

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 16 March 1983

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

PETITION: PRESCRIBED CONCENTRATION OF ALCOHOL

A petition signed by 39 residents of South Australia praying that the House legislate to reduce the 'prescribed concentration of alcohol' to .05 per cent was presented by Mr Ferguson. Petition received.

PETITION: KIMBA T.A.B.

A petition signed by 146 residents of Kimba and surrounding areas praying that the House urge the Government to establish a betting shop or T.A.B. facilities at Kimba was presented by Mr Blacker. Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

SHOP ASSISTANTS

Mr OLSEN: Will the Premier say whether the Government will intervene in a case now before the State Industrial Commission in which shop assistants are seeking a pay rise of \$14 a week? I have been informed that employer groups are concerned about the attitude of the Government to the present wage pause. At the weekend, the Premier was ambivalent in his response to the present industrial dispute in the Cooper Basin. Yesterday, the Minister of Housing, in this House, called the wage pause a 'con trick'—a statement which conflicts directly with the views of the Prime Minister, who has already indicated that he is considering the need for an extension of the wage pause beyond June.

The Premier should be aware that many thousands of South Australian workers have received wage increases in recent weeks as a result of decisions of the Industrial Commission, including those covered by the State clerks award, the hotels, motels and clubs clerks award, the taxi operators clerks award and the R.A.A. clerks award.

The commission now has before it a claim on behalf of more than 90 000 shop assistants (I am pleased that the Deputy Premier is able to give some briefing notes to the Premier), and I believe that employers want the Government to intervene in this case to reinforce the need for an effective wage pause. This is because any substantial wage increase awarded following this claim could result in 6 000 shop assistants being retrenched, and surely the Premier is aware of that view, which no doubt has been expressed to him, as indeed it has to many sections of the South Australian community.

While I am aware that the commission has laid down guidelines for the consideration of claims during the wage pause, Government intervention in this case would dispel concern and confusion which is growing about its position on the wage pause following the Premier's response to the Cooper Basin dispute and the statement of the Minister of Housing yesterday, and would at least dispel the claim that this Government is subservient to union officials.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am glad that the Leader is not in charge of industrial relations in this State, for if he

were we would be in real trouble. An extraordinary attitude has been taken—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I thought that the member for Davenport was a pretty up-beat confrontationist in his approach, but he certainly has a trick or two to learn from his Leader. I would have thought that the bitter experience of the past few years would have made the Opposition rethink this matter. There is nothing to be gained by taking up each and every industrial dispute and trying to make it a matter of public controversy involving the Government and media speculation. That is no way to solve industrial problems. In answer to the Leader's question, at present there is no intention to intervene. The Government did intervene in the clerks case, which was the test case in this matter. Certain guidelines have been laid down by the bench and no doubt they will be applied in the current case.

HILTON BRIDGE

Mr TRAINER: My question involves work undertaken under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme. Will the Minister of Transport say, as construction of the Emerson over-pass has already commenced as part of the A.B.R.D. scheme (and many of my constituents appreciate the work done), what is the present status of the Hilton bridge, will work on that project be included under the A.B.R.D., and when will it commence?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The short answer to the honourable member's question is 'Yes', the Hilton bridge has been included in the A.B.R.D. programme. Initially, work on the Hilton bridge was deferred. However, I inspected that bridge with the Federal Minister, (Mr Ralph Hunt), when he came to Adelaide, and he immediately agreed that it be included in the A.B.R.D. programme. Pre-construction activities will commence in this financial year, and construction is expected to commence early next year and be completed in 1986-87 at a cost of approximately \$12 000 000.

I think it is appropriate that I inform all members of the House about the A.B.R.D. programme. The Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme was announced by the Federal Government in August last year. Members will recall that the A.B.R.D. programme is intended to produce significant advances in Australia's land transport network in time for our bicentennial year.

This is to be achieved through new projects and acceleration of existing programmes of new construction and upgrading. It is funded by a 1 cent per litre levy on fuel, which will rise to 2 cents from July this year and the revenue thereby generated is hypothecated to this programme by way of a trust fund set up under the Act.

The Commonwealth called on the previous State Government to submit projects for the A.B.R.D. programme in the categories of national roads, urban arterial, rural arterial and local roads. As a result, the previous State Government submitted a series of projects as an initial six-year indicative programme. On taking office, the Government expressed support for the A.B.R.D. programmes, as has the new Federal Labor Administration under Prime Minister Hawke.

The previous Commonwealth Minister (Mr Hunt) approved for the 1982-83 financial year expenditure on all but three of the projects submitted in the original programme. These were the Hilton bridge, the Berri bridge, and the Leigh Creek access road. The Commonwealth asked that they be reviewed as to priority. Some adjustment was also needed to accommodate additional projects proposed for A.B.R.D. funding. As a result, some changes have been

made to the six-year indicative programme submitted from South Australia.

In the national roads category, one project has been added; that is, to build a bridge on the Port Pirie to Port Augusta road to take it over the rail spur from Stirling North to the E.T.S.A. power station. This was included after a tragic level crossing accident had taken the lives of two people. Local authorities agreed that the project would significantly increase safety and traffic flow on this busy highway.

In the urban arterial category, we were able to gain approval for the reconstruction of Burbridge Road from South Road to West Terrace, including a new Hilton bridge over the railway yards. As I have mentioned, this was originally withheld by the Federal Minister. There has been pressure for many years to upgrade this substandard structure, and, given the new international status of Adelaide Airport and the proposed new terminal for Australian National, this project is most appropriate for A.B.R.D. funding. In addition we have included a provision to duplicate a section of the Gawler by-pass that comes within the urban arterial category. I will comment further on this project shortly.

Within the urban arterial category, there is a provision for funding of urban public transport. Discussions are currently taking place to identify suitable public transport projects for this allocation of funds. To accommodate the additions to the urban arterial category, one project has been removed; that is, the construction of Quarry Road from Bridge Road to North-East Road. This project will now be undertaken using normal Highways Department funds, but will be commenced sooner than was originally planned.

In the rural arterial category there has been a major readjustment of priorities. The previous State Government had submitted, as part of the programme, a project to build a bridge over the Murray, at Berri, to replace the existing ferry. This project, costing some \$19 000 000 would have taken up almost the entire A.B.R.D. funds available under this category. In addition to A.B.R.D. funds, the Berri bridge project would have required a substantial input of State funds, thereby causing further delays and scaling down on the extension of the rural arterial roads network. In accommodating the Berri bridge, expenditure would have been severely curtailed on projects such as the Burra to Morgan road, Lock-Elliston road, Kimba-Cleve road, Orroroo to Hawker road and the Spalding to Burra road.

The apparent inequities in the total state A.B.R.D. programme resulting from the inclusion of the Berri bridge caused concern to both the Federal Government and ourselves. As a result, we undertook a review of the rural arterial category to see whether there were other suitable projects available with a higher priority than that of the Berri bridge.

As a result, the Berri bridge project has been removed from the A.B.R.D. programme. Two projects have been submitted in its place: the reconstruction of the Taillem Bend to Salt Creek section of the Princes Highway, and the duplication and upgrading of the major part of the western Gawler by-pass.

Sections of the Gawler by-pass are designated as urban arterial, and provision has been made in this category for the work involved, as I have previously indicated. When compared to the Berri bridge, the Gawler by-pass should obviously have higher priority. This two-lane arterial by-pass was completed in 1962-63. It has 15 intersections, 15 other access points, two rail and one river bridge. Its traffic count has gone from 2 000 to 3 000 up to the order of 10 000 vehicles per day. In its present configuration, the road has a significant accident record. During the first six years after its construction six people were killed, 100 were

injured and there was a total of 370 accidents. In the last six years, there were seven killed, 105 injured and 390 accidents. The road geometry, and intersections were a major factor in this continuing accident pattern.

A proposal to construct the Gawler by-pass to four lanes of separated traffic with eight bridge structures, to reduce intersections, was put forward in 1980 and was accepted by the previous Government. It has been awaiting funding. The Government considers that this project should be given high priority. The cost to the community of the present road in terms of lives, injuries and accident damage has been high. The new road should reduce this pattern dramatically, and it will be of benefit to the wider community, including many people in the Riverland who use this highway on their regular travel to Adelaide.

In comparison, the Berri bridge, although the project is supported by strong local agitation, has a benefit mainly of convenience. Delays caused by the existing ferry are in the order of 3½ minutes per vehicle with a four-minute crossing time. During major social or sporting events, delays of up to 20 minutes have occurred on rare occasions. Local travellers between Berri and Loxton would be the main beneficiaries of this project. This Government considers that safety and lives should outweigh convenience in giving priorities in such a situation.

WAGE PAUSE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: After that trip around the roads of South Australia, in answer to a limited question, I direct to the Premier a question that is consequent upon that which was asked by the Leader of the Opposition. In view of the concern expressed by General Motors-Holden's about the impact of wage rises on its operations, will the Premier, during the course of his discussions with the Prime Minister on Friday, raise with Mr Hawke the need to extend the wage pause?

In the statement issued by G.M.H. when it was announcing the retrenchment programme the company indicated that it had sustained a loss of \$126 000 000 and that wage escalation had been a significant factor in that result. That, of course, is not surprising. Although it reduced its work force by more than 2 300 people in 1982, the company's wage bill still rose by more than 23 per cent. The Managing Director of G.M.H., Mr Chuck Chapman, said that costs flowing from wage increases are an ongoing concern to the company (as they are to every company today). General Motors-Holden's is a prime example of the impact of spiralling wages on the operation of a major firm and an indication of the benefits that would flow from an extension of the wage pause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that in that question the Opposition and the Deputy Leader are really distorting the emphasis on what is a very much larger problem than was suggested. Wages may be part of the concern of G.M.H., but I can assure honourable members that by far the overriding concern, not only of G.M.H., concerns market conditions and the whole future of manufacturing industry in this State, and that is what our submissions should be directed to.

Secondly, I point out that the specific question concerning the wage pause and what is going to happen in relation to it will be a matter of discussion at the economic summit which begins on 11 April, and that is where these matters will be canvassed in consultation with all the major groups. Prior to South Australia's attending that conference, I will be having discussions with all the major groups in this State to attempt to see whether they have a unified voice.

Members interjecting:

Mr Olsen: What about your bit of decisive action and direction?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Don't you want us to consult? You never consulted in Government.

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not want a discussion across the coffee table. Let the Premier continue.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I would have thought that the results of elections over the past 12 months, and in particular the most recent Federal election based on the theme of bringing Australia together, would mean that the nonsense coming from Opposition benches would have ceased long ago. But, if they want to persist with confrontation, that is fine. They are completely out of step with the rest of the Australian community, and I can only repeat that there will be wide-ranging consultations on this issue prior to the national economic summit, where the matter will be thrashed out at the national level.

RAIN-WATER TANKS

Mr HAMILTON: In an extremely dry year as the one we are now experiencing, will the Minister of Water Resources say whether the State Government has adopted any measures to encourage the installation of rain-water tanks by householders in the metropolitan area and property owners in the country? If so, what are these measures and to what extent would they supplement reticulated water supplies?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: This week I approved a policy on rain-water tanks for the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The South Australian Government recognises that rain-water tanks are essential in country areas where no reticulated water supply exists. The Government also recognises the desire of some metropolitan householders to install rain-water tanks for reasons of self-sufficiency, conservation, and/or requirements for water with low values of salinity, hardness, colour and turbidity.

The Metropolitan Adelaide Water Resources Study, published in 1978, indicated that rain-water tanks, if widely adopted and used to their fullest extent, could meet only 4 per cent of the total metropolitan demand. It should be recognised, however, that the unit cost of a rain-water tank is high, typically four to five times as high as the reticulated supply. Furthermore, unless the rain-water system is properly maintained, it can constitute a hazard to health.

Given the high cost of rain-water and the ready availability of other conservation devices and practices, Government policy will be to encourage the installation of rain-water tanks as a private initiative, but not to provide financial assistance for their manufacture or installation. For reticulated areas, the Government commends a booklet published by the Engineering and Water Supply Department on the design, operation and maintenance of rain-water systems used to supplement the reticulated water supply. For communities with no reticulated supply, the department will continue to provide, generally through local government, more detailed information on system design, operation and maintenance for that area specifically.

STATE TAXES

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Will the Premier give this House an assurance that no State taxes will be increased while the wage pause is operating in South Australia?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes.

PIE CART

Mr PLUNKETT: Will the Minister of Local Government advise what progress has been made in obtaining extended trading hours for Mr C.M. Oram, the operator of the pie cart located adjacent to the railway station in North Terrace?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This situation has been dragging on far too long, members on both sides of the House having levelled criticism at the Adelaide City Council on the matter. I will not try to say that I have the charisma of Bob Hawke—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am pleased to advise the honourable member that on coming to office I made representations to the Adelaide City Council on Mr Oram's behalf to obtain extended hours in order to allow him to provide a service after hours to people in the city. Following my representations, the council has considered the matter further and has agreed to extend the hours of operation of Mr Oram's stand to 1 a.m. for the term of the licence. In addition, council will give further consideration to the hours of operation of the stand when applications are called for the 1983-84 licence.

WELFARE HOUSING

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Housing say whether an extension of the wage pause would allow the Government to hold down Housing Trust rentals and provide additional funds for welfare housing in South Australia? My question is asked against the background of the Minister's statement in the House yesterday that the national wage pause was a con trick. In saying that, he is in conflict with the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, and also inconsistent with his eagerness to accept the \$8 790 000 for welfare housing from the previous Federal Government, which was a direct result of the wage pause.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Despite what I said yesterday, I have—

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Reconsidered?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: No, not reconsidered. I said that the \$8 800 000 had increased the Housing Trust's design and construct programme, and would help many low-income earners, despite the fact that the Opposition does not agree with the concept. That was made perfectly clear in yesterday's urgency motion. When the summit meeting has been held and we have the figures clearly before the Parliament and before me as the Minister, I will be making the appropriate statement.

CHILD CARE

Ms LENEHAN: Will the Minister of Education report to the House on the progress of the provision of child care at colleges of technical and further education and, in particular, at the new Noarlunga College of Technical and Further Education? This matter concerns not only me but many people in South Australia in that, unless we provide child care at colleges of technical and further education, we are in effect denying equality of access to many people who desperately need access to our technical and further education institutions. In my district, where the college is now operating—

Mr GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. Standing Orders provide for a member to ask a question and to make a brief explanation of it but they do not provide for a member to comment. I suggest that the hon-

ourable member is now commenting on and not explaining the question.

The SPEAKER: Up to this point I rule that there has been no comment, and I accept it as a reasonable explanation.

Ms LENEHAN: A tremendous need exists for child-care facilities within the community, and particularly within the district of Mawson. In explaining that, I was pointing out that people who need equality of access to education need quality child care. In my explanation I would like to point out that the previous Government, in procrastinating and refusing to provide child care, denied community child care.

Mr GUNN: I rise on a further point of order, Mr Speaker. I wish to again suggest that the honourable member was going far beyond an explanation and was commenting on the activities of a former Government, which is out of order.

The SPEAKER: On this occasion I uphold the point of order. What happened was unfortunate in that the member for Mawson in effect attempted to argue the relevance of what she had been putting originally. If she had kept on her original track that would have been all right. I uphold the point of order and call again on the honourable member for Mawson.

Ms LENEHAN: It has been put to me by my constituents that the situation which currently exists is as I have described it. However, in deference to your ruling, I shall not pursue that line. I wish to draw to the attention of this House the great need for the provision of child care, and I therefore ask the Minister whether he can say at what stage is the provision of child care at the moment.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is indeed the policy of the Government to provide child-care facilities at colleges of the Department of Technical and Further Education and to staff those facilities with at least one adequately trained person supported by volunteers. That is in direct contrast to the policy of the previous Government, which did not accept the arguments that indeed access to educational opportunities must require for certain sections of the population adequate child-care facilities. We do accept that argument. We believe it is consistent, if one may take an example, with the decision to provide car-parking facilities at colleges of technical and further education. We do so because we realise that people have to get there, they have to have means of getting there, and if they are travelling by car then they have to have a car park. Likewise, if there are people at home with children who want to get access to educational opportunities they will need some facilities for child care to look after those children when they are partaking of the study opportunities that might be available to them.

This policy, as with many of the other policies of the Government, is to be phased in during the three years of the life of this Parliament, and that is part of our planning. At this stage I have instructed the Director-General of the Department of Technical and Further Education to examine the way in which we can implement this policy proposal for four community colleges in this academic year with regard to staffing them on the basis of two days a week at this stage and increasing that later on to full week staffing.

I have already indicated that capital works at the Noarlunga college are to take place so that the child-care facilities can be put in place at the Noarlunga Community College as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT OFFICERS

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Has the Premier had discussions with the Director-General of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (Mr Max Scriven), the State Ombudsman (Mr Bakewell), and the Agent-General in London (Mr Rundle),

about their future and, if so, what plans does the Government have for them?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the first part of the question is "Yes" and for the second part, 'It is none of the business of the honourable member at this stage.'

FOSTER CHILDREN

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: I will start again, Sir. Is the Minister of Community Welfare aware that, according to information given to me by the Department for Community Welfare, private foster parents in this State are personally liable for the medical bills of children in their care? I have been approached by an extremely concerned foster parent who explained that changes in the conditions of children using their parents' Commonwealth health benefit cards have made it impossible for medical accounts of foster children to be charged against their parents card.

After receiving this information the foster parent involved contacted the Department of Social Security and was informed that there was no way around this problem and that the account involved would have to be paid by the foster parent. The foster parent then contacted the Department for Community Welfare and was again told that there was no way around this problem, but that inquiries should be made as to whether the parents' medical benefits fund would accept the additional child on the family card. He was warned at the same time that previous attempts to do this had been rejected by the medical funds. When the foster parent contacted me, I, in turn, contacted the Minister's office and was referred to a senior officer of the Department for Community Welfare who informed me that foster children are not presently covered for medical expenses and that their foster parents would be personally liable for their accounts. Will the Minister say whether this is so?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question and the interest he has shown in this matter. He advised me that he would be asking this question and this has allowed me to bring forward a more considered answer. I am the first to acknowledge that parents of children in such circumstances have to run the gauntlet of an intricate bureaucracy. The effect of the honourable member's question is that these costs are borne by the public.

Since the introduction of the current health care scheme in September 1981, people who do not have health insurance or health care cover as pensioners, beneficiaries or as 'disadvantaged' persons are not eligible for free hospital/medical care at public hospitals. These children are the victims of a particularly inequitable current national health scheme. My department accepts responsibility for many children who have been placed 'in care', are subject to a court order; my department also provides subsidy payments in approved cases of children placed in private care with a guardian.

Under the current health care scheme, a child who is placed in Department for Community Welfare residential care is eligible in his own right for a health care card as a disadvantaged person, and receives free hospital/medical care in public hospitals. However, children with 'substitute parents', that is, those children for whom family allowance is payable to a person, do not qualify for a card in their own right and have health cover only if the substitute parents are members of a registered health benefit fund which has agreed to include the child, or holders of a pension health benefits, health benefits or health care card.

This is the problem to which the honourable member referred.

Where children are placed 'in care' or are subject to court orders, and it is not possible or desirable for these children to reside with their parents, it is the department's philosophy, in appropriate cases, to place children in substitute and not residential care. At any one time there are approximately 1 600 children in substitute care.

In August 1981, with the new health care scheme imminent, my predecessor wrote to the then Minister of Health requesting that children in substitute care be exempted from charges at public hospitals. However, in December 1981, Cabinet accepted a recommendation from the then Minister of Health that 'Wards of State, foster children, etc., not covered by health insurance of the substitute family or eligible for health benefit cards or health care cards should be charged as ordinary patients. The payment of hospital charges would be the responsibility of the Department for Community Welfare.' My department automatically accepts such responsibility in the case of children 'in care' or subject to a court order. Though medical accounts of children in private care are not ordinarily considered for payment, unless placed by the department, every consideration is being given to such requests for assistance at the present time. The total medical cost to the department over the past 12 months for children in substitute care was approximately \$8 000. The largest single account paid was \$918. This payment was in respect of a child 'in care'.

Earlier this year I wrote to the Minister of Health requesting a re-examination of the current policy, with a view towards an arrangement whereby children in my department's care receive free in-patient and out-patient services as public patients in public hospitals. I point out that the resolution of this problem may be achieved with the introduction of the incoming Federal Government's Medicare health scheme.

TOURISM INDUSTRY

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In view of the potential of the tourism industry to create more than 22 000 jobs in South Australia over the next five years, will the Premier say whether the Government has considered specifically the impact that any proposed new State taxation measure would have on the industry? Has it consulted with the South Australian Tourism Industry Council on the impact of such taxation on the tourism industry growth and, if not, will the Government invite the council to prepare a tourism impact statement in relation to the proposed taxes?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I think that the Government is well aware of the impact of taxes on all sections of the community, including the tourist industry. As to the second aspect of the question, I will consult my colleague the Minister of Tourism about it.

ELIZABETH E. & W.S. DEPOT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Water Resources give urgent consideration to improving the security at the Engineering and Water Supply Department depot at Elizabeth? A constituent has brought to my attention the fact that an employee at that depot was recently bashed with an iron bar between midnight and 1 a.m. The situation, as I understand it from the report given to me, is that the depot security operates only between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. as a result of cuts in staff made by the Liberal Government under the Tonkin Administration.

I am also told that there have been large losses of petrol and other supplies at the depot during the hours in which the depot is unattended. In light of the danger to emergency employees who are required to enter the depot between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. and, in order to protect the department's property, it seems that there is a very strong argument for reverting to the previous practice, which had existed since virtually the establishment of the depot, of having a 24-hour security arrangement in operation.

I ask the Minister whether he could give urgent consideration to introducing that measure not only, as I have said, to protect the department's property but to ensure that emergency personnel who are called out late at night to stop leaks in the water system or to repair problems with the sewerage system can be effectively and properly protected, as we would all hope they would be, when they have to enter the depot at these late hours.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The answer to the honourable member's question is that I will give urgent attention to improving the security at the Elizabeth depot. That brings into question, of course, perhaps other depots in the metropolitan area. I assure the honourable member that I will have the matter investigated immediately and bring down a report to him as soon as possible.

HOUSING POLICY

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Minister of Housing tell the House when the Government intends to implement the promises made in the Labor Party's election policy speech to give further assistance to home buyers, and how much will those promises cost? In the Premier's election policy speech a number of promises were made in relation to his housing policy, and these included deposit gap assistance to assist 1 500 families and an upgraded mortgage assistance scheme to help 4 000 families. When will we see these promises being met, and how much will they cost South Australia?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The honourable member obviously would be aware of the advertisements in the national and local press concerning a review being undertaken so that we can clearly establish exactly what is required. When that review is completed and submitted to Cabinet and to Parliament I think the honourable member will be well satisfied.

SCHOOL ENROLMENTS

Mr MAYES: Will the Minister of Education inform the House what initiatives the Government has taken and will be taking as a consequence of changes in student enrolment numbers for 1983 and those predicted enrolments over the next two years? As a matter of public debate, it is important that the Minister explain clearly the Government's policy on this matter. It is important that the Minister be given the opportunity to outline to this House the present proposals.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I am very pleased to have the opportunity to explain to the House the present situation in regard to 1983 school enrolments. Honourable members would know that predictions were made last year that primary school enrolments in this State would decline by 5 000 and that secondary school enrolments would increase by between 300 and 600 students. I think that it was also well known to the community that the previous Government intended to dispense with 231 teaching positions as a result of that change in enrolments. One of the first decisions of the present Government was to maintain those 231 positions.

In fact, the enrolments that occurred during the first week of the current school year were slightly below the estimate. Enrolments were 5 000 down for primary students, as expected, but there was an increase of 981 in the secondary area. I point out that the previous Government had anticipated that there would be an increase of between 300 and 600 students in the secondary area, but it did not budget for extra salaries. That matter was drawn to my attention within a day of my being appointed to the Ministry, and that is why some of the 231 positions were specifically added to that area of enrolments.

A number of people have asked for details about the spread of those secondary enrolments in regard to the various year levels. The analysis of that information concerning the increase in enrolments in the secondary area shows that 54.3 per cent of the increase is in the compulsory age group of secondary schooling. Only 45.7 per cent is in the years 11 and 12 level of secondary schooling. Of course that meant that some readjustments had to be made concerning deploying staff resources available, and indeed we had to make some adjustments to the way we had proposed to allocate the 231 positions in December last year. The Government had proposed to allocate 81 per cent of those positions to primary schools, with the balance to secondary schools, against the back-drop of there being only 61 per cent of total enrolments in the primary school sector.

In the first few weeks of February this year the Government had to reconsider the position, and we reduced the primary school allocation of the 231 positions to 71 per cent, still in excess of its share of the enrolments, and gave the increase to secondary schools. That then meant that we had a situation where we still needed 50 staff salaries to be accounted for, and the Government decided to share the burden of that—for a burden it is—between both the primary and secondary areas; first, by expecting the primary area to redeploy 25 salaries from the 231 positions and, secondly, by the secondary area being 25 out of 6 400 below its exact entitlement.

A number of people have indicated that the Government has broken its promises. We had the rather interesting situation of the now shadow Minister some weeks ago saying on television that he was old-fashioned enough to believe that promises should be kept. Can I perhaps remind the antique member that in fact the Government has not broken its promises and draw his attention to, and commend for his perusal, the policy document that was issued, not after but before the last election, well and truly in time for everyone to understand what our policy actually contained. I will not read out the entire 44 pages, but it stated, in part:

Labor will retain all of those positions as a result of declining enrolments to staff its initiatives. This commitment will improve the quality of education. It will not in real terms cost the taxpayer any more.

