges built over the line. He did not think about that; he just promised to have double-decker trains operating by 1975. He also said that his Government would introduce a \$22 000 000 project to electrify the entire Adelaide to Christie Downs railway service. That was a long time ago and still we have not got it, even though Mr Virgo said that South Australia would have a high-speed electric double-decker train which would service the new Adelaide to Christie Downs railway line by mid 1975 and as part of the \$22 000 000 project to upgrade that service.

Mr Virgo said that the trains would travel at 70 miles an hour. Can honourable members imagine the trains going through Brighton, and especially the Brighton Road crossing, every six minutes? Can honourable members imagine the trains flying through the crossing at 70 miles an hour? Double-decker trains at that! Mr Virgo said that the trains might be air-conditioned.

An honourable member: Why didn't you make that speech when Mr Virgo was here?

Mr MATHWIN: He told me what to say. The Hon. Geoffrey Virgo told me all about this matter; he even wrote it down. He also stated that the first priority of his Government would be the completion of the Christie Downs line and the electrification of the Elizabeth and Port Adelaide lines. The member for Semaphore would be interested in and disappointed about that statement, because since that time he has even lost his train! It is a pretty shoddy situation as far as promises go.

When people talk about promises, one has to remember that it works both ways. In 1975 (which is not too long ago for members to recall, and certainly I would like it impressed on the minds of the member for Mawson and the member for Brighton), it was anticipated that the development of Adelaide's urban transport system over the next five years would cost the State Government \$130 000 000. Mr Dunstan stated that the capital cost for the development of the system would be about \$26 000 000 in that year and that it was hoped (and the former Minister of Transport in the Liberal Government would be interested in this statement) that the first diesel train would run on the Christie Downs line later on in that year and that the electric train would run in 1977. Therefore, we see what was promised by the previous Government in relation to transport.

The member for Brighton and the member for Mawson should not forget what has happened in the past, because it is very important. These decisions have to be made, and next time there is a meeting for members of Parliament down in the south, members of the Government who previously made promises can make more promises on what is going to happen to the Christie Downs railway line and the south-bound transport.

Mr Trainer: Talk about maiden speeches—this was made in Taiwan!

Mr MATHWIN: The honourable member is not and never has been a maiden. Another report stated that moves to introduce a 300 m.p.h. hover train transport system had been initiated in London by the Minister of Roads, Mr Virgo, who also said that his Government was hoping to find a way in which South Australians would be able to share in the development of a hover train. Mr Virgo said that South Australia was always interested in pioneering, and that, if we were to be the first in Australia to install a hover train, we would be exceedingly happy.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: We are first with the O'Bahn.

Mr MATHWIN: We are the first State to get an O'Bahn system even though Mr Dunstan spent some time in Munich studying this rail system. In 1977 Mr Virgo said that cactus was a possible fuel source, and that one of the most exotic schemes that could be considered was personalised rapid transit, enabling a traveller to dial a destination and be automatically transported at up to 48 km/h in miniature cars over an electric rail network. Mr Virgo also said that the real question was whether people could take it, because the Labor Government could produce the system, but, when people were being whisked over complicated intercrossing tracks at 48 km/h without personal control, he wondered whether the human physique could take it!

I hope that next time we go down to a conference in the southern region that the Labor Party representatives will

take this information with them and explain to the people and all the different councils in the south that the Labor Government has plenty of ideas and has made promises over the years of what would happen to the neglected south; the Cinderella area.

We see, as I mentioned earlier, that it did not take long for the Government to break its promises. In the first week in Parliament the Government broke two promises. It broke the promise on pay-roll tax. Instead of raising the level to \$160 000, it made it \$139 000. It broke another promise in relation to pensioners being granted \$50 a year concession on electricity charges. It did an about-face in relation to ex-service personnel, barring them when originally it said that the concession would be for all pensioners and people with concession cards. That is a shocking situation, discriminating against ex-service personnel. Because of pressure brought about by the R.S.L. and other people (and I will take some credit for that), the Government has changed its mind.

Mr Trainer: You made those dirty phone calls?

Mr MATHWIN: I certainly helped bring that pressure about. When I asked a question last week, even the member for Ascot Park went pale under his beard. I saw that. The Ministers can say anything. I have seen the Premier's speech given during the campaign. He said that there would be concessions for pensioners, including ex-service personnel. Why did he discriminate against them originally? What was his excuse? When asked on the radio during Jeff Medwell's show, one of his three excuses was that ex-service personnel can retire at 60 years of age. Ex-service personnel, he said, were able to get cheaper home loans—at about 8 per cent. There are people in the community who can get loans of \$35 000 at 3 per cent. They are not ex-service personnel. What was the final reason the Minister gave? He said that it was because there were too many of them. That is very nice! It is all very well to encourage people to go away and to tell them that they are being brave in protecting their country. It is all very well to tell them what they will get from it if and when they get back. However, 30 or 40 years later the Government wants to forget them because there are too many of them! That is what the Minister said.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is being harassed.

Mr MATHWIN: If I am being harassed by the member for Albert Park, I can only say that he should go home and play with his train set. I can refer to broken promises. It is quite obvious that the new Premier has followed in the steps of his colleagues in the two other Labor States. We know the situation in New South Wales and the problems it has. In the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 3 July we see the heading, 'Books cooked, Opposition says' and the article states:

The New South Wales Government, with the help of a \$221 million transfer of funds from the State Rail Authority, has finished the financial year with a \$69 million deficit. The Opposition spokesman claimed the Government had "cooked the books" and the actual deficit for 1981-82 was close to \$290 million.

We heard of the New South Wales Premier, Mr Wran, running about wanting to know where he would raise taxes and then immediately putting extra tax on petrol.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: As my colleague the member for Todd has reminded me, they could not buy petrol even for Government cars. Mr Wran, being a senior Labor member in Australia, immediately told the Labor Premier in this State what to do and said, 'Don't worry about it, John, we have had the same problem but ours was much bigger. Forget about it, it is a book debt. We had a much bigger problem than you have—we were over \$200 000 000 in debt'.

What has happened in Victoria? An article written by Greg Kelton, who used to be in Adelaide with the *Advertiser*, states:

Most politicians, whether in the Federal or State arenas, find it very easy to run their respective Treasuries while in Opposition. It is when they make the switch to Government and have to bear the responsibility for any fiscal decisions they make that the problems and accusations start.

The articles go on to refer to the Cain Government's first move after winning government. Let us look at it; it will be familiar to all members of the House. When I get to the point members will probably say, 'Snap'. The article states:

The Cain Government's first move after winning government was to release immediately a statement through the Treasurer—That is what happened here. Immediately on winning government we had a statement from the Treasurer. He was told, 'You had better make some sort of statement, because things are not too good'. The article further states:

Shortly after taking office he refused to renew that pledge. 'All I can say at this stage is that information is not heartening,' he said. 'Victoria is in a much worse financial position than had been thought before the election.'

It further states:

Since taking office, Mr Cain has moved swiftly to raise extra revenue.

That is the second part. We have not got it yet, but it is in the barrel of the shotgun, ready to be fired. It further states:

Hospital charges have been increased by a massive 37 per cent and next week the Government is expected to announce increases of up to 15 per cent in electricity charges.

Mr Lewis: Ours are going up 20 per cent.

Mr MATHWIN: I am glad the honourable member reminded me of that—he is of great assistance to me. The article continues:

An increase in the price of gas is expected to follow shortly.

They are getting at the little people—the people who cannot afford it. It also states that he has been under fire again because of his plan to reintroduce death duties in Victoria. We have heard the same from the Bannon Government. However, that promise has been broken before by his more senior colleagues, who have been Premier longer than he has. They will set the example for him to follow. The flat rate in Victoria is 39 per cent on estates worth more than \$200 000. Therefore, the die is cast in that regard. Premier Cain was reported in *The Age* on 24 September, as follows:

Premier, Mr Cain, said yesterday that tax increases in the Budget were necessary to meet a \$400 000 000 deficit inherited from the previous Government.

They always put it back on the previous Liberal Government. The report continues:

He said that 'taxes have gone up to meet the deficit that was there, that was known by the previous Government to be there and was not known by us or by the public generally. It wasn't a case of taxes to pay for our policies. It was a case of taxes to meet that deficit,' he said. Asked whether big increases in taxes could be expected next year, Mr Cain said he could not discuss future Budgets. 'I can't say that at this stage, it's too early.'

He has not talked to his union bosses. Of course, one knows that before a decision is made by any of these Governments, that is New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, one runs along to the bosses to find out just what one has to do about it and, of course, one gets the direction from the Trades Hall. The report continues (quoting Mr Cain):

This is one of three Budgets that we will deliver in this Parliament and I think that the essential thrust is to put tax gathering on a broader base, where there is some capacity to adjust to inflation.

So we can see what we are in for and what is going to happen to us in this State. I have mentioned the two other Labor States, the ones that are setting the pace. Then we have the editorial in the *Advertiser* today that gives fair warning to the people of South Australia in relation to the keeping of promises to which I have been referring. I have

been reminding members of what has happened in relation to the Labor Party's previous term and its broken promises. Let us see what the *Advertiser* leader states today:

Electors may be sceptical about the election promises of politicians, but they expect the main ones to be kept nevertheless. So they will be unhappy with yesterday's indication that the new Premier Mr Bannon may have to back down on one of his major undertakings—not to increase existing taxes or introduce new ones during his first term in office.—

and there we have it, a softening-up period to get the public ready for the broadside—

within weeks of taking over government in S.A. His decision to appoint an independent inquiry into State taxation as a matter of urgency, following completion of the Budget review by the Under Treasurer, Mr R. D. Barnes, points the way to steeper State taxes.

So it is indeed a softening-up situation.

Mr Ashenden: What about petrol prices?

Mr MATHWIN: My colleague the member for Todd suggests that it might involve an increase in the price of petrol.

Mr Ashenden: They've increased it by 4c a litre over there.

Mr MATHWIN: There has been an increase of 4c a litre in New South Wales in one hit. That sort of increase affects virtually everybody, as most people have cars now. The leader in the *Advertiser* goes on to say:

Mr Bannon blames the Tonkin Government for failing to take sufficient account of unemployment rises, the drought—

he is not blaming us for the drought, surely to goodness; as a Government we could hardly help the drought—

and other depleting effects on State finances. Yet some of his own quickly implemented election promises will add at least \$7m. to the Budget deficit, mostly through the preservation of 600 teaching jobs, as well as concessions and exemptions for pay-roll tax, stamp duty and electricity bills.

It has been mentioned that we will be brought into line with the Labor Governments in New South Wales and Victoria and the like, and now the writing is on the wall. The new member for Unley during his maiden speech told us of the benefits of the public sector and said that it was private enterprise which is, of course, debatable. The honourable member does not realise that when costing workers in the public sector one does not take into consideration the administration costs, which are quite considerable. Therefore, to compare that sector with private enterprise is wrong, because the costing is quite different. I am a member of the Public Works Committee, as members well know, and we find that that is indeed the situation. So there is no doubt in my mind that private enterprise is far less costly than the public sector.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: What about the maintenance of Government lifts?

Mr MATHWIN: The only reason that I do not wish them to do anything about the lifts is that one day the Minister of Local Government may go into the lift and be trapped in it for a couple of days. As I said, no allowance was made for public sector administration costs by the member for Unley. Indeed, the administration section of the Public Service would seem to have become a monster; it is so big. The new member obviously showed us that he is a theorist and not a practical person like his predecessor, Gil Langle. Gil was a likeable chap and certainly a character in this place, and I enjoyed his contributions. His great boast was that he retired from this place undefeated, and certainly he did. He was a good member of Parliament who served his electorate well, and he was continually returned because of that. At least he was a practical person and knew what these things were all about. It is quite obvious that he has now been replaced by a complete theorist.

The new member for Unley said that interest rates were a big factor in relation to costing. I would ask the honourable

member when he has a few minutes to spare over the coming adjournment, maybe on Boxing Day when he is relaxing, to look at the situation in relation to education. If he assesses that situation he will find that the cost of salaries is an enormous component of the education estimates. Millions of dollars go into education, representing over 91 per cent of its budget. If that does not prove to the honourable member that interest rates is well down the list in relation to costing, I do not know what does.

I remind Government members of some decisions taken at the recent A.L.P. national conference in July. One of those decisions will affect their thinking as a Government. The national conference of the A.L.P. met in July 1982 to determine the Party's platform, which is binding on all members. We know the situation: one has to sign a pledge as a member of the Labor Party. If a member breaks that pledge he is out on his ear, or wherever he happens to land.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Did I hear the junior Minister saying that he would like to come to Glenelg and try to take over?

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

Mr MATHWIN: Do not be rude when I am speaking, man. The Minister is the rudest—

The SPEAKER: Order! Will the honourable member resume his seat. The appropriate title to use is 'Minister of Housing' or the 'Minister', not the 'junior Minister'.

Mr MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your direction. Let me remind members that these policies are binding on all members of the Labor Party throughout Australia whether they are Ministers, junior or senior. The overall A.L.P. objective is as follows:

The Australian Labor Party is a democratic socialist Party and has the objective of the democratic socialisation of industry, production, distribution and exchange to the extent necessary to eliminate exploitation and other anti-social features of these fields. The redistribution of income, wealth and economic power. Carefully planned public sector investment. Revitalise the public sector by expanding the scope of public enterprises.

One must consider that statement in an attempt to see what it is all about. After a lot of gobbledegook the document advocates 'public-private sector competition, joint public-private sector ownership and public ownership, including nationalisation'. Therefore, we can see what we are in for during the term of the present Government. The Bannon Government has been in office for only a few short weeks, but it has put over the biggest con job in the world in relation to its stated policies. It is the biggest con job that I have ever seen, and I have seen the experts working: I was in this place when Don Dunstan was here. He was a con man of great repute, but this last policy speech puts him in the shade completely. The standard set by Don Dunstan has been beaten by the present Government and its Leader.

The present Government has to follow an exceptionally fine Government, a businesslike Government and one that brought about progress and development in this State the like of which had never been seen before. The Labor Government will have to do something about the Premier; he will have to be tidied up a bit and will have to neaten his footwork and get away from talking and shilly-shallying about the freeze or the pause. Something must be done. It has been accepted by New South Wales and by Victoria. Perhaps the Premier of New South Wales (Mr Wran) and the Premier of Victoria (Mr Cain) could put him on the right track and help him along. They will protect him if he needs protection from some of the bullies from the left wing. I realise that the Labor Party will have problems controlling some of these people. It is simply impossible to control the Builders Laborers Federation which will be flexing its muscles to get bigger increases. However, the

Government will have to stand firm and get in line with the rest of Australia and support the freeze.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to your position. The speech from the member for Glenelg was the greatest load of diatribe and garbage that we have ever heard from him. I would have thought that the member for Glenelg had problems in his electorate in relation to the unemployed, disadvantaged people, elderly people and those looking for accommodation. I would have thought that the honourable member would be aware of problems in industries in his electorate as well as those concerning small business people. I would have thought that he would have problems in regard to housing or, if I dare mention it, public transport. But no, all we heard was a great load of garbage and his resurrecting of what he believed to be the broken promises of the previous Labor Government. However, he deliberately failed to mention why many of those promises were broken. Australia has had a Federal Liberal Government since 1976, and many of the present ills can be attributed to that Government. I refer to some of the statements made by our so-called esteemed and well respected Prime Minister. In 1974, when shadow Minister for Employment he stated:

I am suggesting that we ought to have a sliding scale rate of benefits; the higher the actual rate of unemployment at any one time, the higher the actual benefit ought to be. The reason underlying this is very simple, that if it is becoming harder in the community to get a job, then the community ought to provide greater compensation for those who are finding it harder to get jobs. I would not see any problem with the maximum rate going up to the minimum wage.

That statement was made on *A.M.* on 9 September 1974. Even the Australian *Financial Review* approved, and its editorial of 10 September 1974 stated:

These innocent people deserve some recognition. Mr Fraser has suggested the adoption of a geared unemployment benefit. He has suggested that the figures should be the equivalent of the minimum wage. There is nothing in terms of economic theory that would suggest that this is not a good idea. In fact it would be an ideal counter-cyclical device.

Where has this big man, who was talking about granting the minimum wage to the unemployed, been since 1976? Where is he now? Has he stood up and been counted? That is not likely. Does the Federal Government believe that the unemployed should receive the minimum wage or that the unemployment benefit should be less than the poverty line? Over 600 000 people in this country are waiting for an answer from this great hypocrite, one of the greatest hypocrites who ever darkened the doors of our Federal Parliament. It outrages me when I hear people waffling on as the member for Glenelg did tonight. One would think that there would be sufficient problems within his electorate to encourage him to make some suggestions to the present Government or to put forward some ideas that we could hopefully take on board. But no, the clowns opposite are laughing, thinking it is a great joke. I do not think it is a great joke to see disadvantaged and unemployed people in the community.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): The member for Glenelg failed to mention many of the problems within his district that I thought he would have raised as the local member. Apart from criticising he did not put up any constructive ideas. When one looks at the unemployment figures over the past three years under Fraser, one sees that the number of people receiving benefits fell by 25 600 in the six months to October. This year the figure has risen by 110 000 over the same six month period. We are all well aware that we are facing a job crisis situation. It is a disaster for Australia, brought on by the Fraser Government's mean treatment of

those receiving benefits and imposing terms and conditions much inferior to those applying to the benefits that I mentioned earlier.

The member for Glenelg also mentioned financial management. One only has to refer to Federal Parliament where the Treasurer under-estimated his Budget by some \$600 000 000. Recently there was another Budget blow-out and the figure was again reviewed. The member for Glenelg referred to financial mismanagement, but he should remember that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones. When the member for Glenelg can get his Federal colleagues to put their house in order perhaps we will listen to him and note what he says. The member for Glenelg also referred to the so-called pressure that he believed he and his Government had brought to bear regarding veterans' electricity concessions. Once again, that statement reeks of hypocrisy. In fact, 12 months prior to the election of 6 November the Labor Party announced its policy on pensioner rebates on electricity bills. We were then attacked by the then Government, and the Deputy Premier said that the Liberals rejected this policy outright. The Retired Union Members Association sent a petition to former Premier Tonkin signed by nearly 12 000 pensioners calling for concessions, but they were refused. It was only during the election campaign that the then Government suddenly discovered our senior citizens and announced a concession scheme. However, the Liberal scheme was not a comprehensive coverage for pensioners. It did not even cover those groups which had a clear need.

Under Labor, the concessions applied from the date of the election and pensioners did not have to wait until next year, unlike the Liberal proposal. Quite clearly, the member for Glenelg has a lot to learn, even given the time he has spent in this place. I would have thought, had he been honest, that he would relate the facts. Rather than display a lack of honesty in relation to support for pensioners, he should have referred to the problems that his Government had in dealing with the difficulties of Vietnam veterans and their desire over a period of many years since the Vietnam war to obtain compensation for the effects of agent orange and the defects with which many of their children have been born as a result of that disastrous war and the commitment of our troops into that country. Clearly, the Liberals have a lot to answer for, not only in this State but federally.

The campaign conducted by the Liberal Party prior to the recent State election was negative and, quite clearly, that was reflected in the ballot box. I believe that people were fed up to the back teeth with the slugging attitude displayed by the Liberals in 1979 and repeated in its campaign leading up to the 6 November election. I do not believe that the Liberals got away with it this time, because they were rejected by the electorate. The electorate, particularly the Albert Park District, recorded a rather good win for the Labor Party. I believe it was a reflection of the hard work put in by Labor Party supporters.