The shadow Minister is on public record as asking me not only to retain the 231 positions but to put in still more salaries.

Had that been the case, that would have been a breach of a promise as spelt out in the policy document because we promised to maintain the teaching numbers. I will highlight one other area which has been suggested is a breach of promise by the present Government, namely, that we are breaching our undertaking to give relatively more of the resources to primary than secondary. The policy document states:

It will be the intention of a Labor Government to see that gap [the gap between primary and secondary] narrowed by means of a redistribution of resources as they become available, in particular, as a result of declining enrolments.

The reality of the matter is that 71 per cent of the positions from the 231 have indeed gone to primary against the back-

drop that primary has declined by 5 000 students. It is quite interesting, therefore, to match up the primary/secondary relativity last year with this year. Members will know that last year the relativity was 65 per cent; in other words, primary received about 65 per cent per capita of that which secondary received. As a result of this Government's coming into office, and as a result of this Government's initiatives on staffing, primary is now getting close to 70 per cent of what the secondary area receives per capita.

Another issue that has been raised is that of class sizes getting larger and that that would be a breach of the Labor Party's promise. I initially asked for class data from a sample survey of primary schools. I found from the sample survey of 50 schools in South Australia that, whereas last year 13 per cent of our primary classes were in excess of 30 students, the result this year is 5 per cent. Whereas last year the number of classes above 27 was about 34 per cent, this year it is down to about 27 per cent. Of course, I suppose one could pose the proposition that a sample of 50 schools is not really an adequate way of measuring what is taking place in the 700 schools throughout South Australia, so I then decided, taking that as a reasonable basis, to ask all the schools in South Australia to provide information on their class sizes and how they pan out. I now present that information for the edification of members in this place. In 1982—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In 1982 in the primary area 34.42 per cent of classes were greater than 27 students in size. This year that has fallen to 27 per cent, so there has been a dramatic improvement in the primary area since this Government has come to power, as one would expect to be the case with 5 000 fewer enrolments. Of course, the secondary situation has not gone that way: it has gone the other way. In 1982 in the secondary area, 13.18 per cent of classes had more than 25 students, and this year it is 15.2 per cent.

So there has been (and I acknowledge this) a minor deterioration in that position. It was for that reason that I decided that we would need to redeploy 25 salaries from primary into secondary—25 from the total primary teaching allocation in excess of 6 900 teachers. This is not an unreasonable decision given that primary schools are still considerably better off than they were last year.

It is the intention of this Government to closely monitor this situation, to look at anomalies that may be taking place, and to re-investigate certain situations. I have been more than open with the schools that have come to me to spell out their needs. This is a Government of financial responsibility. This is not a Government that will merely continue to spend money just because it is asked to do so by the shadow Minister of Education or anyone else. I made that policy commitment before the last election about maintaining the staff levels. It is our intention to keep to that promise because of the serious financial situation the State faces at the moment. To do otherwise and accept the shadow Minister's demand to put in another 120 salaries on top of that would be financially irresponsible.

COUNCIL RATES

Mr RODDA: Will the Minister of Local Government advise whether, despite the fact that he has confirmed his view this afternoon that the wage pause is a con trick, he agrees that the extension of the wage pause will allow councils to limit an increase in rates next financial year?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: To be quite kind, that is the most stupid question that has been asked this afternoon.

Every decision made at the summit conference will affect not only this State or other States but the whole of Australia. Surely the honourable member is not going to say that we are a parochial State and that our borders are severely limited. Members opposite may see South Australia as being the sole State, but the result of the Federal election on 5 March illustrated that the whole of Australia needs to be involved. Coming out of the summit conference will be recommendations to State Governments, and we will react and respond to those recommendations.

LINEAR PARK PROJECT

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Water Resources inform the House when the Linear Park project adjacent to the Torrens River will be completed to the boundaries of Riverway, Kidman Park. People living along Riverway, Kidman Park, have been waiting for more than 20 years for the development of that part of the Torrens River. Unfortunately, that part of the river during summer can only be described as a dirt track. When the wind blows from a northerly direction people in the area have to contend with unpleasant conditions, with dust blowing into their houses. I understand that 90 per cent of the total work has been completed in the area but residents are deeply interested in knowing when the remainder of the work will be completed.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Henley Beach and his constituents will be glad to hear that their long wait for action will reach a happy ending soon. Whilst precise programmes are still being worked out, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has definite plans for completing beautification and flood mitigation work along this section of the river. The development of Torrens River Linear Park from the Fairmont Avenue footbridge at Kidman Park to the sea, which includes the reserve referred to by the honourable member, was originally proposed to be undertaken in 1983-84. At present staging programmes are under review, and I will announce the revised programme as soon as it is available. Between Fairmont Avenue and Findon Road, Kidman Park, the remaining earthworks and grassing will start early in the 1983-84 financial year. Some delay has been occasioned by acquiring all the necessary land from private owners but that has now been achieved. Planting of the trees and shrubs in this area, originally scheduled for the spring, has now been brought forward to be carried out from April 1983.

As usual, we want to involve local residents, so a public meeting is being planned to outline to local residents the extent of the work to be carried out. We will ask local schoolchildren to become part of a programme to involve young people in transplanting and upgrading the banks of the Torrens River. Once planting and grassing are completed, the dust problem will disappear and the river banks will become much more attractive and inviting to nearby residents.

As each area of the scheme is developed, comments are sought from respective councils, local residents and other interested parties prior to final plans being prepared. To date, many positive and constructive suggestions have been put forward and incorporated in the works carried out. A booklet, entitled *River Torrens Linear Park and Flood Mitigation Scheme* outlines the nature and extent of the scheme and is available to any member of the public who contacts the Engineering and Water Supply Department in Victoria Square.

YATALA LABOUR PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: My question is to the Chief Secretary. Why was the review into officer demands at Yatala not considered by the Government immediately following its completion, so avoiding the sit-in staged by prisoners at Yatala recently, and because of the tension which has existed at Yatala and the potential for further confrontation between prisoners and prison officers? What immediate action will the Government take to implement the Swink recommendations following his review of the organisation and staff structure at Yatala and, because of the concern being expressed by the public, when will this report and recommendations be made public?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I think the honourable member has his facts somewhat astray. He asks why the Government did not act immediately upon a list of demands given to it by the officers at Yatala.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That's not what I asked.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Perhaps the honourable member can tell me what he did ask.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: I asked why was the review into officer demands at Yatala not considered by the Government immediately following its completion?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Officer demands?

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That's right; the review into officer demands that was carried out by the task force that you set up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Suddenly it all becomes clear. Probably the prime reason why the review has not been implemented is that it has not as yet reached the Minister and matters are still to be discussed. The honourable member shakes his head. I can assure him and his Leader that the task force has not yet reported to the Minister.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: That's different from what was in the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The task force has not yet reported to the Minister. The task force was charged to report to the Director, and then it would go to the Minister. The report will be addressed when it reaches my table. The original log of claims contained 15 items: three were rejected, three were agreed, and nine were a matter of discussion between the officers and the department. They are still the subject of discussion and, as I understand it, general agreement has been reached on most of them. When they are completed they will be brought to me for final decision.

The member wants to know how that affected the sit-in the week before last. To some extent I believe that it did, but I think honourable members ought to know that there is a feeling somewhat of anxiety within the prison system at the moment because those concerned know that this Government is making the necessary changes that should have been made over the years. Because this is happening, quite obviously those people who are concerned within the prisons, the people who work in the prisons, and the people who are there because of offences, are concerned that their situations are considered by the Government.

I would like to point out to anyone who has any doubts about this that the prison authorities and the Government in South Australia will be managing the prisons, and there is no doubt about that. The Swink Report was given to me last Friday. I am still considering it and after I have done that it will go to Cabinet for consideration and then it will be made public. The honourable member will be given a copy, and all members will have a copy available to them. I hope the Cabinet agrees, as I am sure it will, that that report, because it is such a good one, should have the widest circulation within the community in South Australia and it

will address many of the problems that the honourable member and all members know exist within the prison system in South Australia.

I think that the honourable member ought to be aware that the sit-in is a sign of encouragement for people of South Australia rather than one for despair, which is what the Leader would seem to indicate in a most irresponsible press statement on which I will comment in a moment. There was a list of demands. A potentially explosive situation prevailed at the prison. The Government made the decision, quite properly (the Acting Minister made the decision), that the management at Yatala Labour Prison ought to be given the opportunity to handle a list of administrative problems at that level without interference from the departmental head, without interference from the Minister. It is important, if our institutions are able to fulfil the functions for which they are there, that the people in charge of the institutions have the support and encouragement of the Government and are able to settle disputes at that level. Those disputes were settled.

An independent observer, a man with a history in criminology, a senior person within the prison industry and within academic circles, was fortunately at Yatala at the time of the sit-in. He said:

The new Operations O.I.C. (Mr George Belchev) and the Acting Superintendent (Mr Peter Priest) showed a quiet, confident, firm grasp of the situation and their dealings with staff were exemplary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: On a point of order, Sir, the Minister is quoting from a docket. I ask him to table the entire docket.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: May I continue with my reading, Sir?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister may continue with his reading and his explanation, but the practice is that, having quoted from a docket, he should table it. He can do it now or later.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: There seems to be a glib look on the faces of members opposite. I would suggest to them that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am beginning to take some umbrage at the discussion developing between a claue of people on one side and the Minister. I want addresses made to the Chair and, unless this disorderly conduct ceases, I will take the appropriate action.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The comments continued:

It appears that there is now an executive at head office controlling operations while on the spot Mr Priest's performance was the best I have seen in 30 years observations in prisons in Australia or overseas.

We must contrast that with the irresponsible press statement released by the Leader of the Opposition, when he tried to create an atmosphere of fear in the community of South Australia about what was happening in the prisons at the very time that a prison dispute in the Yatala Labour Prison was being handled in the best way that an expert has seen in 30 years of observing such occurrences in Australia. At that time we had the Leader of the Opposition saying that the prison officers were given no support by the Government; it was the prison officers in concert with leaders in the Yatala Labour Prison who dealt with this matter. It was not brought to the Government; it did not need to be brought to the Government, because it was handled efficiently and professionally.

We had the Leader of the Opposition saying that the Prisons Department was under the control of a press sec-

retary—a quite irresponsible statement for him to make, knowing that it would cause concern in the minds of people in South Australia. He knows, as I know, that press secretaries are the medium through which information is provided to the media. Mr Dawes, the department, and the Acting Minister (the Minister of Community Welfare) were totally in control of the situation. Fortunately, there was no need for them to become involved. That is a matter of encouragement, and not of despair.

The Leader commented that the former Government did much to upgrade conditions in prisons. He then said:

It appears that the present Administration is reverting to the attitude of the Dunstan era of completely ignoring prisons.

I point out to the Leader, the shadow Minister, and all members of the House that, when I came to this portfolio, there was no administrative structure at all within the Yatala Labour Prison. The Superintendent was in the Department of Correctional Services. The Acting Superintendent at the Yatala Labour Prison was in the process of transferring from the Adelaide Gaol to the Port Lincoln Gaol as Acting Superintendent. He went to the Port Lincoln Gaol as quickly as he could because he did not want the other position. Another Acting Superintendent currently is off work due to ill health. There has been a management at Yatala lacking in guidance and experience (and that is no reflection on those people who did their best under existing circumstances). We have created a new structure within the Yatala Labour Prison that will be in vogue within a few weeks. We believe that security in our institutions starts from the top and that there is no point in trying to address this problem from the bottom. There is no point in trying to start from the bottom.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Murray.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: We are implementing an administrative structure at the Yatala Labour Prison that will give the direction and guidance needed. I remind the honourable member that officers at the Yatala Labour Prison raised this matter with me some weeks ago, and it is a matter we have been addressing since that time. When the honourable member has the opportunity to read the Touche Ross Report he will understand that what we are doing fits in snugly with that report. I will not address myself to that subject now, because members ought to have the opportunity to view that report before I make further comment. The way in which the sit-in at the Yatala gaol was handled was an example of professional and competent administration by those persons at the Yatala Labour Prison, and they should be complimented on it.

The matters discussed with me by the officers, the general duties officers and the chief correctional officers have not been put to me for a final decision; when they are a decision will be made. I understand that there is general agreement between the department and the officers and the Touche Ross Report, which is now with me, is under consideration and will be given to Cabinet. Then, hopefully, copies will be provided to everyone in South Australia who has an interest in the report and who wishes to see what is in it. If the honourable member then wants to address this matter again we can debate it or I can answer questions, or in whatever fashion he wishes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I believe that the honourable Minister was asked to table the docket from which he read.

The Hon. G.K. KENEALLY: Very well.

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

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day. I must indicate that, pursuant to Standing Order 44, Other Business must be postponed until after the Address in Reply debate has been completed.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The principal object of this Bill is to make some modifications to the probationary licence scheme, which came into operation on 1 June 1980. At that time, the Government gave an undertaking that the scheme would be reviewed after a reasonable period of time and amendment made where it was found to be necessary or desirable. That review has been carried out, and the review team concluded that the probationary licence scheme has overall been most successful in creating an awareness in a new driver of his responsibilities to himself and others on the road. It is pleasing to note that the majority of new drivers succeed in getting through their first year of holding a licence either offence free, or with only one minor offence.

It has been found, however, that the penalty provision, that is, cancellation of a licence for committing a breach of conditions or committing a minor traffic offence, has resulted in hardship in many cases. Many young drivers require a licence in their employment or to travel to and from their place of employment, where it is not possible to use other forms of transport. It is apparent that some easing of the conditions can be made without detracting from the overall aims of the scheme.

The Bill removes the penalty of cancellation of a licence where a probationary driver breaches a probationary condition (other than the condition relating to blood alcohol levels). Where a breach of the conditions relating to carrying 'P' plates or not exceeding 80 kilometres per hour has been committed, the Registrar will have the power to extend or re-endorse probationary conditions for an extra three months. It should be noted that learner drivers who breach either of those conditions will continue to be liable to have their permits or licences cancelled. Cancellation will also still be available where either a learner or probationary driver breaches the condition relating to blood alcohol levels.

The Bill also proposes a change in relation to the number of demerit points a learner or probationary driver has to incur before losing his licence. Instead of reference to the consultative committee and possible cancellation of the licence upon reaching a points demerit score of three or more, reference will be made when the points score reaches four or more. As the majority of offences attract three points, most probationary drivers will therefore have to commit two offences before consideration is given to cancellation of the licence. The Bill also seeks to correct an anomaly arising out of one of the 1981 amending Acts.

Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 amend the sections of the Act that deal with the probationary conditions attached to both learner's permits and driver's licences. The amendment seeks to correct an oversight that occurred in one of the 1981 amending Acts. The relevant provisions of the Road Traffic Act relating to alcotests and breath analysis

were applied by that amending Act, but section 47e of that Act was omitted in error. If the probationary condition relating to blood alcohol levels is to be made fully effective, section 47e must be included in the list of applied sections.

Clause 4 provides that a probationary driver who breaches a probationary condition (not being the condition relating to blood alcohol levels) may have his probationary conditions extended for an extra three months, or if, by the time that he is convicted of or expiates the offence, he holds a clear licence or does not hold a licence at all, those conditions may be endorsed upon the licence for three months, or upon the next licence issued to him. Where a learner driver breaches any probationary condition, or where a learner or probationary driver breaches the blood alcohol condition, the existing situation will prevail, that is, the matter must be referred to the consultative committee for consideration of the question of cancellation. Where a learner driver or a probationary driver incurs four or more demerit points, the matter must similarly be referred to the consultative committee with a view to cancellation. Subsection (3), which gave the court power to direct that cancellation not occur, is repealed, as cancellation will now only be available in more serious circumstances. Appeals still lie, of course, against cancellation, on the grounds of hardship. The Registrar is given the power to require delivery up of a licence for the purpose of endorsement of conditions.

Clause 5 empowers the Registrar to require a licence holder to submit his licence for endorsement where the consultative committee exercises its power under section 82 to endorse probationary conditions upon the licence.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

At the end of 1978, a scheme was enacted whereby disabled persons could apply to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles for a special parking permit allowing extra time on parking meters and in parking zones of 15 or more minutes. The Act defines a disabled person as one who is unable to use public transport because of a permanent impairment in the use of his limbs and whose speed of movement is severely restricted as a result of that impairment.

Since the introduction of the permit system, there has been some pressure from the Totally and Permanently Disabled Soldiers' Association of Australia, and from various other organisations and private individuals, for a relaxation of the rather restricted criteria used in determining a person's eligibility for a permit. It has been pointed out that some persons suffering from severe respiratory or cardiac disorders cannot use public transport or walk at a normal pace as a result of their disorders. The Government therefore believes that the Act should be broadened to enable such persons to apply for parking permits.

The Government has consulted Sir Charles Bright, Chairman of the committee whose recommendations gave rise

to the original scheme, in relation to this Bill and has also discussed the proposal with the Adelaide City Council. Only 430 permits have so far been granted—a figure much lower than that originally anticipated. I therefore believe that the proposed broadening of the eligibility criteria would not put any undue pressure on the city's turnover in parking spaces.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes the reference to impairment in the use of a person's limbs, and substitutes a more general reference to any physical impairment in the use of a person's limbs, and substitutes a more general reference to any physical impairment. It should be borne in mind that the impairment must still be permanent, and must still result in an inability to use public transport and a severe restriction in speed of movement.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South-Eastern Drainage Act, 1931-1980. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal objective of the Bill is to provide for staggered elections of the two landholder members of the South-Eastern Drainage Board (a four person board) and also provide for the board to be consulted by the Minister prior to the appointment of future board chairmen. Under the present Act the landholder members are elected at the same time and concurrently serve three-year terms. Should both these members be defeated at an election, or both retire simultaneously and the two public servant members, who are appointed by the Governor, retire at or near the same time, the board would obviously lack experienced personnel.

The board desires to overcome this problem by providing in the Act for one landholder member to be elected at two-year intervals, and each to hold office for four years. This would ensure continuity of experience and minimise the disruptive effect changes in membership have on boards comprised of such a small number. Under the existing legislation the selection of the board chairman is the prerogative of the Minister and there is no requirement to consult the board on this matter or to seek its recommendation. However, it is considered that such a procedure should be adopted before future chairmen are appointed by the Governor. I seek leave to have the formal part of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The provisions of the Bill are as follows—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have to ask the Minister whether or not he has finished his second reading explanation. I will try to recapitulate what has just happened. The Minister appeared to have partly read a second reading explanation and then sought leave to have the formal part of that explanation inserted in *Hansard* without his reading it. I asked whether leave was granted to incorporate that formal material and an honourable member refused leave by calling 'No'. In those circumstances, I ask the Minister to complete his speech; if he has already completed it, that is all that will be in *Hansard*.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I wish to proceed with the remainder of the second reading explanation.

The SPEAKER: Very well.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 provides that clause 4 of the Act is to come into operation after the completion of the next board election. This means that the current landholder members will serve their present three-year term, and that thereafter elections will be held at two-year intervals. Clause 3 provides that landholder members of the board will be elected for four-year terms of office. One of the members elected at the next election is to hold office for only two years, thus providing for staggered retirements. Clause 4 provides for elections to be held every two years. Other consequential amendments are effected. This clause will come into operation after the next election is held under the Act. Clause 5 provides that the Governor shall not at any time appoint a Chairman of the board unless the Minister has first consulted with the board and considered any recommendation the board may wish to make.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 15 March. Page 313.)

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth): For the purposes of *Hansard*, I note that the incorrigible clock has cheated me of one minute, which almost inevitably and invariably seems to be the case when a member continues his speech from one day to the next. However, battling on against this tyranny of time, I shall continue to make my points in the reduced time left to me.

Mr Becker: Move for an extension of time.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: If any honourable member opposite wishes to move an extension of time for me, I am sure I can accommodate them. Last evening I was dealing with the subject of Government assistance and involvement in industry in this State. I am one of those people who believe that, given our existing economic circumstances in this State, we really do not have much option any more: we are either going to sit by quietly and watch what little remains of our industrial base slowly being frittered away, sold off, taken over, or exported overseas or to another State or, alternatively, we, as South Australians, both individually and through our Government, must intervene to ensure that industries and jobs remain here and, more importantly, expand here. It seems to me that this is the only choice.

The general philosophy and policy of the Tonkin Government, of sitting by and allegedly getting out of the road of industry, commerce and business, and waiting in the wings as it were in the hope that business would see some remarkable attractions in coming to South Australia, is just not going to work. It is the thinking of the 1930s and 1940s and, if we are to persist with that sort of approach, the only conclusion from pursuing that sort of policy will be a decline and eventually an eradication of the industrial base in this State.

The only way we can improve our position industrially as a manufacturing entity is with assistance from the Government to develop not only the existing small industries here (and I dealt with that aspect last evening) but also to establish industries in this State with Government expertise either bought, acquired, or existing. Yesterday, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was vocal in criticising Government

initiatives that had been taken by the Dunstan Government. Well, anyone could take a list of private entrepreneurs and demonstrate just as clearly that many of their projects had failed dismally and draw the conclusion from that premise that private industry is not efficient and cannot work either. Of course, that is just so much poppy-cock, and it was interesting to read in the *Advertiser* this morning that the South Australian Film Corporation is now reaching a stage of profitability.

Mr Becker: Very good.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: The member for Hanson wanted to sell off the corporation, but no doubt he is now carping about its proven success. Anyone in business knows that an enterprise such as a film corporation will not give an instant return: it will give a return over a period of years, because the films must be made and leased out, and the corporation will thereby get a rolling return on its expenditure. Over the years a film library of titles, over which the corporation has the copyright, is built up, so in this way both the revenue and the profitability of the organisation can be built up. I predict that in future the South Australian Film Corporation will be shown to be one of the most profitable enterprises in this State.

Mr Becker: It will never last that long.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I hope that the person in the corporation who reads through *Hansard* to find that sort of trivial comment will note that comment carefully. Obviously, it is a threat from the Liberal Party that, given the opportunity again (which that Party is not likely to get), it will do all in its power to destroy the corporation. Many other Government corporations are trading effectively in the interests of the nation, and many can be demonstrated to be trading effectively in the interests of South Australia, especially the State Bank, the South Australian Savings Bank, and the State Government Insurance Commission. I believe that those three institutions are excellent examples of South Australian Government community enterprises at work and, if we are to develop and expand our industrial and commercial bases in future, it is essential that the Government establish business enterprises on behalf of all South Australians.

Anyone opposing that type of proposal is rail-roading South Australia into a future of economic gloom and doom, because nowhere on the horizon is there any indication of a private organisation prepared to come to South Australia and set up an industry that will provide jobs on a large scale. No industry was likely to set up under the Tonkin regime, nor is there likely, under the Bannon Government, to be an industry coming here to set up which would provide jobs on a large scale. Because of that, the only chance we have of providing jobs for the 80 000 South Australians now unemployed is for the Government to take the initiative, using the best brains available in this State and elsewhere, and to set up trading corporations in the interests of the people of South Australia.

There will be a lot of ideological bunk spoken against this sort of proposal. I do not suggest for a moment that such organisations need to be set up and run specifically by the Government. I am suggesting that the Government ought to take the initiative on behalf of the people of South Australia and establish such corporations. Once they are running it may well be that it will be appropriate to issue shares to private shareholders for portions of the capital, or other mechanisms of control might be tried. However, it is necessary for the Government to take the initiative because the Government—and I emphasise this point—is the only organisation in our State which now has the financial power to be able to undertake the establishment of such industries. If one looks at the situation that existed 20 years ago one finds that there were 15 or 20 medium size companies in

South Australia which could take initiatives to establish and develop industries. That is no longer the case.

Mr Becker: Who destroyed them?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: They have been destroyed, as the honourable member would know, by the incompetence, in many cases, of some of the boards of directors in this State. The honourable member was merely looking for me to mention one in particular, he and I having had many discussions about the incompetence of the board of the Bank of Adelaide and the way in which that bank was destroyed as a South Australian institution. I believe that the Government has to take the initiative in this matter and I challenge members of the Opposition to take up the question of who will develop industries in South Australia if it is not the Government? Who will establish industries in this State? Will we get overseas enterprises investing in this State as we used to? I think not, simply because it is unlikely that large corporations such as motor vehicle manufacturers and steel companies will want to come to what is, in international terms, a backwater. That is simply the fact, and if we want to protect ourselves, our futures and the futures of our children, our Government will have to take a much more active role in creating and establishing industries for the good of this State.

I will deal now with a matter that has been raised in the past few days by the R.A.A. I saw in the press this week that the R.A.A. is suggesting that we should follow the example apparently set in Western Australia of installing cameras at traffic lights to catch motorists who are going through the red lights. When I read that article I initially thought that that did not seem to be a bad idea. The article said that the system worked very well in Western Australia, and somewhere else, as I understand it. I then started thinking about the likely cost of such an investment, and while it might be possible to recover the cost in an initial period through additional fines it seemed to me that that was an example of reasonably small thinking.