However, I am concerned about some issues that have arisen from the election, and they need watching. First, I have written to the Attorney-General about ballot-papers, particularly those for the House of Assembly which had voting instructions printed at the top. The No. 1 was the same height as the instructions but the numerals, 2, 3 and 4 were in much bolder print. I am informed by scrutineers that many of the informal ballot-papers were marked 2, 4 and 3 but clearly demonstrated the constituents' wishes. Those papers were marked informal. I hope the Attorney-General will look at this situation where a preference is clearly indicated on the ballot-paper.

The other matter is the need for an ethics committee. Some of the publicity put out by my opponent in the Albert Park District bordered on being libellous. Quite clearly, the

Liberal Party headquarters framed press releases which were printed in the local Messenger Press, even to the extent that two of the advertisements released by the Liberal Party were not authorised. That matter is being looked at by the Attorney-General as I understand they contravene the Act. I was disturbed about an advertisement in the Messenger Press of 3 November 1982, as follows:

BEHIND THE FACADE LABOR MP REPRESENTS ALBERT PARK OR THE UNIONS

The Labor Member for Albert Park is an honest and hard worker—but on whose behalf? The people whom he represents in Albert Park don't get much of a look in. At last count he had asked over 643 questions in the House. Only 70 of these related to his electorate in any real way. Nearly 235 were on transport matters, mainly directed to the minor details of S.T.A. regulations and operations. He spends more time representing the unions than you, his electorate!

The advertisement continued to describe my contribution in relation to other matters, particularly in relation to the transport industry. I make no apology for the fact that I worked in the transport industry. There are members of this Parliament who come from the education and legal arenas and from many other walks of life, and they all make contributions in this House. Many of the questions that I asked certainly exposed some of the deficiencies in the State Transport Authority and Australian National and related to other transport issues. I even recall the then Minister of Transport commending me on a number of occasions for the constructive criticisms I had made which he believed should be taken up.

What disturbed me more than anything was the candidate himself, when the Liberal Party put what I considered to be misleading statements in his advertisement, 'Ingerson family to live in the electorate'. Since the election, to my knowledge, my political opponent certainly has not moved into the electorate and I do not believe that it was his intention unless he had won the election. It is my belief that the electorate has demonstrated time and time again that it wants people who live in the district and not outsiders, and I can say that from both sides of the fence.

The other question raised was the amount of money spent in the election campaign. It is my belief that there should be State funding for election campaigns. We have heard a great hullabaloo from the Opposition in the past week or so about the alleged donation of \$40 000 to the A.L.P. Whether that is the case or not I do not know, but if the Opposition was sincere about it one would have thought that it would have introduced legislation in this place for the public disclosure of donations to political Parties. I believe that it should put its money where its mouth is so to speak, or put up or shut up, to overcome that problem if it is really sincere.

The matter of informal votes concerned me, and I have written to the Minister of Education asking that the teaching of politics in schools be seriously looked at, as well as the manner in which students are told how they can vote properly. It is my belief that many people who vote informal, not only during this election but in many previous elections, were workers or migrants who were unclear as to how they should vote. If we believe that these people should be given the opportunity to exercise their democratic right then I believe that it should be an ongoing education programme for these people to register and know the proper manner in which they should register their informal vote.

As for my opponent, whilst he has got the name of 'Slingsun' in my electorate, I felt rather sorry for him in many respects, because I believe that those advertisements were put up by the so-called intellectuals on Greenhill Road, and I would like to thank them for the advertisements they placed, because there is no doubt in my mind that they were worth 1 000 or 1 500 votes to me in that electorate. It

has been said to me time and time again since the election that people were sick and tired of the mud-slinging by the Liberal Party in that area, even to the extent where I had a member of the Liberal Party who lived on Delfin Island visit me on the Wednesday after the election, saying that he was going up to resign from the Liberal Party because he believed in a 'fair go, mate'. He said 'I have been a Liberal all my life, Kevin, but the mud-slinging that you were subjected to, outraged me. Not only did it get my vote, but two other members of my family registered their disgust by voting against their own Party.' I think there is a lesson inherent in that for each and every one of us in this place.

I refer now to the support given to me in the electorate, particularly by some disadvantaged people. Whilst their donations were small (in some instances 50 cents and \$1), a magnificent amount was donated at my electorate office. Clearly, the wishes of the majority of those people were fulfilled.

I refer now to the Speech of the Governor. One of the industries in my electorate is the South Australian Film Corporation. I believe, as I know the Premier and the Government believe, that this should be properly exploited. We all know of the major film successes of the corporation, not only here in South Australia and in Australia, but overseas, and the world acclaim that many of those films have received, for example, *Breaker Morant*, *Storm Boy*, etc. I believe that the aim of the Premier to promote the South Australian film industry as a major tourist attraction and to establish a film expo in Adelaide is certainly worthy of commendation. I look forward to the day when the South Australian Film Corporation will be in a position to take over the entire Hendon Philips complex.

At the same time, I do not wish to see those industries already located there disadvantaged, but it may well be that they can be relocated with mutual agreement in years to come. I hope that this becomes a reality, because I can see benefits not only to students and constituents in my electorate, but to the people in South Australia, from the viewpoint of tourism. As I said, I look forward to the day when that becomes a reality and when one goes through that complex at Hendon, which I have done on numerous occasions, and sees the amount of work and local talent involved in that industry, one can only marvel at the expertise of these people, many of them locals, who are involved in the production of materials and clothing for the various films being made by the corporation.

I took note of the statement by the former Minister of Tourism in support of her local candidate in that area about its potential for tourism. Clearly, I agree with those sentiments. I have been watching this for some time, and whether or not the Minister had read some of my speeches in the Parliament about the potential of the West Lakes area I do not know. Clearly, there can be functions similar to those held down at Glenelg, such as the Bay Sheffield on the reserve. I believe that a similar function could possibly be held in the West Lakes area.

One could imagine that the full potential not only of Football Park but of the surrounding areas could be utilised. In conjunction with that, the waterway could be used for many aquatic events, coupled with the associated facilities available in that area. West Lakes has a tremendous potential as far as I am concerned, and I will certainly be making representations to our respective Ministers of Tourism and Recreation and Sport to see what can be done in my area. There is no doubt, that if it is properly sold and we get support from the Government, many local business houses will be only too happy to sponsor the events that could be held at West Lakes which one day I hope will be not only

a major tourism industry but a major venue for sport and recreation.

I do not believe that the potential of that area has been fully exploited, and I will be doing everything I can to assist and bring those issues to the attention of the Government. Some major problems have already been addressed, but some have not been finalised. I have spoken previously in this Parliament on traffic control in the area. Whilst I do not wish to rehash all the details of traffic problems in the area, a need exists for more information to be provided to local residents and the sporting public on proper ingress and egress.

I was given the opportunity prior to the last election (and I thank the previous Chief Secretary for that) to have a flight for some 2½ hours in the Wales helicopter to look at the manner in which the police exercised traffic control in that area. I was full of praise for the manner in which they conducted that exercise, which is a normal function during football finals. It certainly cleared up many doubts in my mind as to how that control was being carried out. However, I believe that the extension of West Lakes Boulevard will lessen the problems that my constituents have experienced. The extension of West Lakes Boulevard from Tapleys Hill Road along the old spur line to Clark Terrace will certainly assist patrons attending the venues to have quick egress from the West Lakes area in order to get on to the Port Road and out to the eastern suburbs. Coupled with that is the proposed connection of the Red Hill bridge to the Bower Road trunk, which will assist traffic to flow out of the area much more easily.

In the previous Parliament I raised the issue with the Minister of Transport and suggested that, when major functions are being held (particularly football functions), the Government of the day should communicate with the respective football clubs through their in-house magazines, and the clubs then should provide State Transport Authority vehicles to transport club supporters to Football Park, eliminating much of the congestion on the roads and allowing patrons to have a quicker return to their football clubs to enjoy the hospitality of their home league club or to their homes. I hope that this matter has been followed through by my colleague the Minister of Transport, because I believe that it is one that will greatly assist patrons in the area. Not only will it provide additional revenue to the State Transport Authority and hopefully provide a few more jobs, but it will assist in more safety on the roads. I am hoping that that will be taken on board by the Minister of Transport for the next football season, although I know that it will not overcome all the problems of car parking in the area.

During discussions with the Woodville council on the matter, a number of constructive comments were raised. Adjacent school grounds possibly could be used for the parking of motor vehicles rather than vehicles being parked in side streets, Housing Trust estates in Seaton, in areas adjacent to Sportsman's Drive, or on Delfin Island, which has caused a considerable amount of concern to local residents. Other areas can be utilised and vacant land could be used by the council or the Government to assist in the car-parking problem. There is no doubt that in years to come this problem will compound and the need for better public transport and the education of patrons using such transport should be looked at closely. I hope that experiments are conducted along such lines leading up to the football season this year.

I refer now to a matter that concerns me and, I believe, all members of this Parliament, namely, unemployment. Whilst it is not as bad in my area as in many other suburbs, particularly the north-eastern areas, it is, nonetheless, a problem. The latest figure I have is that it is running at about 10.4 per cent. Like many other members of this

House, I suggest that it is not a weekly but rather a daily event to have constituents come to one's office seeking jobs of any description rather than going on to unemployment benefits. Only this morning my secretary had the job, whilst interviewing another constituent, of helping a chap who had major problems with lack of income and outstanding bills. He was injured on the job and could not get other work because of his back injury. That is typical of what we all experience every day.

However, earlier this week I had the opportunity to take around approximately 150 toys made by a well-known local resident who is now retired and who makes toys for disadvantaged children in the district. He is well known as the past Mayor of Woodville, Alderman Sutherland. He picks up scrap pieces of timber and various other materials and spends a considerable amount of time with his lathes in a workshop in Hendon. The toys are extremely well made. I know that he does not seek praise for the amount of work that he puts in, but it is certainly commendable, particularly for the disadvantaged children in the area and for parents who do not have the money to buy presents for their children at this time of the year. He has been doing this for a considerable number of years. However, what really took my interest was the fact that he is getting on in years and would be only too happy to show other people in the area, particularly the unemployed who are looking for an opportunity to use what they consider useless time, how to continue his work.

He said that he would be prepared to provide them with his time and expertise to teach them how to make these toys, and I will be writing to the Minister for Labour to see what assistance can be given in that area. Not only will it assist the unemployed, but hopefully it could enlarge and perhaps become a local industry in the north-western suburbs. I believe that it has potential, where a chap such as I have described is prepared to assist. However, I believe it would need some financial assistance from the Government and I hope that the Deputy Premier in his portfolio would be able to assist me in that regard. The Mayor of Woodville, in discussions, also expressed interest in such a project. Having seen the cottage industries in the hills and also the Rocks, in Sydney, I believe that that is an area which, with Government assistance, perhaps can create many jobs in that region, and I am looking forward to a positive response from this Government to assist in that regard. I know that the Government has said that it will introduce a direct job creation programme that will concentrate on giving people skills and training, and that we will be working through local government and community organisations to provide useful and satisfying jobs for those people in the future. I accept the fact, as does the Government, that we have a responsibility for direct job creation schemes, and I am hoping that this may be one of those areas in which we can give assistance to the local residents.

Another matter that concerns me (and I have expressed my views on this over a number of years in my electorate), is the problem of break-ins and burglaries. I raised this issue last year in the Parliament, and when, in seeking answers to questions I raised with the then Government the matter of the incidence of burglaries and break-ins within the electorate, I was surprised to find that there were 5 061 attempts to break into homes in that area in three months. I believed then, as I do now, that there is a greater need for public education to deter people from breaking into homes. A leaflet that was put out by the previous Government and which is still available, I believe was worthy of greater dissemination not only in my electorate, but throughout South Australia. For example, it gives hints to people who are going away during the Christmas and New Year break, suggestions which may sound common sense: lock all doors

and windows, do not hide the keys, do not leave notes, do not leave money on premises, leave an inside light on during the evening, leave a radio on, mark your property for identification, photograph antiques, jewellery, etc.; when on holidays also cancel milk, bread and paper deliveries, lock away gardening tools, and ask your neighbour to keep a general eye on the area.

I believe that the Minister may consider giving greater publicity to this in the ensuing couple of weeks, because I know of a number of people who have been away and have come home to find not only that the house had been broken into and many of their valuables stolen, but that a great deal of damage has been occasioned to the contents of that home, and many (in their opinion) priceless heirlooms having been stolen. The other problem is that many people are under-insured for the contents of their home, and it is a rather traumatic experience for many of them to meet this situation. In these times when money is tight, many people find that it will take them many years to get back, if they can, to the situation of restoring those goods that have been stolen.

To this end, I had questioned the previous Government about the number of police cadets and an increase in the Police Force in South Australia during its term of office, and I was surprised to see a dramatic reduction in cadet recruitment under that Government. I was pleased to see that this Government has pledged to increase the levels of cadet recruitment within the Police Force, and perhaps they can be used in walking around, knocking on doors, and talking to people in a programme similar to the one conducted in Henley and Grange about 18 months ago. I am pleased to see that the Government has given high priority to an increase in the Police Force. Whilst I know that many people in the community, perhaps in one way through no fault of their own, turn to crime as a source of income or to supplement the family budget, and whilst I do not agree with that, we all know that that occurs.

I recall only recently, before the State election, walking around on Sunday morning and noticing a number of cars that had been broken into and the number of cars that had had their petrol tanks milked in the north-western part of my electorate. Indeed, in some of the disadvantaged areas, which I do not want to nominate, there are similar problems. I believe that if the Government will have a 'crime alert' programme or a similar programme alerting constituents or householders in that area to the problems that they can experience, hopefully that will go some way to reducing the amount of crime being experienced in that area. I would like to address myself to a problem which many of us experience: the constant requests from constituents for Housing Trust accommodation. I was pleased only this day to receive correspondence from the Minister in which he said that more Housing Trust accommodation was provided next year. Certainly that may reduce the number of requests for such accommodation. I am hopeful that that will occur, but, on the pessimistic side, I believe that, with the problem of interest rates, and with people living on a four-day week or reduced hours at their place of employment, the problem will not be overcome. I hope that I am wrong, but I believe that the problem will compound in the next 12 months. I raised an issue last year on the question of investigations into the use of caravans in caravan parks.

I have received only one adverse reaction to the question I asked on that matter, which was from a group of people in the south, outside the boundary of my electorate, who believed that I was reflecting on their way of life, although it was certainly not my intention to do that. However, considering the response that I received from the Minister of Environment and Planning, I believe that the Government did not conduct a survey into the long-term occupancy of these caravan parks. I feel that that is perhaps something

that should be looked at by my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare. I believe that there could be many hidden problems in those areas, including the problems of health, safety and those involving amenities for children and adults living in those areas. I am aware that the provisions of the Health Act apply to caravan parks, but I would hope that the Minister would look at this matter to ascertain whether there is a need for such a survey into the long-term occupancy of these caravan parks.

I now refer to the problem associated with the Port Adelaide sewage treatment plant, a problem that has gone on for donkey's years. I know that successive Governments have been trying to solve it, but the expenditure of well over half a million dollars has still not eliminated those offensive odours noticed by many people living in the Royal Park, Seaton and West Lakes areas. Officers of the E. & W.S. Department have told me that, owing to the high level of industrial and commercial sewage that goes into the system, they are finding it difficult to eliminate those offensive odours. I took the opportunity of having a look at the Glenelg treatment works and was informed by the management that the high salt content and the commercial problems are nowhere near as extreme at Glenelg as they are in the north-western suburbs and, in particular, at the Port Adelaide sewage treatment works.

Mr Becker: Did you let the member for that area know that you were going?

Mr HAMILTON: No, I must apologise for that. It was an oversight on my behalf. I will keep it in mind in the future. I would hope that during its term of office the Government will see its way clear to take additional steps to eliminate problems caused by those offensive odours.

Mr LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Adjourned debate in Committee (resumed on motion).
(Continued from page 197.)

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—'Retail storekeeper's licence.'

Mr BECKER: I thank the Minister for deferring consideration of this Bill in Committee to allow me to make some inquiries about the impact of this amendment. The provisions of new subsection 5 are as follows:

The court may, on the application of an applicant for, or the holder of, a retail storekeeper's licence, extend the trading hours authorised by the licence to nine o'clock in the evening on the days fixed by or under subsection (6) as the days on which the extension of trading hours shall operate.

The Government is endeavouring to enable late trading in liquor shops on an extra day during the Christmas trading period and on an extra day before New Year's Eve, so that this year there will be trading on Wednesday and Thursday in the suburbs and on Thursday and Friday in the metropolitan area. However, I am not particularly happy with the wording, because new subsection (6) provides:

An extension of trading hours granted under subsection (5) shall operate—

(a) where the licensed premises are situated in a shopping district—on any day on which late trading is permitted in that shopping district;

I seek an assurance from the Minister that that means that the provision will apply prior to Christmas and prior to New Year's Eve, and that it does not refer to any other subsequent period if there is an alteration to shop trading

hours. I seek an unequivocal assurance from the Minister in case there are any further disputes in relation to this legislation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I understand that this legislation is to provide for trading by bottle shops, if I can use that expression, for the same periods during which other shopping facilities are open in exceptional circumstances that apply traditionally over the Christmas trading period. That provision will apply each year. My understanding of this measure is that there are opportunities for extensions of normal shop trading hours in particular circumstances. I presume that if late night trading is granted for shops in a particular set of circumstances, for example, during the Festival of Arts, this provision would enable bottle shops to open at the same time; they would not be barred from opening as they are now, and shoppers could obtain a full range of services. I must say that that is an exception, and it has been the practice that late night trading exceptions occur over the Christmas and New Year period each year. This provision overcomes an anomaly. I would suggest that the danger to which the honourable member alludes is not met in this legislation but in the normal shop trading hours legislation. This is not the appropriate legislation to deal with an objection to any further extension of trading hours. I can see no other problem arising from the matter.

I refer the honourable member to the statement that his colleague made in another place when he said that the Bill only does those things which the Attorney said, that is, it enables bottle shops to open late for shopping nights before Christmas and in the New Year.

Mr BECKER: I thank the Minister for his explanation. That is the assurance that I sought. I am aware of the statements made in another place by the Attorney-General and the previous Minister who handled this legislation. Great play was made of the need to review the Licensing Act. I have received assurances from the Hotels Association that it supports this legislation. It believes that it is only fair and just that bottle shops should be able to trade in the same manner as any other shop in a shopping district covered by shop trading legislation.

There has been no suggestion, and I do not know whether the Minister knows, that shop trading hours are to be extended in the future (whether before Easter, as he said, during the Festival, for the bicentenary celebrations or for some other specific festive occasion). I do not think that that aspect has been considered by any of the Parties. That is what I was alluding to. If the Minister knows whether that is likely to happen he should inform the Committee.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: He may know, but if he does not he should say so. The other assurance I require from the Minister relates to new subsection (7). Why are the words 'or later' included? Does the Minister envisage that late night shopping may be extended to 10 p.m. or 11 p.m. in the future?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: In relation to the honourable member's first question, I have no knowledge of any current representations or submissions to extend shop trading hours. I alluded to that as an example to assist the honourable member in his consideration of the Bill. I will seek information from the Attorney in another place in relation to the other question. My off-the-cuff comment is that those words have been added to give the Licensing Court some flexibility in certain parts of the State, particularly in remote areas. I undertake to obtain that information for the honourable member.

Mr BLACKER: I refer to a problem in a little township in my district involving a bottle shop and its proprietor's ability to apply for Sunday trading in the same way as applies to bar trading. The place concerned is a tourist town

with no hotel. It does have a yacht club which has bar trade for limited hours. Day trippers to the tourist town have pointed out on many occasions that they should be able to buy a couple of bottles of beer to have with their lunch on the beach. At the moment, there is no way that the bottle shop proprietor can apply for Sunday trading. Under those circumstances I believe there is merit in the bottle shop having the ability to trade on Sundays. Is there a provision under this clause to allow the Licensing Court the flexibility to at least consider an application for Sunday trading for a bottle shop in the circumstances that I have described?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: The honourable member has raised a point of obvious interest to many townships in remote areas. However, I do not think it relates to this measure, which is specifically linked to shop trading hours. The honourable member is referring to a different section of the Licensing Act which relates to bar trading on Sundays. The Attorney-General has said that the review that is being undertaken into the Licensing Act will continue. Obviously, the honourable member's comments should be put to the Attorney-General or to those who are conducting the review of the Licensing Act. As I understand it, the problems mentioned by the honourable member will not be redressed by this measure.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I appreciated the opportunity to look at the Bill in Committee and to ask some questions about its impact. Whilst I understand that the Hotels Association is in full agreement with the measure and that bottle shop proprietors will also support and appreciate the extension and opportunity to trade on an additional evening before Christmas and on an additional evening before the new year, there is one area of the amending Bill that concerns me. The Minister has assured me that he will obtain the information that I seek, but I point out that we may not have been told of the legislation's full impact. I refer to new subsection (7), as follows:

'day on which late trading is permitted' means a day on which shops (not being exempt shops) may, in pursuance of the Shop Trading Hours Act, 1977-1980, remain open for business until nine o'clock in the evening or later.

Nothing was said in another place about this subsection. Subsection (7) also provides:

'trading hours' in relation to a retail storekeeper's licence means the hours during which the licensee is authorised under the licence to sell and dispose of liquor.

I am suspicious, if I may use that term, that licensed bottle shops may have an opportunity to remain open until midnight in certain hotels. In some cases I believe hotels can do that, and the same situation applies on a Sunday in the country. Because some hotels can trade much later, in some cases until midnight, I believe that we could see bottle shops trading until midnight as well.

That is why I am very disappointed that the Attorney in another place did not spell out this section. I am very disappointed that it was not picked up in another place and that the Minister representing the Attorney in this Chamber does not have that information for us now. I am not prepared to delay the legislation and consider amendments, but I do believe that the Minister in another place has a responsibility to advise members in this Chamber before any alteration is made to the trading hours of bottle shops in the metropolitan area and throughout the State. Suggestions have been made that there will be a review of the Licensing Act, and I think that that review is now urgent.

I believe that the Government has an onus to advise this Parliament of its intention in relation to the two words 'or later' as far as trading hours are concerned. I believe that neither the Hotels Association nor the proprietors of those bottle shops would be aware of this, although I may be wrong. However, I do give notice to the new Government that, when introducing legislation in Parliament, it is necessary to spend more time and be more thorough. It should not be left to individual members to go through and check provisions and to read meanings into them. I think it is fair and reasonable that if there is an intention to extend the trading hours it should be spelt out. Therefore, I appeal to the integrity of the Government to let us know as soon as possible what the intentions are regarding the provision in question.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank members for their support for this measure, which I am sure will assist consumers in this State and those who conduct this sector of small business.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 212).

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the motion. I offer my congratulations on your election to the office of Speaker, Sir. I am sure that, given the time and the opportunity to demonstrate it, you will acquit yourself with the distinction for which previous Speakers in this place are known and renowned, and I refer particularly, of course, to the immediate past Speaker, the member for Light, whom I am sure we all agree showed that he had ability in that role equal to, if not greater than, that of any Speaker since the Second World War and probably any Speaker this century.

I also wish to congratulate my Leader, the member for Rocky River, on his election to that office. I commend him for the very capable way in which he has taken political initiative in the absence of any leadership anywhere else in this Chamber. That is a direct and deliberate comment about the prevarication and ineptitude demonstrated by the new Government since Parliament reassembled. The new Government has not only failed to get its act together in this House but also failed in political terms.

It seemed a couple of days ago that we had a gorgeous quinella of a couple of Acts relating to racing and gambling in this State when there were very urgent and pressing problems surrounding the current high levels of unemployment (which show no sign whatever of abating in their upward trend), and the difficulties that cause that unemployment, which this Government showed no inclination to face or try to solve. It showed no leadership in any direction. On the other hand, the Opposition, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, has shown that he does understand the problem and has attempted, along with the assistance today of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, to bring on the matter for debate. There can be no other more pressing or urgent matter needing debate in this State at this time, and the Government ran away! It does not have the guts to face the realities that confront it in political terms on that question. I am disappointed not only in the Government's attitude on that very pressing and important question but also with the way in which the Minister of Environment and Planning has behaved in connection with the acquisition of a piece of farmland in my electorate.

Mr Gunn: Scurrilous and scandalous.

Mr LEWIS: I can find even more adequate adjectives to describe it. In this instance, I find that the respect I had for the Minister has fallen not just a few points, but through the floor. He has misled this Chamber. I will now read a statement which has been given to me by the former owner of that land and which describes how he became owner and how he then came in such short order to be dispossessed of it. The owner states:

Let me say, first, that I am in favour of conservation of wild life and fauna. Also, my four children and wife feel as I do; they have been brought up that way, with a love of the bush and wild life.

I would interpose there that I, too, am a conservationist, and am publicly avowed to supporting those views, having been a member of the Conservation Council in this State for several years. Mr Brown, of Maggea, continues:

I condemn the Minister wholeheartedly for the worry his actions of issuing the papers to take over our freehold farm block caused to our whole family and the faith of my children in their rightful country where they were born and could willingly defend. After the issuing of this notice my two children, who were at school at the time, came home after a journey of 140 kilometres to the East Murray Area School.

It may be interesting to members to know that their school is 70 kilometres away from their home. I doubt very much whether any members in the Government have any children in any of their electorates who have to travel half that distance to get to school. These children travel 70 kilometres each way each day. The statement continues:

My youngest boy (11 years) who drew all his savings out of his school bank to help us raise the deposit for us to purchase the block, which he has always called 'our farm', began crying and we could not convince him at that stage that it could be true, it was no longer ours.

I interpose at this point to say that Mr Brown has a chronic medical condition. He continues:

Also my daughter, 14 years, was upset as that is about the only thing she has talked about. She put her savings of \$500, which she has been saving for a horse since she was six, to help us with the deposit for the farm. The balance of the deposit money was made up by our two sons, Anthony and Christopher, who are 17 and 18 years old. That was \$2 000. We still had to borrow \$10 000 which cost us \$3 632 in interest on our personal loan. Further costs at the time of purchase were \$680 stamp duty paid to the Government, travelling and brokers fees.

All in all, if we add up his immediate cash costs involved, they come to some \$20 612. I will outline how that comes to be so in due course. He further states:

We had no notice of their [that is the Minister's] intention to acquire the land until the day the notice was issued to us, for they had told us on a previous occasion when they spoke of buying it that our price was too high.

That was during the term of the previous Government. The letter continues:

They were no further interested but helped us, one officer from the department, with his qualified information on the best way to clear the block which would not interfere greatly with the wildlife on it. We started chaining—

earlier this year after they had purchased the land—

leaving what they suggested us to do and more which we thought would also help.

I know that they consulted a number of people who are conservationists not the least of whom was a member of the Soil Conservation Council, Mr Doug Fullston, the Mayor of the Karoonda East Murray District Council, with whom I have had discussions on this matter. The letter continues:

These chaining operations cost us a further \$3 600 plus our own labour, plus the interest on the \$3 000 overdraft we had borrowed to do the chaining. Those costs have not been added in. Prior to buying the block we had a small telephone exchange—

I am giving the history of the family—

at Sanderson at which we considered we served the public and the people well for four years. We were happy there and the people were always helpful to us and our children. We carted stumps and wood and did share-farming but, unfortunately, prog-

ress went on and the exchange went automatic. As most people know, telephone exchanges and post offices are very poorly paid but the wood and share-farming helped us along but being together and in the country was all we really wanted. After closure of Telecom, pay was cut down to carry on the post office so low that we could not keep going, so we moved to Kongolia where we had a few acres of lucerne. Just after we arrived, our neighbour asked us to take over the telephone exchange there which we welcomed with open arms, for, with one son left at school and one about to leave, it would help us. Unfortunately for us, that exchange also went automatic after two years. We struggled on for a while but found it very hard to keep our heads above water. At that stage the two boys took over 175 beehives and plant but unfortunately, as has been known for the last two years, beekeeping has been a dead loss and the boys had to work hard splitting stumps and cutting wood to help pay them off.

The House may be interested to learn that I do not expect the international honey market to recover this side of the turn of the century unless there is an enormous disaster for the recently expanded and well established honey industry in China which outstrips any other exporting country and can provide honey at a fraction of the cost of Australian apiarists. Short of a disaster there, honey prices cannot ever be expected to rise on the export market for Australian markets to the point where they can compensate for the capital tied up, let alone for wages. The letter continues:

At this stage we were picking stumps at Maggea, and we were told that we could buy a good block for \$12 000 or so which would make a good farm for the boys in time. Being a freehold block we thought it would be theirs for ever, so we purchased it. We knew it would be hard work on wood and stumps and tractor driving, fixing shearing sheds, etc. We agreed that they would do good as they are not hard to please. They do not need new cars and other things like drink and smoking to please them. The four children and my wife all play tennis for Maggea.

Mr Brown and his family have re-established the tennis club in that locality and have done other things in that community. People in the general district regard them as an outstanding asset and a breath of fresh air. They are willing to organise things and are reliable in every respect. He continues:

My eldest son is the President of the newly formed club. They like the area and almost everyone around and get on well with them and would hate to have to leave, but if we are forced to accept the offer which this Government, in payment for forced acquisition, is offering we must surely leave this district. To where this time I would not know but we certainly would not be able to make a living for the six of us without our block to get some wood and stumps off the land we clear. Of the 2 500 acres we had no intention at any time of clearing any more than 1 300 acres.

That fact I have been able to verify publicly. He continues:

For the rest is open grazing country and bigger type timber which grows good feed and the wildlife and fauna on this property is mostly in that area. It would be left in its natural state. I offered it to the National Parks and Wildlife Service as long as we had the grazing rights of it but they would not accept.

That is Mr Brown's opinion, and he is welcome to that view. He continues:

After we started chaining, department officers came out and introduced themselves and said they were informed that we had started chaining our block. I said, 'Yes' and was quite surprised when they asked me to take them out to look over it. They rang before coming. They had lunch with us and my wife made sandwiches and tea for them. We had a pleasant day. I was busy but enjoyed their company and their knowledge of wildlife. I took them to a few Mallee fowl nests and we walked over quite an area. We came back to the house and had a drink of tea and they left with a couple of jars of the boys' honey. Before they left they asked whether I would consider selling the land. I said I had no intention of selling but I did realise that it was a real park like property and told them that if I was in the position financially they could have it but I was not as I have a family to consider. I must be able to get enough to at least put a deposit on another property.

I said, 'What price do you think the department would pay?' and he said he thought about \$20 000. I said we could not possibly accept that at this stage and he asked us would we mind not chaining any more until he gave us a ring the next day, which he did. He told me that the price would be about \$20 000 to \$25 000

and how much did I think I would want for it. I told him I would have to talk to my sons and wife about it as it was their money and work which helped to buy the place and I would ring him back. This I did after speaking with them. I told him we would have to get at least \$38 000.

And I think he is being modest; I would like to be his advocate in court. He continues:

And he asked me if I would put that in writing and send it off to them, which I did.

Mr Gunn: That is absolutely scurrilous.

Mr LEWIS: They have taken down a very sincere, honest and forthright man in the most despicable way. He states:

He rang me back and said that it did not warrant presentation of our price to the Minister.

And if that is the case, then there are some officers of that department who should be given some lessons about their responsibilities. He states:

We had a talk to the National Parks and Wildlife officer and asked him 'What happens now?', and he told us or gave us the impression that they were no further interested and said we could go ahead and clear it all, as it was freehold property and they had no authority to stop us in any way. I asked him if they thought anything about the other suggestions which we had discussed previously and had no answer. These suggestions were that the department find another place nearby, if we could find another place—

this is summarising—

if it was too much to expect them to pay, would they at least help us to find a deposit on it. Would they consider buying us out?

That is the farm, the house and the implement sheds that they had erected since procuring the place less than 12 months ago. The letter goes on:

... as they would be of no further use to us without our farm or other land in the near vicinity. It would be extremely hard to sell this house and implement shed—

they are on separate titles—

for any like its true value.

It is out in an isolated Mallee town which has now virtually gone. It is useless to someone who does not have a farm with no home on it to live in, and all the farms in that general locality (bar a few) do have homes already established on them. He imagines he would not get more than about \$18 000 for the lot, which means that he would be losing \$20 000. He points out that it cost him \$63 187 to set up there, so that it would be a viable proposition for the whole family. He states:

All these proposals, I got no answer. As a matter of fact at no time during any discussions we had was there a firm price of \$25 000 or any other figure made to me. Even on the day of acquisition I did not know what the price was to be, whether the \$25 000 would be a firm price or not. Nothing was ever in writing, the only thing in writing was from me when they asked me to put what I would accept for the property and send it to them, which I did. After this they told us we could go on chaining but said that our \$38 000, which was the price I had stated did not warrant presentation to the Minister, so we went on chaining with a further cost of \$3 600 in direct cash outlay—

that is my explanation—

as we had planned to do before we were approached by them. We had intended to put our house out on the farm, but after applying for electricity we were told it would be in the vicinity of \$10 000 which we never had to spend. Also at this stage we would have had to have a bore put down and we were talking to a local farmer who said he could get us these two blocks at Maggea and we could make arrangements with him for water and could still work the farm economically from there. It is only approximately eight miles to the farm from Maggea. This seemed the best thing to do all round, so that is what we did. On those blocks we erected our sheds, garage, boys room, cement paths, septic tank, transportable home, and so on, at a total cost of which was \$42 575. We are set up here quite comfortably and very happy. Without the farm all this would be for nothing. The house could be shifted but having already been shifted twice it would not be advisable and would be an expensive operation.

I have done some rough calculations, and have estimated the minimum payment which the Crown should make,

every taxpayer in South Australia should make to this man. If it is our judgment as a Parliament and if it is this Government's judgment that this land should be acquired in this way, the very minimum in conscience that every South Australian should be prepared to contribute to that man is at least \$75 000; \$25 000 is an absolutely despicable figure; it is theft.

In a report in the *Advertiser* on 4 December 1982, some of the points made by the Minister or his spokesman are answered in the following way by Mr Brown:

No negotiations had broken down because there were at no time any firm negotiations. The National Parks and Wildlife gave no answer to any other proposals I put to them, so how could it be said that there were negotiations? At no time during interviews did they set any real price; only about \$20 000 to \$25 000. The first time we really knew \$25 000 was on the day of the issue of the acquisition only by word of mouth. The one negotiated price I made had to be in writing to them. The only time I had seen the offer was the next day in the *Advertiser*. Whoever said we were going to cut fire wood systematically is utter rubbish—

and I have verified these facts by speaking to local people who have come to know the Browns—

and it shows their ignorance. After I told them we would cut the wood out of what we had chained, as we were only at any time going to clear 800 acres on the first year, 200 acres each year until we had an area of approximately 1300 acres cleared for that would be the most of the good arable land. The balance is grazing, consisting of open stony country with big timber which we never had any intention of clearing, as I have said.

To say I went on chaining after negotiations had broken down was untrue. When National Parks and Wildlife said they would not accept to pay the price we had put in writing they gave us the okay to go on chaining. I rang them back to see if there was any developments. They said, 'No,' and it seemed they were no further interested at that time. At this time I also asked them what would be a good width to leave the corridor down the south side for bird life to connect with the two other properties of scrub adjoining ours. At this stage they said, 'Are you going to leave the sand hill running east and west, and I said, 'Yes,' and that I would be disturbing as little wildlife as possible. That was the last contact we had with them until they served the acquisition notice which I and all my family could hardly believe, as it was quite unnecessary to upset them—

meaning the family. He then outlines a couple of other notes, including Mr Hopgood's comment in the *Advertiser* of 25 November, that if there had been much delay in acquisition there would have been nothing left. He stated:

That there would be nothing left is untrue as the chaining was finished three days before that, and a track chained through the scrub so that we could load the tractors at an old quarry site.

Incidentally, I note that the Minister still has failed to appear, although I have been speaking on this topic for nearly an hour. He is obviously smirking away somewhere in the basement. The TD-14s, or whatever tractors they were, do not belong to the Browns. They hired the tractors and the boys drove them. They were told that they must not remove the tractors and were also told that they may never again enter that land without written permission of the Minister on pain of 12 months imprisonment or a \$2 000 fine.

Mr Gunn: That is not the first time that they have acted in a high-handed fashion. Talk about a police State!

Mr LEWIS: It is quite unreasonable.

Mr Gunn interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: Yes, I would join with that comment. Mr Brown further states:

We even asked the National Parks and Wildlife Service if there was any type of bush or tree that would suit this area that we could plant that would be of use for the boys with their bees. My oldest boy has grown quite a few hundred gum trees and native trees from seedlings while we had the exchange at Sanderson. My daughter in her choice of jobs has always said that she has wanted to work in the National Parks and Wildlife Service.

As the matter stands now, the daughter never wants to hear of the department again, and even to attempt to discuss the matter with her brings her to tears. This man did not come

to me in the first instance with his problem because he sincerely believed that Labor Ministers were reasonable people. I have shared that view in the past, but I am not sure what my attitude is in the general case, although I am quite sure of what it is in this case. This man is a simple, humble, very hard-working, honest, sincere committed person of the kind that made this country great. He told me when he telephoned me, as an apology to me, that he had never voted for me or the Liberal Party in his life, that he had even worked in support of the Labor Party. It upset him now to have to come to me. We got over those difficulties in a matter of five or 10 minutes and he explained his problem to me; that is when I asked for this written material.

It should be noted that not only has he been a supporter of the Labor Party all his life but that he came to Adelaide and stayed here at his own expense for three days in the belief that he would be able to enter into some meaningful discussions, some negotiations, some consultation over the acquisition notice that had been served on him so peremptorily, so suddenly, that it ripped the guts out of his life and left him and his family devastated. Neither the Minister nor any of his officers showed any inclination to see those people, and they have now gone home. Had the Minister the common courtesy at least to instruct one of his staff to see the man or tell him that he must write to make an appointment or to get in touch with his local member, I might not be standing here saying this; but that did not happen. The man was ignored and fobbed off. The land that has been acquired in this way for this purpose (and I do not dispute that the purpose may be appropriate; it may be) was cleared 30 years ago or less, and the scrub that has been acquired is not natural mallee virgin scrub, but it is regrowth. I find that laughable.

The department could easily have found other areas of scrub that had not been logged previously. I can see no value in the department's having pursued this policy in this way. I find it incomprehensible, especially after hearing Ministers and members opposite standing up and trying to tell me and other members of the Parliament that they believe in consultation—what a joke!

Mr Gunn: Consensus—that is the Premier's word.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Mitcham quite adequately and appropriately pointed out that the word 'consensus', broken into two parts, perhaps gives the meaning of the word as it is used by some people in this Government, 'con' meaning to deceive or trick, and 'sensus', or 'sensus', meaning to fiddle the figures, or whatever. Certainly the Government has done a fiddle in this case and has deceived and tricked this man. His bank has foreclosed on him. He has no security whatever to service a loan. That has been stripped from him. The price that he has been offered is less than the cash costs that he has incurred quite lawfully doing what he was on his own land. He is left without any means of taking the matter to arbitration. He does not have the money. I suspect that the Minister knows that, and that is why the department has decided to act in the way it has done.