The malaise of Australian society is the way we simply think about a problem and try to find a solution in a relatively narrow fashion. I think that there is a much better way of resolving this sort of problem. If one is to spend money on cameras of this sort it would be better to install a system of synchronised or sequenced—and I do not care which of these words people prefer as I have heard arguments about them for a long time—traffic lights along the main roads in Adelaide.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That is what we are doing.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I appreciate that and I will get on to that in a moment. It would be much better to install a system of synchronised or sequenced set of traffic lights along the main roads and in the city area instead of spending money on these cameras, because synchronised traffic lights mean generally that far more of the traffic that is moving through is not required to stop at traffic lights. I think that the money that would be spent on this R.A.A. proposal would be far better expended if it were to be added to the relatively small amounts that we are spending at present on introducing synchronised lights in the city area. I think that we are only introducing them in the city at the moment.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Plus education; we could do with a lot more of that.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I believe that this money could be well spent on installing synchronised or sequenced lights on roads such as Goodwood Road, and particularly on South Road, Main North Road, Prospect Road, Main North-East Road and the like, and also for the benefit of my friend, the member for Henley Beach, most certainly Grange Road and possibly Brighton Road.

Mr Hamilton: What about Port Road?

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: I have a particular objection to that for football reasons which I will not mention here. If there were sufficient money available, I believe that a much greater education campaign could be instituted, a programme which would certainly go a long way toward improving the road habits of motorists. There is a problem with people jumping red lights, on the one hand, and trying to catch them, on the other, and everybody in this place, I am sure, would well understand that that is a problem. However, I think that money could be better spent in these two other areas than in putting in sneak cameras to catch people who are going through red lights.

I have been asked to conclude my remarks and, accordingly, I simply conclude by congratulating you again, Mr Speaker, on your appointment. I hope that when I speak in this debate again in 12 months there will be a far brighter economic horizon in South Australia and in our nation than there is at present. One cannot conclude a speech like this without reflecting on the disasters that have befallen us and that are around us at present that I referred to last night. I sincerely hope that the policies of our new Federal Government and our not-so-new State Government will lead to a much improved situation in South Australia so that people will again be able to look forward to a life of relatively good prosperity.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I support the motion and congratulate the Speaker on his appointment to his high office. I also congratulate all new members on their election to this House, particularly my colleagues, the members for Mitcham and Goyder. I congratulate the Labor Party for endorsing two women contesting seats which they won after intensive campaigning. I also congratulate the Federal Labor Government on its endorsement of women candidates in seats that were winnable by the Labor Party. I think that the election of those women to the Federal Parliament will certainly enrich the life of the nation.

I regret very much that the Liberal Party has been caught lagging in this respect and I hope that it will not be too long before my Party catches up with what are quite obviously the wishes of the community in terms of a more representative representation (if I can describe it in those terms) in our State and Federal Parliaments. There is no doubt that the election of women to Parliament will increase in the 1980s and I think that, if all Parties can ensure that that occurs, then the community will be the richer for it.

I would like to pay a tribute to those members of this place who retired at the last election, either voluntarily or involuntarily, in particular, the former member for Brighton, Mr Dick Glazbrook who, throughout his term in this Parliament, was a great support to me as Minister of Tourism with his knowledge of the industry, his continuing interest in the industry and his very diligent approach to the problems of the industry.

I understand that Mr Glazbrook has now gone back into the tourist industry as a consultant, and I think that his services will be much valued by the industry in South Australia. We certainly need more people in South Australia who take a professional approach to tourism, which is certainly what Dick Glazbrook does.

Another former member to whom I would like to pay a tribute is the former member for Hartley and former Premier, Mr Des Corcoran, who, I knew as a local colleague who shared an electorate boundary with the electorate of Coles. He worked with me to represent the people of the City of Campbelltown and I always enjoyed a good personal working relationship with Des Corcoran. I appreciate the fact that in matters to do with local government he and I were always able to take a bipartisan approach, and I think that we

never differed—certainly, publicly—in our efforts to assist the Campbelltown council to carry out its responsibilities.

I express my gratitude to the people of the electorate of Coles for their continued confidence in me. Immediately after the 1979 election, when there was a 10 per cent swing to the Liberal Party in Coles, there having been a narrow victory for the Liberal Party in the 1977 election, I recognised that if people can swing 10 per cent one way they can swing 10 per cent the other way. That is precisely what happened. The factors that contributed to that swing were those that have contributed to swings all around Australia. There are a significant number of families in the electorate of Coles who are paying off mortgages and who have experienced all of the difficulties associated with doing that due to the high interest rates applying over recent years. Also, there are a significant number of teachers in the electorate of Coles, and I believe that the part played by the South Australian Institute of Teachers in the State election must have influenced members of the teaching profession in the electorate that I represent and in other marginal electorates.

I note with interest the debate that continues in the columns of the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal, to which reference is made in this evening's *News* concerning the propriety of a so-called professional body, more accurately described now as an industrial body, taking an active party-political role. I think that it will be to the long-term detriment of the profession if SAIT continues in this role, and I believe that it is important for teachers who are concerned about the future of their profession and about the future of education to stand up and be counted and to ensure that the leadership of SAIT embodies people whose sole aim is to ensure the furtherance of the profession and the benefits of children in education. It might well be said that the leadership of SAIT believes that it is pursuing that goal now. However, I say that the community of South Australia is becoming disenchanted with the profession, and the vast majority of teachers who do not pursue a Party-political line must suffer as a result of this (I know that they do, because many have told me that that is the case).

Unless that vast majority of teachers express their view forcibly through the channels open to them, by way of the institute, then education in South Australia will suffer. It must suffer, because if the individual practitioners of a profession can no longer hold up their heads in society and feel that they are professionals, with all that that entails, namely, the pursuance of an ethic which puts their service to the community ahead of all other considerations (certainly, ahead of power struggles), then the children of the late twentieth century and the twenty-first century will certainly suffer. I do not want to see that happen. There needs to be a great deal of soul searching among those in the teaching profession.

I want to devote the principal part of my speech to issues confronting the tourism industry. I was honoured to be appointed by my Leader as the shadow Minister of Tourism. I believe it is significant that this portfolio has been allotted as a single portfolio in recognition of the extraordinary importance of the tourism industry in South Australia and its economic development and prosperity. At no time in the past has this been done. I recognise the fact that over the three years when the Tonkin Government was in office the combined demands of a very heavy human service portfolio, namely, health, and an economic development portfolio at a critical time, namely, tourism, were very heavy for one Minister. I never identified how much time I spent on either of those portfolios, but I tried to do my utmost in both cases.

I believe that the time has come for State Governments and the Federal Government to recognise the importance of tourism and to not lump it in with any a number of grab

bag portfolios, as is the case at present with the extraordinary combination of correctional services, police and tourism. Tourism should be given the priority it deserves and be placed under the control of a senior Cabinet Minister, who should be given sufficient time to pursue all the interests that are inevitably involved with its development.

I want to sound a note of extreme disappointment, to the point of condemnation of the new Federal Government for its failure to recognise the importance of tourism and include a representative of the tourism industry at the national economic summit conference. There are cries of alarm from the Government benches, indicating the very root of this whole problem: politicians on both sides and in all Houses of Parliament in Australia (and I believe that the member for Albert Park might be with me on this, because he has taken an interest in tourism) have failed to recognise the extraordinary economic, social, political and cultural importance of tourism to the nation and to the world, insisting on sweeping it aside as some kind of froth and bubble portfolio.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The member for Henley Beach says that I will be wanting the milk man there next. I point out to the honourable member that the occupation of milk man is one that can benefit from the development of tourism. In fact, there is not one single industry in this country, or in the world, except the defence industry, that does not significantly benefit from the development of tourism. That fact should be indelibly printed on the mind of every politician in this country, but we have a long way to go before that occurs.

The banking, construction, manufacturing, transport, agriculture, mining and retail industries will all be represented at the national conference, but tourism, which is Australia's best hope as a generator of jobs speedily and effectively, will not be represented there, yet the generation of jobs is supposed to be what the economic summit conference is all about. I know that Sir Peter Abeles, who is the Managing Director and Deputy Chairman of Thomas Nationwide Transport and the Joint Chief Executive Officer of Ansett Transport Industries Limited is going to be at the conference.

It is no use Mr Hawke saying that people like Sir Peter Abeles can speak for tourism. Sir Peter can speak for transport, the airline industry or the accommodation industry. Those three industries are, of course, critical components of the tourism industry. Sir Peter has not the authority to speak for the industry as a whole, nor would he claim to speak for the industry as a whole.

Tourism is an extraordinarily diverse and complex industry all under one umbrella. It needs an umbrella organisation to speak for it at a national conference like this one. Those industries are far too important to be left out of the summit conference. The perspective which individual industries like transport, airlines, and accommodation need for their own interests, needs to be broadened to include the interest of the industry as a whole and its development. That will not happen unless Mr Hawke agrees to invite an organisation such as the Australian Travel Industry Association to that conference, so that that umbrella organisation can put forward a co-ordinated view. This morning, I sent a telegram to the Prime Minister urging that course of action. It states:

Urge you to recognise the importance to Australia's economy of tourism by including tourism industry representation and your tourist Minister—

Mr Brown is not even going to be at that conference—

—at the economic summit conference. Tourism in Australia is one of the few growth industries providing opportunities for the nation to employ young people, women and migrants. It is a naturally decentralised industry capable of adding employment stability to towns and regions which suffer from a narrow economic

base and/or which are exposed to seasonal and market fluctuations in the agricultural sector—

Heaven knows, the market fluctuations in the agricultural sector are hitting Australia harder now than they have done over many, many decades. The telegram continued:

Every single industry in this country, except defence, benefits from tourism growth. It is essential that an industry organisation such as the Australian Travel Industry Association has the opportunity to put a co-ordinated case for the industry at the conference. Please remember that tourism is of greater economic value to Australia than mining and motor manufacturing and is second only to agriculture in terms of annual value to our country. The industry must not be left out of a summit conference.

Copies of that telegram have been sent to the Premier of South Australia, the Minister of Tourism in South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra, the Chairman of the South Australian Tourism Industry Council, and the new Federal Minister for Tourism—who I notice does not rank near the top of the new Cabinet (he is No. 15) and who shares that portfolio with the portfolio of Sport and Recreation. The linking of tourism with sport and recreation simply demonstrates what has become an article of faith and what is absolutely false. Tourism is an economic development portfolio. It is not a fun and games portfolio and should not be linked with recreation and sport. If it is going to be linked with any other portfolio it should be linked with a service or economic development portfolio such as transport.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: I have already acknowledged that that was an inappropriate linking. My Leader has acknowledged that and I feel sure that members will not see any Liberal Government in future linking tourism with anything other than economic development. That is something that should benefit the state of the nation when that is recognised.

I will refer briefly to the situation of the tourism industry when the Tonkin Government came to office, because I think it is important to put into perspective the achievements of the last three years and to use the level of achievement at the time we left office in November 1982 as a benchmark for what can occur in three years of intensive effort. It is important that in three years time we can again measure what has occurred. I stress that the achievements of the last three years were made in the light of a downturn when we came to office.

The present Government has been fortunate enough to inherit solid foundations for further growth which were laid from mid-1980 onwards. To assess the position of tourism in South Australia when the Tonkin Government came to office, it is interesting to look at a paper prepared by the Department of Tourism at my request in February 1980. That paper attempted to portray South Australia's relative position in the area of tourism in 1980 and to show how that position had been reached as a result of policies adopted over the previous five years. The review certainly demonstrated the need for bold decisions to be taken at once if our State was to participate strongly in the considerable economic and social benefits which would result from the tourism expansion of the 1980s.

What did I find when that report was presented to me? It is unfortunate that *Hansard* cannot reproduce graphs because if it were able to reproduce graphs we would see a graph that shows an almost 45 degree down-turn in three respects between the years 1973-74 and 1978-79: in terms of international tourism as a percentage of the national total, South Australia went steadily downhill; in terms of promotional expenditure as a percentage of the national total South Australia went steadily downhill; and in terms of intrastate tourism as a percentage of the national total South

Australia went steadily downhill. On page 8 of the paper 'Tourism in South Australia: the Current Position', it states:

This erosion of South Australia's competitive position has occurred in each of the major sectors of tourist activity . . . South Australia had lost market share between 1973-74 and 1978-79 in each of the intrastate, interstate and international travel segments.

I recommend to anyone who is interested in the industry to read the facts and figures in this paper which argues that a major contributing factor to the process of decline in the tourism industry in South Australia was our lesser performance in terms of the growth of Government expenditure in tourism, particularly advertising and promotional expenditure, when compared with other States.

What was the story when we left Government? Again, the facts and figures can be found in an excellent newsletter produced by the Department of Tourism entitled *Tourism Research Newsletter*. The issue of 4 December, in effect, summarises growth in the previous three years. On page 6, it states, under the heading 'National Trends' that throughout Australia the total number of domestic trips recorded in the 12 months ended June 1982 was an increase of only 1.7 per cent, and that this national growth rate is well down on the 5.9 per cent growth recorded in 1980-81 in South Australia and the 6.8 per cent growth recorded in 1979-80.

It is significant that when those figures were released, and as they became available (and this is simply a summary), the good news was treated in a very modest fashion by the South Australian media. If there is a down-turn we are likely to see headlines, but a significant growth rate in an industry which has the capacity to create employment, particularly among women migrants and young people, did not rate anything significant in the way of headlines.

Mr Lewis: Typical.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It may be typical but, somehow or other, and using all the persistence at our command, we have to change that attitude. The newsletter continues:

At the same time the average trip duration increased, resulting in a 4.7 per cent increase in the number of nights spent away from home.

Of course, for every additional night spent away from home, in addition to the increase in the number of visitors, there is increased expenditure in local regional economies which significantly benefits those towns and regions. So, although the travel industry was depressed throughout Australia last year, South Australia achieved healthy growth. Total domestic trips, that is, South Australians travelling within their own State, were 6 per cent more than in 1980-81, but perhaps the most pleasing aspect of South Australia's healthy travel performance was the re-emergence of the State as a destination for interstate travellers. There, we increased our performance by an impressive 9.5 per cent. Again, it was impressive not only in actual terms but also in comparative terms when looking at the other States and the nation.

There was also a healthy increase in the various regions in South Australia. The largest increases in visitation occurred on Eyre Peninsula, the Riverland, Adelaide (the city of Adelaide being the principal tourist destination in South Australia), Fleurieu Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, the Flinders Ranges, the Lower Murray and the Mid-North. I could quote for some time the statistics in this excellent document. Suffice to say that the growth that has occurred simply indicates the enormous potential of the growth that could occur. If this growth was achieved simply by the injection of not a large sum (certainly significant in terms of the overall tourist budget but not large in terms of the other portfolios, particularly the human service portfolios in the State Budget)—if we can achieve that growth, which results in job creation, by injecting a \$1 000 000 or so increase in the tourist budget, think what we could do if a South

Australian Government were to commit itself resolutely to tourism development in the same way as did the Government of British Columbia in Canada. When I say that I am conscious of the fact that tourism development must be controlled if it is to enhance the lifestyle of the residents of the local area. It must not be allowed to occur in such a way that it has an adverse impact.

I can refer to your electorate, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, as an example. The City of Port Adelaide has enormous potential for tourism development. Such development would greatly enhance your constituents' lifestyle and improve the facilities available to them. The restoration of historic buildings in that area would aesthetically enhance Port Adelaide, which is already a beautiful but slightly shabby city (and I do not say that unkindly). The employment that would result from visitations to those restored buildings would give a tremendous lift to the morale of people living in that area. It would generate all kinds of not only economic but social and cultural benefits and would enrich the lives of people who at the moment do not have a great deal to look forward to in terms of job opportunities, recreation or personal fulfilment. Port Adelaide is a classic example.

Other classic examples are the towns of the Iron Triangle which on the surface one might say are hardly likely spots for visitors. Yet, as a base for exploring regions and because of their own intrinsic interest which their own residents often tend to overlook, those towns have potential which if realised could be of immense benefit to the State. The *Tourism Research Newsletter* contains an interesting section on page 8 entitled 'The opportunity for low-cost accommodation'. It states:

Two other forms of low-cost accommodation must not be overlooked. Many older hotels with standard bedrooms offer bed and breakfast at very competitive rates and certainly qualify as low-cost accommodation. While guests must walk down the passage to use the facilities, the inconvenience is more than overcome by the value provided. These older hotels are to be found throughout the State and many are in desirable locations in the Adelaide Hills and at country and suburban beaches.

It is timely and fortuitous that I am making this speech on the day that the Australian Hotels Association has launched its Town and Country Pub Gold Star Hospitality promotion. I commend the A.H.A. for its enterprise in recognising the enormous resource that South Australia has at its disposal in regard to old pubs (that is the best way we can describe them: everyone knows what we mean when we say 'old pubs'). Throughout the State, in both the city and the country, we have magnificent examples of mostly Victorian architecture and some early nineteenth century architecture. In Adelaide we have some much more recent architecture in hotels which, over the last three decades, have downgraded their accommodation role and have relied almost exclusively on their bar trade, bottle departments and, to some extent, their dining-rooms.

The hotel industry is now realising the wealth of this resource. Its Director, Mr Bill Spurr, and its Chairman, Mr Peter Whallin, have developed a scheme which will enable these hotels to market their accommodation under the banner 'Town and Country Pubs'. There are 44 hotels which have so far been registered under the banner and which are going to stress their traditions of hospitality, traditional character and moderate cost. This morning a launching breakfast was held at the Brecknock Hotel, and the Minister of Tourism, the Hon. Mr Keneally, spoke with warmth and feeling of the importance of the role of the town and country pub in the development of tourism in South Australia.

I well recall that my own introduction to tourism as a child was in just such hotels. I came fairly near the end of the family, and my father would take my mother, younger sister and me for occasional weekends in the country. We often went to the Barossa Valley, which was close to home:

one could be there on a Friday night and return on the Sunday evening and not lose any working time. The pub we stayed at was Crabb's Hotel at Angaston, which provided excellent accommodation. It was in the centre of an immensely interesting district and offered warm hospitality. We used to strike out and explore the Barossa Valley from the Angaston hotel in the same way as I hope many South Australians will strike out and explore the local areas from the town and country pubs registered with the Australian Hotels Association directory. In those days, the early 1950s, most of the roads in the Barossa Valley were white gravel roads. They ribboned their way through the green vineyards. They were beautiful to look at although a little gritty to walk on, but they certainly enhanced the peacefulness of the scenery. Then, as now, the Barossa Valley offered a tremendous amount for the weekend visitor to do and see in the space of two days. I place on record my congratulations to the Hotels Association, my good wishes to all members who have registered their pubs, and my confidence that these pubs are on a good thing. The promotion has been well thought out, the marketing is excellent and the promotional material stresses the fact that the most enjoyable part of a stay in a town and country pub is free, namely, the charm, atmosphere and hospitality. Along with that one gets a comfortable bed in a nice clean room. Also, in country towns one gets immediate access to all the knowledge one would need of that town.

The pub is often the centre, the hub, of the community's activities. The publican is aware of all that is going on in the town and the district, and the guest really has a mini tourist information centre right at the end of the passage if he or she wants to use it to good effect.

Having spoken about the need for growth in the industry, the foundation for growth in the industry, the need for recognition of its importance by Governments, the media and the industry itself, I stress that education is a key factor in all those issues that I have just listed. In regard to education, the South Australian Tourism and Hospitality Industry Training Committee is undoubtedly the key body with the responsibility in this area. The industry training committees are voluntary committees which are established with the objective of developing systematic training for specific industries, be they motor manufacturing, mining, clay and ceramics, dairy processing, drilling, timber, road transport, retailing or wool producing—you name it, and there is probably a hospitality training committee that has a responsibility for that industry.

The committee in South Australia is an autonomous tripartite body established under the aegis of the National Training Council to develop and co-ordinate training within the tourism and hospitality industry in South Australia. Quietly and unobtrusively, that committee has gone about its job. There has been little in the way of headlines or commendation but there has been a great deal in the way of solid achievement. The long-term goals of the committee are to continue to document existing sources of manpower supply and training practices and to monitor and project the effect of structural changes within the industry, which will be significant in tourism as more and more people, for one reason or another—either early retirement or increased leisure and recreation, whether voluntarily or involuntarily—will need to come to grips with those social changes which will result in structural change.

Another goal is to survey or direct outside surveys of manpower and training needs to determine the people and skills required now and in the future. The committee recommends to the various tertiary education authorities programmes of action to improve manpower selection and development; it provides continuing and co-ordinated guidance on manpower issues, notably those affecting training

development and it provides that information for the national umbrella organisations. The result of that effort is that the College of Technical and Further Education at Regency Park is providing courses that are directly related to the present and emerging needs of the industry. For example, at the moment in South Australia there is an extraordinary shortage of qualified cooks at all levels, be they cooks with fairly basic qualifications required for serving employees in camps or cooks with basic catering requirements, right up to the top-level chefs in top-grade restaurants.

The work being done at Regency Park—and I acknowledge the foresight of the Dunstan Labor Government in establishing that college for this purpose—is of immense value to the industry. It needs to be expanded, and I hope that the Minister of Education and the Minister of Tourism can get together to ensure that the resources that must be made available if we are to cope with the growth in the industry which will occur in the coming decade are made available, because if they are not there will be an adverse effect on the economic growth of the State.

I would like to refer to one of the courses being conducted at Regency Park. This new course, which could not be called strictly a technical course but which I suppose is a basic course as part of further education for the tourism industry, is called the In-bound Tourism Course. The aim of this course is to provide a comprehensive knowledge base of South Australia's tourist facilities, to provide a working knowledge of the skills required to successfully plan, sell, market and operate in those industries and facilities and to develop in the student a co-ordinated approach to the South Australian tourist industry. I enrolled as a foundation student in the first course, and I am immensely impressed with the work, thought and care that has gone into the development of the curriculum, with the quality of the lecturers and with the foresight that has been shown. There are only 21 students in the course which runs one day a week for 10 weeks. The second course will commence in June or July.

It could be said that that is a small dent to make in developing professionalism in the tourist industry, but as the Chinese proverb says, 'The longest journey starts with a single step.' The continuing sustained thread throughout the comments of every lecturer is the need to develop professionalism, the need to ensure that standards of service are high. Service is what tourism is all about. Tourism is the flowers on the table, the chocolate on the pillow, the shine on the silver and the smile on the face of the receptionist. Very often the little things in tourism that are directly related to the warmth and quality of the human service provided can be more important, more memorable and more effective in bringing people back to a locality than the quality of the sunset, the height of the hills or the green of the grass. It really is an industry that relies very much indeed on the human element to ensure that it runs as it should.

I am impressed with the course so far. Whilst quite clearly a former Minister is bound to find that a lot of information about the industry is familiar, there is always a great deal that one can learn, and even if the information is familiar it is interesting to see what is being taught to other students, the manner in which it is being taught and the general style and approach. Having noted, admittedly on the strength of only two lectures so far, the quality that is there, I believe that good foundations are being laid.

When I started this speech, I referred to the need for tourism representation at the economic summit conference. I want to conclude by again stressing that need. The efforts of everyone at the moment are being bent towards job creation: why is it that very few State Governments recognise that tourism has a greater capacity to create jobs than agriculture, that it has a greater capacity than manufacturing,

because of the long lead times, and that it has a greater capacity than mining? It is a service industry that uses people. It can quickly train unskilled people. It can quickly train people who are young and who have had little experience that would normally be required for employment. Even the youngest and most inexperienced boy or girl can find a place in the tourism industry if we can generate the growth and the demand which will bring visitors from all over Australia to our State and from all over the world to our country.

Because of the diversity of the tourist industry, figures are somewhat difficult to obtain, although in the past five or six years the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the Bureau of Industry Economics have certainly contributed much basic data required for planning by the Governments involved in the industry. In September 1982, the then acting Minister for Industry and Commerce (Mr Wal Fife) released a statement that indicated the value of tourism in Australia. The figures I am about to use do not include post-trip and pre-trip expenditure by tourists, whereas such expenditure is significant. After all, if one is going to the beach for a holiday one is likely to equip oneself with a new beach bag, towel and bathers.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Not for Maslins.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Possibly not, but one would certainly need sunburn cream. The pharmacist, the newsagent, the draper, the restaurateur: there is no-one who does not benefit from tourism.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: How about the candlestick maker?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Surely the Minister has been to restaurants and seen the candlesticks placed on the table and burning by the dozen. Even without post-trip or pre-trip expenditure, the figures indicate that in Australia during the year ended September 1982 domestic tourist expenditure totalled \$5 800 000 000 and expenditure by day trippers \$1 800 000 000. Expenditure in Australia on international tourism during that year was \$1 100 000 000. The total of such expenditure, even on a conservative basis, was \$8 000 000 000. Those figures do not take into account the multiplier effect of tourist expenditure (namely, for every \$1 spent \$2.62 is generated as expenditure in the local economy). Therefore, on those figures tourism is significantly more valuable to Australia than is motor vehicle manufacturing, and in employment terms it is more valuable than mining. For these reasons, it can no longer be ignored or set aside by Governments. It should not be lumped with other portfolios, either significant or insignificant, and it must not be left out of national conferences. Governments must play their part, and the industry must play its part.

Members of the tourist industry, in this State at least, would be the first to recognise that their strength lies in their cohesiveness and that the accommodation industry, transport industry, retailing industry, attractions industry and, in this State, the wine industry, as well as many other industries, should get together to make their representations to the Government to give them a strength that cannot be ignored or overlooked.

Since the Tonkin Government left office, tourism in this State has gone off the boil. Projects which were in the pipeline and for which expenditure had been approved in the Budget have not been proceeded with, and the results are already being seen and felt. Promotions that were planned to take place in New Zealand have not taken place, and it must be remembered that tourist promotion involves a short lead time between the marketing and the sale of the product.