I am not normally cynical but the circumstances of this case make me think that some wrong advice has been given to the Minister about the intentions of this man, about his motives and his attitudes, and that he may have been described as someone completely irresponsible, unwilling to show any interest or concern for the natural environment, who may have been hell-bent on ripping the guts out of a piece of beautiful virgin bush. However, nothing could be further from the truth: it is regrowth on his own property. He made it public knowledge that he intended to clear only 1 300 acres. That had already been logged. He consulted the department to get its view about which strips of vegetation to leave to ensure that there would be a corridor for the

movement of birds and other fauna from one patch of vegetation to the other. He consulted with the Department of Agriculture and other officials in soil conservation concerning which parts of the scrub needed to be left on the light sand to ensure that it never drifted.

That is the kind of man that he is. I thought that he might have been inaccurately portrayed to the Minister by some over zealous officer, and that the Minister may not have been fully aware of the facts. However, I heard a question yesterday from someone who did not know the difference between a stockowner and a stockholder.

Mr Gunn: A Dorothy Dixier.

Mr LEWIS: A beautiful Dorothy Dixier. It confirmed to my horror that the Minister was aware of and privy to the deal that was done—and what a one-sided deal it was, too. That stinks, and so do the Minister's attitude and his policy. I trust that he will attempt to restore some of the good faith which most South Australians place in him and other members of his Party, by agreeing to see me with Mr Brown and a couple of other people (all of whom are reasonably level-headed and considerate) to discuss the misunderstanding (and I hope that is all it is) that has arisen. If I am mistaken, if Mr Brown has misled me, and if the people in the community to whom I have spoken have told me lies, then I will apologise. However, I suggest that the balance of probabilities, on the weight of evidence (based on the numbers of people to whom I have spoken) is strongly against the probability of my being in that position.

I will now leave that matter noting regrettably that we have seen neither hair nor hide of the Minister, the Hon. Dr Hopgood, during the course of my remarks. I turn now to some of the comments that have been made by people around this nation and in this Parliament about wages, the unemployment crisis and the Government's failure to understand the fundamental economic principles involved. In the last session I referred to one of the most senior economic advisers that the Labor Party has had over the last decade, until a few months ago, Professor Harcourt. People who read his book on economic activity will find an explanation of the meaning of a 'real wage overhang', which is what this country is suffering from now.

We are paying what is available in the way of real wages, and that can be equated in dollar terms or not, to fewer people than are willing to work. This will not affect total demand, but it will affect the bundle of commodities demanded in the macro economic context. If fewer people get that money, as is the increasing case in Australia at the moment (and definitely the case in countries such as the Philippines), then the goods that they seek to procure with that spending power change the composition of the commodities in the demand schedule. The very wealthy, and there are few of them, have the spending power and they buy a small number of luxury goods, while the mass of people stricken in poverty are not even able to purchase the basic necessities of life. I mean that—the basic necessities of life.

In this country no-one goes without basic necessities—and I mean that. If my mother can live and pay her rent on an old age pension without any other financial assistance of any kind and still save money, no-one can tell me that the pension cannot provide at least the basic necessities of life. She had no great amount of savings after raising 10 children.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: She made a lot of mistakes in life.

Mr LEWIS: If that is a reflection on my mother I ask the honourable member to withdraw it. The fact remains that we need to recognise that, if we want full employment, there is only so much spending power that can be distributed in the form of wages through the economy to provide it. If we give that spending power to a lesser number of people

by paying them more in each of their wage packets (over and above their real wage level) we will end up with a percentage of people unemployed. The people who have the jobs then believe that they can salve their consciences by paying tax, which in turn pays the dole.

I even saw one hair-brained scheme cooked up a couple of weeks ago by someone in the A.C.T.U. who suggested that each member of an affiliated trade union should make a contribution from each pay to a central fund administered by the union so that it could engage in job creation schemes. Of course, that would give the A.C.T.U. much greater power over people's lives. It may already be heading in that direction, which is clearly a socialist objective.

I am not paranoid about socialists, I just abhor their philosophy. I understand it and I think it is utterly ridiculous. Therefore, we need to recognise that pretend jobs of the type that the A.C.T.U. is cooking up, or the type that we saw in the Whitlam era, still cost money. They must come from within the economy, whether through taxation or by stealth through inflation by reducing the spending power of the rest of the population. If the Government prints the money (if it does not take it in taxation) to meet the burden of the expenditure that is involved without collecting taxes, then more money is chasing the same number of goods and services. Automatically, those people who want the goods more than others will bid up the price. When the price rises and we hear the argument that it is inflation. Indeed it is. People are left with reduced spending power for the same money wage. That is exactly the result of those types of schemes.

If taxation is collected to finance these schemes, the amount of money left with employers and with people is reduced, thereby reducing their spending power, so that someone else can enjoy it. The job that has been created is a pretend job. Had the money been left in the free economy it would have created a job far more effectively. A dollar is a dollar wherever it is found. The tragedy is that people think that money can be printed to create jobs or that taxation can be increased to create jobs: either way it destroys the incentive of those people engaged in the production of essential goods and services to continue to work as hard. It destroys their incentive by destroying their reward and they will feel less inclined to work hard. They will either work at the same rate per hour (in terms of effort output) for fewer hours each week and each year, thereby producing less, or they will simply slow down and say, 'It is not worth it, I do not want to pay this extra tax. Why should I work so hard for so little marginal gain personally?'

I know that members opposite from Trades Hall can stand up and quote me chapter, book and verse about the number of documented instances where that theory does not fit. I would answer them simply, and say that, along with large corporate capitalists, they have aided and abetted each other in creating cartels and monopolies in this country for their collective benefit—against the interests of the available labour force.

It is easy for a trade union to screw a monopoly or a cartel for higher wages, especially if at some point in the history of its relationship with that corporation it is able to achieve a closed shop agreement. Once the union has a closed shop, it has the cartel or corporation, the rest of the country (and that means the people) by whatever it is you can grab when you reach out and grab it, fingers extended, hand upwards.

You can squeal all you like, but that is exactly where they have got them. The Kernell refinery (and the industrial disputation there is a classic example of that) and the construction workers on the gas and oil pipelines from Bass Strait are two recent examples where closed shop unionists have a firm grip on the supply of essential commodities and where their wage price is higher than the Australian

price on the open market. At least for the sake of economic argument, that is the case. There we have it. I suggest to members opposite that what they should do is understand, after studying what Professor Harcourt has had to say about that (Geoffrey is no mug). They should then go and explain it to other members of their organisations (their trade union representatives and the members of the trade unions) to help them understand the basic economic facts of life.

They are immutable laws. I have heard people asking about the Phillips curve theory; that is where the Government spends money to create jobs. It is okay to overcome frictional unemployment but not structural unemployment in the economy. If one expends money to try to overcome structural unemployment by giving people jobs that are unrelated to the new direction in which the economy needs to go (that is, like the RED scheme and so on), then you have done the economy a grave disservice; you have created false expectations and thereby prevented or destroyed a re-orientation of resources in any realistic way. There needs to be a greater willingness for mobility in the national work force and there needs to be a greater understanding that pay rises do indeed mean jobs lost. There are other arguments that support that, but the immutable fact about the Phillips curve is that you cannot trade off a certain amount of inflation for a certain amount of unemployment. That is to say, if unemployment is at, say, 6 per cent and you want to bring it down to 4 per cent, you cannot say, 'I will increase inflation this year from, say 5 per cent to 8 per cent,' to do so. If Governments pursue such policies they will come unstuck and end up where Australia is right now, and where a number of other countries have ended up who have misunderstood the Keynes theory. They thought that they could trade off a certain amount of inflation to reduce unemployment. It does not work.

I would like to answer the comment made by a senior official, whose rank and name I cannot remember but who was referred to by the honourable member for Unley in his remarks. I believe that the official came from the Master Builders Association and I believe that he attacked the previous Tonkin Liberal Government for cutting capital works expenditure by \$41 000 000. I say to that official that he ought to answer the question before attacking the Government. Is he and the members of his association willing to pay that \$41 000 000 in tax? Is he or his organisation members willing, if they are not willing to pay the tax, to cop the inflation sweet? Or does he advocate that someone else should pick up the tax burden, such that it should be shared equally throughout the community so that his industry can thereby benefit disproportionately by that means?

Someone has to pay. If the Government does not collect it in taxes the end result will be higher inflation. What a ridiculous assertion on that official's part. Maybe he felt he had to say it on behalf of his organisation or felt he had to say it to keep his support and high office in that organisation, but to be so inanely critical of a Government which was absolutely and utterly responsible in the way in which it managed the finances at its disposal—without putting up taxes—demonstrates to any intelligent person the utter selfishness of that organisation, or its spokesman in this instance.

I refer now to the despicable way in which the Porter's shearing shed was burnt down recently in Naracoorte. I have certain knowledge that that was an organised arson and, contrary to the public statement made by 'Knuckles' Thompson, from the A.W.U., he did know about it before it happened and had discussed it—or my ears were flapping in the pub one night. I will not name the pub, nor will I describe the gentleman, but I point out that loose talk in the pub on that occasion alerted me to the fact that there

was a plan afoot three weeks before the Porter's shearing shed was destroyed.

I only got the date wrong; I could not hear it that well. I think that it was despicable of 'Knuckles' Thompson to deny any knowledge of it. 'Knuckles' said the dispute was over the use of wide combs. When I was shearing, I used wide combs myself and to say that it is ridiculous, unnecessary, unreasonable and all the other things which those people within the union who opposed the introduction of wide combs for shearing have said, is ridiculous. That is like saying we should never have introduced the scythe and should have stuck to the sickle. That would mean that we would still have more people out there mowing the crops: furthermore, that we ought never to have introduced mechanical shearing, anyway—we should have stuck to the blades. What is worse still, perhaps Ridley should never have invented his stripper—or the combine harvester. Maybe an even better illustration of the stupidity of this argument in the interests of the Seamen's Union membership is that we ought never to have invented the aeroplane, because we would therefore now still be carrying people around this globe in ships at sea and not in aircraft. It is technological change! Sheep have been bred better. Steel is now stronger. The wide comb is an admirable and appropriate means by which to remove the fleeces from the sheep that have to be shorn each year. I weigh in on that side of the argument as a shearer, and I know that a good many other members of the union do also.

I refer now to the fishing industry in my electorate. There are not sufficient fishing inspectors to carry out the job of stopping blue-potting between fishermen—whether by licensed professionals or by those poachers who are amateurs and who find the pots of others and steal the fish from them before the rightful owners can collect them. The previous Government, of which I was proud to be a member, introduced the most comprehensive reform in terms of fishing legislation ever seen in this country. I call on the present Government to continue through the process of ensuring that the industry in South Australia becomes even more of an example to the fishing industries throughout the Commonwealth, by appointing extra inspectors. They are necessary to protect the gear, the catch and prevent albeit perhaps murder on the sea—because it could come to that. Of course, we also need these extra inspectors to stop people from taking illegal undersized fish, and to encourage people to understand the necessity to respect and retain breeding stock. It has happened in Queensland where, without any management in the fishery at all, they have reduced or destroyed the breeding stock of several commercial species and the harvestable numbers of fish that can come from it. They have gone past what is known as the point of maximum sustainable yield. They can increase the technology, they can increase the tonnage and the boats on the water, they can increase the capital invested in the system all they like in the waters in question, but in spite of all this their fishing industry will continue to get decreasing yields from their waters.

That is the prospect with which we were confronted in this State when we first discussed managed fisheries years ago. Not enough was done about management of those fisheries during the life of the previous Labor Government. We got our act together and introduced a most comprehensive Fisheries Act, which is acknowledged as such around this country. I call on the Government to see it through and make sure that there are adequate inspectors with adequate equipment to do the job.

I point out also that some funds could be well spent on developing commercial fish farms (the technology for which is well known, and can be found by anybody who reads the literature on this matter to be found in any library). It costs

no more capital to set up an aquaculture unit that would produce a given amount of fish flesh each year than it would cost to set up a chicken farm to produce the same amount of chicken flesh.

Equal capital is involved. Feed costs are less for fish. The conversion rate of raw food to marketable product is narrower, the ratio is better and more efficient and the end product is worth more in the market place. Chicken cannot be worth much more than \$3 or so a kilo. Properly farmed fish can be worth as much as \$15 a kilo at the farm gate. It is an eminently more profitable venture and I urge the Government, through the Fisheries Department, to consider the benefit of putting a number of people to work as self employed fish farmers. Enormous natural resources exist to do so. We could easily pump irrigation water twice to do so.

During the next year, I will provide the House with an extensive explanation of the enormous contribution that Roseworthy Agricultural College has made to this State and to this nation. Next year is its centenary year. It has been an outstanding institution in its own right and an example to other States. Like South Australia in other ways, in this instance we again showed what could be done and we led the way. It was the first agricultural college established in Australia.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): At the outset of my speech tonight I wish to congratulate the member for Playford on his election as Speaker and the member for Whyalla on his election as Chairman of Committees, and to welcome the members for Brighton, Henley Beach, Mawson and Unley to the Chamber as members of the Government. May they have a long period in Government. I welcome the members for Mitcham and Goyder as members of the Opposition. I wish well the members of this House who retired voluntarily and involuntarily and hope that in retirement they will find useful work to do to assist our community. I welcome the Opposition to the Parliament and hope it has a long and successful career in Opposition.

I thank the member for Bragg for calling the election on 6 November. I will recall to the House a few words I had to say when I first spoke in this Chamber on 14 September, as follows:

I want to thank the Liberal Party members who did go out to door knock and try to explain their policies, because it seems to me that that must have assisted in the swing towards me in Florey. If that swing was transferred into a State-wide basis, we would see the Parliamentary Labor Party sitting on the other side of this Chamber and in Government, and the sooner the election is held the better because I want to go over on that side. Our party is working hard so that this election can be held, and we want it to be held soon.

The prophecies there (or at least two of them) worked out exceptionally well. Within eight weeks of my being elected, we found ourselves on this side of the House. I also found that the swing towards me on primary votes in the 6 November election was 1.62 per cent but that the swing on an all-Party preferred basis was away from myself to the extent of 1.2 per cent. I can only assume that that slight diminution of votes was caused by Liberal Party Cabinet Ministers not campaigning in Florey and explaining their policies. If they had campaigned I would have received many more votes.

We have seen in this Chamber, since we resumed sitting, a thrust from the Opposition for a wage pause. All we have

been able to get from the Opposition is a demand for a wage pause and a parroting of statements, attitudes and policies as enunciated by their Federal Leader in Canberra, from his sick bed or wherever he may be. What is the problem? They have in a very simplistic way suggested that wages have caused all economic problems in Australia. Whilst Maximillian Walsh may not exactly be a supporter of working people, this Party or the under-privileged of this country, I regard him as a journalist who writes what he thinks. I will read to the House some of his comments published in *Australian Business* on 23 December 1982, as follows:

The first and obvious conclusion that must be reached is that the Budget brought down by John Howard in August was every bit as irresponsible in content as Labor's infamous Budget of 1974.

He goes on to say:

... the 1982 Budget was a calculated piece of political cynicism designed solely for the purpose of winning an early election.

He continues:

It identified three causes:

A recessed international economy showing no signs of early recovery.

A widespread and protracted drought.

Excessive wage demands through the last financial year.

All of these conditions were known when the Budget was framed. There has been no acceleration in wage claims since the Budget—just the opposite. Wages were expected to grow by about 12 per cent at the time of the Budget. Before the wage pause was decided that rate of growth estimate had already been cut by about 1.5 per cent.

The so-called wage pause will perhaps mean a further reduction of 2 per cent—certainly no more. That 1.5 per cent overestimate of wage growth added about \$400 million to the domestic deficit through loss of taxation. The total deficit was supposed to be of the order of \$1.6 billion or 1 per cent of gross domestic product. It is now estimated to be at least \$4 billion and likely to blow out further.

He further states:

In this financial year we are facing a total public sector deficit of the order of 5 per cent—or more. We will see the Whitlam era record of 5.4 per cent broken either this year or next.

He continues:

In these circumstances the rash of tax cuts and concessions handed down in the Federal Budget can be seen in their true perspective as economic letter-bombs—attractively packaged gifts which will blow up in the faces of the recipients.

That is what is happening at the moment. The colleagues of members opposite seek to hide what they have done, hide their cynicism and their drive to get back into office at any cost to the Australian economy, attacking the Australian worker and blaming him for all the economic ills of this country. They claim that if we have a wage pause for 12 months they will save \$300 000 000. If one reads the *Advertiser*, or the *Australian* or any other newspapers in the other states, or if one watches television or listens to the radio, one gets the impression that there is a lot more money involved than just \$300 000 000. They talk about \$100 000 000 for housing; they talk about money for this and money for that, yet in this instance they are only talking about \$300 000 000.

They do not appreciate that by reducing the wages by that amount, they also cut their revenue and blow out their deficit further. The other paradox of their attitude towards job creation is that when the A.C.T.U. approached the Federal Government with a proposal that there should be an economic summit to talk about the problems confronting Australia and to talk about its proposal of levying its members to create a fund so that it can engage in job creation programmes, the Leader of the Federal Party and his Deputy Prime Minister pooh-poohed that idea as job creation which will not work because it will not create permanent jobs. The member for Mallee, who has just finished speaking said exactly the same thing, and yet I want to know this: if that

will not create jobs, why has it suddenly become that important to cut the wages of people who are in jobs to embark on job creation programmes? Surely the programmes that they will start on are exactly those that the A.C.T.U. and Labor Premiers would want.

It seems to me that one just cannot have one's cake and eat it too. One cannot say that job creation programmes created by the \$300 000 000, no matter how many times one says it, will be any better than or any different from those that we wanted to create. The A.C.T.U. has, as long as I can recall, being a member of the Executive, been demanding of the Prime Minister that there be an economic summit of employee-employer representatives, State Government, local government and the Federal Government to consider the direction of the economy of Australia. On all occasions when that demand was made by the President of the A.C.T.U. (Mr Hawke), it was rejected, principally on the grounds that Fraser was of the view that the A.C.T.U. would use it to play politics. I am of the view that if the Prime Minister of Australia does not want to play politics, he should opt out of it and go back to sheep and cattle grazing and let somebody else do it. But apparently he wanted to continue playing, but not with the players.

Since Mr Dolan has been the President those demands have been made, but there has never been a real conference. We note that the Leader of this State Government has been making a similar demand and there is a very good reason for it. We had an exposition tonight from the member for Mallee, who was explaining to us the problems confronting the economy in Australia. If one were to apply his theories on economic recovery, just using his theories, we would find that we would be sliding further into recession and would not be getting out of it. I am taking into account exactly what is happening as one of the problems of the Federal Government. It governs for the day; it does not govern for tomorrow. I am pleased that the reason why the Liberal Party in this State is on the other side is that it has the same attitudes; it does the same things. It was not governing for next year and the years after.

If these conferences that we have been looking for had been held, perhaps we would have some understanding of unemployment and how it has been caused. If there is a vast structural change taking place in our country today, all the economic theories announced by the member for Mallee will not stop those industries from shedding employees, because structural change means that industry is changing, and we have seen a change in our lifetime. We have seen manufacturing industry grow in our country, and we are now seeing it being reduced, and we need to take concrete action to ensure that people are getting employment; that if they are not able to get employment in the manufacturing industry, they are able to get employment in other types of useful work. It is important that people have work; it is important that people are able to go to work because, when people work with dignity, they are taking part in our community and are fulfilling a self-esteem; they have pride in themselves. They are able to provide for their families, and when they cannot do that their self-esteem goes down, and then we have a lot of other problems in our community.

An indication of change which is taking place is that in the United States in the last decade 92 proposed nuclear reactors have been cancelled; 13 others were abandoned; nearly 1 800 oil tankers were sent to the scrap heap, 23 oil refineries were shut down in 1981 alone, and some 100 000 petrol stations permanently closed. They did not close because there was a recession; they closed because people were buying less fuel because cars in America were using less fuel to travel the same distance. Down-sizing has had an effect on motor cars. Over a five-year period Ford has removed 453.6 kilograms of various materials from its aver-

age motor cars. That means that less steel is being used; it means that less iron ore needs to be mined; it means that less coal needs to be mined.

If there is no understanding of these things and if we just go on parroting, "One man's wage increase is another man's job", then we are deluding ourselves and the public, and I think that it is about time that there was an approach to problems that are confronting us so that we can ensure that Australian people have jobs in the future. One has only to take the example of Sweden. Sweden is a country with fewer people than Australia, of smaller land size than Australia, with less natural resources than Australia, but it has several significant differences. One is that, in the last figures available, the Government spent 62 per cent of the gross domestic product. In Australia we only spent 32 per cent. Sweden has a better standard of living than we have. It is also able to provide better for its people. It is also able to build a very modern fighter plane of its own; that is something that we cannot do because we do not have the technology to do it. We have arguably the largest iron ore reserves in the world and yet we do not have a specialised steel industry; they have. Admittedly, they are having problems at the moment but that country has been innovative in a number of areas.

One thing that does not happen in Sweden is that one does not see the conservative politicians and employers engaging in the ritual that occurs in Australia of kicking the unions for a bit of cheap political publicity. Over there they have discussion and consultations, and things are worked out so that the country can become economically strong and independent. Furthermore, they ensure that they remain neutral, that they do not follow the coat tails of big and powerful friends. If our country were to adopt a policy of being independent, we might be in the position of Sweden, better able to weather the recession that we are experiencing at the moment. We might also be in the position to ensure that our young people who are leaving schools today have jobs; to ensure that we do not have areas where 50 per cent of school leavers know that they will not have a job in the foreseeable future and in all possibility will not have worked at all before they are 25. That is the scandal that we have, and all that we have been able to get from our friends across the aisle is, 'Let's have a wage freeze'.

If one looks at the figures provided on real wages from 1930 to 1940 one finds (if one looks at 1911 as being equal to 1 000) that in 1930 it was 1 198 and in 1940 it was 1 190, and unemployment was extremely high then and was reduced only when the country was engaged in a war with the fascists. We have come to the situation today when people are suggesting that if we want to get out of the recession perhaps we ought to go to war. Heaven forbid—fancy advocating the destruction of hundreds of thousands of our youth just to get out of a recession. Surely we can approach this on a commonsense basis of consensus and discussion in an attempt to get out of it.

In the 1930s we were confronted with the so-called Premiers' plan which involved wage cuts for workers in Australia. I remind the House of what happened to those Premiers: in New South Wales, Lang did not introduce the wage cut and the Government dismissed him. In Victoria, Hogan was the Premier and he was reluctant to introduce the Premiers' plan. He was defeated on the floor of the House and lost the subsequent election. In Queensland, Moore, a Country Party member, was defeated in an election in 1932. In South Australia, Hill, Leader of the Labor Party, was removed from the Labor Party for acceptance of the plan, and Labor lost the election in 1933. In Western Australia, the Country Party was defeated in 1933, and in Tasmania it was replaced in an election. The Commonwealth was defeated in the 1931 election. Therefore, any political

Party looking at a wage cut for workers of the magnitude undertaken in the 1930s is facing certain political defeat at the next election.

I suggest that while members opposite and their colleagues in the National Parliament are talking about a wage freeze, sooner or later the public is going to come to realise how they are being conned, misled and lied to, because in the whole of this exercise there has been no attempt by the Federal Government to concentrate on anything other than wages. It has not looked at rents, Government and semi-government charges, gas, electricity, water, health care, transport, professional fees, staple commodities of food, petroleum products, or company charges. The Federal Government has said, 'Let's cut wages on the basis that that will solve our problems.' When Menzies was able to persuade the Arbitration Commission to abolish the quarterly cost of living adjustments in 1953, Australian workers suffered a wage freeze because there was little or no movement in wages at that time. Prices continued to slide up the scale and were not prevented from rising, and eventually there had to be considerable disruption so that workers would get a better wage.

The National Government is quite explicit concerning what it is about in regard to a wage freeze: it will divert the available moneys from workers to the companies. Early in the campaign when Mr Anthony was told that the proposal for a wage freeze would reduce the standard of living for workers and not really affect the economy, he made it quite clear that there had to be a diversion of profit back to employers, otherwise there would not be a recovery.

One aspect that has not really been talked about is interest rates. Perhaps interest rates could be considered on this basis: in the first half of 1982-83 the Email company blamed a fall in profits partly on the leap in interest on borrowings from \$593 000 to \$2 300 000. If the Government is concerned about companies keeping their profits up and about workers having jobs, perhaps it should cut interest rates and have a freeze on them, reduce the profits of the banks and money-lenders, and perhaps the person whom we say a prayer to each day when this House opens had the right idea when he threw the moneylenders out of the temple—perhaps he was getting to the root of what was causing the problem in those days. It might not be a bad idea to attack this area. Email was not the only company to run into problems. Pioneer Concrete's interest on borrowings went from \$41 400 000 to \$67 600 000; Myer went from \$24 900 000 to \$57 800 000; and Boral went from \$14 100 000 to \$17 400 000.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Do you think the Federal Government can artificially reduce interest rates?

Mr GREGORY: I do not know whether it can or not, but it ought to try. Whether it can have an effect on the wages of workers by legislating is debatable, because I think the member for Torrens would know that the Conciliation and Arbitration Act is based on a section of the Constitution that gives the Commonwealth Government power to legislate for the settlement of industrial disputes. The very reason why the Whitlam Government sought a referendum to change the Constitution on wages and prices was because it knew that it did not have the power to do that, to legislate for it. One finds that many of the actions that the Federal Government has taken are unconstitutional.

In regard to the wage freeze, no consideration at all has been given to the hundreds and thousands of workers who have suffered real wage cuts with the reduction of working time to four days a week and to those who have been determined redundant and who are no longer able to be employed. To indicate how serious this is, I point out that the vehicle retail industry which employs about 200 000 people in Australia is seeking the power in its awards to

employ people on short-time. The Labor Government in Victoria is legislating to force employers to consult prior to dismissal, when they make workers redundant.

While I was waiting to make my contribution, we had an amazing dissertation from the member for Mallee. Several things amazed me in his contribution. The honourable member complained about how effective the trade unions are when their members are working in areas such as oil and gas line construction.

I thought that, as a member of a conservative Party, an upholder of the theory of capitalism, he would have approved of workers who are able to work, to go out and earn as much as they possibly can. I thought he would have approved of that. I was surprised to hear him complaining about workers who apply the economic theories that he loves to expand on so much. I have a further comment for the member for Mallee and the House. When trade unions have had their rights restricted and workers have had their right to form and take part in trade unions restricted, that is when democracies cease to function and the living conditions of people deteriorate. Whilst the representatives of the employers and the owners live quite well, the majority of workers and other people live in poor, unhygienic conditions and dictatorships reign supreme.

I hope I never live to see the day when the power of trade unions is curtailed so that some of the mad theories propounded by members opposite prevail. Quite frankly, very few members opposite have any experience in dealing with employees in an employee relationship. Members opposite have no idea and no concept of what is involved. In the short time that I have sat in this House and listened to members opposite that has become more apparent. One has only to cast one's mind back to the debate on the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill in the previous Parliament to understand the attitudes of members opposite. They rejected the concept of conciliation and discussion and, instead, preferred force. They rejected the theory that people could combine together to do the things they thought were necessary.

The member for Mallee also referred to the fishing industry. I believe that some of his comments about fish farming were sensible. In fact, fish farming occurs in other parts of the world and here in Australia. Most of the rainbow trout eaten in Adelaide restaurants (and they can be purchased occasionally in the fish markets) are grown in commercial fish hatcheries and fish farms. It is intriguing that, whilst the member for Mallee talked about job creation, not creating permanent jobs, and the Government should not be spending this money, he also wanted more fishing inspectors on the Murray River to stop poaching. Perhaps he would agree that we should increase the licence fees on the Murray River to pay for additional inspectors.

The member for Mallee also wanted the Government to provide grants to put people to work running fish farms. His cost estimates for fish and chicken farms were interesting. Perhaps we should explore that avenue, because fish is a highly nutritional food. Fish is better for us than are some of the fatty red meats that some members opposite grow and sell. We might have fewer fat people running around the streets of Australia. We might have more and healthier people running around if we had more fish farms. Perhaps the member for Eyre will start growing fish instead of sheep—I do not know. That needs to be looked at.

I am amazed that, on the one hand, the member for Mallee said that we should not have big government and we should not be spending all this money when, on the other hand, he asked for money for fish farmers. I find that paradox not too difficult to understand. I find it amazing that he can stand there and say it. He should be saying that, if fish farms are so economical and can be run as efficiently

as chicken farms and produce more meat, people should be turning to that industry without assistance from the Government.

I am sure that my Party will successfully govern this State over the next three years and protect the rights and interests of working people. I am sure that it will ensure that they are not called upon to bear an increasing burden of the economic problems of this country and that it will do everything necessary to assist people. I am quite sure that my Leader has the right approach, by having discussions with all the parties involved. I have heard the baying from members opposite who refer to the Premier's talking to the unions as getting his marching orders from South Terrace. However, they do not say anything when he meets with members of the Employers Federation or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. In fact, tonight he is meeting with representatives from members of all employer groups and the trade unions collectively to discuss the grave problems facing Australia today.

If members opposite were fair dinkum and objective they would not have made some of their statements, because they would have realised that the only way out of the mess we are in is to work together. I believe that members opposite know as well as I do that if we had consultation and discussion we might find out how much of the mess with which we are confronted today and which we have to clean up was created by them. In conclusion, I wish this Parliament and my colleagues well. When my Party goes to the next election we will win it, just as we won the last one.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have an opportunity to say a few words in this debate. However, I wish to have an audience and, therefore, I draw your attention to the state of the House, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: I did not want to disappoint the Minister of Local Government. I wanted to keep up his example, so every time less than the number required to form a quorum is present I will remind you, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to have been re-elected as the member for Eyre for the sixth time, and on this occasion to have increased my majority by 2.2 per cent. The only other member on this side to have done that was the member for Chafey, who increased his majority by, I think, 1.6 per cent. I take this opportunity to congratulate the member for Playford on his election to the position of Speaker. I have no doubt that he will perform his duties according to the best traditions of the House. If he follows the manner in which the member for Light conducted himself, I am sure that all of us will support him.

I was disappointed that the member for Playford declined to wear the traditional regalia, because I believe that it adds a little colour and dignity to the House. When one considers that the member for Playford is using his position as Speaker for advancement to another bench in the future, like all lawyers who aspire to become judges, I think it would have been good training to have become used to wearing a wig.

Mr Groom: What do you aspire to become?

Mr GUNN: I will deal with the honourable member—temporary member—directly. So, I do wish the Speaker well, as I do the member for Whyalla, who just scraped back into this Chamber after getting a fright from ex-councillor Murphy. I remember telling the member for Whyalla a few years ago that Mr Murphy would make him unemployed, and he went very close to it. I can see that the member for Brighton is not pleased with what I have had to say about Mr Murphy: I have a couple of things to say about the member for Brighton and about the dirty tricks campaign in which she was engaged in Brighton, but that will keep.

Mr Trainer: You've been up to that for a long time.

Mr GUNN: The Government Whip has now joined the argument. Perhaps he was a part of the dirty tricks campaign, too.

Mr Trainer: I'm not talking about dirty tricks: I'm talking about your candidate's campaign in Ascot Park.

Mr GUNN: As the honourable member is out of order in interjecting, I will not respond. I will just continue to make my speech. I have plenty of time. I have 56 minutes, and I do not mind if members interject. They can interject as much as they like. I do not mind, I have been in this place long enough to quite enjoy these occasions.

Mr Trainer: In a good bipartisan spirit.

Mr GUNN: I am sure that the honourable member will agree that I am very charitable and easy to get along with. I want to congratulate all those members of the Government who have been elected Ministers. I am sure that to the limit of their abilities they will do their best. May I say that there were some surprises, but I wish them well, and I hope that they can fulfil the confidence that the people of South Australia have placed in them.

I think they are fully aware that the voting difference between the two Parties is fairly small, and with less than about 1 000 votes deciding the election they should bear that in mind, particularly the member for Brighton and one or two of the other members who are only temporarily in this Chamber, including the member for Henley Beach. They will soon be feeling the chilly winds at the ballot-box, and as their august Leader continues to break more promises they will realise that the day of judgment is descending upon them. They will be placed out in the cold before long.

I wish to comment now on the election of the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. I had the pleasure of being on the Public Accounts Committee, along with the member for Hanson, the former member for Florey (Mr Wells), the former member for Semaphore (Mr Olson), the member for Price and, for a short time, the member for Newland (Mr Klunder). During the time I was a member of the Public Accounts Committee, the committee carried out a very lengthy and detailed examination of the South Australian Hospitals Department, which was a most interesting exercise to be involved in. Although time consuming, I regarded it as one of the most important roles I played as a member of Parliament, and I was concerned to make sure that the committee brought down a responsible and accurate report.

It was obvious that after a few weeks of taking evidence this was a very difficult area and that the report was going to be one of the most significant that the Public Accounts Committee had ever prepared. It was during that time that I began to understand the value and importance of that committee. In my judgment, in no circumstances should Ministers or the Government be in a position to dominate or direct the committee. The committee should be free to go about its business in a responsible and unencumbered manner.

When that particular report was tabled in this House, it attracted a great deal of publicity and discussion. The report was obviously an embarrassment to the Government, because the report proved that over a long period there had always been problems within the administration of the Hospitals Department. The member for Price, who at that stage I understand was State President of the Labor Party, was unceremoniously removed and placed on the Public Works Committee. The Labor Party got rid of him, and it was my understanding that he was placed on that committee to make sure that the Government was not embarrassed. However, he had a few other problems at that stage, I understand, with agenda items—

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You honestly believe in fairy tales, don't you?

Mr GUNN: We have listened to the Minister for the last 2½ years and he has obviously been reading *Alice in Wonderland* during all that time, from the nonsense he put before this House. However, the member for Price was replaced on the Public Accounts Committee by the member for Newland. I think that in the 2½ months that the honourable member was on that committee we had five meetings. It was obvious that the Government did not want that committee to sit, and it was also obvious from the attitude of the member for Newland that he was trying to make sure that the committee did not do anything at all. I remember having a very stern discussion with him at one of those meetings, and it was obvious that he was going to make sure that the committee was a rubber stamp of the Government.

It is my belief that the Public Accounts Committee and other committees of this Parliament have a most important role to play, and I am of the view that we should have more committees of that type in the Parliament, because it gives members a better insight into the operations of Government. One of the problems is that the average backbencher, on either side, does not have a great input, and there ought to be more committees, which should be able to operate freely.

The member for Elizabeth was good enough to be Her Majesty's Chief Law Officer, the Attorney-General of the State, for four or five years, as well as being Minister of Health, but he was not good enough to be Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. He is far more experienced than the member for Newland and the Minister of Local Government. However, when we examine the daily press it is interesting to see some of the comments made. Of course, one should also bear in mind that about 12 months ago when the member for Elizabeth described the new Premier as being as weak as 'orange flower water' and was not to be trusted.

It was most interesting when the honourable member made that statement. The present Government Whip was sitting here, and the member for Elizabeth came in and sat next to him. One would have thought he was contaminated because of the way in which the member for Ascot Park tried to get away as far away from the honourable member for Elizabeth as he possibly could. The Deputy Premier had to blunder into issue when Duncan—

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the member for Eyre will refer to other honourable members by their districts and not by their surnames.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: Is this the fruit of 12 years membership in Parliament?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: I certainly did not intend to transgress. The Minister of Environment and Planning was not in the Chamber earlier this evening when he ought to have been here and when the member for Mallee was bringing to the attention of the House a disgraceful course of action, in which his officers and he were involved, when they actually stole, in my judgment, a lamb from a poor helpless farmer in the Murray Mallee and to this day they have not done the right thing.

I am fully aware that the Labor socialist Government has no regard for landholders. We know how they treated the poor person down on Burbidge Road when the Government got the Highways Department to seize his property. To this day the Highways Department has never used that land. The Minister wants to get me stirred up, but I challenge him and the Government to table that docket in this House and also give an undertaking that no documents have been removed from that docket in relation to the acquisition of

that property. Let the honourable member make his own comments and I will talk about any issue I desire as long as I am in this House. I do not need to be prompted or advised by him. I suggest he put his own house in order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe the member for Alexandra has a point of order.

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: I was somewhat diverted but I had finished my comments in relation to that matter. I believe that the conduct of the Government in relation to the so-called compulsive acquisition of that land in the Murray Mallee was a disgraceful concern. From the information that I have and from the reading of the newspapers I believe that that person has been treated in a shameful and shabby fashion. It clearly indicates that the Land Acquisition Act ought to be amended. It is a shocking piece of legislation whereby people can be divested of their property without any recourse to having that decision challenged by an impartial person or without reference to the courts. One can only argue about the price. It is disgraceful.

I was referring to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee. In the *Advertiser* of Wednesday 24 November we see the headline 'Duncan blasts Bannon after defeat'. The article stated:

The fact of the matter is that the Deputy Premier, Mr Wright, has a deep and abiding hatred of me, as does the Leader, Mr Bannon.

That was what Mr Duncan had to say. In the *Advertiser* the next day the Deputy Premier had to get into the act with both feet and a further article was headed 'Duncan not best man for the job—Wright'. The article stated:

'Mr Duncan was not the best man for the job of Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee,' the Deputy Premier, Mr Wright, said yesterday.

That is an amazing state of affairs. The member for Elizabeth, was good enough to be the Attorney-General of South Australia. It is an amazing situation if he cannot now chair the Public Accounts Committee. He was also the Minister of Health. The Government has made the member for Newland the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee so that he can sit and make sure the committee does no work and causes no embarrassment. We all know that the member for Newland is under the thumb of the Government. The member for Elizabeth would be difficult to handle. I do not often agree with him but at least he would make sure that the committee carried out its obligations. It is a known fact that he has certain views in relation to public servants and he would not be put off. However, the Government wants to put the lid on all inquiries and has appointed the member for Newland. He is noted as being a rubber stamp for the Labor Party.

Mr Whitten: He is always working hard.

Mr GUNN: I explained how the member for Price was unceremoniously dumped from the Public Accounts Committee when he got the Government into trouble. We need to hear no more about that subject as I am sure the public of South Australia is well aware of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope the member for Eyre will not be harassed.

Mr GUNN: I understand that some noise is coming from across the benches. However, I wish to say something about some of the promises and comments made by honourable members in recent times. The member for Stuart has been making many comments over the past 12 months and referring to the fact that there is going to be a redistribution of electoral boundaries. He has been talking about petrol prices, the road down to the shack sites at Port Augusta, and about

allowing bookmakers to set up betting shops in country towns. Now we will be in a position to see when he is going to start to deliver some of these promises. In the *Trans-Continental* of 17 November, printed in Port Augusta—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We cannot hear the member for Eyre.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You are lucky.