It is already clear that the Auckland-Adelaide air route, upon which we pinned such high hopes and into which I put such efforts to ensure that the planes were filled, is already tailing. I certainly want to know why those pro-

motions in New Zealand have not gone ahead. Why have not the joint ventures planned between the airlines and the South Australian Government to market South Australia in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane not gone ahead in February and March as they were planned to do? The figures that will be released next year to indicate what will have occurred in the September quarter of this year will show up the inadequacies of the present Minister in failing to make the decisions that would enable action to be taken now and, indeed, action that should have been taken two or three months ago.

Within one term of office (that is, within a short three years) the upturn or the downturn of the industry can be seen. At the end of three years, or however long the Bannon Government retains office, if South Australians see a downturn similar to that which was evident when the Tonkin Government came to office, the Bannon Government will be grossly culpable and answerable to the tourist industry for its neglect. The industry has got its act sufficiently together not to stand for neglect, being brushed aside, for budget cuts, for procrastination, or for failure to come to decisions.

Far too much is at stake for that to be allowed to occur and, although tourism is allegedly the principal portfolio of the Minister in terms of the way he is named in public and in this House, I venture to suggest that in terms of time and of column-inches of publicity he is reported more in his secondary portfolio as Chief Secretary, which I concede is also an extremely important portfolio, than as Minister of Tourism. This has been an eye-opener to people in the tourism industry who cannot help noticing that, when they see photographs of the Chief Secretary, he is usually making statements on his Government's performance on prisons. That is an important subject and I give him credit for that, but he and his press secretary would know that many more column-inches are given to his work as Chief Secretary than to his work as Minister of Tourism, whereas it is important that the tourism industry and the community at large should see a standard bearer and an advocate, someone prepared to fight in the interests of members of that industry.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: In a T-shirt?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: In a T-shirt or whatever else is appropriate to the occasion. I serve notice on the Premier that, if he pursues, as he has stated he will pursue, the course of setting up a tourist commission, and, if he goes as far as his colleague in the Victorian Parliament has gone (namely, to establish a commission and then abolish the Ministry), he will face a revolt from the South Australian tourist industry. It is absolutely outrageous that a Ministry of Tourism should not exist in Victoria, although such a state of affairs is understandable when there is a former Premier at the head of the commission and when we know of his unwillingness to share the limelight with a Minister of Tourism.

The reality is that tourism needs strong advocacy in Cabinet, someone answerable to Parliament, and someone at the political level who will fight for the needs and the future of the industry. I have expressed myself to the Minister, and I again ask him to note what I have said, because the industry will certainly be taking note of it. The benchmarks for 1979 and 1982 have been set, and the question is where the industry will be in 1985-86.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, I support the motion and ask you to convey my congratulations to the Speaker on his election to office for the term of this Government. I welcome new members to this Chamber, especially my colleagues from Mitcham and Goyder. I would also like to pay a tribute to those members who left the Parliament after the last session. All of them, without

exception, put in an enormous amount of work in their electorates and I am sure that, regardless of a variance in political persuasion, we had men who were willing to work to the best of their ability and to utmost extremes for the good of the constituents that they represented.

I would also like to thank the electors of Morphett for once again returning me as their member. I think that the results in Morphett are perhaps worth placing on public record, because they were a disaster for the Labor Party in that campaign. The swing in Morphett on that occasion was 3.6 per cent as against a State-wide swing averaging around 7.8 per cent, and higher in some places. I think that for the local candidate in this case to achieve on behalf of the Party only a 3.6 per cent swing in Morphett, which certainly has some volatile boxes, indicates that either the Leader could claim that 3.6 per cent or the local candidate could claim that 3.6 per cent. However, either way it is a disaster for someone somewhere in the area. I take note of the figures and accept the fact that in Morphett we have now built up support for the work that has been done there, and I would hope that in the next three years I can give the electors of Morphett the same service as they have received in the past.

I would not be at all surprised if in the redistribution we see an attempt by the Labor Party to wipe out Morphett. It has now attempted to replace me at two elections, without success, and perhaps the only way that it will remove me from Morphett is to redraw the boundaries so that Morphett ceases to exist. If that happens, I can assure honourable members that I will still be around in this place afterwards.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: In the early part of my remarks I would like to refer to the campaign that was conducted around the Morphett District, and I would particularly like to talk about issues. I am not interested in talking about the personalities but, rather, the issues that were presented by both Parties. The tactic employed against me, which is perhaps fairly common in most electorates, was to go out with market research and determine the expectations of the public and then to go around knocking on doors and ensuring that those expectations are talked about. After the candidate or doorknocker has been around the area doorknocking, newsletters are put out saying, 'I have called on all the homes in the electorate and the following issues were raised.' This happened in my electorate, and it certainly happened in other electorates; it will happen, because that is the nature of political campaigning.

I would like to take up a few of those issues that were raised in Morphett and to look at them and to take the opportunity of rebutting them on this occasion. It was claimed that interest rates was one issue that everyone at the doors talked about. It certainly would have been discussed around the district: I have no doubt about that, but certainly nowhere near the depth of discussion that is in these newsletters. One comment in a newsletter states:

Furthermore, the restrictive economic policies of the Tonkin Liberal Government have contributed to a severe down-turn in the building industry within the State.

In reply, it is interesting to look at the record of the Tonkin Government at that time. It is interesting to note in reference to that comment by the A.L.P. sub-branch that the Liberal Government increased State funding that had been authorised by the Liberal Party by some \$49 000 000. That is not insignificant.

Those who were here may recall that the State Government of the day was also able to inject new sources of funds. Some \$28 500 000 came in from the S.G.I.C., Superannuation Fund, and other sources. I think that that rather makes nonsense of the statement that was put around my district

that the Liberal Government was doing nothing at all for the housing industry.

I refer to some other statistics. There were 5 868 tenants housed for the first time during 1980-81, the highest number in any one year. Yet, we have the A.L.P. saying that we were not doing anything. Another interesting statistic is in the area of cottage flats. In 1978-79, the last year of the A.L.P. Government, some 64 pensioner cottage flats were commenced in the metropolitan area. In 1979-80, when we came into office, 239 were commenced. In 1980-81, 254 were commenced. In 1981 to March 1982, 289 were commenced. Of course, these figures can be backed up by facts in official documents.

I refer to small business, and I think that this was a magnificent attempt by the A.L.P. to really pull the wool over the eyes of the public on a subject which they could not actively debate and on which they did not have statistics. It was very easy for them to come up with statements such as this:

Small business has suffered as a consequence of mismanagement of the State's economy. In 1980-81 a total of 2 000 bankruptcies occurred in South Australia. This figure is alarming, given that small businesses provide 60 per cent of the total employment in the private sector.

The last sentence is correct; the rest of it is totally misleading, because, when one sees the official figures of the South Australian share of national bankruptcies, one finds that the percentage of the national total peaked not during the time of the Tonkin Government but in the 1978-79 financial year. If it peaked in 1978-79, it would have peaked because of what was happening in the business community prior to 1978-79. For the whole of the Tonkin Administration the percentage of bankruptcies dropped consistently right through the period when that Government was in office, which makes a complete lie of that statement in that newsletter circulated around my district. Another statement in the newsletter is this:

A Bannon Government will take initiatives in stimulating small business by expanding and upgrading the role of the Small Business Advisory Unit, and will improve the access of small business to finance.

What they did not say in that document about what the A.L.P. had in mind for small business (and it is no different now because the manifesto is still on the books of the State council) is that the South Australian Labor Government is committed to Government enterprise competing with private business. I think that that was the main thrust of the Address in Reply speech of the member for Elizabeth, who put forward reasons why the State should get involved in the business community and in the structure of companies. He has not quite developed how far that would go and what the State's shareholding structure would be. I would be fascinated to find out what the member for Elizabeth envisages as suitable shareholdings, so that the State would have interests in these companies which he sees as necessary to get the private sector going again.

The Liberal Party also is committed to quarterly c.p.i. rises, plus productivity increases, long service leave entitlement increases after five years, leave loadings of up to 25 per cent, six months notice to retrench, significantly increased benefits for retrenched employees, and a restrictive new consumer protection scheme enforced through an involvement in business management. None of those factors was included in the newsletter that castigated the Tonkin Government for its lack of attention to the problems of small business.

The next newsletter is an attack on the Tonkin Administration for daring to raise bus, tram and train fares, electricity, water, and motor vehicle registrations. I think that that is interesting, and I believe that the local sub-branch will rue the day that it put out in one of its newsletters a

statement that probably will be trotted out again and again. It states:

Increased State charges present us with the same result as increased State taxes—the public pays.

The Labor Party will rue the day that it ever made that statement. The Bannon Government has already commenced increasing State charges and, of course, the public does pay. A further statement was made as follows:

The Labor Government will intervene on petrol pricing on your behalf.

That means that people were advised by a local sub-branch that the Labor Party was going to introduce price control on petrol. I shall not comment on that and we will wait for the Government to make further policy statements. It is interesting that in most cases statements made during a campaign are quite irresponsible.

I refer to another pamphlet that was issued concerning the Adelaide Airport. Honourable members will recall that members of the A.L.P. sub-branch in the area adjacent to the airport moved around the area with petitions, and so on, to generate a feeling in the community that the local candidate was opposed to international flights coming into the airport, while at the same time the former shadow Minister of Tourism (the member for Gilles) and the former Leader of the Opposition were negotiating publicly with overseas countries to bring flights in. Of course, these were totally conflicting views. On a statewide level the leaders of the Labor Party were saying that we desperately needed international flights, while the local candidate was running around saying that he was opposed to them. This caused a great deal of confusion in the area.

I want to refer to what I consider to be the most scurrilous statement I have ever seen in print concerning a personal attack. It was contained in one of the pamphlets which stated:

The erratic performance of the Chief Secretary has led, amongst other things, to speculation about corruption in the South Australian Police Force.

One does not have to read that many times to realise the clear intent of the man who put out this pamphlet, namely, to try to write corruption into the actions of the Chief Secretary. I thought that was a disgraceful performance. This occurred in the House under Parliamentary privilege, but I do not know why someone was not sued for putting out such a document in the electorate. It was possibly because of the good nature of the man involved that nothing came of it.

This leads to an interesting aspect of what has happened in South Australia, *vis-a-vis* the attacks made on the former Chief Secretary some time ago. It is all very well now that the A.L.P. is in Government, but we can well recall how the Labor Party performed at the time of the Tognalini episode and the way that it attacked mercilessly the position of Chief Secretary concerning this affair, the apprehension and custody of prisoners, and so on. This may be boring for members opposite, but it is not boring for the people who are concerned about the matter which I am about to bring to the attention of the House.

Let us look at what the new Chief Secretary has done since taking over. He was the man who stood in this place day after day and castigated his counterpart opposite for the escapes and for what was happening. It is interesting to note what has occurred since the new Chief Secretary has been on the Government benches. In future he may have a little more humility when he is back on the Opposition benches. A press article described prison incidents as follows (I will not name those involved):

9 November 1982—three escapees from Yatala, one was serving 10 years for rape.

15 November 1982—... described as dangerous and being held in connection with a series of offences, escaped from Yatala.

10 January 1983—three prison officers attacked in the maximum security 'B' division.

I know that the Minister is aware of these incidents, but I am making the public aware of them. The report continues:

16 January 1983—... described as dangerous, and serving 10 years for manslaughter, escaped from Yatala; and

8 February 1983—two prisoners escaped from Yatala, one serving a life sentence for murder, by hiding in food boxes on a truck.

While members opposite are in a humourous mood, thinking that this a great joke, let me refer to another article which appeared in the press and which highlights the lack of supervision somewhere along the line. The report states:

A 'fairly intoxicated' prisoner had stumbled out of Cadell Training Centre. It is believed that... had been unaware that he had escaped until he had sobered up after falling asleep.

That was the farcical situation of a prisoner being able to escape from custody in one of the institutions under the control of the Minister, but not knowing that he had escaped until he had sobered up. I do not think that members opposite should treat this as a joke, because when one looks through *Hansard* one can see the performance that the Minister put on when these events were occurring. When the present Chief Secretary is back in Opposition he would be well advised to be more careful before launching into such attacks which I thought were most disgraceful. In a political environment such as that in this place we come to expect the sort of thing that occurred in the past, but one does not expect attacks such as those that we had in those days. A state-wide pamphlet distributed in Glenelg and elsewhere, put out by the former Leader of the Opposition, begins by stating:

On 6 November South Australians have a clear choice. They can choose between energy or indecision.

As it has turned out, five months later, further words could be read into that, namely, the choice between energy, which was the former cohesive Tonkin Government, or indecision, which is already surrounding the present Government, this Government of indecision. Already the Premier has a reputation of being a man who cannot make a decision. He is indecisive and, as time goes on, this is becoming more and more evident to the people of South Australia.

He went on to say, 'South Australians are leaving our State in droves.' That was just a total untruth. It is well-known that in the quarter from January to March 1982 there was the largest influx of immigrants back into South Australia since records have been kept. Yet we have this man putting out a statement which is frankly quite untrue.

Under the heading, 'Jobs', we see five points. The last of which states:

We will introduce a direct job creation programme. We will involve local government and community organisations in our training and jobs programme.

That has not happened. Now, there will be an uproar and they will say 'What about the job creation scheme?' The job creation scheme, as we all know, is Federal money and the State Government cannot hop onto that band waggon, although it is desperately trying to do so. Five points are set out under 'Housing'. The fifth, which has been dealt with, states:

We will establish a Ramsay Trust to raise finance from private sector investors to enable lower income households to achieve home-ownership.

It has now been established that that has failed, and I will not develop that point any further.

Under the heading of 'Education' there are a couple of points, one of which says, 'We will reduce primary class sizes in schools'. That is interesting; that is all I wish to comment there. The House is well aware what has happened

in that area. Under the heading 'Resource Development', one point states:

The Bannon Government will give strong backing to resource and mineral development.

My question to the people of South Australia is, 'Are they genuine and will they?' Let us have a short look at Honeymoon and analyse what it is all about. Honeymoon is small compared with Roxby Downs and I understand that it offers only 50 job opportunities on site and 200 additional service jobs to be created in Adelaide. The important aspect is that, if the Government stops Honeymoon, Beverley will also be stopped, therefore incurring a further loss of 100 jobs and also the loss of some 400 service jobs in the service industry.

The crux of the matter is that South Australia will no longer be considered as a site for uranium conversion or a uranium enrichment plant. I know that some members opposite are heading up along that course of action, because some of them would dearly like that to happen. I am also aware that there are a number of members opposite who would genuinely like to see the Honeymoon and Beverley projects proceed. But so be it; they are locked into the policies of their Party.

If we do not see this area developed to the stage of a uranium enrichment plant, we will see \$1 250 000 000 of investment lost; we will see the opportunity to create 3 000 construction jobs lost; up to 800-odd plant operating jobs will be lost; and some 1 400 service industry jobs will be lost. The question begs itself: what impact will the Honeymoon decision have on mining generally?

I refer to someone who is authoritative in his comment and who knows about these things. I quote from a letter in the *Advertiser* from Mr I.F. Drysdale, the Manager of the South Australian Chamber of Mines. It reads:

Furthermore, because uranium is relatively widespread, South Australian companies exploring for other minerals may also encounter uranium, as happened at Roxby Downs. If uranium mining is taboo in South Australia, why should exploration companies risk millions of dollars searching for minerals when they may be unable to mine those they find? Not only will exploration activity be dealt a body blow with the job losses that entails, but South Australia's bright prospects for future mineral discoveries and opportunities for new permanent jobs created by mine developments will be snuffed out. If the South Australian Government will not grant the Honeymoon project licences, it will be another tragic loss for all South Australians concerned about the future of this State.

That worries me, and I think it is worrying the majority of South Australians. I would have thought that, after the debate in this place and in the public arena, over the Roxby Downs indenture the Labor Party would have come to its senses.

Another press release expands the views of others on the subject. It states:

Only 4 per cent of South Australian companies expect to increase the size of their work force in 1983, according to a survey by the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Eighty-six per cent of companies expect low consumer demand will be the most significant factor restricting expansion this year. The chamber's survey of economic conditions during the December quarter concludes that South Australia's business community has little confidence in the short-term future of the State's economy.

Knowing that, I would have thought that we would be grasping at any industry, whether it be resource, manufacturing, or whatever, to help reverse that situation. The report continues:

A positive and prompt announcement of approval for the Honeymoon uranium project would help considerably to instil some confidence in this vital area . . . The chamber has 3 324 members employing about 180 000 people or about 40 per cent of the State's work force. The 100 companies surveyed represented a cross-section of industrial and commercial activity in South Australia.

The Premier's pamphlet, under the heading, 'Taxes', states:

We will stop the use of State charges like transport fares, electricity, water, and hospital charges as a form of backdoor taxation.

What does that remind us of? Immediately when they came into Government, up went hospital charges. But in a pamphlet put out by the Leader, over his photograph, is the claim that he would not touch those charges because that is a form of backdoor taxation. Another point is that the A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession or death duties (I hope for its sake that it does not), and will not introduce new taxes. Time will tell, and we will see how this new Government will explain that to the people of South Australia. Under the heading of 'Arts' the pamphlet states:

We will ensure that South Australia retains its pre-eminence in the arts, and we will return full backing to the South Australian Film Corporation.

I noted in the press last week that the corporation is in the black and has made a profit for the year. I commend it on that line of action. I am reliably informed that the Premier is already in trouble with the independent film producers. It will be interesting over the next year or two to see how the Premier handles his problems in the independent film industry, because his statements of intent prior to the election did not endear him to that body. Under the heading 'Transport', the pamphlet states:

We will give priority in upgrading transport corridors from the city to the north-eastern and southern suburbs.

An honourable member: Just have it incorporated in *Hansard*.

Mr OSWALD: I am not going to incorporate this in *Hansard*?. This is the sort of thing members opposite like to hear. The suggestion of incorporating it in *Hansard* shows that they are embarrassed. If that is so, I certainly have no intention of incorporating it in *Hansard*. It will give members opposite the pleasure of hearing all about the A.L.P. policies and plans for transport in the southern suburbs. They may be quite interested to hear what the reaction has been in the southern suburbs.

Before the last election, the southern metropolitan regional organisations invited both Parties to send delegates down to meet with the council and discuss the needs of the southern region, a proper course of action.

They invited the sitting members from the region, both Liberal and Labor. They invited the Liberal Cabinet. Not being in Cabinet I was not there to hear their deliberations. They discussed the future of the region. Also, they invited the shadow Cabinet or part of it—I am not sure how many members. Subsequent to those meetings, an exchange of letters took place. I have a copy of a letter written to Mr Bannon on 17 December by the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation. I will refer to the opening paragraph of that letter and to the section of it referring to transport as it is applicable to my area, particularly as one of my councils is a member of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation. The letter states:

Thank you for your letter of 27 October [that is pre-election] which clarifies your Party's policies in regard to a number of issues identified by this region.

It then breaks into a number of headings. I refer to the heading 'Transport' which states:

Your southern policy statement makes a general and welcome commitment to 'give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern area of Adelaide'. Apart from the previously announced agreement to the upgrading of Flagstaff Road and Reservoir Drive however, the policy lacks specific detail on how this is to be achieved. A re-examination of the north-south corridor is proposed, as is a 'review of public transport needs in the south' and of options for upgrading the Darlington intersection. The region will be pleased to assist in ensuring these reviews are achieved speedily so that decisions can be made and projects proceed without undue delay. In general we believe the necessary background work has been done by the transport agencies and by the Southern Areas Transport and Land Issues Working Party.

It then went on to pick out several key areas that were worrying local council areas. It stated that the region gave high priority to increasing capacity and speed of traffic between Daws Road and Anzac Highway. It talked about certain road overpasses and extensions to various railway lines.

It must be borne in mind that, when the Australian Labor Party shadow Minister and others went to meet council members they were prepared to make some pretty wild promises (bearing in mind that if they got into Government they would have to keep them). Nevertheless, they made those wild promises and it was not until formal letters had to be exchanged between the then Leader, Mr Bannon, and the council, that things started to firm up. Now they are in Government. Subsequent to the Premier's exchange of letters in which he said he would send his Minister down to fine tune their promises (bearing in mind that those promises were specific to the letter as to what they would do for the southern region and that the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation issued a press statement prior to the election applauding Australian Labor Party policy and saying how good it was for the area), there was an official press release issued on 3 March by that organisation under the signature of its Chairman and Secretary. It makes interesting reading and will give some indication of how the Australian Labor Party can go into a campaign making specific promises and yet, once its members are elected, can have another think about matters. The press release states:

Southern councils believe the State Government is neglecting the transport needs of southern areas, and is not implementing its own transport policies for the south as announced during the election campaign.

If ever I have heard a damning statement, that is one. It further states:

The Minister of Transport outlined the Government's transport programme for the next 5-10 years at a recent meeting of the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation which represents Marion, Brighton, Noarlunga, Meadows and Willunga councils. The Chairman of the southern region, Meadows Mayor, Geoff Simpson, said:

The list outlined by the Minister contains nothing new. All of the projects listed are part of the current programme of the S.T.A. and Highways Department. The better deal in transport which was promised by the Government—

that is, the Labor Party when in Opposition—

during the election campaign was not evident in the Minister's statement. He appeared simply to reiterate the current views of the S.T.A. and Highways Department. There has been virtually no change in the programme as a result of the new Government.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Sounds like the Minister is doing what he is told.

Mr OSWALD: That is exactly right. The statement continues:

In fact, a number of the projects committed by the previous Government such as the South Road widening, appear to have been downgraded.

That is a typical example of a Government to be going into an election campaign making promises which it probably had no intention of keeping. In the Morphett electorate the Labor candidate went wild making promises around the district which he knew very well his Party could not keep when in government. He knew, when making those statements, that there was an element of truth in all of them but not a lot of truth in any of them.

Mr Trainer: Who said that—Abraham Lincoln?

Mr OSWALD: The honourable member should listen to what I am saying, because it affects the area of Ascot Park. The honourable member will have to answer these questions if the incompetent Minister will not, or if the Minister continues to be incorrect when espousing policies on behalf of his Leader. The press release further states:

The Government in its election campaign promised to 'give priority to upgrading transport corridors to the neglected southern areas of Adelaide' and would 'make a strong commitment to improving access to public transport in the south'. There has been little evidence to date that the Government is taking that commitment seriously.

That is a disgrace. It continues, later:

Since the election the region has written a number of letters and sent delegations to a number of Ministers, but to little effect.

I have heard that said elsewhere by my colleagues in Opposition. One can write to a Minister in an attempt to get a delegation to go somewhere and not get a response. It is one thing to do that to Liberal members of the Opposition, but it is another to do it to an official body such as the Southern Metropolitan Regional Organisation. I did not think a Government would be game to adopt such a line of action, but obviously the Government does not mind, or else it is unaware or incompetent and does not know what it is doing. The release further states:

The major transport issues in the area have not been addressed. The Government has yet to make a firm commitment to the widening of South Road (Daws Road-Anzac Highway), or the grade separation at Hove railway crossing. A decision on the extension of the railway from Hallett Cove to Hackham is yet to be made, while a number of investigations and reviews do not appear to have begun.

When the Leader went down there this was all documented. They knew where they were going! However, we now find that these reviews have not been commenced. If that is not an incompetent Party fooling the people in an attempt to get on to the Treasury benches, I do not know what is. It continues:

Despite a statement during the election campaign that the Government 'accepts the need for improved public transport to sparsely settled areas' like Aldinga, Willunga, Clarendon and Kangarilla, the Government appears to have no intention of even examining the matter.

That is a disgrace. They are not interested in examining the matter. It further states:

Other bus service improvements in the south appear to be no more than was previously scheduled. Perhaps it is a matter of a new Government needing to find its feet but to date the region has been given no assurance that the Government intends to meet its election commitments. The Minister appeared to know little about the transport needs in the south despite the huge amount of work which has been done by his own department in recent years. The region hopes this is not another example of promises being made during an election only to be forgotten afterwards.

I fear that unless we have a virile Opposition over the next couple of years the Government will worm its way out of its promises, will turn its back on the southern region and will be prepared and happy to let the southern region stew in its problems and will not address itself to them. The press release continues:

The region accepts that State finance is tight and that improvements will not happen overnight. What we are looking for is a commitment to a proper upgrading programme over a 10-year period which can be implemented in stages as State or Commonwealth funds become available.

The council that made that statement is a reasonable one. It does not expect the world, but it does expect Government Ministers to keep their word and, if they make a statement of intent, to follow through and at least show an interest. They do not expect members, once they are elected, to become disinterested and go back to Victoria Square saying that they will not worry about the problem until the lead up to the next election. The press release continues:

The Minister has agreed to return to a regional meeting in the near future and to discuss the issues further. The region would hope that at that time he is able to give us an assurance that commitments will be met, and outline how he intends to go about it.

I hope, for the sake of my southern region constituents, that the Premier decides to go down to that area and get some action going and does not send his Ministers there. It is not

good enough to send Ministers when the councils involved have put in a lot of work to make presentations to these high level committees. It is not good enough when councils have to contend with that sort of behaviour from members of a Government.

I make the point that over the past three years Ministers, including the Minister opposite, relentlessly attacked the former Tonkin Government for not spending enough money. The member for Norwood, as shadow Minister for welfare, was on his feet frequently castigating us for not spending enough on welfare. The member for Napier criticised us over housing policies, for not starting enough houses and for not subsidising rents enough. When the Minister opposite was shadow Chief Secretary he criticised our activities in the prison reform area. The shadow Minister of Health spoke frequently about staff levels and the fact that we were not spending enough on hospital staff. Also, he complained that we were not addressing ourselves to the creation of new hospitals.