Mr GUNN: We have had to listen to the inane interjections of the Minister in this House. He is regarded as a lightweight. If he wants to make a fool of himself, do not stop him, Mr Speaker—let him continue. As he travels around Australia addressing local government conferences people will judge him for what he is.

In the *Trans-Continental* of 17 November attention is drawn to the member for Stuart and the promises he has been making. He is asked what he is going to do. He is going for a larger slice of the cake. He had a lot to say about petrol prices. We are all waiting with baited breath for some action by this Government. When is that problem going to be solved? In regard to the redistribution, the honourable member has been advocating a certain course of action and making statements. He has been telling the people of Port Pirie that they should have their own seat. That is a reflection on his own ability to represent the area. If he was a little more active and got out among his constituents, those complaints would not be forthcoming. The State Secretary of the Labor Party, Mr Schacht, said to me in the tally room at the Adelaide Town Hall, 'We did not get you at the ballot box, but we will get you at the redistribution'. It is obvious that the Government is setting out to get a gerrymander.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The whole question of electoral boundaries is in the hands of the court. Any reflections on the court are in direct breach of the Standing Orders of this House and will be dealt with very seriously. I assure the member for Eyre that I will deal with the matter seriously.

Mr GUNN: Are you ruling, Mr Speaker, that I cannot discuss the redistribution? I hope that that is not your ruling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask for quiet in the House. I have allowed a fair amount of cut and thrust in the debate as we have one of the most experienced members of the House speaking. There has been a lot of give and take and that is fair enough. However, we have now reached a serious point. Of course, I am not ruling that a redistribution as such cannot be discussed. However, if what the honourable member said is a reflection upon the tribunal, which is established by law, then I must uphold Standing Orders, and I will.

Mr GUNN: Let us make it quite clear, Mr Speaker. So far my comments have not reflected in any way upon the tribunal. I am fully aware of the composition of the tribunal. At this stage the tribunal is not sitting because it is my understanding that the chairman has not been appointed. Therefore, I have made no comments in relation to the judgment of the tribunal. I said that the member for Stuart and the secretary of the Labor Party were setting out to draw up a gerrymander. It is clear from their public utterances and from the comments that the secretary made to me in person that that is their clear intention and that they want to deny the people in the northern part of the State any opportunity to select their members of Parliament. They want to lock them into Port Augusta and Port Pirie, so that the northern and eastern parts of South Australia are completely dominated by those two centres. That is the basis of their argument. They want to make sure that they do not count: they are purely numbers for the quota. They know full well that those two centres can dominate the area, and

in my judgment that is a gerrymander. That is not a reflection upon the tribunal. I am confident that it will give due attention to matters put before it when it is constituted under the Act.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is my fault that I have not read to the House today, and it was purely an oversight, a letter received from the Chief Justice indicating that a Justice of the Supreme Court had been appointed as Chairman of the tribunal. We are getting the letter at the moment, and I will read it to you as soon as possible. In fact it was done in another place earlier today, but I would ask the honourable member to be careful in his approach to the whole matter.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will certainly endeavour to do that, because I am the last person who would want to reflect upon the tribunal or upon any other person in this place without very good grounds for so doing. However, I was pointing out that, in my view, the attitude of the Labor Party and the member for Stuart was not only unfortunate but was quite scurrilous. I believe it was an attempt to condition people about what should take place, advising them that the Labor Party would be arguing a fair and just cause. In fact, it was just the reverse. It would be an attempt to deny people in outlying districts the opportunity to have any influence whatsoever over who represented them. We all know that if the two cities I mentioned are used as a centre, it does not matter where the boundaries are drawn, because that will become the dominant area, and that is the aim of the Labor Party. It wants to use the wagon wheel principle. We are all quite familiar with how it operates.

An honourable member: Tell us what the Liberal Party said.

Mr GUNN: All good things come to those who wait. In a few weeks time if the honourable member is a little patient he will no doubt be made aware of it. I look forward to the time when that is put forward. The Liberal Party will be putting forward a fair and just submission based on the long experience of its members who have represented large isolated electorates. That is something that the Labor Party has not experienced in this Chamber. It does not represent any country areas except the electorate of Stuart. The majority of voters in that district reside in Port Pirie and Port Augusta. I was speaking at some length about the National Parks and Wildlife Service and its decision to compulsorily acquire the property owned by a constituent of the member for Mallee. I have been concerned at the manner in which it has dealt with land on Kangaroo Island. I think its actions were ill-advised and quite foolish. I have been most concerned about the way that it has dealt with land at Coffins Bay. That was a clear act of arrogance, because it went against the wishes of the District Council of Lincoln and the majority of the residents of that area. It was quite arrogant and an unnecessary course of action.

The problems could have been resolved if they had allowed the select committee set up by the previous Government to operate, and I am sure that commonsense would have prevailed. But, no, under the complete domination of irresponsible environmentalists, radical elements within society, it wants to get its hands on every bit of land that it possibly can. The honourable member knows nothing about it and I look forward to the day when that decision is reversed because we now have a situation where a wedge has been driven between the majority of country people and those people in the environmental region.

The same situation is occurring in Tasmania. That is one of the most amazing debates that has ever taken place. Earlier today the Minister supported the case put forward by the Tasmanian Wilderness Society, which failed to appreciate or understand that the people of Tasmania have on two occasions approved the project. I understand that the

Federal Leader of the Labor Party is on record as saying that during and prior to the recent Tasmanian election he did not want to become involved. He said that it is an issue for Tasmania. When the issue was debated in the Tasmanian Parliament the result was 29 ayes and two noes. For the benefit of the members opposite, one of those persons supporting the second reading of that particular Bill was the Hon. Ken Wright, Leader of the Parliamentary Labor Party in Tasmania and a former Senator and Minister—who else? Others who supported the second reading included the immediate past Premier, Mr Holgate and former Speaker Mr Davies, just to mention a few of the names we would all recognise as being prominent members of the Labor Party. The Bill passed all stages, yet members opposite continue to state daily that they do not support that project.

Where do they really stand? I believe that they are just using that particular issue like a number of others to extract the maximum political mileage. I believe they have joined the conservation band wagon to use it as a political whipping horse in an attempt to attack the Federal and Tasmanian Liberal Parties. The people of Tasmania have made it very clear where they stand and, in my judgment, it is a matter for them to decide. What would we say if people from Tasmania told us that we could not build the Kangaroo Creek dam or any other dam, or that we could not pump water from the Murray River. We would tell them to mind their own business and look after things which concern them in Tasmania. I believe this matter should be determined by the people of Tasmania, and we should not be involved. It is pretty obvious that the Tasmanian Labor Party fully appreciates the political dangers involved.

I will say no more about that matter. I refer again to the recent State election. I mentioned earlier that I would say one or two things in regard to the new member for Brighton. I have been advised that during the campaign a number of interesting things took place in that electorate. All of us who know Mr Glazbrook, the former member for Brighton, know that he was a hard working, sincere and good member of Parliament. There is no doubt that he will be back in this place again in the relatively near future.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I point out to the member for Albert Park that he will be back again. The honourable member and the people of Brighton will appreciate the sort of scurrilous things that were done in that area. None of us minds a rugged campaign, but at least it ought to be fair and above board. I do not know who was responsible, but some of the things that took place were very interesting. For example, there were two voter surveys in which certain people were involved. I understand that people were ringing up claiming to represent channel 7 and a well known public opinion survey. People were telephoned and asked whether they would still vote for the Liberal Party in view of the fact that the Liberal Party intended to put on a 2½ per cent sales tax following the election. Both those companies were contacted, and it was found that they had not been involved: someone or a group of persons set out to poison the electorate and the member for the area, Mr Glazbrook, in a most scurrilous and devious way.

Further, a letter was sent to some constituents. On one occasion the actual home address of the then member was put on a letter of which he had no knowledge whatsoever—a quite scurrilous thing. Then, on election day a former Minister and member for Brighton harassed and pushed people into the polling booth. I understand that two complaints were made, one from the Australian Democrats and one from the Liberal Party at a particular polling booth. These were just some of the incidents. It is all right for the member for Brighton to grumble under her beard, but I

point out that complaints were made at that polling booth concerning the conduct of a former member of this place.

Mr Mathwin: Mr Hudson, it was.

Mr GUNN: I did not intend to mention the name; the member for Brighton and the people would know, as did the returning officer at the polling booth the tricks that people get up to. The member for Brighton and other new members who came into the House will have to carry the promises made by the Labor Party and by the Premier when he does not deliver the goods and when it is found that he does not have that magic wand, and they will have to answer those people who were tricked. The Premier told the people of South Australia that he could lift South Australia out of this economic recession, that he had all the answers, that he had examined the financial situation and knew what it was, and that he had all the information (in South Australia we were providing more information than any other Parliament, apparently), that he had all the answers.

However, we have seen the net result. The new members will have to go back and explain to people why taxes and charges have gone up. We heard on nearly a daily basis complaints from members opposite about electricity charges. I now issue a challenge to the Premier and to the Minister of Mines and Energy to do something about electricity charges. They told us what was wrong during the three years when the Liberal Party was in Government; let them do something about it now. They were critical, and a full page advertisement appeared in the daily paper saying that electricity charges had risen by 18 per cent. What is the Labor Government going to do about it now that it has the opportunity? It cannot sit quietly by, because it led the people to believe that it could do something about it. Can the Labor Party give a guarantee that water rates will not increase, or that public transport fares will not increase? During the Norwood by-election it can be recalled that a Labor Party advertisement was put out in the form of a bus ticket to indicate to people that electricity charges were going to rise. Can the Labor Party give us a guarantee now that charges will not go up?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The former Opposition members had a big list that it used to peddle out of all the charges that had been increased by the Liberal Government; they called it back-door taxation. Using the same criteria that the now Premier had then, every charge and tax increase is a responsibility of the Labor Party and it must accept the full blame for it. The Ministers and all the back benchers are part of the team and cannot escape the odium; they blamed the Liberal Party, but now they are in government they must accept the full responsibility. The member for Brighton and her colleagues will have to go back and tell their constituents what the situation is when they receive the inevitable complaints; they will have to say that they are very sorry but that they did not know anything about it. Of course, the chilly winds will be passed over.

Mr Trainer: That is a bit of a mixed metaphor.

Mr GUNN: I assure the honourable member who interjects that the people will do so. The previous Government was straightforward and honest, made tough decisions and was financially responsible, unlike members opposite.

Mr Trainer interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is interesting to hear the interjections from the other side, but in regard to those dirty tricks they will have to sit by while members of the House are made fully aware of the details. The letters will be read into *Hansard* at the appropriate time, and people will be aware of what was said.

Mr Hamilton: Are you blaming the Labor Party?

Mr GUNN: I am telling members of the House what took place. If the honourable member wants to accept the blame for the Labor Party, that is entirely up to him. I have told members of the House what has been passed on to me in relation to these matters. When I have further information in the near future I will give a chapter and verse description of what happened.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It is obvious that the honourable member has a guilty conscience. I have not said that it was the Labor Party; I am simply telling honourable members what took place.

Mr Trainer: You implied it.

Mr GUNN: No, I did not, but it is obvious from the reaction of members opposite that they must have guilty consciences.

Mr Trainer: Tell us about a few people who got sued for their advertisements?

Mr GUNN: I understand that if legal action has been taken against certain persons it would be improper for me to discuss those matters at this stage.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is perfectly correct.

Mr GUNN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I did not want to transgress Standing Orders, because, as one who has had the pleasure of occupying the Chair, I want to give a good example to all other honourable members.

As honourable members would be aware, because I represent a very large district I have many problems. I suppose the greatest problems facing my district at present are the drought and the associated problems. The time has arrived when Governments will have to find adequate funds to extend and improve the water systems within the northern and western parts of the State. Excuses are no longer good enough.

The people who live west of Ceduna have been most patient and reasonable for a long time. I am not blaming the present Government for the problem, because it has existed for a long time. However, we can no longer accept that funds are not available to provide a pipeline west of Ceduna over the next few years. It is absolutely essential that the pipeline is extended to Denial Bay. This is a growing area, and Ceduna is a developing town which plays an important role in the State's economy.

I know that the Minister of Water Resources has problems, as did his predecessor, in raising the necessary funds. However, I believe that the Government should allocate money in a responsible fashion. If this Government has money to waste in stealing people's farms when there is no need, it should have money to build a pipeline. I give notice that I intend to pursue this matter for the remainder of my stay in this House. These people should not be discriminated against any longer. I realise that it is a tremendous cost, but if this Parliament can subsidise the metropolitan bus system by giving it millions of dollars, it can find funds to extend this pipeline.

Why should my constituents in Coober Pedy have to pay \$50 per 1 000 gallons of water, which is provided in very limited quantities? The situation is not good enough and it is no longer acceptable. It is no good the Government saying that it does not have the money. The Government finds money to continually extend the bus systems and to pay for the Minister's trains and subsidise them at a tremendous rate. It is time for some justice in this world. People in other parts of my district do not have adequate supplies of water. I realise that it is a long-term project, but it must be implemented.

The people of Andamooka have their water carted in tankers from Woomera. There is not enough water to go around. People in places like Coober Pedy have no hope of

planting trees because of the cost of the water, and they cannot get enough, anyway. The situation in Andamooka is deplorable. Unfortunately, money has been wasted there: a dam was built that could not hold water. Residents of the town did not listen to the advice they received. It is a difficult situation because of the inadequate supplies of underground water. However, the Electricity Trust is able to desalinate enough water at Leigh Creek to water the lawns and things of that nature. I believe that funds must be forthcoming to provide alternative arrangements in other parts of the State.

These people pay their taxes the same as anyone else, and they are entitled to receive assistance. Those members who read the country edition of the *Advertiser* would have seen one of my constituents standing in the bottom of an empty tank at Ceduna. I appeal to the Minister to extend the water contract to other tanks west of Ceduna, because there are real problems. I know it is expensive, and that is unfortunate. A few years ago I carted water myself on a regular basis and I am aware of the problems. It is expensive and it is certainly time consuming and we do not see anything for the money we spend. I understand the problem. I appeal to the Minister and his officers. I know the officers are concerned, but they do not have the money. I believe that it is a matter of distributing the funds available more justly.

In relation to education, I have 41 schools in my electorate. The Ceduna school is one of the biggest country schools in South Australia, but I also have small one-teacher schools. They all provide a wide range of education facilities. I have a number of Aboriginal schools in the north-west of my district where, unfortunately, a number of senior people have been posted for a long time. When I spoke to these teachers recently they had received no guarantee that they would be transferred out. I believe that if teachers put in three years in an isolated area with its associated difficulties some action should be taken to transfer them to other positions.

I do not accept that these teachers should be left to take pot luck. It is not fair to a teacher and it is not fair to his wife or family. If it is good enough for these people, someone else should have the opportunity to go to these areas and take their turn. I believe the present situation is quite unfair and unacceptable. I will not name the schools involved, because I believe the Minister is aware of the problem. The Institute of Teachers should give the matter close attention. It is not fair that a few of its members should be isolated in these remote areas and left to their own devices. I am most concerned about this matter, which is a problem that should be resolved once and for all.

The teachers who eventually replace these people should know that they will be in these remote areas for no longer than two or three years and that they will receive a promotion and a transfer out at the end of that time. These teachers have given great service and on some occasions they do much more than their job requires. The principal at Nepabunna has done a great deal to enhance that community for a number of years. In actual fact, he has done far more than anyone could expect of a principal. I hope that the Minister and his officers will take the appropriate action, if it has not been taken already. If he has taken action, I commend him for it.

I will now turn to the question of roads. If there is one thing that I have brought to my attention on a regular basis it is the condition of a large number of roads within the north-west of my district. I am pleased to see that my friend, the former Minister of Transport, who did his best and gave a considerable amount of help, is present in the House. One thing that the Tonkin Government will be remembered for is the amount of money that it spent on the Stuart Highway. Its record in relation to that matter must go

without question. When one considers the lousy \$1 000 000 that the Dunstan and Corcoran Governments spent in this area before the Tonkin Government was elected one can only compare it to the progress that has been made.

The road is virtually sealed to Bon Bon, which shows that the Minister in the previous Government did a great deal for the North. As well as sealing that road, the contracts that the previous Government organised, which are about to be put into effect, will break that road's back. When that road is fully sealed the benefits to South Australia will be enormous. Unfortunately, we have lost about 70 per cent of our trade with the Northern Territory because of the condition of that road. I hope we can regain that trade when that road is eventually sealed.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: About \$40 000 000 was spent.

Mr GUNN: That is correct: \$40 000 000 was spent in three years, compared with less than \$2 000 000 in the previous financial year. That is a pretty good record. I could rattle off a list of roads that I would like to see sealed, probably at a cost of many millions of dollars. However, my constituents and I realise that they cannot all be done at once. I point out that we do not want to see any cut-backs in the programme. I look forward to that day when the road is sealed from the Leader of the Opposition's district, from Orroroo up to Hawker, completing the Hawker to Leigh Creek Road.

Many of my constituents believe that, in view of the importance that we have placed on tourism over the past few years, we should construct a road north of Lyndhurst to come around the top of Lake Torrens, through Stuart's Creek to Andamooka, to provide a ready route for tourists so they can go up through Wilpena and Blinman to Parachilna, through Leigh Creek to Lyndhurst, down through Andamooka and into Roxby Downs, Olympic Dam, down to Woomera and Port Augusta.

It would be a most attractive trip. Therefore, there is not a lot of money needed to be spent on that road to make it attractive for tourists. Some sand hills need covering. I appeal to the new Government and the officers in the Highways Department to give their attention to that matter, as I believe that it would give a great deal to promote tourism in this State. The roads on the West Coast, as in the Far North, are always in need of urgent repair. May I pay a compliment to the Highways Department? A few weeks ago I had the pleasure of driving from Coober Pedy down to Kingoonya, and through to the Eyre Highway. I had not been along that road for a few months and I was delighted to see that the ramps were completed and there were no gates on the roads. The Highways Department did a very good job, and the officers responsible at Port Lincoln are entitled to be praised for the action they have taken because it certainly is pleasing not to have to get out and open those gates. I do not like to recall how many gates I opened when I first started driving out in the 1970s, between Wirrulla and Kingoonya. The ramps are well constructed, and a great improvement. There is a great deal of traffic on the road.

Of course, one day I hope that the Eyre Highway and the Stuart Highway will be connected with a bitumen road, because there will be a lot of traffic. When one is travelling from Wirrulla to Kingoonya that is the shortest route to take and I am sure that the people of Wirrulla would agree. It is interesting even now that there are a number of trucks and other interstate vehicles on that road.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that the new Government does not make the mistakes of the former Labor Government, that it does not charge into its pet programmes without giving due attention to the real problems facing the people of this State. Any political Party that allows its political philosophy to blind its judgment and does not take into

account the long-term effects of those decisions, and puts its political philosophies before common sense, is, of course, heading for trouble. I sincerely hope that this Government will give proper consideration and will act in the very near future to the quite responsible and necessary proposals that the Commonwealth have been promoting over the last few weeks.

It is an amazing state of affairs that a Government that purports to want to seek people employed is not prepared to take a course of action, even though it may not have 100 per cent support of some of its colleagues, and is not prepared to act in a manner which would put some of those people back into work. I think all of us, unfortunately, will have to take some slight reduction in our living standards if we want to see more jobs created for those people who currently do not have jobs. It is quite obvious that we are in the course of graphically pricing ourselves out of overseas markets that we already have.

I therefore hope that the Government gives very careful consideration to its programme and to the action that it takes, and that it does not engage in those wild spending programmes which we had foisted upon us in the 1970s. We do not want any more Monartos. The member for Davenport described the project as 'the City that never was'. We do not want any more Monartos. We do not want any more frozen food factories. We do not want any more great media offices established in the Premier's Department, and various other unfortunate projects which we could mention.

It was interesting to listen to the Premier blaming the previous Government for promoting itself with a book. I ask the Premier what he is going to do with the many thousands of copies of a booklet which Mr Chatterton had printed in Chinese and which, as I understand it, are stored in the Department of Agriculture.

I support this motion, and I look forward to the next couple of years, as the Liberal Party gets ready to regain the Treasury benches of this State. I believe that this Government will be short lived; already it has proved that it has not got the courage of its convictions, as it is starting to go back on the unequivocal undertakings that it made.

I am pleased to welcome new members on this side of the House. I am sure that they will make a fine contribution to the welfare of this Parliament. I was disappointed that some of our colleagues were not returned at the election. I am confident that those people will be back in this Parliament, because they had a great deal to contribute to it. Brian Billard was an outstanding member, Dick Glazbrook made a great contribution and Bob Randall and Ivar Schmidt played an important role in this House and I am sure that the electors, when they are given an opportunity to make their choice again, will realise the real worth of those people and re-elect them to this place. I support the motion.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): From the outset, I indicate my support for the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I wish to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your elevation to the Speakership. I have known you for many years and I know you will bring great dignity and skill to the office, as you have already demonstrated. I congratulate the new members on both sides of the House on their election to Parliament. Opposition members, particularly new members, will have to adjust to their role in Opposition, because they are facing a long time in that role.

I want to pay a tribute to my predecessor, Des Corcoran, who in his various capacities contributed much, to not only the electorates of Millicent and Hartley, but to the State as a whole. His contribution has been a tremendous one and will the mark him as a great South Australian.

I want to place on record my thanks to my campaign workers for their untiring efforts during the campaign and

to the voters in the district who supported and placed their trust in me and in the Government. Upon returning to this Chamber, I am quite appalled by the State's financial situation. The Corcoran Government left office in 1979 with a surplus of around \$10 000 000. To read the Under Treasurer's Report to the Treasurer, it is quite appalling to find that in three years the Liberal Government has changed this surplus into a deficit in the vicinity of \$30 000 000. Not only that, but it has used extensively money from capital works, and some \$80 000 000 has been siphoned off over the last three years, but the financial position facing the Bannon Government is a quite appalling one and I am very sad to have to come back to this Chamber from a situation where the Government left the surplus and a very workable Budget and to find that now this has been converted to a \$30 000 000 deficit. It is quite a significant loss of revenue and indicates the extent of mismanagement on the part of the Liberal Government.

I wish to make a few remarks in relation to the proposed wage freeze, because it is a proposal of the conservative forces in Australia. The history of the wage movement is really relevant to this question. Between 1921 and 1953 Australia's basic wage was automatically adjusted on a quarterly basis in line with changes in the consumer price level.

This was quite an orderly system. Working people knew approximately what they were going to get, and there was some degree of control so far as the domestic economy was concerned. Apart from the depression in the 1930s, we were able to maintain very good employment levels. The Menzies Government got into difficulties in 1953 because it mismanaged the economy, and there was a spurt of inflation. So, once again, the people who had to carry the burden were the wage earners of this country, and so the Liberals started modifying the system.

Prior to 1966 we ended up with wage and salary levels that comprised two components—the basic wage component, (a minimum type of wage) and a margin for skill. It tended to be adjusted prior to 1966 on an annual basis in line with the rate of price inflation. By 1966 the basic wage concept was abolished, and we got a total wage. This remained in force until early 1975. As a result of change, an instability factor was brought into the economy, and there was a large number of over-award payments prior to 1975. Once again people did not know what they were going to get from one year to another, and that is a destabilising element in any economy.

There was a call for a return to a centralised wage fixation system which took place in April 1975. In December 1975 a Liberal Government was elected in Canberra, and it clearly had no intention of honouring the wage indexation system that had been ratified by the Arbitration Commission. It set about dismantling it and opposing the indexation movements that would normally flow on to workers. So, we got a system whereby a series of partial indexation increases were granted. This created a snowballing effect, because people's living standards were being lowered, and therefore there was pressure to get wages adjusted so that living standards could be maintained.

So, the situation we faced was a destruction of the indexation system. Indeed, that was ultimately abandoned by the Arbitration Commission under great pressure from the Fraser Government. It simply broke down as a result of the Government's inability to come to grips with the fact that working people of this country are entitled to reasonable remuneration and a reasonable living standard. The benefits of the indexation system were apparent for working people because it meant an orderly system. Again, it was a mechanism for controlling the domestic economy. But, not only did the Fraser Government set about destroying a central

system of wage indexation: it also set about destroying the Prices Justification Tribunal, which had been set up by the Whitlam Government. The effect of that tribunal, although it was described in some disparaging terms on occasions, was nevertheless the start of a mechanism for controlling prices in the economy. The Fraser Government would not have that because it put impediments on its friends and it set about abolishing the Prices Justification Tribunal.

In the 1970s we saw the curtailing of two very important mechanisms that could be used for future control of the economy. There was a central wage indexation fixing system so far as wage control was concerned, and there was also a degree of control over prices through the Prices Justification Tribunal. All of that went by the board, and we are now in an unknown area where no-one really knows what is going on.

I now want to mention a few things which the Fraser Government said on coming to office. On 6 December 1975 in the *News* the Prime Minister said he would cut the number of jobless by something like 200 000 people. At that time the number of unemployed in Australia was about 300 000. In his pre-election speech in November 1975, Mr Fraser said he would need three years to carry out the Liberal Party's programme and get Australia back on its feet. We all know what has happened. Unemployment is predicted to reach something like 600 000 people by January. What about inflation? On 6 December 1975 he was reported in the *News* in his pre-election spiel as saying that he would cut inflation by 11 per cent. He said he would cut inflation by 11 per cent down to 4 per cent, so by implication he was conceding that inflation was running at about 15 per cent. In fact, it was a bit lower than that.

After seven years of the Fraser Liberal/Country Party Government's conservative-type management of the country, what have we got? We have a predicted unemployment rate of 600 000 people by January of next year. Inflation is still in double figures, and I understand that the official figures are roughly 12 per cent. That Government destroyed the wage indexation system; it dismantled the Prices Justification Tribunal—two mechanisms for control of the economy. It has failed this nation. It is well to remember that the conservative forces have governed this nation since 1949 except for three years, and their record is appalling. They have failed to give leadership to this country, and they have failed the Australian people. We had an example of conservatism in our own State over the last three years. From a Budget surplus in 1979 of \$10 000 000, we have gone to a deficit of \$30 000 000 and frittered away \$80 000 000 in capital works money during that time.

So, with regard to a wage freeze, let us be quite frank about it: it has no chance of success. The Federal legislation introduced in the Federal Parliament by Mr Fraser is likely to be unconstitutional. The Federal Government does not have the Constitutional power to legislate on wages. Under section 51 (35) of the Constitution, the power is conciliation and arbitration for the prevention and settlement of industrial disputes extending beyond the limits of any one State. Its legislation will be challenged in the High Court: I have no doubt about that. I believe that it will be declared unconstitutional simply because it contravenes section 51 (35). Other Governments have sought this power, and that cannot be unknown to the Federal Government.

Stanley Bruce, of whom in many ways Fraser is a mirror, in 1925 or 1926 put a constitutional amendment to the people of Australia to give him the power to legislate to control wages and, I believe, prices, but he was not successful. Stanley Bruce said, 'We are going to give all the Federal awards back to the States,' and he proceeded to do that and introduced legislation to have the Federal Government remove itself from the industrial field as far as setting wage

controls is concerned. He was defeated on the floor of the House and was forced to an election, which he duly lost.

That is an example of conservatism. We have it again with Mr Fraser. Let us make no mistake about it. Mr Fraser's actions in calling for a wage freeze is an election gimmick. We all know that in May 1983 he proposes to go to an election. He is simply building up an election issue. He has no illusions. He knows that the wage freeze is completely unworkable and will not solve any thing. He has history before him. He knows that he does not have the power and that it will be challenged in the High Court. I believe it will be declared unconstitutional if it is challenged. It is probably in breach of section 51 (35) of the Australian Constitution and will fail.

We cannot have the States legislating to control employees under State awards, because most employees are under Federal awards, so an immediate dichotomy is being built up in the economy. It is well to remember that the Australian economy is a dependent economy. It is heavily reliant on overseas trade—it trades in competitive world markets. It has little influence on either prices it receives for exports or the prices it pays for imports, and changes in domestic conditions of supply and demand have little impact on export or import policies.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: So, the recession is due to external forces?

Mr GROOM: To a large extent it is due to external forces, and I do not resile from that. We know what is happening in the third world countries—they cannot meet the interest payments they have to make to the International Monetary Fund or to whichever countries they are borrowing from because the inflation rate is high.

We all know that the interest rate is geared to the inflation rate and that to save these countries from bankruptcy, we know that the inflation rate has to come down, which in turn will bring the interest rate down. There are external factors at work. The honourable member is making the very point that I am making: freezing wages will not do anything. It will not affect the domestic situation at all. It will not affect our overseas trading position. It is simply because changes in domestic conditions have little impact at all on our export prices or our import prices and external factors do dominate that area, because the Australian economy is small compared with most of its trading partners.

Our exports consist mainly of agricultural and mineral products. Imports are primarily manufactured products and comprise mainly capital goods and producer goods. The relevant question is the extent to which a wages policy would alleviate the balance of payments pressures generated by inflation and, more importantly, there are strong grounds for doubting the ability of an incomes policy to lower the inflation rate. In fact, I think that most economists really accept that a wages policy alone will not eliminate inflation and one must simply eliminate the cause, not the effects of it. What I have heard from members opposite over the last few days is what I can only describe as a chorus of collectivist cajolery; it is almost Maoist in tone because the Leader of the Opposition, in co-ordination with the Prime Minister, has been conjuring, summoning and calling for some national will, some community spirit so that the country's economic problems would be suddenly eliminated in one remorseless campaign pursued by millions of people in one enormous campaign on wages. This idea of summoning up the national will, the collectivist philosophy, is very Maoist in tone. One should remember that the Federal Liberal Government started a wages-prices freeze back in April 1977 and conveniently selected 13 April 1977 to announce a wages-prices freeze. It has been described that that took place in April fools month and the thirteenth was the unlucky Friday. But what they sought to do simply demonstrated the abysmal

economic illiteracy of the conservative forces in this country. That wages-prices freeze lasted a mere 41 days and simply petered out; it ended on 24 May in failure because it just could not work. We have the same sort of choruses coming from the Liberal Premiers. Dick Hamer went away from that Premier's Conference and said that this wage freeze was going to bring about a permanent check to inflation. He said, 'We should all pull together,' and here is the national will, the Maoist tone coming from members opposite but used in a misguided way. "We should all pull together recognising that we all have something to contribute to the fight. It would give the whole community a breathing space," and other phrases which he used were that what was needed was a real national consensus.

They all knew it was doomed to failure, and indeed it did fail, but political gimmickry was for the electorate, because we now know in hindsight that Mr Fraser in 1977 was gearing up for an early election, so he wanted an election gimmick and he thought that it would work. One would think that the conservative forces in this country would learn by history and by experience because these types of policies on wage freezes have been tried in many Western world countries and they have all failed. Indeed, when they tried it in April 1977 it failed and it will fail again because it will not control the problems that honourable members maintain. Just on an elementary level, they are trying to control the wages of working people. They have no policy on rents; they have no policies to control professional fees; the dividend earners, doctors, dentists, lawyers. They do not really believe that they will control doctors fees, dentists fees or lawyers fees. There is no real commitment to that. As I understand it, they will talk to these people. That is just a lot of rubbish.

What will happen after this wage freeze is over? They do not propose any catch-up, because the philosophy is that the burden will fall on the working people, the wage earners of this country and they are the ones whose living standards will be reduced. I know from experience that they will not seek to genuinely control doctors fees, or indeed, lawyers fees because doctors have one thousands ways of getting around the sort of clamps that members opposite are talking about. They know how to get around it. There are many ways in which they could increase their income in other areas. There is simply no genuine commitment, and the real reason is that Mr Fraser is after an election issue for 1983. He wants to go around May 1983, and this wage freeze, because it strikes a nice chord, it is simplistic, acceptable and it is probably not a bad sort of thing to put forward from his point of view, purely for election purposes.

He has no commitment whatsoever to seek to control the economy. He knows it will not work. I suspect that he believes that in a few months time it will be declared unconstitutional and he will say, 'Too bad, we tried', but he will be into an election period and that is the real purpose of this so-called wage freeze. But it has one end in sight, and that is to lower the standard of living of working people in this State and members opposite ought to be condemned for seeking to lower the standard of ordinary working people in this community, knowing that it will have no effect on the inflation that they talk about; knowing that they do not intend genuinely to control the incomes of the groups that ought to be properly controlled. It is nothing more than an election gimmick.

I want to mention another issue in this debate and it concerns the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act. The amendment that was passed in 1982. It is an abysmal piece of legislation and it reflects poorly on members opposite for seeking to even introduce what they did in 1982. It was proclaimed, as I understand it, last month. The first Bill was introduced by the then Attorney-General, Robin Mill-

house, in September 1969 and, in introducing that Bill, which was a new measure, he said:

It is directed at a social injustice for which there has hitherto been no effective legislative solution in this State.

The sum of \$1 000 was the amount that was set. It was low, that is true, but it was a start. The idea behind the scheme was that innocent victims of crime who suffered injury could claim on the public purse at that stage up to \$1 000 and they could take an action against the criminal concerned and get an order which would be satisfied by the Treasury.

In various stages the \$1 000 was increased and ultimately by the end of the 1970s it had reached \$10 000. Last year, because members opposite when they were in Government must have known that they were getting themselves into financial difficulties, started what they are doing now in the wage freeze, that is, placing the burden on ordinary people and here they started sending the burden back to innocent victims of crime, because they passed legislation which has emasculated this Act and which deliberately places barriers in the way of innocent victims from obtaining compensation.

What they have done, for example, and I propose to run through a couple of things, because I hope that the Government of the day will remedy this particular matter and I will be quite vocal about it. The Act No. 66 of 1982 assented to on 1 July contained various types of provisions. The amended section 7 (4) provides:

An application for compensation under this Act may be made (a) where the alleged offender has been brought to trial for the offence, the court before which he has been brought to trial, or (b) District Court.

Subsection (4) (a) provides:

An application under subsection (4) (a) must be made before the proceedings in relation to the alleged offence have been finally determined.

Section 7 (1) provides:

A victim of an offence may within 12 months apply to the appropriate court for an order.

But then they have imposed a subsection 4 (a) in very mandatory terms, because they use the word 'must' which requires victims to bring a claim for compensation, and it must be made before the proceedings in relation to the alleged offence have finally been determined.

It uses the word 'must', which indicates that it is mandatory, and 'finally determined' must refer to either conviction and sentence, or to acquittal. But what happens in the case of someone who is injured as a result of a criminal activity, who suffers bodily harm? When the criminal is brought before the court and pleads guilty on that day, what happens then? The legislation provides that the victim must bring the proceedings before the offence has been finally determined. But if a criminal is arrested on a common assault charge under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act on Thursday night, turns up in the Magistrates Court on Friday and pleads guilty, it is finally determined. What does the victim do?

Under this legislation the victim seems to be deprived of any entitlement to compensation. What sort of legislative standard is that? What sort of emasculation of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act is that? It is quite peculiar. The relevant section is now completely unworkable; it has been proclaimed and has come into operation, but is totally unworkable. No-one knows what on earth they are going to do with it. It appears as though one cannot get an extension of time, because if there are any inconsistencies the later amendment repeals the earlier provisions concerning any inconsistencies. It is in mandatory terms and victims can well be deprived of their entitlement to compensation. Section 7 (a) (1) indicates just the sort of standard that honourable members opposite have set for people who are injured through no fault of their own, as indeed they are

seeking to do in general philosophical terms in regard to wage earners. The provisions under section 7 (a) state that:

A claimant under an application for compensation under this Act—

this is something quite new and innovative as far as members opposite are concerned—

shall if a party to the proceedings requires him to do so, submit himself [or presumably herself] for medical examination by a medical practitioner nominated by the party making the request.

The Crown is always a party to these proceedings, as is the criminal because he is served with the application. So, a victim can be required to undergo two examinations. However, what about a multiple rape situation, where the victim has been injured by three or four people, who would all be represented and all have their own doctors to consult? Therefore, a victim of a multiple rape situation could be required to undergo five or six medical examinations. I can tell members opposite that individual lawyers representing each person convicted of a crime will request that a victim be examined by a medical practitioner of their choice, and that they will invoke this section. This provision gives the court no discretion. Why should the victim have to undergo multiple medical examinations? Why can one not rely on a reputable doctor's medical examination tendered to the court? This is simply quite peculiar. Perhaps members opposite are hoping that by this sort of device the victim might be more amenable to opting for a lower consent order, presumably seeking to save the Treasury some money.

One of the most iniquitous provisions in the legislation, which makes it more difficult for victims to get just compensation, concerns section 8 (1) (a) which provides that now one has to prove one's injuries beyond all reasonable doubt. No longer is it the civil burden of proof which is on the balance of probabilities, that is, more likely than not. Now one has to prove one's injuries beyond all reasonable doubt. That is the criminal burden of proof.

When members opposite were in Government that burden of proof was placed on victims to make it more difficult for them to gain compensation. But why does it occur in respect of injuries? There may be good argument for having to prove that a crime has been committed beyond all reasonable doubt. There is an argument for that; one should not have to prove that on the balance of probabilities, but that it must be proved conclusively, beyond all reasonable doubt, that a crime has been committed. But why on earth do victims have to prove their injuries beyond all reasonable doubt, when in a civil court one simply proves that more likely than not one suffered an injury? One can only surmise that this provision is designed to impede victims gaining compensation. Not only that, but there is a further burden of proof impediment, namely, that to succeed a person must have corroboration. One must now prove corroboration in a material particular. What is to happen if the crime is unwitnessed. If there is a successful prosecution but the injuries have not been witnessed, where does one go so far as corroboration is concerned? In actual fact, in practice, there are plenty of ways around that. Many things can amount to corroboration. However, the whole effect of the 1982 Act is that it is completely unworkable. It has emasculated a just Act and has made it more difficult for people to gain compensation in the courts. I hope that this legislation will be looked at by the Attorney-General. It certainly is an adverse reflection on honourable members opposite seeking to bring in this piece of legislation. But they do not learn, because it is part of their philosophy, and they are doing such things to wage earners today.

Finally, I want to make a few brief remarks about my electorate. I thank the people of Hartley for their confidence in me and I also thank my campaign workers. Hartley has a very large ethnic population and the electorate has special

needs. Honourable members can be assured, as indeed can the electors of my district, that I will be very vocal in relation to their needs over the ensuing years.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. There are a number of matters I want to comment on, not the least being the situation that exists, as far as South Australia is concerned, as well as the overall position in regard to the Murray River. I noted with interest that in his Speech His Excellency indicated that the Government would introduce legislation to ratify the River Murray Waters Agreement. Naturally, I will support that legislation introduced by the Minister of Water Resources today. It will have my wholehearted support, as it is the legislation that I introduced into this Parliament only a month or so ago to ratify the agreement that was achieved by the Liberal Government at that time. That agreement was a significant achievement by the Liberal Government of South Australia, involving a great deal of time and effort.