In the area of water resources, the shadow Minister was always asking us to hasten the water filtration programme. We were criticised about our method of water rating, which we had inherited. In all fairness, both Parties have wrestled with the problem of finding an equitable method of water rating. We were castigated for our level of staffing in schools and in kindergartens. The member for Gilles said that we were not allocating enough money in the Budget for tourism and, of course, everyone was getting into the former Premier because of staff ceilings in the Public Service and for not supporting wage rises for union members.

It appears that the Premier is the only person capable of speaking on behalf of the Government at the moment. Other Labor members were hidden during the election campaign and are still being kept hidden. The Premier is constantly complaining bitterly about the size of the Budget deficit, but he cannot have it both ways: he and his shadow Ministers castigated us when they were in Opposition because we did not spend enough money; now he is castigating us because of the size of the deficit. He cannot have it both ways. He should have a closer look at his knowledge of finance and adopt a more moderate line.

One issue in my district, which I have raised with various Transport Ministers of both persuasions and which I raised when I was a candidate in 1978, is the need for a by-pass road to be constructed from Tapleys Hill Road to James Melrose Avenue on the south-western corner of the Adelaide Airport. At the moment that corner of Adelaide Airport is occupied by the old Commonwealth hostel. The hostel land is leased by a horse-riding association. The existing building has limited use by staff of the Adelaide Airport. There is a vital need for a road to be constructed through that particular allotment to take traffic out of Glenelg North. If traffic could turn off of Tapleys Hill Road and cut across the airport boundary to James Melrose Avenue it would by-pass Warren Avenue and Shannon Avenue and be re-routed behind the gold course.

I think most people in the district know of the particular problem to which I am referring. At the moment a massive traffic volume proceeds through Glenelg North by way of Shannon Avenue and Warren Avenue, takes a short cut through to Pine Avenue and then proceeds to Anzac Highway. This situation could be relieved considerably by the construction of a by-pass road through the area presently occupied by the Commonwealth hostel. Every time I have suggested this to a Government of either persuasion I have been told that the airport might need that piece of land for future requirements. I believe that is absolute nonsense. At the moment the buildings are used, to a degree, by staff but it would not be impossible for them to cross a road and proceed across the airport. This happens at Essendon airport,

which is established on both sides of a highway. I am going to ask the Minister of Transport to raise this matter once again with the Federal Minister for Transport because it is extremely important to constituents in that area. The by-pass road will be built one day, so I see no reason why it cannot be built now. I ask the Government to support me in my attempt to have this by-pass land purchased so that one day in the near future we will see a by-pass road connecting Tapleys Hill Road with James Melrose Avenue and taking the extremely heavy traffic out of Warren Avenue and Shannon Avenue so that those roads will be safer for the community.

Once again I thank the constituents of Morphett for trusting me with the job of representing them over the next three years. I hope that I will do this to their satisfaction and I assure them that I will be trying to the best of my ability to achieve that aim.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): It appears that at last some members have got the idea that the 60 minutes allocated to this debate is too long. It is pleasing to see that even members of the Opposition have, by design or intention, reduced the length of their speeches. I think that is a credit to them.

Mr Mathwin: I took only 59 minutes.

Mr MAX BROWN: I know the honourable member did. I think he took 59½ minutes, but at least that was a reduction. I have said many times that if a debate was ever a complete waste of time this one certainly is. Having said that, I have some interesting points to raise in my allotted time, and I am sure that I will hold the interest of members throughout the 60 minutes I shall obviously be using.

First, I join with members who have already spoken in this debate in congratulating you, Mr Speaker, on your election to your high office. Having said that, may I say that I am amazed that no previous speaker in this debate, to my knowledge at any rate, has referred to your gigantic decision in departing from the traditional dress which has been associated with your high office since the sixteenth century and which, unfortunately, has been used for far too long. You are therefore to be congratulated on deciding to depart from that dress. I do not believe that your decision will make you any less a man or mean that you have less capacity for fairness than had previous Speakers to do your job. For some years I watched on television a notable lawyer who never lost a case, even though he wore neither wig nor gown: I refer to the infamous Perry Mason. Further, I do not believe that, even if he had worn a wig or gown, he would have been any better a lawyer than he was in that television series. Mr Speaker, your decision on dress is important, and I hope that future Speakers will follow your precedent.

During the past recess Mr John Coumbe, a former member of this House, died. When I was first elected to Parliament in 1970, Mr Coumbe was one of two members of the then Opposition that I found approachable and reasonable in discussion in this House. I learned from other people that Mr Coumbe was an industrialist, an engineer, and an employer of labour. It could be easily assumed that Mr Coumbe and I would be at loggerheads in industrial discussions, because I came from the other side of the industrial fence from him. However, he was a man with a great understanding of employer-employee relationships, and I say that having had a long experience in such relationships. It was good to see a man on the other side of the industrial fence who could be so understanding on industrial relationships. Throughout our association in this House, Mr Coumbe remained approachable to other members, thoughtful on the many problems dealt with by Parliament, and eager to discuss such problems at any time in a conciliatory manner.

I extend my sincere sympathy to members of his family in their loss and say that, if there were more employers of the calibre of Mr Coumbe, industrial relationships might be just that much better.

I would be remiss in this debate if I did not refer to the political ravings of a so-called best-informed political writer who, prior to the last State election, wrote an article, under the *nom de plume* of 'Onlooker', on my future. I understand that the writer in question is a Mr Quirke. I do not know whether he is or is not Mr Quirke, but I could not care less. Whatever his real name, I have never thought much of people writing under a *nom de plume* or anonymously.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: You didn't use a *nom de plume* for your report.

Mr MAX BROWN: No. People who write political criticism should have the decency to put their name to that criticism. About two years ago this gentleman wrote in his column that I would be retiring before last year's State election, but that prediction was either wishful thinking or the ravings of an insane political writer. Even before he wrote those ravings I had been preselected by my Party, and a simple telephone call to me, my Party, or one of my colleagues would have confirmed that fact. Instead, 'Onlooker' raved on with his so-called best information. In his most recent article on my life in Parliament he said that this current term would be my last.

Mr Gunn: He was pretty close.

Mr MAX BROWN: That is yet to be decided and, if 'Onlooker' takes the time and trouble to read or listen to my remarks on this occasion and quote odds (because I do not like even money bets), perhaps I can get on, too. Not content with such a barrage of nonsense, in the *Sunday Mail* of 5 December 1982, 'Onlooker' states:

Moves are expected on Wednesday to block Labor M.P. Mr Max Brown from taking the important Chairman of Committees position in State Parliament. The Liberal Opposition is understood to be planning to nominate another M.P. for the position when Parliament resumes.

I understand the move by the Opposition after what they had learnt from us while we were in Opposition, the only difference being that we were successful whereas they were not. The article continues:

A number of Labor M.P.s and other Party members are understood to be upset by the Caucus vote which made Mr Brown the Party's nomination.

I find that statement extraordinary. Because of the unsuccessful stand three years ago by the member for Goyder for the position of Speaker, does 'Onlooker' suggest that the then member, Mr Russack, was not a good politician, not of good character, not looked up to by his colleagues, and did not play his proper part in Parliament? I simply say that unfortunately Mr Russack was a victim of circumstances at that time. As I said, I found it unbelievable. There has never been, in 13 years or thereabouts, any reason to believe that any Caucus member of the Labor Party has been upset by my actions or my attitude.

Mr Gunn: But you haven't done anything.

Mr MAX BROWN: In fact, I would say that 'Onlooker' obviously knows very little of the makeup or the workings of the Labor Caucus, and I suspect that he only wishes to be a mischief-maker, anyway. The truth of the matter was that during the election one of my opponents wanted his bread buttered on both sides. He criticised my non-involvement in Adelaide, which I duly admitted and, I admit it again, because I say that the seat of Whyalla (and I have made no secret of this situation) has a very great depth of problems, which still exist.

On the other hand, when it became known that I was seeking more involvement in Adelaide, the criticism then turned and my opponent said that I was neglecting Whyalla.

Of course, as I have said, that particular opponent wanted his bread buttered on both sides. I say that 'Onlooker' was endeavouring to make mischief out of that criticism. It is a terrible pity that he or his informant were not prepared to seek out truths rather than fiction.

I conclude my remarks on 'Onlooker' by turning my attention to two other statements made by him. First, in a statement made on 12 December, 'Onlooker' was prepared to name the member for Elizabeth (Hon. Peter Duncan) as the person in Caucus who did not support me. Again, as I have said, I find that statement incredible. In fact, I would say that the member for Elizabeth and I were very, very close to each other.

In some instances, newspapers and others have tagged both the member for Elizabeth and me as being raving left wingers and very strong supporters of the so-called progressive elements in the Party. The ironical situation was that, when I supposedly wanted a vote from the member for Elizabeth in some secret ballot, he was, for some reason that I cannot find that would make sense, to turn against me and that tag of allegiance was cast aside, presumably, by a vote against me. When this did not happen I can only assume that our so-called tag of allegiance stood the test of doubt.

The second and last statement which 'Onlooker' made in that article and one which I find most strange, indeed, is as follows:

Time will tell if Mr Brown handles his new job as effectively as Dr Eastick did his.

I find that statement rather interesting, too. I would have thought that, if any comparison was to be made, it would be made between Mr Gunn, the member for Eyre, and me. I believe that the member for Eyre, even though we have had our differences of opinion over the years, carried out his duties in the last Parliament quite satisfactorily and capably, and I do not say that because the honourable member sits opposite in the seat: I say that quite genuinely. I have found that, even though we have had our differences of opinion. So much for 'Onlooker', and if he is the best informed political writer in this country, God help the rest.

I turn now to what I can only consider, and have always considered, the most important and very degrading position that we have in our country today, that is, the question of unemployment. I can only describe as the ugliest type of cancer-like growth the unemployment that is occurring, and has been occurring, within our community and throughout the nation for some years. This subject is not new, and of course without exception all members of this House are concerned about it. In saying that, I would add that probably the major difference between our politics in this place is that we in the Labor Party are not only concerned with this problem but we want to mould the various major organisations together with the Government to work positively and purposefully towards the ultimate cure of this cancer in our community. I think that that is where the Liberal Party failed both at the State election and at the Federal election, because it did not endeavour to mould that confidence or conciliation. This would be one, if not the major, reason why the current efforts of Bob Hawke and his new Government should be supported and why an attempt should be made to co-operate at the summit conference.

Whatever I have said or done in relation to the question of unemployment has been because of a personal interest. I was again criticised for supposedly not being interested in the question of unemployment during the last election. I have unfortunately been involved with this particular problem for too many years. Perhaps I should not say this in the House, but at some time even two of my sons have been unemployed. I do not know how much closer one can get to a problem or how much more one can know about

a problem, but when it affects one's own flesh and blood there is personal involvement in that problem. I assure the House that the criticism that was levelled at me and the claim that I was not interested in the unemployment situation has left me dumbfounded.

I have consistently stated that there is a great need for Government, industrial organisations, the unions and others, to work together diligently to reach the ultimate target of providing relief in this major area, and I welcome the Hawke Government's current move. I wish it the greatest possible success, and stress that if ever we are going to solve this problem we must get behind this conference.

Unfortunately, many people do not understand, or do not want to understand, what happens in a community where there is high unemployment, and not nearly enough notice is taken of this fact. I would say that the city of Whyalla is showing more and more effects of unemployment. I refer to young people having time on their hands, to their frustration and to their need for money to support their day-to-day existence, and I refer also to crimes such as vandalism, larceny (including motor car stealing), drunkenness, disorderly conduct and wife-bashing. We have even got to the stage in the city of Whyalla where we have had a murder outside a hotel, although I will not say that that has been proven to be a direct result of unemployment or that the culprit has even been found.

The list could go on but I point out to the House that for all these crimes society pays a high price. I am grateful for an editorial in the local *Whyalla News* which points to the very core of what I have been saying. It highlights the problems I have mentioned and also deals with Aboriginal people and the way in which they are affected. The editorial states:

Recent crime statistics released by the Attorney-General provide considerable scope for thought by people who are worried about what appears to be a growing trend to lawlessness in our community. The figures show that unemployed adults are grossly over-represented among defendants on criminal charges. The figures reveal that, although the rate of unemployment in South Australia during the period from July to December 1981, was only 6 per cent, almost 40 per cent of defendants who appeared before courts in this period were unemployed.

Offences with the highest rates were offensive behaviour, drunkenness, vagrancy, and liquor offences (47 per cent unemployed), breaking and entering (69 per cent unemployed), vehicle theft (65 per cent unemployed) and other larceny (51 per cent unemployed).

I pause there and point out that those figures may be only figures but they glaringly point to what is happening in our society as a result of this very wrong and vicious situation in which we find ourselves—unemployment. The editorial continues:

Overseas studies have in the past established strong links between unemployment and crime, and according to Attorney-General Chris Sumner, this trend is being followed in South Australia. He says the proportion of unemployed defendants in criminal courts has been consistently high over the past three years and the percentage of unemployed people resorting to break and enter offences (whose average age was just 24 years) suggests that offences may be particularly high among younger people who have never had the opportunity of enjoying legitimate employment. Another area of concern is the difference in justice meted out to defendants in Adelaide and the more remote country areas.

That is also a rather interesting situation. It further states:

Defendants outside Adelaide were more likely to have been arrested rather than summonsed and to have been remanded in custody before appearing. This was markedly the case for Aboriginal people who appeared for minor offences such as drunkenness and vagrancy. Aboriginal people on these charges appearing in courts outside Adelaide were two and a half times more likely to have received gaol sentences than their white counterparts. And more than 60 per cent had been held in custody before appearing.

On this latter figure Mr Sumner has undertaken to see what action can be taken. Whether Government action is possible, or whether a whole change of attitude by white communities who have what they consider 'black problems' is the real answer

remains to be seen. What must be of concern is that black offenders are seen to not be so equal under law as their white counterparts. Such a situation cannot be allowed to continue, and must be overcome in some way.

Whyalla is a city with higher than average unemployment, and it is no secret that our police have their hands full dealing with such things as breakings and thefts every day of the week. The growing incidence of crime is something that communities will have to come to grips with in the near future. But it is a problem that does not have an easy answer, and that will take more than just soothing words from our leaders to solve.

It is symptomatic of the ills facing this country as unemployment continues to climb. And it points to the need for a more determined, united approach to getting the economy back on the rails—and getting Australians back to work.

I commend the *Whyalla News* for that editorial, because I believe it was a very truthful and purposeful piece of writing. The figures outlined in the editorial could only be described as disturbing, and all members should be disturbed by them. The last paragraph of the editorial states that the job of getting Australians back to work is not an easy task. It is not a task that one individual can achieve: it is not a task that one organisation can achieve: but it is a task that must be tackled immediately by a combined effort, and, if the first attempt in the combined effort fails or is only partly successful, then we must try and try again until success appears.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do you think it would be more successful if it was broader?

Mr MAX BROWN: I can understand what the member for Light means and I know that he makes that interjection in a genuine way, but let me point out to the honourable member that I have found that, if an important decision is to be made, quite often it can be achieved more readily if a smaller number of people are involved instead of an expanded group. Perhaps that is what the Federal Government may be considering at this time.

I believe that that editorial was responsible. It showed that that newspaper is prepared to play its role in a community of unemployed. Although I am not always receptive to the *Whyalla News*, I want to give credit where I believe credit ought to be given. On many occasions I have stated that newspapers have a responsibility to a community, a State, and a nation. Unfortunately, on too many occasions that responsibility is not always accepted by the daily press and too much thought is given to selling the paper rather than to assisting constructively the problems that we face every day. I do not have to elaborate too much for members to get the gist of what I am talking about.

I want to go a little further on this subject by referring to several cases that have been brought to my attention of alleged (and I say 'alleged' advisedly) police harassment, involving, in particular, unemployed youths and the actions of police in my district. I have found that, in the main, the situation has arisen because young people are drinking and frequenting hotels and discos. I could go on. If one considers the problem and becomes involved in it, one finds that youths are just killing time, as they have described it to me. However, they are killing time in a degrading way or, as they say, for kicks or something of that nature. Invariably, that is their answer.

From the frequenting of hotels came what appears to be a spate of assaults, so much so that at the beginning of 1982 I asked the then Attorney-General (Hon. K.T. Griffin) for information about the number of assaults occurring at hotels. I received the following reply:

Information concerning the number of assaults occurring at hotels is not readily available from records compiled by the Police Department. To obtain the information would involve a labour intensive exercise to analyse manual files.

I can appreciate that, but at the time I asked the question there were no fewer than three major assaults in three different hotels and on three different managers of hotels

in the City of Whyalla. It was obvious that this situation could not continue: there had to be an answer. If the figures could have been attained I am sure that they would have been quite alarming.

At this time I became aware of the huge numbers of under-age drinkers. Hotels are allowed unlimited numbers of electronically operated coin fun machines, commonly called Space Invaders. These machines are usually run by privately owned operators who take, in the main, 50 per cent to 60 per cent of the turnover and allow the hotel proprietor 40 per cent to 50 per cent, depending on the circumstances. The machines are not like the operation of mini-bingo, beer ticket machines, small lotteries, and so on. The owners of hotels do not have to pay a licence fee and do not make out a turnover return to the Department of Recreation and Sport and, to be candid, because of this, in my opinion, these machines are much more popular to hotelkeepers. In May 1982 I issued a press statement in Whyalla dealing with the problem that I was trying to bring to the attention of the community generally which, in part, said:

[Mr Brown] asked Labor's shadow Attorney-General (Hon. Chris Sumner), to investigate the possibilities of tightening up the under-age drinking laws operative within this State. Mr Brown had been advised by the Police Department that the under-age drinking law was difficult to administer and Mr Brown was desirous of making every endeavour to eliminate this very detrimental activity amongst our youth as much as possible. Also, Mr Brown has requested Mr Sumner to examine the current provisions allowing coin operated fun parlour machines in hotels. Mr Brown believes that there is currently no restriction on these machines in hotels and he further believes the machines act as an enticement for 16 and 17 year olds to frequent a hotel, rather than an unlicensed premises.

I found that hotels could put these machines on their premises, attract a youngster, even if he did not drink, and yet, if a person wanted to set up a fun parlour business he was thwarted with all sorts of laws and do-gooders who did not want these machines in operation. Yet, hotels could have any number of them operating day and night and that did not make any difference. My press release went on to say:

Mr Brown was concerned that with the high unemployment being experienced in Whyalla, particularly amongst our youth, under-age drinking and the gathering of 16 to 17 year olds in hotels playing these machines, was adding to the current wave of vandalism and near criminal activities in Whyalla.

That statement clearly outlined my thoughts on that problem at that time. It may be of interest to the House that following the local paper using that statement the secretary of the trade union movement in Whyalla rang and advised me that twice in a month shops had been broken into in a major shopping area in Whyalla called Playford Avenue—five shops the first time and seven the second time. They alleged at that time that the culprits were possibly children looking for money, but it may be of interest that one of the seven shops broken into was a rifle shop.

When I approached the police at that time with that information they readily informed me that this activity by young people was on the increase. At that time I advised the secretary of the trade union movement that I was awaiting figures from the Office of Crime Statistics—that I had figures for 1980-81, but had requested figures for 1979-80. I got those figures, which are as follows: in 1979-80—offences reported, 604; offences cleared up, 83; offences unsolved, 521. In 1980-81 the figures were: reported, 675; cleared up, 104; unsolved, 571—which was an increase.

Now I want very briefly—and I will not be much longer, I can assure the House—to turn to some of the cases that were brought to my attention. The first case with which I want to deal relates to a visit from the father of a young lad, who will remain anonymous. It was a very bad case in that at that time, unfortunately, there was in Whyalla the crooked cop, as I call him, who is now serving a gaol

sentence. In saying that, I do not want to get anybody off side in this House or have them think that I believe that the police force in some way condones this sort of action, because it does not. In my experience, the police force in South Australia is a very good force and I have had nothing but the most cordial co-operation from the police on anything that I have taken up. I can understand the question of harassment because in the city of Whyalla there was a whole group of young people who frequented hotels and got themselves intoxicated and who, when the police were called in to try to ease this problem, ganged up on the police. So, this harassment developed, and it is a terrible pity that it did but, nevertheless, that was the position. In this case, this police officer associate of the person whom I call 'the crooked cop' was involved. This gentleman's son was one of approximately four lads who had been allegedly mistreated by the police. In fact, the allegation was that they had been bashed up.

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

Mr MAX BROWN: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was speaking about an allegation of police harassment and the fact that it could be linked to what I consider to be the problems emanating from the unemployment situation. The case I referred to involved, unfortunately, what I will call the 'crooked cop's case' in the city of Whyalla. The person involved was later remanded to prison. At the same time another police officer also found himself in some difficulty. I became involved in the case because the father of one of the youths involved came to see me and alleged that the police officer in question had been telling untruths about his boy. In fact, he went as far as to allege that the police officer in question had told untruths on about four occasions, yet in dealing with the case the court had done little about the matter as far as the police officer was concerned.

As I have said, I became involved in the case. I believe that the police officers were probably at fault in that case because of the, shall I say, strange way that some of them handled the case. The youths involved were also at fault, because they may have exacerbated the situation and caused the alleged harassment by the police. Nevertheless, whoever was at fault and whoever might have been involved, I strongly believe that this incident was part of the price that society is paying generally because of the high unemployment level. The city of Whyalla has experienced that high unemployment level for some time.

I will not go through all the cases that were drawn to my attention as a result of the case I have mentioned. As I have said, I did become deeply involved in one particular matter. Correspondence transpired between the member for Elizabeth and myself and between the then shadow Attorney-General and myself. In the final analysis I concluded that the youth's final redress was to seek advice from a lawyer and to go through the legal remedy offered by society. I advised him as follows:

Following upon your telephone conversation with me, concerning alleged police harassment of youths in the City of Whyalla, I have had a discussion with Peter Duncan and I have also made a press statement with respect to my concern at the activities both of the police and youths in general.

Unfortunately, I can see no real method of alleviating the problem between police and youths, the system which we live under is obviously at fault and that system, from the youths point of view, demands that any possible action with respect to alleged police harassment can only be dealt with through the court.

It seems to me that the Legal Services Commission people who come every week to Whyalla might assist in some general way but, other than that situation, I find it very difficult to suggest a complete solution to the problem.

As I said earlier, in that case the officer involved was dealt with by the courts. Whatever else can be said about such

cases. I just point out that the matter is the direct result—a result to which too many people pay insufficient attention—of unemployment. There is no question about that.

Here is a community with a high percentage of unemployed people who are causing such problems. The Government is almost paying these people money to be unemployed and produce nothing. They get into trouble and the community is paying a high indirect cost through harassment resulting from stolen vehicles, vandalism and other problems that I have outlined in my comments. I can only say that I hope that in 12 months when I next speak in this debate I will be able to say that the new Federal Government and this State Government have played an important role in alleviating and reducing unemployment problems. I support the motion.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I record my condolences to the relatives of former members of Parliament, namely, the late Hon. Cyril Hutchens, C.B.E., and the Hon. Gordon Gilfillan. I respected Cyril Hutchens for what he stood for and his endeavours in his Parliamentary career. I thought he was a fair-minded person who tried to do his best for those he represented. The late Hon. Gordon Gilfillan was, in my opinion, a quiet achiever. He was a helper and comforter to me and my committee when times were rough in the transition from L.C.L. to the Liberal Party.

He was a person to whom I could go quietly and seek advice. Such a difficult time can bring out the best in all of us if we believe in what we are striving for, and it can bring us close together. The Hon. Gordon Gilfillan was a person who, in his quiet way, was a tremendous help.

Since the delivery of His Excellency's address to Parliament we were further saddened by the passing of Mr John Coumbe, a former Deputy Leader of our Party. I always considered John a close political friend. No matter when we met or how tough things appeared, in those early days he was always a tremendous help to me and my family. He always greeted me with, 'How are you going mate?' in a really friendly and sincere manner.

John Coumbe taught me much politically and always emphasised honesty and sincerity. He appreciated my circumstances in those days as a total newcomer to politics after winning a very marginal seat. Since then we have always kept in touch, even in his retirement. He kept asking how things were going and always took a close interest in my Parliamentary work, my family and my charity work. As a family man, John was interested in the well-being of young people, and he emphasised that to me often. His cheery personality will be sadly missed, but not forgotten.

Recently, the member for Ascot Park and I attended a luncheon with members of the board of the Electricity Trust of South Australia. I understand that this innovation, involving back-benchers, was arranged by the Hon. Glen Broomhill, a former member for Henley Beach. This occasion gave two members an excellent opportunity to meet members of the Electricity Trust Board and further enhanced the already high standing of the trust. While we may all complain about our high electricity accounts, we, in South Australia, are fortunate that the trust is so well managed as to keep that cost down to reasonable proportions. Further, the building of power stations and generators has ensured that the supply is adequate to meet peak demands, and black-outs are few and far between because of the sound planning and excellent economic management of the trust. If this had not been so, we could well have found ourselves in a similar position to consumers in New South Wales and Victoria, where electricity users do not know when the electricity supply will fail.

The late John Coumbe was a member of the Electricity Trust board and served that organisation well. It was disappointing that he could not be with us at the luncheon, but I now place on record, as I am sure the member for Ascot Park would, our appreciation of the innovation. I hope that all members will have the opportunity at some time to visit ETSA to meet members of the board, and to inspect the various installations of the trust.

I take this opportunity to publicly congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your election to adjudicate in the debates of this Chamber, and I also take the opportunity to welcome new members. In doing so, I echo the sentiments that you have often expressed about our responsibilities to constituents. I well recall that, after the election in 1970, you advised those of us who were new members to be careful in giving legal advice to constituents, because people will try to use their local member to get such advice. You warned us that there were certain ramifications in that regard, and I hope that that message is being passed on to all new members: that members can easily be used and can be easily sought to provide free legal advice when such advice should be obtained from a member of the legal profession.

I draw on my experience in advising new members that there are many wellknown persons in our State, especially in local communities, who will approach a member with certain problems. Such persons will not necessarily approach only their local member. Regrettably, some of these people have personality problems and seem at first sight to be victims of discriminating practices. In this regard some people try to achieve the impossible, and we now find that such people fall into a small but delicate category. I find that they come somewhere between those requiring assistance from such sources as the Department for Community Welfare, Crisis Care, Mental Health Services, the Intellectually Disabled Services, and certain voluntary agencies.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They seem to fall somewhere between the whole lot.

Mr BECKER: Yes, and this is commonly known as the grey areas in respect of which it is extremely difficult to ascertain what they want a member to do for them. If the member cannot provide the answer or the assistance required, the person goes off to see someone else. Over the years all members have been tried, some successfully and some unsuccessfully, but it does not hurt to confide with a Parliamentary colleague, irrespective of Party affiliation, about the name actually used and about the statement that another member would not help, and to check back on the facts. We need a highly structured service to help such people, but I find it difficult to define such a service. The voluntary agencies and the other services to which I have referred are taxed to the limit at present.

Whilst at the moment the number of people who seek this highly skilled professional service may not be great, what really worries me is that the numbers will grow and, as the economic situation continues (for hopefully only a short period), these numbers will still be there; these people will still want this assistance. So, I mention in passing that my advice to new members is to be alert and endeavour to apprise themselves of the services that are available through Government and voluntary agencies so that we can somehow quickly provide the assistance that these people are seeking. However, all their problems will not be soluble.

Of course, the role of a member of Parliament today has changed dramatically. It has changed to such a degree that we find ourselves now in some cases a voluntary social worker, a father confessor and, as I said, a legal adviser, financial adviser, and a general Mr Fix-it of all problems. New members will be well advised that their role and the demands on their time will increase and increase dramatically as they become established. In some respects I hope that

they may not make the mistakes that I have made. Whilst it has always been my policy to be available and accessible to all and sundry, of course it is preferable to be on call for one's own local constituents. As one builds up a reputation in certain areas one finds that the demand on one's time comes not within one's electorate, but from outside and from the whole of the State.

Only last evening about 40 minutes after I had retired the phone rang. A very distraught housewife phoned. She had had a family argument and was threatening all types of action. After about 45 minutes I was able to calm her down and endeavour to retrieve the situation. It is not uncommon for me to receive phone calls at 2 a.m., 3 a.m. and 4 a.m., which normally would be calls handled by Crisis Care, or I often find that Crisis Care had been contacted and the person was still not satisfied and had come back either to the local member or somebody he knew in that area who may be able to assist him. So, these are the problems that members will and can experience from time to time. The secret (or the skill) is knowing how to handle the situation and knowing that hopefully one can calm the person so that he will not take drastic action, as threatened.

However, the situation we have today and the uncertainty of the future are starting to create a lot of these problems. These are the people for whom I really feel sorry: the people who are crying out for help and really cannot get that help and cannot get that satisfaction to help them solve those problems. So, to the new members, I hope that they will be able to apprise themselves of the services and facilities available and assist their constituents in any way possible. I believe that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to be involved in that manner. Of course, not all members believe that that is their role and, certainly, it is the ideal to be able to be involved in a legislative programme of Parliament and, through that system, to be able to contribute to the affairs of the State and provide an excellent avenue for creating positive contributions to the future of South Australia.

After all, irrespective of the area we have been allocated in the name of an electorate, we are responsible to the people of South Australia and to our State. I believe that in these difficult times, particularly economically, we must be mindful of those disadvantaged people who, through lack of employment and low-cost housing and the high cost of living, are suffering. These tragic circumstances have not occurred overnight and the current recession has slowly crept on the Australian community since the golden years of the Whitlam era. The situation was further exacerbated by the sabotage of the economy by aggressive, greedy unions and society in general.

The 'lucky country', of course, may be considered to be in trouble. I believe that that is only temporary. We must combine all of our energy and talents to trade out of the situation as quickly as possible, and I believe that it is beholden on all of us to support the Government to achieve this; irrespective of political philosophies which may keep some of us apart, our prime target must be to restore economic sanity and to reduce the horrendous unemployment, housing crises, and mounting poverty.

I well remember, when speaking in this debate in August 1982, bringing to the attention of the House the world-wide economic difficulties. I also highlighted the scandalous tax increases of the Wran New South Wales Government and the huge deficit blow-out of his Budget. I, therefore, wish to refer quickly to that situation again. On 10 August 1982 (page 364 *Hansard*) I quoted from the *Business Review Weekly*, an article headed 'Who runs Wran?', or should it have been, 'How to embezzle taxpayers' money'? The article states:

Neville Wran's advisers ran the New South Wales economy on borrowed time and now face a disguised \$300 000 000 Budget deficit—

in fact, the whole story really started six years ago—

... for six years Wran and a little-known team have dominated N.S.W. economic planning almost to the exclusion of Wran's generally lacklustre Cabinet colleagues and the deeply conservative State Public Service.

I then went on to quote further extracts from that article, which highlighted a post-Budget deficit of \$3 200 000, which then grew to \$29 000 000 and was heading for \$69 300 000, with the prospect of going up to \$300 000 000. I referred to the situation overseas as well as in New South Wales, and generally I was endeavouring to warn the Parliament that we had to be mindful of the current economic situation and the world-wide recession. What really concerned me was that I thought that the message had to be put, and I did conclude my speech by saying this:

What this all means is the increase in Government benefit in this magnificent era. New South Wales has faced the problem, and South Australia has had the problem and we have set out to rectify it. All I can say to the Opposition regarding the lead up and recent promises is 'Be warned and be careful.' Rational decisions need to be made now to prepare for our future and future generations. We as a Parliament owe future generations more than we inherited. This Parliament must be mindful of its responsibilities, particularly in handling taxpayers' money.

The then Leader of the Opposition followed my speech and, in his opening sentence, he had this to say:

Following on from the contribution by the member for Hanson, it is certainly true that, in developing any programme for government in these difficult financial times, one must pay close attention to the financial resources available and to the efficiency with which those resources are spent, and we have been conscious throughout our period in Opposition of just that responsibility.

It often seems to me extraordinary that the present Government, with its abysmal record of financial management of this State, is constantly trying to suggest that we in some way are responsible in terms of financial management in what we are proposing, when we are very careful in what we propose and how we propose it. However, no doubt all that will be canvassed and debated in the course of the coming general election campaign, if not sooner.

I took that as the attitude of the then Leader of the Opposition and the now Premier of South Australia: that he and his Party would accept a responsible approach to the finances of the State; that the Australian Labor Party would ensure that, in the build-up to the State election on 6 November the Party (or, if successful, the Government) would hold to the promises of no tax increases; that it would ensure sound financial management; and that it would ensure taxpayers received value for money.

We now find statements that the State Budget could overrun up to \$140 000 000. We have already had statements and a document from the Under Treasurer advising the Government that the Budget could blow out to somewhere in the vicinity of \$69 000 000. That was in December. We have had, regrettably, a disastrous bushfire and floods. Whilst I know that the State suffered tremendous losses in the South-East, the people have also suffered severe losses and hardship. I find it difficult to see how the current Revenue Account can blow out to the projected \$140 000 000. It has been difficult as a back-bencher to track down the financial situation of the State Treasury. The only document we received, under the guise of open Parliament, is the statement of Consolidated Accounts. We receive them every month, generally with a brief statement. It is given to the media with the usual warning that it is dangerous to compare figures and to make accurate predictions. I go along with that and accept it: it is dangerous half way through a Budget period to say that this or that would happen.

The Treasury officers know, to a reasonable percentage, the state of the State. I believe that the Premier has got to make announcements quickly and must place before Parliament as much information as we seek to allow us to examine

the financial affairs of the State. Personally, I believe that Parliament should insist on a special Parliamentary committee or select committee being established to examine the Budget brought down by the previous Government as well as examining the current financial situation. Such a select committee—a non-partisan approach—would tackle the problem and ensure that what is occurring can be controlled and contained. I believe that the taxpayers of South Australia are not being given a fair go. I fail to see how a Parliament can approve a Budget which, it was proposed, would be balanced and then we see an overrun of about 7 per cent—roughly \$140 000 000.

There should be protection for the taxpayers of South Australia to ensure that politicians or senior public servants, such as Directors-General as the heads of various departments responsible for the spending in those departments, do not exceed the Budget allocations. There are very few countries in the world in which politicians and public servants are given a blank cheque, as occurs in this State. Every person would believe that, when the Budget is brought down, it represents the spending and the revenue raising programme. When a variation of figures occurs to the degree that has been presented to us, it is high time something was done to ensure that the situation does not occur again.

Expenditure was proposed of \$2 161 000, and the revenue that was to be raised was a similar figure. For the six months ending December 1982, payments in regard to waterworks, sewers and irrigation were to be \$86 400 000. For the first six months of the financial year, the expenditure under that line was \$46 500 000. If we take that figure as a halfway lever (and it is dangerous to do that, I accept, but it gives a guide), we see that spending on that line alone could be about \$93 000 000, or a \$7 000 000 overrun.

The Budget allocation for social services, education, science, art and research was \$624 100 000. For the first six months, or half of the budgetary year, expenditure was \$351 000 000. If we take that as a halfway point, \$702 000 000 will be spent in that area, an overrun of about \$76 000 000. The Budget allocation in the medical, health and recreation areas was \$232 300 000: for the first six months, \$144 000 000 was spent. If we take that as a halfway mark and double the figure, we see that about \$288 000 000 will be spent, or a \$56 000 000 overrun.

The Budget allocation for community welfare was \$55 300 000, the halfway spending was \$32 000 000, and therefore it is reasonable to assume that about \$64 000 000 will be spent in this area, which is an overrun of about \$9 000 000. These halfway figures are frightening, particularly when one considers the overruns.

In other areas we pick up \$5 000 000 and \$6 000 000, taking the allocation for the State Transport Authority contribution towards its deficit of \$59 000 000. Already the authority has received \$32 000 000, and its deficit could be about \$64 000 000, which is a huge loss with which to operate buses, trams, and the few trains that are left. That figure represents well over \$1 000 000 a week, and presents real problems for the Government. On the expenditure side, bearing in mind that \$105 000 000 was allowed for increases in wage and salary rates and increased prices, there is an expected overexpenditure of about \$51 000 000.

When one looks at the receipts side the figures become even more frightening. It was proposed that the State would receive \$231 000 000 in pay-roll tax. For the first six months of the year it received \$112 500 000. One would assume that that is the half-way mark. Doubling the figure gives us \$225 000 000, a shortfall of \$6 000 000.

The Budget proposal was for an income of \$119 000 000 from stamp duties. In the first six months of the financial year \$47 500 000 was received from stamp duties. Doubling that figure gives us \$95 000 000, a shortfall of about

\$24 000 000. There is obviously something drastically wrong in the estimates of income from stamp duties.

Of the further contributions for indirect taxation the expected statutory corporations contribution is shown as \$26 500 000. In the first six months of the financial year \$8 300 000 was received, which indicates that there could be a shortfall, although some statutory corporations could make their contributions in June. The Budget proposal was that total indirect taxation would be \$552 300 000. In the first six months of the financial year State Treasury received \$258 000 000 from that source. This means that it could receive approximately \$516 000 000 from that source, a \$36 000 000 shortfall. I do not think that that will occur and that it will be as bad as that, although income from stamp duties could well be down, say, \$10 000 000 or \$20 000 000. One cannot get close enough to these figures as this is all the information that Treasury will provide to members of Parliament. If that is all the information that we are provided with, how can the public of South Australia understand what is really going on? The contribution from the Commonwealth Government is exactly half the Budget allocation and is spot on. So, somewhere, somehow, these figures are way out. I believe that the areas of education and health will probably incur the highest over-runs.

As far as waterworks, sewers, and irrigation is concerned, the proposed Budget receipt is \$150 000 000. In the first six months of the financial year receipts were \$65 300 000, excess water accounts will soon start to come in, so that Budget allocation could well be near enough to accurate and could well be exceeded because the E. & W.S. Department has changed the billing system for excess water in some council areas. In my district the water allocation was supposedly for 12 months but was only for 11 months, so the new billing period started a month earlier and at the hottest time of summer. Therefore, during the next financial year people who closely monitor their water consumption might find that they run into excess usage. I believe that we are gradually moving to a system with water billing where all ratepayers will eventually use excess water. Of course, that is where the Government really makes its money. If there is to be a balancing of the budget for the E. & W.S. Department then payment of excess water accounts is about the only way that that can be achieved, but at a terrific cost to property owners.

Two days ago I received a copy of the Revenue Account for the month of January. There was no explanation with the figures, but they still indicate to me that the proposed excess in payments of some \$52 000 000 is continuing and that the overall situation of State finances is not improving. In January the Treasury received \$6 000 000 in stamp duties, which indicates a \$20 000 000 shortfall in that area. We should be provided with information as to why that is so. Parliament deserves that information, as do the people of South Australia, because they are going to be asked to make up this shortfall. As I have said before, I do not believe that we should give any Government or Parliament a blank cheque.

Once one sets one's Budget allocation one must stick to it. We should follow the American system where, if one wants further money, one comes to the Parliament. In other words, if the department head overspends he bankrupts his department; let him tell his public servants that there is no more money there to carry on his function.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Well, the Director-General advises the Minister and vice versa, but I am still not sure as I very much rely on my readings of that book and the wellknown television programme, *Yes, Minister*. There is a tremendous amount of truth in what is going on there. It is a tragedy that the A.B.C. has not continued that programme. If ever

they have missed out on the rating challenges it is at the present moment. The A.B.C. should be getting the up-to-date programmes of *Yes, Minister*, because when the Public Accounts Committee investigates the Minister all hell breaks loose because he is given false information. Public Accounts picks it up; he ends up at No. 10 Downing Street and, unfortunately, I was not in England long enough to find out what happened in the next episode.

Unless we are going to get true accountability in Government and avoid the situation that occurred in New South Wales, Victoria and here (and I will deal later with the situation in Canberra), the taxpayers of this State are being raped. It affects the credibility of politicians—the members of Parliament who pass budgetary documents in good faith and say to the various departments, 'This is your Budget allocation,' only to find that no-one takes any notice of it. Where does Parliament stand when we pick up a document such as the Revenue Account and find that everyone just snubs their noses at it? There has to be a fall-back situation, a system that can put the brakes on, whether it is three or four months after the Budget has been brought through or in a situation such as we have now.

It was not uncommon during the Dunstan Labor Government period that at this time of the year we would have a supplementary Budget, and I think that we had one during the term of the Tonkin Government. There needs to be this check system but, more importantly under the current situation, we should establish a select committee now so that members of Parliament can examine the whole situation and make recommendations to the Government. That way the whole Parliament would be involved in coming up with a solution to the problem. The Government is in trouble because it promised no tax increases. The Parliament may now understand that that is unavoidable, or it may be able to find solutions. I would have thought if I were running the State, if I were acting in the interests of the people, or if I were concerned with the large number of unemployed, the housing crisis, or the mounting disastrous poverty that is facing the State, that I would get down and work with a solid committee to solve those problems because we all represent people—that is what Parliament has always been about and that is what it should be about. I hope that the Premier remembers what he said in reply to my previous Address in Reply speech, that he will bear in mind the responsibility he has to the taxpayers of South Australia.

Of course, since the Address in Reply speech we have had a change of Federal Government. During that very brief and enlightening campaign, we in politics learned a lot. The people of South Australia and of Australia will find how they have been duped. It brought out something new: the promotion and marketing of an individual to satisfy that person's goals. I took a day off—and rarely do I take a few days off—to go to the one-day cricket matches, during which I bought a Benson and Hedges World Series Cup official cricket book. I paid \$3 for it, which is a bit of rip-off, but I needed something to watch when I was sitting out there between matches. I opened the magazine to the first page and saw a foreword written by R.J.L. Hawke, M.P.

An honourable member: When was this?

Mr BECKER: I purchased the magazine during the long weekend in January. When one looks at the format of the programme, it can be seen that the magazine would have been prepared in about June, because the one-day series cricket matches started early in the summer. I thought then that there was something odd. I wondered why Bob Hawke would write a foreword for a cricket book, why there would be a glossy photograph promoting Bob Hawke, and why he would be involved in such a promotion.

Mr Mathwin: He can't play cricket.

Mr BECKER: He is a cricket supporter, and that is well recognised. I thought the foreword was well written, to give credit where credit is due. At least he put together a good foreword.

Mr Mathwin: Let's be fair.

Mr BECKER: It was fair, and I will read it into *Hansard*, because there is one paragraph that I really liked. I remind the House that this foreword was written a long time before the people of Australia knew that there was to be a change in the leadership of the then Federal Labor Opposition. The foreword written by Mr Hawke states:

The English have done a lot for cricket. If they didn't actually conceive of it they certainly made a very effective takeover bid from the French quite early in the business. Anglo-French relations have never been tranquil since.

The member for Glenelg would know that.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: Are you going to table that?

Mr BECKER: I think I should—it has a nice colour photograph. The foreword by Mr Hawke continues:

They adapted the game and made it a very part of England and of the Establishment. There wasn't, however, a universal embrace of the glorious game by all the upper echelons. In fact, one particular heretic, Lord Mancroft, delivered himself of the observation: 'Cricket is a game which the English, not being a spiritual people, invented to give themselves some conception of eternity.'

As all of us who love the game know full well, Mancroft did less than justice to those positive qualities that can be so attractive in a good drawn-out cricket contest. But we live in a world of change, indeed of accelerating change. Very little is immune from this process which carries with it, more and more, the demand for instant gratification.

It would have been possible, I suppose, for cricket officialdom to have set its face resolutely against the tide and insisted that whilst all around was changing and adapting, cricket itself would remain pure and unsullied by change. Some, indeed, would have preferred this, advocating such a course in the face of initiatives by more adventurous spirits. Those spirits have prevailed and what a good thing they did. Cricket has been immeasurably widened in its appeal by the provision and promotion of one-day cricket at the highest level of participation.

Those who want the peep at 'eternity' can still get it in the Tests. But for those who want the more immediate and concentrated joys to be experienced in watching the supreme skills of the top players strenuously directed to achieving an early result, one-day cricket has the lot. It puts a premium on the provision of pleasure and in this troubled world we should welcome that. And look at the cricketers who will provide us with this pleasure in the tri-angular contest. The brilliance of Botham, the elegance of Gower and Chappell, the explosiveness of Lillee, the aggressive competitiveness of Hadlee and the great talents of Turner which we hope will be revealed in this exciting environment. I wish the players well and look forward to sharing with hundreds of thousands of my fellow Australians in the delights that await us all in this one-day series.

There is no real reason why Hawke should write a foreword for a cricket magazine except that he is a member of Parliament. I still believe that the crux of the whole foreword is the following paragraph:

But we live in a world of change, indeed of accelerating change. Very little is immune from this process, which carries with it, more and more, the demand for instant gratification.

When I heard that Hawke had replaced Hayden, I immediately felt sorry for Hayden when the election was announced, because poor Bill Hayden did all the hack work, did all the hard work, and we now find him—

Mr Mathwin: He stone walled and was caught in slips.

Mr BECKER: It was more than a catch—they certainly did a good stone walling job. He was beaten by personality and by someone who was marketed and well promoted. This person, who wanted instant gratification, not as Leader of the Opposition but as Prime Minister, has won the battle. I now hope that for this country's sake he will keep his promises. In an interview reported in the *Australian Stock Exchange Journal* of February 1983 he had this to say:

I offer no fistful of dollars to be snatched back after the election. What I do offer is a programme to produce growth and expansion

in the economy, achievable goals for the rebuilding and reconstruction of this nation. What we have to do is break out of the vicious cycle of confrontation imposed by seven long years of the Fraser Government.

That will involve significant new expenditure, significant new investment from both the public and private sectors. It will also involve putting in place mechanisms to ensure that the new growth does not simply disappear in a new round of inflation. That is what our prices and incomes policy is all about.

The whole thrust of our policy is to attack the twin evils of unemployment and inflation together, to get growth back into the economy while ensuring that Australian living standards no longer continue to be eroded by inflation.

Let us look at the track record since this country elected its new Prime Minister. We immediately had the devaluation of the Australian dollar and two billion dollars went out of this country. The devaluation took place and the money started to trickle back to Australia. A total of \$200 000 000 profit was made by certain business entrepreneurs.

Clearly, \$200 000 000 is a pretty good profit in just under a week. Funds started leaving Australia before 5 March, before the election, and as soon as the devaluation occurred the money came back. A group of businessmen, a group of merchant bankers, financiers or individuals, made \$200 000 000. If that money has come back to Australia, will income tax be paid on it? I believe the new Prime Minister should investigate who made that profit, and who was responsible for taking that money out of Australia and bringing it back? I believe that this can be traced through the Reserve Bank if it properly watched the movement of money in and out of this country as it should have done and as it has done in the past. The sum of \$200 000 000 is not a bad pay-off to the business sector, promoters and marketers and the like. They may have promoted one of the political Parties, I do not know, but somehow the people of Australia must pay for that \$200 000 000. It makes me furious to think that the people have been gypped again, that big business or big multi-nationals or certain individuals have made such a profit at the expense of those who cannot afford it, those people who are unfortunately in that poverty line area at the present time.

An amount of \$200 000 000 could have done much good for such people, but such investors do not give a damn about them. I wish the new Prime Minister well in trying to plug the loopholes in this area to prevent tax avoidance. I would wish him even better if he could apply some tax on that \$200 000 000. My bet is that that money will not come back to Australia and that it is planted elsewhere for the benefit of the greedy. So, the poor old Aussie battler suffers again.

I was particularly interested to see itemised some of the major planks of the Labor Party's policy. This is what the new Prime Minister promised:

- Increased economic growth will be achieved through:
- Increased public works and service
 - Tax reductions for low and middle income earners—

I think that is an excellent idea—

- Greater borrowing opportunities for business, farmers and home-buyers

I could not support that more than I do. Where the Ramsay Trust regrettably did fail is obvious from just looking at the prospectus, which does not turn anyone on. We need in this country a system under which the Government can go to the people and borrow funds in the form of Government guaranteed debentures.

It would have been better if the Housing Trust had sponsored the Ramsay Trust rather than a group of entrepreneurs who did not have that much experience in this area. That is the point I tried to make yesterday: one must know what one is doing in regard to low rental-purchase housing systems. We need to provide an opportunity for young people to borrow money not for 20 years but up to 40 years at a

maximum acceptable interest rate of 4 per cent. We should get back to sane interest rates. The Government should be involved in the amount of interest paid, as was the situation 30 years ago. Why cannot we return to that position?

Both my parents and I had the opportunity to borrow at a long term on low interest rates. Such a situation can be forcibly brought about through the taxation system and other controls exercised by the Reserve Bank. This is where the Federal Liberal Government failed and where the Federal Labor Government failed in the Whitlam era—it is where we are still failing. The Reserve Bank is there as the prop to the financial institutions in this country. It is fortunate that we have it. In America banks are still failing, with about 20 banks crashing there up to August last year. Many large banks are in trouble now through the dropping OPEC oil prices. There are problems in Mexico, and other countries will experience terrible problems making the interest payments on their multi-billion dollar loans from American banks.

The finance companies, the merchant banks, and the moneylenders have never been controlled, yet the banking system is controlled even though that is the only part of the financial system that provides long-term low-interest finance. Indeed, that is what it is there for. The entry of foreign banks into the Australian financial field will have no beneficial effect. Such banks will only fiddle with exchange rates: they will not invest money for little or no return.

Depositors could be protected by the same method as that applying in America where deposits of up to \$100 000 are protected. If the bank goes into liquidation, the depositor is protected up to \$100 000 of his deposit. Our system is better under the Reserve Bank. Building societies and life assurance and other insurance societies can be controlled under the appropriate legislation. If the new Prime Minister has any courage, this is how he should work and this is what he should do to ensure that sufficient funds are available to take up the slack and make money available for people to purchase their own homes.

The object of the Ramsay Trust was good, but the concept proved to be only an academic exercise. One must use practical common sense when considering national finance, and I wish the new Federal Government well in this area. I hope that the State Government will insist that the Federal Government implement these suggestions. A worthwhile innovation would be the issue of what are known in New Zealand as 'Granny bonds', where pensioners and other retired persons, who do not wish to earn much interest because of the adverse effect of such interest on income tax and pension benefits, require only that their money be kept safely for them. If we had such a scheme, tens of millions of dollars would be waiting to be invested.