It is an agreement of considerable significance, but it should be realised quite clearly that the agreement in itself is not the end of the problem as far as South Australia is concerned; nor will it end all the problems in regard to the total Murray River system. It is the first step in endeavouring to solve the problems of this great river system that have built up over a period of some 140 years of use following European occupation of this country. During that time there has been a steady decline of that great resource. It is high time that every conceivable effort was put into reversing that trend. We have taken the first step and have achieved the first objective, namely, a new River Murray Waters Agreement between South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and the Commonwealth.

However, there is a long way to go. It is of no value, under the difficult situation that exists today, for the Minister to continue to state that all is well and that there is no problem. Quite obviously there is a problem. If the Minister wants to ignore the Chief Executive Officer of the River Murray Commission, Mr Ken Johnson, then I believe he is very foolish indeed. Mr Johnson has been involved with the River Murray Commission for a long time. I am quite sure that every River Murray Commissioner involved with the River Murray Commission certainly respects his views and attitudes in relation to his assessment of the commission, the storages and the state of the river as a whole. He would not have made his comments lightly.

I am not in the business of endeavouring to create unnecessary fear in the minds of the people of South Australia. We have been working solidly for the past three years to make the progress that we have made. The people of South Australia are concerned at the moment that if the work and effort that has been evident over the past three years is not sustained by the present Government, then obviously Victoria and New South Wales will be happy to let things slip quietly back to the state that existed when we came into government. That is quite natural. It is not a new scene—that is human nature.

I refer back to the total situation as I have seen it from 1977. I do so because that is when I undertook a Parliamentary study tour to the United States for the specific purpose of looking at a similar river situation similar to the Murray-Darling system, and I refer to the river system associated with the Colorado River in the United States and Mexico. The problems of the Colorado system and the Murray-Darling river system are almost identical in many ways.

First, the major source of salinity in the Colorado River is as a result of bad irrigation practices. Therefore, it is induced salinity as a result of practices being undertaken in the development that has occurred along the Colorado and

its tributaries. The natural saline groundwater inflows are also a major contributor. The Murray-Darling river system is in almost the same situation. Therefore, in 1977, I spent a month on the Colorado River system to learn as much as I could about it, because I was aware of the long protracted negotiations that had occurred between the United States and Mexico in trying to come to grips with the very problem of sharing a common resource and yet trying to make sure that everyone received a fair share and that their share was in a form that they could utilise effectively.

I refer to the States within the United States through which the tributaries of the Colorado and the Colorado River flow. The headwaters of the Colorado River are found in the States of Wyoming and, in particular, Colorado and to a lesser degree in New Mexico. The other main States through which the river proper flows along with some of its major tributaries are Utah, Nevada, Arizona, and California before it crosses the border into Mexico. We are in exactly the same position in South Australia as Mexico finds itself in relation to the Colorado system.

Obviously the development that occurs in the upper basin States of Colorado, Wyoming and to a lesser degree New Mexico has a very real bearing on the States of Utah, Arizona, Nevada and California, because they are further downstream. We have exactly the same problem. The upper basin States, whatever development they undertake, have a direct bearing on the quality of water in the States further down the river system. When the water finally crosses the border into Mexico, the quality a few years ago was so bad that it virtually wiped out development in Mexico in the Mexicali Valley, which is the large irrigation development in that country.

The history behind the agreement in relation to the Colorado River took some 16 years of negotiation between the United States and Mexico. I have copies of the minutes of the meetings that occurred in that time. The first meeting was held in Mexico between 6 and 11 February 1961. Meetings were held every year after that for 16 years through to between 25 and 29 February 1976, when a final agreement was reached between the two countries as to the proper management and control of the Colorado River.

We finally have a situation where Mexico receives its allocation of water. It is interesting to note, once again, the similarity between the Murray and the Colorado inasmuch as Mexico receives 1 850 000 megalitres as its allocation under the treaty between the United States and Mexico, which is exactly the same figure as South Australia receives under the River Murray Waters Act. The agreement now provides a water quality standard at the border. That water quality standard is determined at Imperial Dam, which is the last dam on the Colorado before it crosses into Mexico.

The standard laid down is that water entering Mexico is to be of a quality not exceeding 115 parts per million, plus or minus 30 parts per million greater than the content of the water in Imperial Dam. Therefore, a very real safeguard is built in for the people of Mexico. Because the large Imperial Valley irrigation area in California draws its water from Imperial Dam, naturally the people in the United States and California have a vested interest in maintaining the quality of water in Imperial Dam at the absolute minimum salinity level. Therefore, that assures Mexico of a satisfactory standard of water quality. When I returned to South Australia from that study tour I brought back a lot of material both from the Colorado River area and as a result of my discussions with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington, which provided me with copies of the minutes of the negotiations that had occurred for 16 years and copies of the legislation and other material, which provided a very clear picture of the arrangements that were agreed between the two countries.

On arriving back in South Australia, I made that material available to the then Dunstan Government, with the suggestion that that was the basis on which we should be approaching the problems of the Murray River and that we should be working on the problem in that way. Because of the similarities of the two river systems, we could very well apply the principles that had been adopted in those negotiations to the scene here in Australia. I made all these documents available to the Dunstan Government and some two to three months later they were returned to me with the assurance that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had had an opportunity to look at and assess the documents that I had brought back. However, the decision was that there was to be no action in relation to the material that I had brought back.

One could well imagine my surprise when, on becoming the Minister of Water Resources and raising this matter with senior offices of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, they expressed surprise that they had never seen the material before. Consequently, that was why they had had difficulty in understanding what I had been talking about as a member in Opposition. I think that sort of situation is extremely unfortunate: because a member of the Opposition happens to submit a proposal which is put forward in a non-political manner for the benefit of the State and of Australia as a whole, it is not followed through and given due consideration. That is why I think some concern is being expressed at the moment, in as much as the document that was prepared by the Liberal Government, referred to as 'A permanent solution to the River Murray salinity problem,' is in actual fact a replica of the proposal developed in the United States over that very long period of time in conjunction with Mexico.

I refer to one of the documents that I brought back from the State Department in the United States. This document is a Bill to bring into effect the agreement between the United States and Mexico and is entitled 'A permanent and definitive solution to the international problem of the salinity of the Colorado River'. One can well see where I drew the title of the document 'A permanent solution to the River Murray salinity problem'. There is a base proposal before the Federal Government and before the three States—South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales—which will cost in the vicinity of \$400 000 000, but which still has a great deal of merit and is the basis of coming to grips with the salinity problem. I have no doubt that as time passes there will need to be some modification to that document. Fundamentally, it will go a long way to solving the problem.

It was not until a month or two ago that the Deputy Prime Minister was in Adelaide for a meeting of the Save the Murray Campaign Committee. He spoke at a luncheon held at the Old Lion Hotel. On that occasion, he referred to comments made by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister refers to the Murray-Darling system as the greatest natural recurring resource that Australia has. He stated that it is quite absurd to consider that the money cannot be found to correct the problems of this massive asset that Australia has.

When one considers that we are talking about \$400 000 000, which will largely right the problems of this great asset, it is a very small sum indeed, and my only real criticism of the Government at the moment in relation to the Murray River is that the Government at this stage has a golden opportunity in which to press home, not only with the Federal Government but certainly with its colleagues in Victoria and New South Wales, the need to pursue with all haste to implement that proposal. The fact that this proposal was prepared by the Liberal Government should have no bearing on it whatsoever. I am quite happy if the present Labor Government wants to revamp it and put its own

name on the front page. I would be more than happy to see it do that.

The opportunity is there and I think the example was shown when the mouth of the Murray closed when a sandbar formed across it. It is very difficult to get across to the public at large the severity of the situation without some physical demonstration. The press contacted me one morning, expressing great concern that a sandbar had built up across the mouth of the Murray and that in fact the river was not flowing. I tried to explain to the media that that was what I had been trying to tell them for the past six to nine months: that the river had not been flowing for that period of time. The fact that there was now a physical barrier over the mouth and that they could see it suddenly brought home to them that there was a serious situation.

I can assure you, Sir, that not one drop of water had flowed through the barrages into the sea for a period of some six to nine months before that sandbar actually formed, but it was necessary for some physical demonstration to actually get through to the public at large and get through to the people in the Eastern States, the Governments in the Eastern States, and also the Federal Government, that we did have a serious situation on hand. I think that was one of the main features that brought the Federal Government into the total scene, and the recognition by the Federal Government that it did have to take a leading role in coming to grips with the total problem.

That is exactly what occurred in the United States. The constitutional situation in the United States is a little different from what it is here in Australia, inasmuch as the Upper States, with their own vested interests, were not prepared to spend vast sums of their own State resources for the benefit of States further down stream. It was necessary for the Federal Government to come in over the top of those States, with the agreement of the States, and to fund the necessary works to come to grips with the salinity problem. That is exactly what occurred and what is still in the process of occurring over there.

Once again, I think there is recognition now by the Federal Government that ultimately this is the only way in which this problem will be solved in Australia. There is no doubt that the Eastern States and the Federal Government will certainly look to other priorities unless pressure is maintained to make sure that this remains top priority as far as Australia is concerned. I think the opportunity is there, and we have to put it forward as an Australian Bicentennial project. I think that, if we let any opportunity slip and do not continue to push for this work to be undertaken, we will be doing a massive disservice not only to the people of South Australia at the moment but certainly to future generations. The work that is to be undertaken is in two main means: the interception of natural groundwater inflows and improved irrigation practices. South Australia is well in front of the Eastern States as far as improved irrigation practices are concerned.

We have had to develop improved irrigation practices because of the high salinity that has existed. If we did not enter into improved irrigation practices and methods, the salinity situation would be much worse in the State than it is now. In fact, the work that has been undertaken in South Australia is well on the way to putting our own house in order. We inherit more than 100 000 000 tonnes of salt annually from the Eastern States. We also put into the river in South Australia some 500 000 tonnes of salt. So, we are putting in 500 000 tonnes in this State. But, by the same token, we currently remove approximately 300 000 tonnes as a result of diversion in the form of irrigation and other diversions in metropolitan Adelaide and to service the 22 000 kilometres of pipeline throughout South Australia. We are diverting 300 000 tonnes.

The Noora scheme, when fully operational, will remove a further 157 000 tonnes and the project currently being investigated by consultants between lock 2 and lock 3 it is believed will remove 600 000 tonnes of an estimated 90 000 tonnes that currently comes in as natural groundwater inflow in that section of the river. It is estimated that 60 000 tonnes can be intercepted and disposed of in a similar Noora-type scheme. When the lock 2 and lock 3 scheme is proven and put into operation in conjunction with the Noora scheme, plus the diversion that occurs in South Australia, we will in fact be removing from the river as much salt as we are putting into it. There can be no argument from the Eastern States that South Australia has not come to grips with the problem and has now put its own house in order. That does not solve the problem in the Eastern States. We are still inheriting across the border some 1 200 000 tonnes of salt annually.

The document, 'The Permanent Solution to the River Murray Salinity Problem' picked up the main areas where that 1 200 000 tonnes is coming from and puts forward the remedies to the problem. Until such time as sufficient pressure is brought to bear so that the necessary work is undertaken in Victoria and New South Wales to significantly reduce that 1 200 000 tonnes, the problem will continue in South Australia. The 1 200 000 tonnes, is made up of natural groundwater inflows and also, to a large extent, of poor irrigation practices. We have had significant and very large levels of experience as far as improved irrigation practice is concerned in South Australia. When we look at the methods still currently being used in Victoria and New South Wales, in vast areas of cotton and rice in particular, the actual waste water in the first place, and the tremendous drainage inflow of high ground water tables making their way back to the river and carrying vast quantities of salt with it, means that until the farmers are induced to put in modern irrigation systems that problem will continue.

Part of the package that we put to the Federal Government and the two Eastern States in October last year contained a section recommending that some \$50 000 000 be made available in long-term, low-interest loans to irrigators to assist them in installing modern irrigation systems. As a result of that proposal, a working party was established and came back with a recommendation to the Federal Government. It contained a slight variation of what we put forward as far as long-term, low-interest loans were concerned, whereby it recommended that the grower approach his normal lending institution and that the Federal Government subsidise the interest to make it an attractive proposition. That variation was submitted to us and, approximately a month or six weeks prior to the last State election, Cabinet agreed to the proposal and we responded to the Federal Government indicating South Australia's support. Unfortunately, to this time (and it may have changed since the election) neither Victoria nor New South Wales has responded to that proposal by the Federal Government.

It is essential that incentives be provided. There is no doubt in my mind that the single greatest contributor to the salinity problem is certainly poor irrigation practices. We are much further advanced in South Australia than is either of the Eastern States. In fact, the United States has gone so far in the Colorado River system that it is offering grants to farmers to convert to modern irrigation practices. They have come to the conclusion that it is far better to treat the cause of the problem than to treat the problem for ever after by way of tube-wheel interception and ongoing salinity disposal schemes.

In other words, we should reach a stage where we can accurately apply water to our irrigation undertakings and plantings (and we are quickly reaching that stage). A great deal of work has been done in South Australia at the Loxton

Research Centre of the Department of Agriculture. A great deal of work has been done on this matter in Riverside, in California, where the object of the exercise is to come up with an efficient irrigation system which will apply water on a daily or every-other-day basis to the plantings, which will retain not only the right soil moisture content for that planting but will maintain a salinity level in the soil in which the plant can live.

In other words, it is a matter of applying sufficient water to keep the critical salinity level below the root zone of the plant but not applying the quantity of water to build up a high water table like we have in the Shepparton area, in Victoria, which creates a tremendous drain back to the lowest point, namely, the river. This can be achieved. It can be done, and it has been proved that it can be done effectively. By applying precisely the right amount of water when the planting is needed, we can not only save water but also save fertilisers because we are not leaching that fertiliser through the soil and back to the river.

The problem of salinity or salt load in the soil we are talking about is between the planting and the river. In most instances that salt load has been there for a long period of time. It is a matter of leaving that salt load exactly where it is and not interfering with it. Inefficient irrigation practices do exactly that. They interfere with the salt load. The groundwater movement through the salt load carries the high load of salinity back into the river. Even with the rehabilitation work being done in South Australia to this stage, it has been shown in the Renmark Irrigation Trust Area (which was the first major area in South Australia to be rehabilitated with a modern irrigation distribution system of closed pipe system, doing away with the open channels), that the installation of a closed pipe system, cutting down on natural losses and seepage from the system, as compared with the old broken concrete and earthen channels, coupled with improved irrigation practices on the properties themselves, has reduced the drainage coming away from those properties by anything up to 50 per cent. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The SPEAKER: I have to advise the House that this day I have received from the Chief Justice's Chambers the following letter dated 13 December 1982:

Dear Mr Speaker,

I am required by section 78 of the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended, to appoint a judge of the Supreme Court to be Chairman of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission.

Subsection (2) of section 78 provides that the judge so appointed 'should be the most senior puisne judge who is available to undertake the duties of Chairman of the Commission'. The senior puisne judge, Justice Mitchell, is not so available because, during a considerable part of 1983 when the next redistribution must take place, she will be required to act as Chief Justice by reason of my absence on leave.

I have therefore appointed the next senior puisne judge, Mr Justice G.H. Walters, to be Chairman of the commission.

I have advised the Attorney-General, the President of the Legislative Council and the Electoral Commissioner for South Australia.

Yours sincerely,
L.J. King, Chief Justice

PAY-ROLL TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

**SAVINGS BANK OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 223.)

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): What I have been trying to demonstrate is that the physical problems of the Murray River can certainly be solved, and I have always believed that the problems can be solved so long as sufficient resources are put into their solution. It is the duty of the South Australian Government, particularly under the circumstances that exist, to forge ahead with every resource available, to press home to the Eastern States, that is, Victoria and New South Wales and the Commonwealth, that this work which is fundamentally spelt out in the permanent solution to the Murray River salinity problem, be proceeded with all haste. As I have said, if the Government fails to do that then it has certainly abdicated its responsibility to South Australia, to this generation, and certainly to future generations, because it is the key resource of South Australia, not only the river districts but the agricultural areas of South Australia, and most of the major centres of South Australia. As has been stated in the press in the past few days, with Adelaide being some 85 per cent dependent on the Murray River this summer, one does not have to have a very vivid imagination to imagine what it would be like living in Adelaide now if it were not for the water resources available from the Murray River.

I wish to refer to another matter which has received a great deal of publicity in recent times, and that is the Riverland Cannery. A great deal of criticism was levelled at the Liberal Government for the resources, the taxpayers funds, put into retaining that cannery. I would like to take this opportunity of paying a tribute to the receivers, particularly John Pridham and his team, on the remarkable achievements that they have managed in the past three years. At the time that we came into Government some three years ago it became apparent that the Riverland Cannery was running at a loss of about \$750 000 a month, and the receivers have now reduced that to a loss of about \$2 500 000 this financial year. That is a great achievement, and there is no doubt that it vindicates the stance that was adopted by the Liberal Government in relation to this industry in South Australia.

It is the sole cannery that we have in this State. It is an important part of the overall economic survival of the Riverland, and it is a major employer in that part of the State. The efforts that have been put into retaining that

cannery, not only for the Riverland, but for South Australia, I believe have placed South Australia in a fairly sound position as far as the canning fruit industry is concerned in Australia. I believe that the Federal Government will have to come to the party. We are anticipating a final report and finding of the IAC to be handed down in about March next year, but, with the assistance that has been provided to the industry in South Australia (and I believe that the Federal Government will find it necessary to support the industry in Australia as a whole), the South Australian canning fruit industry will then be better placed. Because of the support that it has received in the past three years and with the efforts that have been put into it by the receivers, the cannery is in such a position that it can well be saved for South Australia. It would be an absolute disaster and disgrace if at this stage, having taken the cannery through that difficult period, it were to be lost to South Australia in the future.

The contribution and financial input from the Government, from the taxpayers of South Australia, means that we have an industry which, I believe, can now be successfully retained for South Australia. How did the industry get into the mess it was in when the Liberal Party came into Government in 1979? We have only to go back to 1978 when the Labor Government, for all intents and purposes, very effectively took control of the cannery for about a mere \$400 000. That was achieved by converting a loan to a grant at the request of the board of the cannery. Part of the deal with the Government of the day in agreeing to convert that loan to a grant was that it would give the South Australian Government the right to have three members on the board, plus the right to appoint a managing director which, in effect, gave the Government a controlling interest in that cannery. The agreement entered into with Henry Jones was one that was well known to canning fruit growers in the Riverland. It was an agreement that was totally one-sided, and there was no way that it could ever be of benefit to growers in the industry. I pay a tribute to the receivers for the negotiations with Henry Jones and because that loss has been reduced to a comparatively small figure compared to what it was some three years ago. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

- No. 1. Page 3, lines 41 to 46 (clause 10)—Leave out all words occurring in these lines after the passage 'are repealed'.
- No. 2. Page 4, line 3 (clause 11)—Leave out 'on sale'.
- No. 3. Page 4, line 5 (clause 11)—Leave out 'on sale'.
- No. 4. Page 4, line 8 (clause 11)—Leave out 'on sale'.
- No. 5. Page 4, line 11 (clause 11)—Leave out 'on sale'.
- No. 6. Page 4, line 15 (clause 11)—Leave out 'on sale'.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

The amendments are technical in that they seek to resolve what has been identified as an internal inconsistency in the original Bill. There could be an inconsistency with section 71 and some of the new clauses that are being inserted in the Bill and the amendment has picked that up and has clarified the position and, accordingly, it is worthy of support.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.25 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 16 December at 2 p.m.