We do not want people putting money under the bed or into a sock: they should be able to put their money into 4 per cent bonds, to be known as 'Granny bonds' for want of a better name. The Federal Government can help the States in this respect. The new Prime Minister has promised to increase the real value of the pay packet, to stimulate demand in the economy, and to restore equity to the tax system. I wish him well in those aims. He has also promised to prevent the erosion of after-tax income by inflation, but I do not know how he will do that. He has further promised to end the loss of millions of dollars through tax evasion and tax avoidance, and to wipe out such practices. However, I believe that that is impossible because I brought to the attention of the previous Treasurer certain tax avoidance schemes that had been suggested to me through charitable organisations, and for about 18 months Treasury officials wrestled with legislation to try to wipe out such schemes.

They could have wiped them out if they named the organisations, the solicitors and quite a few other financiers

involved in the system. However, this is an extremely difficult area, particularly where there are cash businesses, cash crops and the cash-and-carry type situation. There will never be a fair and equitable distribution of taxation in this country, and that is why I believe that the Medicare system will fall again because not everybody will pay his share.

It would be ideal to have a national superannuation fund into which everyone pays a percentage of his income tax and that income tax is marked for a national superannuation fund. However, there are many people in our society who grow cash crops or who, in the cash situation, never declare it. They are skimming it off every retail business that we know of. Retail has so much skimmed off every week in cash. So, who will pay his fair share: the poor old average working bloke. One never hears anything from the Labor Party on that one. It does not seem to be able to come to grips with that problem.

So, I wish Bob Hawke well. If he can solve that problem, I will support him all the way if he can assure us that there is an equal tax situation. So, when one gets Governments making promises like this and when one gets prospective candidates in elections making promises to the people, I think that it is only fair and reasonable that we insist from now on that they spell out these details and tell us how these programmes will work.

I think that Bob Hawke put a plan to the electorate—'Win at all costs and let us worry about paying the bill later on.' I am starting to think that that may well have been the Labor Party's intention at our last State election and, certainly, that situation occurred in Victoria. I do not know how Premier Wran keeps maintaining that magnificent majority in New South Wales, but he does.

Mr Mathwin: He promises them everything and gives them nothing.

Mr BECKER: That is right. I cannot understand why the people in Australia accept such a situation. We have the Federal Labor Government saying there is a Federal Budget blow-out of \$9 billion, with Mr Howard arguing \$6 billion, and on it goes. However, I thought that it was quite ironic that in his Address in Reply speech on 14 December the member for Henley Beach had this to say in *Hansard*, at page 117:

We are now facing record current account deficits of more than \$9 000 000 000. This deficit has a serious implication for currency stability, domestic interest rates policy and budgetary policies.

If ever the member for Henley Beach was spot-on in his predictions and spot-on about the economic situation as it has occurred, it was in that statement. I do not know whether he had insight or inside information. Perhaps that \$9 billion is a figure that the Labor Party came up with in December and it is the figure that they have been promoting ever since. I recall that during the Federal election campaign the shadow Treasurer, Mr Keating, was asked, 'How can you pay for your promises?' He said, 'There is no problem. We can pay for our promises, because the Liberal Federal Government has just borrowed \$3.5 billion overseas, and that money is being held in trust. That will pay for our promises.' Perhaps there may have been \$9 billion. Perhaps that \$3.5 billion was sitting there offsetting deficit, so that the \$6 billion is the true figure.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It wasn't enough to pay all the defeated Liberal members' superannuation.

Mr BECKER: I disagree with the Minister.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: The point is that I believe that that \$3.5 billion was offset and that the actual deficit figure that has been promoted by Mr Howard was accurate. But Keating somehow fell for the three-card trick by saying, 'It is there in trust and we will use it.' Nothing was said about that and it was not followed through. I cannot understand how

the media or our own politicians did not follow through how Keating knew that there was \$3 500 000 000 sitting there. So many unanswered questions and so many problems are being conjured up by the various Labor Governments in New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and now federally that people have been conditioned into thinking that they are going to have to pay, pay and pay.

One of the major promises made by the Labor Party was that if OPEC dropped its oil price the Government would drop petrol prices by 3c a litre. Bob Hawke said that, and a report was published stating that there would be an immediate reduction in the petrol price by 3c a litre. He has already broken that promise. He did not say that that would be spread over three years, or whatever period; he said that he would reduce petrol prices immediately by 3c a litre. There we are, the first promise. In office less than a week and that promise is broken. The same situation is happening here.

I feel for the people of this country who are unemployed, who are facing a housing crisis, and who are on the poverty line. They are the people who deserve immediate attention, and it is time that this State Government, which has been in office for 126 days, started to do something for them. It is also time that the Federal Government started to move to uphold its promises. If not, then it should hand over to those who are prepared to do something for the people.

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

The Hon. M.M. WILSON (Torrens): I support the motion. I take this opportunity of welcoming you, Mr Speaker, to the very responsible position to which this House has appointed you, and I am sure that over the time which faces us in this Parliament we will reap the benefits of your fairness and your considerations of the Standing Orders.

I welcome all new members to this House. I mean that very sincerely. Members opposite will forgive me if I welcome in particular the members for Mitcham and Goyder. I must say that, in listening to their maiden speeches before the end of last year, I was extremely impressed and I am sure that both will make signal contributions to this House. I also take the opportunity to congratulate the member for Morphett on his speech today. I am sorry that the Minister of Transport has left the Chamber, not because I regard the Minister of Recreation and Sport as a lesser member of the Ministry, but because the speech by the member for Morphett was devoted to a large extent to transport to the southern suburbs. I congratulate the member for Morphett on his very efficient resume of what has happened in the southern suburbs regarding the promises made by the Labor Party before the last State election.

I commend the reading of the speech by the member for Morphett to the Minister of Transport, because he will find in that speech many items of interest which I hope will cause him to look at the promises that he made on behalf of the Labor Party before the last election in providing transportation (and I use that in a general sense, including roads and public transport) to the southern suburbs. These suburbs are very important indeed, suburbs which, I believe, are disadvantaged in many ways, not least with regard to transportation, and they do need special consideration. I make that point because I was most impressed by the contribution by the member for Morphett.

I am sorry that the Minister has left because I wish to canvass one matter in particular regarding his responsibility as Minister of Marine. It is a matter which has been a bipartisan effort. I refer, of course, to the obtaining of shipping services, especially cellular container shipping services, to Adelaide through the Australian North-South Shipping Conference which, in fact, means shipping services between—

Mr Whitten: Refer to the member for Victoria's contribution.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: —between Adelaide, Japan-Korea. The only point I wish to make is that I am disappointed that the Minister has not yet been able to announce the successful culmination of negotiations which have been going ahead over a period of time. As the member for Price mentioned the member for Victoria, I take this opportunity to once again pay a tribute to the work done by the member for Victoria when he was Minister of Marine.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: How many boats did he sink?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I would have expected better from the member for Elizabeth. The original negotiations for the Australia to Europe Shipping Conference were started by the former member for Hartley, the former Premier, Mr Corcoran. They were continued by the member for Victoria when he was Minister. I had the privilege of being Minister of Marine when that agreement was signed. It is to the credit of those previous Ministers that I was able to do that.

In particular, one fact which I believe turned the scales in favour of gaining that very important shipping service for South Australia was the formation by the member for Victoria of the South Australian Shipping User Group, a group of importers and exporters who would use the shipping services. It was because the shipping conferences could meet not only with the Minister and officials of the Department of Marine and Harbors, but also with representatives of the South Australian Shipping User Group, that tipped the scales in South Australia's favour. In my negotiations as Minister with the Japanese, with the Eastern States representatives of the Australia North-South Shipping Conference, and with the Australian National Lines, the fact that we were backed up in our negotiations by the South Australian Shipping User Group brought us to a very successful culmination of talks just before the last State election.

Those talks were held in the Cabinet room with representatives of Japan and with the bodies I have outlined. The then Premier, the member for Bragg, attended and at that meeting a virtual guarantee was given that South Australia would receive the benefits of a direct container shipping service between Adelaide and Japan-Korea. To give him credit, when the Government changed the present Minister of Marine travelled to Japan to fill in the appointment I had made for what I had hoped would be the final meeting to be followed by an announcement that the contracts or agreement had been signed for the service.

The Minister, to his credit, came back and stated that he had not been able to finalise the deal but that he hoped very much to be able to announce early in the new year that the service had been agreed to, in particular by the Japanese. I mention this only because it has been a bipartisan effort, but I must say that I am extremely disappointed that the Minister has not yet been able to announce that very important agreement. I hope very much that he will be able to do that soon. I pledge the support of the Opposition and any good offices that we have to the Government in its obtaining that cellular container shipping service between Japan, Korea, and the port of Adelaide. That is all I wanted to say on that matter. I hope that the Minister of Recreation and Sport will pass on my offer to his colleague, because I regard this matter as extremely important.

I refer now to education, and I guess that no-one would be surprised at that. The first matter I wish to canvass is the political actions of the teachers unions. I want to make clear that I do not intend this to be an attack on teachers; nor is it an exercise in teacher bashing. Let me say at the outset that, from my information gathering as shadow Minister of Education, I am now in no doubt whatever that our teachers and our State education system are the best in the

Commonwealth. I have not been told that by South Australian educationalists only—we could forgive them for having pride in their own system. I have been told that by teachers and fairly highly placed officials who have moved from the Victorian and New South Wales education systems. Only last week a person told me that there is no doubt that the South Australian system is the best, and we must preserve it as the best.

That does not mean that the teachers unions should be absolved from criticism when they deserve it; nor does it mean that the Minister and the education system should be absolved from criticism when we believe that there can be improvements, and I will say more about that later. Before the last State election, the Executive of the South Australian Institute of Teachers commissioned a series of advertisements attacking the then Government. I understand that about \$50 000 to \$60 000 was dedicated to that exercise.

Before the recent Federal election, the Australian Teachers Federation, which is the national body, with which the South Australian Institute of Teachers is now affiliated, spent about \$500 000 in supporting the Labor Party campaign. Quite recently, an advertisement, opposing uranium mining at Honeymoon, was placed in a local South Australian newspaper by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I agree with what the former Federal Minister for Education, Senator Baume, had to say a few weeks ago, that in any union, whether it be a white-collar union or a trade union, provided a decision is reached by the democratic process, then there is not much anybody else can do about it except criticise it, which he did at that stage.

The executive of the South Australian Institute of Teachers is coming under a lot of criticism from its own membership. That has been most evident in the past few days. I have had numerous representations from members of that institute expressing grave dissatisfaction with the actions of the Executive. I qualify that; I have had some talks with the institute and Ms Ebert, its President. I must be fair in saying that the decision to place the advertisement which opposed uranium mining at Honeymoon was taken by the conference of the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I place that on record because I have, in the past, referred to the executive.

In my negotiations with the President, she told me that most of these decisions were taken either by conference or by the State Council of the institute. I place that on record so that what I am saying can be regarded as balanced. However, I reiterate that there is grave dissatisfaction within the ranks of the institute. I take this opportunity to gently chastise some of those people who are dissatisfied with the institute and are threatening to resign from it. I believe that that is a mistake and that those teachers and members of the union who are dissatisfied with the actions of the Executive should not resign, but stay within the councils of the union and try to ensure that their point of view is heard. That is the democratic process and I believe that that is the way it should be carried out.

Before the Federal election we had, mainly at the instigation of the Australian Teachers Federation and the institute, a revival in this State of the divisive State-aid debate. The debate on State aid is one of the great issues of debate in this country since Federation, and before. It ranks with the great debates on conscription and free trade. Those are the three great debates in Australia since the Constitution was signed in 1901. Fortunately, over the past 10 or so years until now the divisiveness of that debate has abated. I believe that debates which cause divisions within the community are dangerous and counter-productive, especially when they cause such grave divisions that set families against families and income groups against other socio-economic groups. Unfortunately, during the past 12 months or so the

divisiveness of the State-aid debate has once more become apparent.

Mr Lewis: Anything but bringing Australia together.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Indeed, as the member for Mallee reminds me. It has been brought to the attention of the Australian people, mainly because of the dedication of the Australian Teachers Federation in particular and, to a lesser extent, its affiliate in South Australia, and has caused divisions which, if we lived in New South Wales or Victoria, we would find hard to believe. We are fortunate in South Australia that the two different spheres of schooling co-exist and have, up to this stage, existed reasonably well and with mutual respect. I hope very much that that continues, and I know that the Minister of Education believes that, too. But, there is no doubt that in the Eastern States the debate has been extremely divisive.

The member for Unley has criticised the Independent Schools Parents Associations Federation for a pamphlet that it sent home through its schools with the schoolchildren to parents. The member for Unley criticised that because he believed that it was blatantly political. I cannot remember his exact words and I do not want to misquote him, but it was something to that effect. But, can one blame the federation for reacting when it saw the type of advertising that was being inserted in the newspapers by, in this case, the Institute of Teachers in South Australia, or the executive of the institute, because in that advertising, when talking about the funding for students at non-Government schools, the institute dealt with only half of the story? In its pamphlet, which was widely distributed amongst the community, it said that the Federal Government gave more to students at non-government schools than it did to students at Government schools. If one take the figures straight from the Federal Budget on that line that is so. However, what the institute did not say in the advertisement was that the Federal Government funds education in the States. Certainly, the States are responsible for education under our Constitution, and I hope that they always will be, but the institute did not say that the Federal Government funded education in the States, and when one adds the two figures together one finds—and honourable members opposite may be able to pick me up on points of minor detail on this—that 12 per cent of the total education funding by Governments in this country goes to non-government schools when they have 20 per cent plus of the students. How can one blame the Federation of Independent School Parents Associations for reacting to that type of statement?

That is the problem with the executive of the teachers union, because that is one of the things that is causing dissatisfaction amongst its members. Many members of the union are teachers at non-government schools, and that is good. It is eminently desirable for the non-government sector and the Government sector to mix as much as possible and, in particular, with teachers because teachers are the most important profession in this community; do not let anybody be under any doubt about that, because they have in their hands the ability to mould the minds of our young.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: May I say how glad I am to see that the Minister of Education has entered the House.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I must apologise, because I did not know that the honourable member was speaking. I undertake to read his comments, as he reads mine.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I am glad to hear that the Minister of Education has retained his sense of humour, because I think that he is going to need it. I was just concluding my remarks, when my colleague kindly called members in to hear what I was saying, about the State aid

debate and the involvement in such issues of the Institute of Teachers and the Australian Teachers Federation. I reiterate that I have tried to be constructive in my remarks about the teachers unions. I have spoken to the leadership of the teachers unions as well as to many members of those unions, and we must always have such a dialogue.

It was important for me to say what I have said. Before moving to my next point, I welcome you to the Chair for the first time, Madam Acting Deputy Speaker, because I believe that it is the first time a woman has taken the Chair since the former member for Todd, Mrs Byrne.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It was Tea Tree Gully then.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Tea Tree Gully, yes. I do not think that that should pass without comment. I now refer to the present Labor Government in South Australia and a couple of facets of what it has done in the field of education since it came to office on 6 November. In education, as in many other Ministries, the Government has not done well. The Minister has not done well, and I point out at this stage that I respect the Minister of Education. I believe that he is capable and that he has integrity. However, that does not mean that he does not make mistakes. Indeed, he has made mistakes and the Government has made mistakes in two areas especially since it was formed.

The first thing that the Government did was to close down the school building programme. It put a stop to all public works while it held a review. It is not my charter tonight to go through a list of all the public works that the Government has stopped. However, the cessation of the school building programme caused grievous alarm in the community, especially amongst those communities with schools that were affected. In particular, I refer to the school at Kingston, in the electorate of my colleague from Mallee.

Mr Mathwin: What about the school at Brighton in the district of your colleague from Glenelg?

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I do not have to mention that because the honourable member has just done that. I refer to the Stirling East Primary School and the Prospect Primary School. I could go on, but I will not go through them all in detail.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: In replying to an interjection that is out of order, I indicate that Prospect Primary School is in the Premier's District of Ross Smith on the boundary between Ross Smith and Torrens District. That does not take away from the ham-fisted way that the Government has handled the situation by putting a stop to the school building programme while the programme was reviewed. Only now are decisions being made about the schools. Indeed, I have a Question of Notice to the Minister which he has not yet answered concerning which of the former Government's school building programmes have been deferred and the cost of that deferral.

In regard to Kingston, there is a community that had negotiated with two former Governments. It had gone to the former Labor Government and had negotiated for years in regard to this most imaginative co-operative venture. Negotiations had involved not just the Education Department but also the Department of Recreation and Sport to form a magnificent concept of a joint recreation/school facility, with the community providing the bulk of the money.

The council and the people of Kingston in the South-East were to put in the bulk of the money. Those negotiations had gone on for years. I believe they went on for too long under the Government of which I was a member, but at last in 1982 decisions were reached, and the additional funding from the Department of Recreation and Sport was gained, as well as that from the Education Department, and the council and the citizens of Kingston agreed to raise the

extra money for that most imaginative project. The go ahead was given, and they were told that tenders would be called in January. The member for Mallee can correct me—

Mr Lewis: In December, and tenders were called.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Tenders were called in January, but the whole process was stopped by the Labor Government's review of the school building programme. Now, only in the last few days has the Minister of Public Works—

Mr Rodda: The boss!

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: Yes—the Minister who has obviously disappointed his colleague the Minister of Education. Only in the last few days has the go-ahead been given after a tremendous upheaval in the Kingston community. At one stage they kept their children away from school as a protest at the actions of the State Government. The Minister of Public Works had the hide to tell these people recently that, if the project went over budget, the community itself would have to pay, yet he had delayed the project for four months with the resultant cost escalation in building costs. That is shameful.

It would be less shameful if he had not asked them to pay the cost over and above the budget. However, that was what had to be agreed to by the people of Kingston if the project was to go ahead. I cite that as an example of the ham-fisted way in which this Government has handled the matter. It got to the stage where the Minister of Education was besieged with deputations concerning the school building programme. I believe that his and his officers' time was continually taken up by going to see school communities, working on this problem and the review of the school building programme.

I understand that another agreement has been reached regarding Stirling East, but it is not what the people have been promised; it is not what they were told they would get by the previous Government, but a compromise. I do not wish to say any more on that matter other than to point out that the Government handled it very badly and, as I say, caused a lot of unnecessary anguish in the community.

I now refer to the Minister's handling of the current dispute concerning the transfer of primary salaries to the secondary sector. Honourable members will recall that the Minister answered a question on that matter today. I have to say that my admiration for the Minister's footwork grew when I heard his answer, because he danced around the subject in a maze of statistics. He is very good at that; he did it in Opposition, too. However, he never once really got to the main issue at stake, namely, that the staff of 29 primary schools in this State who were promised the staffing allocation that they had were told on or about 3 March this year that, depending on the school, they were to lose between 0.5 and two staff members. On 3 March, four weeks into the school year they were told that. If ever a Minister was ham-fisted in his handling of a problem, this was a very, very good example of it.

It simply boils down to this: in this regard the Minister has not honoured the promise that he made. He has admitted that by his press statements. The simple facts are that the Minister said that the Labor Government would retain 231 teaching positions over and above what would have applied under a Liberal Government. The Minister has said that publicly: he cannot deny that. He has said, I repeat, that 'the Labor Government will retain 231 teaching positions over and above what would apply under a Liberal Government'. He admitted in the newspapers last week that that had been reduced to 167. The South Australian Institute of Teachers says that it is 140. I say that it is even less than that, and it is important that the House understands this point, because nowhere in his statement did the Minister mention the post-Budget promise of the Liberal Government

to allocate \$1 000 000 extra between January and 30 June 1983. The sum of \$1 000 000 extra was offered by the Tonkin Government between 1 January (or the beginning of the school year) and 30 June, and that represents 100 teachers. The Treasury advice to the Tonkin Government on the cost of a teacher in the system is \$22 000 per annum.

The member for Newland is making notes, and I hope that he checks it; I have asked the Minister to check it. The figure is not 167 but is a good deal less than 100, and yet the Minister said that he would retain 231 teaching positions over and above what the Tonkin Government was going to supply. In addition, he enunciated as Labor Party policy that there would be 940 teaching positions over three years. The former Deputy Premier knows what that means in money terms: it means \$20 000 000 a year in three years time. The Minister has really only supplied, by his own admission, 167, but by my calculations it would be a good deal less than 100, so he has still got 800 to go. That means that he has to find \$16 000 000. That is the Minister's problem, he knows it and so does Cabinet.

I return to the transfer of primary salaries to secondary, because it is not I saying this but also the South Australian Institute of Teachers, which in an advertisement in the *Advertiser* on 15 March said:

Mr Bannon—who will be my teacher next week? It is good that 2 000 more students than expected have stayed in school this year. But their needs must be met, and the Government is not providing the extra teachers needed.

That was a reference to the Minister's plea to secondary school students to stay on at school. There are about 1 600 who have stayed on at secondary school this year over and above the estimate made by the Education Department. The advertisement continues:

Primary students are having to go into different and bigger classes because their teachers are being moved away. Many children are having to start the year all over again, and many secondary students are still in over-size classes. This situation is not acceptable to parents and teachers in schools affected by these disruptions. We need some positive action, Mr Bannon!

It then says:

Inserted by concerned parents and teachers present at a meeting on 11 March 1983. Concerned parents and teachers, come to Parliament House steps on Thursday 17 March at 4.30 p.m. Inserted by the South Australian Institute of Teachers.

Mr Groom: You said that they were no good.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I did not say that they were no good; you know it, and do not try to put words in my mouth. It involves not just the South Australian Institute of Teachers: let us have a look at what the Primary Principals Association thinks of the present action by the Government. Before reading what that association thinks of this action by the Minister, I will read a letter received by this Party on the question of the removal of one of a school's primary staff on 3 March, four weeks into the school year. The letter is from the Naracoorte Primary School and addressed to my colleague the member for Victoria. It states:

Dear Sir,

School's in its fourth week back, the children are settled and we're settled with everything running well. We get a message: 'You must lose a staff member.' Consternation. Who? From what area? What about teaching programmes? Too bad. One must and will go.

We, the staff of the Naracoorte Primary School, wish to draw to your attention the most unsatisfactory decision taken this week by the department, which we consider to be particularly disruptive to the overall effective operation of the school, its students and staff.

Last year our school put forward meritorious programmes which enabled us to have negotiable salaries. This is what we have lost, and so innovative learning programmes, remedial help, grouping, etc., have to go so that there can be a salary transferred to a high school. Many primary schools are being thus affected.

In fact, 29 schools are affected. The letter continues:

The Minister invited older students back to school, but if he cannot pay teachers to teach them, then he should not do so. Two thousand more secondary students returned than were expected, and the result has been that primary salaries have been removed to the secondary level. Primary students are now worse off as individual teacher-student time has been decreased. The most relevant point is that young children in their formative years are paying for the Minister's generous offer. Perhaps the Minister would return these teachers, thus giving our younger children the opportunities they deserve.

That letter was sent by the staff of the Naracoorte Primary School. Not only the Institute of Teachers was upset about the Minister's decision and believed that his handling of the situation was ham-fisted: the Primary Principals Association believed the same. I will quote yet again a letter written to me by the President of the Primary Principals Association. I also point out that he wrote a letter to the Premier. If I have time I will also read that into the record but it is a long letter.

Mr Gunn: Was he pleased?

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: He was not pleased. I will omit the first page of the letter to me, although members are quite free to see it. That page deals with the list of schools affected. The President then states:

I believe that these 25 schools are expected to lose their equivalent—

Mr Whitten: I thought you said it was 29 schools.

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I am quoting the letter. The President was in error and later telephoned me (as did the Institute of Teachers) to confirm that there were four more. The letter states:

I believe that these 25 schools are expected to lose the equivalent of 21.9 salaries. There may be some modification as a result of feedback from the regional directors.

It is interesting to note that some of the schools received the staff, which they are about to lose, at the beginning of the year on the basis of school needs in accordance with submissions by the school principals, in accordance with requests by me as President of the Primary Principals Association, and in accord with responses we believe at Ministerial level, for example, LeFevre, Allenby Gardens, Mansfield Park, Ridley Grove, Hendon, Pennington and Goodwood. To appoint additional staff to a school like Mansfield Park—

which I believe is in the Premier's electorate—

which would be seen as a school with special needs by any Education Department and any Government, and then to withdraw that staff on the flimsy pretext of 'unexpected' increased enrolments in secondary schools resulting from the Minister's own public action shows a lack of apparent response and propriety on the part of the Minister.

Those are not my words but the words of Mr Talbot, the President of the Primary Principals Association. He continues:

So that there are no misunderstandings, you may use the copy of my letter to the Premier and this letter publicly, either in the media or in the Parliament.

This is very important:

It is not my intention, as President of the Primary Principals Association, to sit by whilst this [Labor] Government repudiates its agreements, welches on its undertakings, apparently by stealth, without even going through the motions of consultation, so much a part of the Government's public posture. As long as I am President of the Primary Principals Association, our association will pursue policies of putting the needs of children first without fear or favour, no matter which Party is in government. We have proved that to be so in the past, and will continue to act that way in the future.

No Minister could expect a more damning indictment than a letter such as that from an organisation that is dedicated to the welfare of our children in the schools. I will not quote the letter to the Premier, because it is too long, but I am sure that members opposite—

Mr Groom: What would you have done?

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: I believe that the member for Hartley infers that I will not quote the letter because it contains criticism of the former Minister. I have spoken

to the former Minister, and he is quite happy for me to quote this letter. I reflect back to what the Minister stated in Question Time today. He did not deal with the specific issue: he dealt with everything else but the specific issue. The plain fact is that the Minister and the Government have not kept their promises to the teachers. They are saying that the economy and the bush fires have involved extra Government expenditure.

But it does not matter what is the real cause. The Government promised something and it has not delivered. So far, the Minister's only defence has been to say that, if the Liberals were in Government, there would be no extra teachers. I have already exploded that myth by bringing to the attention of the House once again that a post-Budget announcement in 1982 stated that the Tonkin Government had allocated an extra 100 teaching positions, representing \$1 000 000, for the six months of the school year up to June 1983. Of course, that would be \$2 000 000 in one year.

I now wish to refer very briefly to the Government's education promises. The costing of the Government's education promises has been to the fore of late. Education is a very expensive item. I have already stated that, from the education policy document that was issued on 17 October, 950 extra teaching positions were to be retained over what was required under the formula. The education policy document of the Labor Party states (not my words, but words that, no doubt, were drafted by the present Minister of Education):

Declining enrolments over the next three years will notionally liberate 950 teaching positions; Labor will retain all of those positions to staff its initiatives.

I have already explained that that involved \$20 500 000, taking into account the average teaching salary as at 15 July 1982 of \$21 600 per annum. Of course, that figure will inflate markedly over the next three years, during which the extra 950 teaching positions will have to be brought on stream.

So, it will be more than \$20 500 000 on the basis of July figures. In the area of early childhood education, we are told that a Labor Government will assist in the development of television programmes and Labor will continue and expand its assistance to toy library programmes. That is costed on the basis of assuming that the production cost for one minute of television viewing material is \$1 200, and that one half-hour programme per week over 40 weeks of the school year would be a cost of \$1 400 000 per annum.

The Labor Party commits itself to reducing the staff ratio in pre schools from its present level of 11.5 to 1 to 10 to 1 within its next term of government. Once achieved this would cost \$800 000 a year, on Labor Party costings. I am not saying that some of these things are not eminently desirable, but it is extremely important that the community is aware of the cost of education. There is nothing more important in the education debate than that people should be aware of the cost of the provision of education because, in the Minister's own words, he admits that priorities have to be set; money cannot continue to be poured into education because there is just no money to pour into it. The Minister used those words last night at a meeting I attended.

Concerning indexed budget operating grants payable to pre schools, Labor will double the present special services section of the Kindergarten Union. Labor will provide up to \$25 000 annually to meet requests for funding programmes at pre schools designed to assist in the integration of handicapped children. In particular, an allocation of \$10 000 per year will be made to the Seawynd Centre for a three-year period. These are admirable policy presentations, at a cost of \$430 000 per annum. I am not saying that these policies should not be carried out, but the cost has to be found and

told to the public. It is the duty of the Opposition to find out the cost of these programmes.

A Labor Government, we are told, will establish a maximum class size of 25 for the junior primary level of schooling within three years. That is a very important promise. It is estimated that this requires the equivalent of 100 full-time equivalent positions. A Labor Government will establish a maximum class size of 27 for the remaining levels of primary schooling. It is estimated that this will require 150 full-time equivalent positions. The Opposition has not allocated any cost to this as I assume that those teaching positions will come from the 950 staff promised by the Government. So, the Opposition is being fair in not allocating costs to that promise.

Concerning school assistants, reversion to the 1979 school assistants staffing formula, which the Minister promised, has done and should get credit for, is to cost \$1 548 000. Those costs are worked out by public servants, not by me. It would cost \$50 000 a year for the establishment of a centre for childhood difficulties, which is the Minister's cost in Opposition. A multicultural resource centre will cost \$100 000. An extra allocation of 40 full-time equivalent positions will be created in Aboriginal education. Obviously, that will come out of the 950 staff, so there is no cost allocation for that. The North-West Community Education Centre is costed at \$660 000. Curriculum materials (the cost is estimated by public servants and not by me) are costed at \$220 000 and, in addition, each school will receive a small grant for the purchase of additional curriculum materials.

Regarding study leave for teachers, 75 full-time equivalent positions would be required. We assume that that will come out of the 950 pool that the Minister has already mentioned. Regarding the Teacher Housing Authority, Labor will remove the anomalies caused by the Teacher Housing Authority charging different rates according to the source of the house, whether authority-owned or leased from the Housing Trust or from private sources. The cost of that promise is \$100 000 per annum. Regarding technical and further education, stream six fees will not be increased beyond the c.p.i. and the concessions policy will be reviewed. Child care facilities will be provided at community colleges, with one professionally trained staff member in each. The Minister spoke about it at Question Time—\$500 000 per annum. And so it goes on. The total of those promises at the end of three years is \$24 500 000 in today's dollars.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who blew out the Budget?

The Hon. M.M. WILSON: From what you can believe, it was caused by natural disasters in this State. That is the way the Government likes to present it, yet the Government has said that it was the former Government which blew out the Budget—according to the Premier. Yet these are the costs of implementing the Government's education policy in a full year after three years—\$24 500 000. I hasten to add that some of these promises are very worth while and if at all possible they should be carried out, and this Opposition will see that they are carried out.

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

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 KLUNDER (Newland): May I say at the beginning that while I am very glad to see you there, Mr Deputy Speaker, I am slightly disappointed that you took over from the member for Brighton at the time you did. I was looking

forward to addressing her as 'Madam Acting Speaker', or perhaps traditionally as 'Mr Acting Speaker', or perhaps as 'Mrs Acting Speaker' so we could work out whether or not there was a 'Mr Acting Speaker' around the place somewhere, or perhaps even in deference to the member for Glenelg as 'Ms Acting Speaker', and perhaps even totally neutrally as 'Person Acting Speaker'. But, I wish to comment, also, like the member for Torrens—

An honourable member: Do you know that 'person' is gender derivative?

Mr KLUNDER: We will not go into that argument now. As the member for Torrens remarked, it is the first time that a lady, or a person of the female sex, has taken the Chair during debates since Mrs Molly Byrne did during the time when she might still have been the member for Barossa, or perhaps during the time when she was the member for Tea Tree Gully. The first time she took the Chair was certainly before she became the member for Todd. I saw Mrs Molly Byrne this afternoon. She is well. I shall take great delight in pointing out to her that her so-many-year-old record has now been equalled.

I do not want to say too much about the contribution to the debate of the member for Torrens because I am not too sure that he would want me to. The one and only question that he did not answer, although it was put to him from this side on several occasions, was where he would have got the money from. The point is that one can only be so negative, and that is all he was. He indicated that the Government should have provided the money; he did not indicate where he in the same position would have taken the money from—which Government department he would have taken millions of dollars away from in order to do it. The point is, of course, that in a later point he made on another issue, also on education, he stated that the Government could not keep on pouring money into education. He really must decide whether he wants to run with the hares or the hounds in relation to this matter.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: You made the promises.

Mr KLUNDER: It is easy to be negative, and I suppose it is pleasant to be negative when in Opposition. However, I would have hoped for better from the member for Torrens, because I know that he is capable of a better standard of debate. I now refer to some matters that are peripheral to the tourist industry. Obviously, the time constraint does not allow one to debate the tourist industry in detail. However, I hope to make some suggestions and some comments. My interest in this matter began when a teacher called at my office and pointed out that he would like some material to take to the United States, where he was going on a 12-month exchange scholarship. He wanted to give the material to his students in that country to engender some interest in the State of South Australia.

The teacher found it remarkably difficult, and so did I, to obtain enough material. It was put to me by the Tourist Department, I think quite correctly, that it was unreasonable to spend money which would end up in the scrapbooks of kids in the United States, when that money was originally allocated to be spent to attract people to South Australia. This led me, via a rather circuitous route, to look at cost-effective ways in which South Australia could be promoted overseas to increase our share of the tourist cake.

In my contribution tonight I do not want to criticise the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau in any way. I believe that it does quite a reasonable job in the difficult economic situation in which it finds itself, like all Government departments. In fact, it is quite obvious that it has done a great deal of good thinking in this area and I will quite shamelessly use some of its analysis of the tourist market. The tourist bureau believes that it provides infor-

mation for tourists at three distinct levels, and the first is known as motivational material.

Motivational material is information which is basically used to persuade people to visit South Australia, because South Australia is an attractive, good or pretty place. It is information which is sent overseas; it is information which goes to tourist agencies, to travel agencies, and airline agencies both interstate and overseas for dissemination to clients; and it is information which the people of South Australia could easily send overseas to promote this State amongst people that they happen to know overseas.

By definition, such material is glossy, full of photographs, very pretty, and very expensive. Examples of it include, for example, a booklet put out by the tourist bureau entitled *The Many Worlds of South Australia*. It contains about 30 pages of material, all of it very pretty, very glossy and which takes in an overall coverage of the State. It includes sections on Adelaide, the Flinders Ranges, the vineyards, the outback, and so on. The booklet does not contain terribly much detailed information, but it is not meant to. I suppose one could also include under the heading 'motivational material' a document simply entitled *South Australia*, which was printed by the State Promotion Unit of the Premier's Department under the last Government. I understand that some 30 000 of these booklets were printed during the last 12 months of the Tonkin Government. Each booklet contains a photograph of the then Premier, and there are still 25 000 of those booklets lying around. It is an interesting piece of documentation, because it provides information which mainly relates to industry and South Australia's resource base. It also contains a chapter on tourism entitled 'The Pleasure is yours'.

Also, it has a chapter headed 'Living' with the subheading 'The good life'. When one thinks about it, it is only in documentation provided by the previous Liberal Government under the heading 'The good life' that we could find a full page glossy photograph (and quite a pretty one) of Rundle Mall in which there is a newspaper billboard with the clear heading 'Machete attack in the city'. I am not sure what clientele that is supposed to attract to South Australia, but doubtless someone will tell me. The second level of information for potential tourists is in what are the so-called sight-seeing guides.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson: Did you find the photograph of the Mitcham Labor candidate there?

Mr KLUNDER: No. I take it you put him in there to contrast with the concept of the machete attack. The so-called sight-seeing guides, and I just happened to pick one up from the Tourist Bureau about the South-East, give a more detailed regional approach to tourism. The one I have here provides information with many pretty photographs. It provides information about lobsters, prawns, volcanoes, caverns, the Blue Lake, Coonawarra, cheese, and so on, all kinds of tourist attractions available in that region. While such a publication is motivational, it is more precisely directed and tends to be directed to people who have already made up their mind to come to South Australia but who are not entirely sure where in South Australia they would want to visit.

Mr Lewis: It is the biggest rock lobster in the world.

Mr KLUNDER: I believe it, and I hope that other lobsters are more edible than that one. The third level of information details the particular area to a level that people overseas would not be interested in until they had decided to come here. It is the type of information that is more likely to be given out in this State rather than elsewhere. It indicates where one should eat, what sight-seeing situations are available, where the caravan parks are, how much hotel accommodation costs and things of that nature.

There is little doubt in all this that the South Australian Tourist Bureau does an excellent job. The information it produces is spot on to the level of tourism that it seeks to attract. However, it seems to me that this is a broad frontal approach and misses areas where one could well attract people to this State very cheaply, making it a much more cost-effective and more target-oriented approach. One area about which I would like to talk is, for instance, the area of convention hosting. Certainly, I do not want to imply that no work has been done in this area both by the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau and the Adelaide Business and Convention Centre.

For instance, put out by the South Australian Tourist Bureau is a leaflet headed, 'Your convention centre' and subheaded 'Adelaide, the Festival City', which is excellent promotional material if it can be sent to the right place. The Adelaide Business and Convention Centre puts out a number of leaflets such as 'Organising a convention—Here is how we can help' and other publications which make it easy for people, once they have expressed an interest in South Australia, to actually host conventions here or be attracted here.

It seems to me that there is a major avenue for attracting conventions to South Australia which has been missed. In my opinion no businessman or professional man such as a doctor, dentist or lawyer should ever be able to leave this State to go to a convention interstate or overseas unless he carried with him a kit of information about Adelaide as a convention centre. Such a kit might include 'The Many Worlds of South Australia', 'Your Convention Centre' and a number of other documents.

It would have the advantage of penetrating, at negligible cost, the very bodies that are in the business of holding conventions and I do not think that it would be all that difficult to achieve that sort of penetration. It seems to me that all it would require is a degree of communication between the tourist bureau and the various business and professional organisations, and perhaps some advertising within the journals of those organisations. It seems to me that if one asked a doctor, dentist, or other people visiting overseas conventions, to take this information with them they would be only too delighted to do so.

The second area in which we could improve our performance would be in that area of people who actually visit South Australia and come here to visit friends and/or relatives. Of course, the migrant market (if you like) has a major application here because there is a very large number of people who migrated here 10, 20 or 30 years ago who now have friends and relatives visiting them.

It seems to me that such visitors might well extend their South Australian stay if they were more aware of the facilities available here. At present the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau tends to react in these situations. If I went to the bureau and said that I had friends in Europe who were thinking of coming to stay with me then they would be as helpful as they could possibly be. I would be presented with a great deal of information about South Australia and I have no doubt that they would be very very helpful indeed.

Again, it seems to me that this is a sort of reaction. A much deeper penetration of that market could well be arrived at by merely writing to the various ethnic or migrant communities and clubs. I am certain that many of those organisations would be only too delighted to make space available at no cost in their newsletters, or whatever communications they use, to the Government Tourist Bureau.

I think that the third market penetration of this nature would involve the various sports and recreation fields. Again, if a secretary were to approach the Government Tourist Bureau and indicated that his club was acting as a host for

an interstate meet or an Australian championship, he would be gladly given such information as he required.

Again, we have a reaction situation here. It seems to me that the tourist bureau might well write to all sporting organisations and the department dealing with tourism and recreation several times during the year to ask if they were aware of any such meetings or championships being held in Adelaide or South Australia. Again, in those circumstances the tourist bureau would be taking an initiative and might find out about some of these situations early enough to be able to send information to the relevant secretary interstate to ensure that those people received that information before they came to South Australia. If they found out that there were interesting things to be seen and done here, they might well extend or plan to extend their stay before coming here.

The fourth and final point that I make is that we should be somewhat more opportunistic in all our dealings with the tourism market. As an example, a few months ago I was amongst a group of people mainly from the Adelaide City Council who were holding a reception for the city councillors from Himeji our sister city in Japan. One thing that struck me was that at the end of the evening there was not a single South Australian in that hall who had not received from the Japanese delegation a great deal of motivational information about the city of Himeji and, in particular, about the major tourist attraction in that city, namely, the medieval Himeji Castle.

However, the information seemed to be all one way. We received a great deal of information about Japan but our visitors there had no information at all about South Australia. It seems to me that, if someone had provided them with a nice glossy kit to take back to the city council of Himeji, we might well have found displays being put up around there; a great number of people might have found out that we existed and that, in fact that might be a pleasant place to visit. The point, of course, is that we should always be ready to advertise South Australia and that neither the Government Tourist Bureau nor any of us should be just satisfied at reacting to requests by other people.

The second topic that I raise deals with the area of appointments to the Public Service. Quite obviously, I do not want to deal with the area of how appointments are made or who is appointed to them, but rather I want to spend some time dealing with the delays that often tend to creep in during the appointment of people to positions within the Public Service.

I will start by outlining a kind of scenario which will indicate the scope of the problem. Obviously, when a job becomes vacant, that job is then, I presume, considered and a decision made to replace the person occupying that position. Such a position would then be advertised. There would be a deadline by which people should have made their applications, and a selection panel would then sit to consider the applicants and an appointment would be made. That is all very logical, very neat and very tidy.

Then there is an appeal situation. There is a deadline by which appeals have to be lodged with the Public Service Board, and then the appeals are heard. Unfortunately, the delay in hearing the appeals can be as long as 15 or more weeks. The appeals are then heard on a particular day, a decision is made by the appeal board and an appointment is then either confirmed or upset and somebody else appointed. I do not think that I am in any way exaggerating the situation when I say that from start to finish such a process could easily take six months.

Obviously, if the job is sufficiently important to replace, or to place another person in it, it cannot be left empty for that six months, so usually an acting appointment is made. People who act in positions are, first, learning the job and, secondly, unlikely to want to make a decision which will

be binding on the person who later receives the substantive appointment. So, if the job takes six months to learn (and some jobs may well be complex enough to warrant that) we may have a situation where somebody is in an acting capacity in that job for six months while he is learning how to go about his duties and unwilling to make binding decisions. Then we end up with somebody who gets that position and then spends the next six months learning how to handle it. If that person then shifts to a different job in three or four years time, and we must start the whole process again, we end up with a situation in the Public Service where between 10 per cent and 25 per cent of jobs (whatever the figure is) might have people in them who are either learning the job or who are acting in that position.

If we have a situation where a decision must be made by a chain of command or a group of people acting jointly, we could almost certainly count on there being someone in that chain or group who is not in a position of tenure and/or still learning the job. That does not give us a very pretty picture of the decision-making process within the Public Service. There are, of course, a number of possible solutions. One is through a legislative or administrative reduction in the number of appeals. I understand that one of the options that the Commonwealth Government is considering is that appeals should be allowed only if a disagreement exists between the Public Service Board and the employing department. To me that does not sound like a particularly good system. I am not certain whether the Commonwealth will employ such a principle because it takes away the right of the individual and could lead to all sorts of deals between the board and the employing department.

The second way of reducing the delay situation would be to change attitudes within the Public Service so that public servants would not wish to appeal in as many situations. That is an attitudinal change and is difficult to try to inculcate into people, particularly as there are several quite strong attitudes in the Public Service at the moment. One is that there are remarkably few promotional opportunities available at present and an almost desperate situation exists so that, when people are not appointed to a job, they appeal on the off chance that, if the appeal is successful, they will end up in one of the very few promotion positions.

The second attitude prevalent within the Public Service is that the board somehow takes notice of the quality of one's appeal. So, if one does not get a job and one puts up a brilliant appeal (and there are few people who would argue that they themselves had not put up a brilliant appeal), the board will take notice of that and, rather than be embarrassed next time by another brilliant appeal, would pick that person rather than someone else for the position that becomes vacant. Changing attitudes under those circumstances could be difficult.

The third possible way of reducing the time factor to which I have referred would be to decrease the appeal waiting time. I understand that there is only one appeal board, the Chairman of which is a magistrate, and that it meets once a week. If so, that is obviously a totally insufficient situation, and there is no way in which that ought to be allowed to continue. Indeed, it may be necessary to either restructure the board or, alternatively, ensure that the board sits more frequently.

Finally, I wish to reply to at least part of the charges made by the member for Eyre in his Address in Reply speech on 15 December 1982. I am sorry to find that he is not in the Chamber.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: He never is.

Mr KLUNDER: That may well be true. The seriousness with which one treats accusations is proportional to the credibility of the accuser. Consequently, I do not believe that I personally have a case to answer, and I will not do

so. I do, however, take strong exception to the completely unfounded, wrong and irresponsible comments that the member for Eyre made about my colleague the member for Price. The member for Eyre stated unequivocally that the member for Price was unceremoniously removed from the Public Accounts Committee and that he was replaced by me. The quality of comments of the member for Eyre can be judged by the fact that the member for Price and I served concurrently, simultaneously and contemporaneously on the Public Accounts Committee until the end of the 43rd Parliament.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr Speaker, on your appointment to the very high office of Speaker. Having served under a number of Speakers in this place, I very much appreciated the way in which the previous Speaker handled the position. He was a very fair Speaker, and I am sure that you, Sir, will also be a fair Speaker.

I congratulate the new members who have come into this place on both sides. I am pleased to see that there are some new members on this side, and I am perhaps not quite so pleased to see that there are new members on the other side. I regret that certain members are not still with us on this side. I guess that, if those members were still present, we would be on the other side of the House.

I refer particularly to the previous member for Newland (Brian Billard), the previous member for Henley Beach (Bob Randall), the previous member for Mawson (Ivor Schmidt), and the previous member for Brighton (Dick Glazbrook). They were four excellent members, and the contributions that they made to this House were indeed outstanding. As a Minister in the previous Government, I appreciated the support that each of those members gave me. I wish them well, and hope that it is not very long before we see them back in the House of Assembly. I next refer especially to the previous member for Goyder, Mr Keith Russack, who has retired. Keith was recognised as a father of the Parliament. He was always available to assist new members when they came into this House.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Keith Russack was very sincere in his desire to assist his constituents and to make this State a better place in which to live. I will certainly miss his cheery face and the contribution that he made in this House.

I wish to refer now to a number of matters. I support the motion that is before the House at present. I will relate my comments to both my portfolio areas in Opposition—environment and planning, and Chief Secretary. First, I wish to refer to the devastating fires that occurred in this State last month. Many people were affected by the fires in the District of Murray. I was affected, as was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I want to say at the outset that I appreciate tremendously, as do all South Australians, the work of the volunteers and the Country Fire Services. I commend those people for the way in which they conducted themselves on that day. They always do an excellent job in protecting the State from fires in country areas, but on that occasion they performed better than they have ever performed previously. There was more demand for their attention.

I also commend the Metropolitan Fire Service for its involvement. I was particularly pleased to see the co-operation that existed between the C.F.S. and the M.F.S. on that day. I know that there is now a much closer working relationship between those two organisations than previously existed. I am pleased about that but was particularly pleased to see that co-operation taking place in a practical way on Ash Wednesday 1983.

I have had an opportunity to speak to many people in my electorate and some outside my electorate who were affected by the fires, many of whom lost loved ones and personal possessions. Having had an opportunity to talk to those people, I can only say that they have shown tremendous courage and strength during these very difficult times. We should not kid ourselves that the worst has passed for these people, as many of them are only just now starting to realise exactly what has happened to them. The shock is now starting to set in, and at this time we should be conscious of the need to support these people.

During the fires I was trapped on Greenhill Road and was fortunate to escape from that situation. A number of post-mortems have taken place, and further discussions will come about as a result of the fires. Indeed, some of my colleagues have already referred to this. I wish to make one point I made to the people concerned with such matters, and that is that I believe there is a very real need in the future to look at the communications available to people affected by fires and to people who might be trapped in any way.

I found that on many occasions during the afternoon there were various communications coming over the commercial radio stations. It is important under these circumstances that the authorities take control of the radio stations so that people can be properly advised of the situation in future. Speaking personally, while it might be very good broadcasting, to be sitting in a car totally surrounded by flames and listening to a reporter explaining how his house is on fire when one knows it is only half a kilometre away is not reassuring. I believe that it is even more important that correct information and advice be given to people in such situations. People trapped in homes and various other circumstances should be receiving guidance from people who understand the problems and can provide the correct information to them. That should be looked at in the future.

All South Australians have been overwhelmed by the generosity shown by people of this State, other States and overseas. I am sure that we recognise the response received as being very gratifying. I have some concerns about the handing out of assistance, particularly financial assistance, as a result of the funds set up.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much audible conversation in the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I know that it is always difficult to ensure that the people most deserving get the support available, particularly the financial support, when it comes through public subscription. I am certain that this is something that needs to be looked at very closely, because I am aware that in some cases people are receiving financial assistance as a result of the funds who are not as deserving as are many others. It is certainly something that needs to be looked in the future.

Just before I conclude on the matter of the fire—because I want to say a little more about the fires when I refer to the responsibilities that I had in Government in the portfolio of environment and planning, particularly as it relates to national parks—I want to bring one matter to the attention of the Government. I have already done so in a letter, but it is necessary that I do so again. On 24 November last year a serious bush fire swept through the Wistow area, near Mount Barker, in my own electorate. It was a devastating fire—not to the same extent as that experienced in February of this year, but to a number of people it was devastating in that it wiped out their properties. Two homes were lost and another was damaged and, of course, there was the loss of many outbuildings on that occasion.

I have made strong representations to the Premier to allow victims of that bush fire, which swept through the Wistow area, to become eligible for the same sort of subsidies

and assistance that have been offered to those affected by the 16 February Ash Wednesday fires. I am aware that a number of people suffered great losses in that fire. While we all understand the willingness of many people and the Government to help those affected in the horrific fires of 16 February, it seems very wrong that those who had suffered in the same way under similar circumstances in drought conditions only a matter of months earlier are receiving very little assistance. In fact, there are some who have been able to obtain no assistance at all, Government or otherwise.

Some victims of the Wistow fire suffered losses as great as, if not worse than, many of the victims of the February fires. Many of the farmers in that area who were able to retain stock during the drought have lost machinery, sheds and feed, not to mention very large amounts of internal and boundary fencing. Of course, the cost of bringing in fodder since the fire has been prohibitive. I have informed the Premier that I would be happy to arrange a deputation from those affected by that fire if he needs further evidence of the problems facing some of these people. They certainly have the right to question why they are not eligible for subsidies that others in similar circumstances are now receiving. I have asked, and I ask again, that the Premier give this matter his immediate attention, because many people are awaiting his reply on this matter.

I want to refer to the achievements that were made in the portfolio of environment and planning during the 3¼ years under the Tonkin Government. First, let me say that I very much enjoyed my responsibilities in that portfolio. It is a very interesting portfolio, with a number of sensitive areas, and we would all appreciate that. It is a most interesting portfolio with a great deal of variety, and I am pleased that I had the opportunity of serving in it. I can assure members of this House that I learned a great deal as a result of that experience.

When we came to Government in 1979 and I became the Minister of that department, I had a number of concerns about the administration of the department because it was one that lacked direction. This was obvious when we were in Opposition; we could see a very real need for direction to be outlined for the future of the Department of the Environment, in particular. Of course, at that time we had two separate departments—the Environment Department and the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs.

The Environment Department was a closed department. That matter gave me particular concern, because it was vitally important that information was freely available from it. In Opposition, it was blatantly clear that it was extremely difficult to obtain information from that department generally. I believe that we achieved more in the environment and planning area in the 3¼ years that we were in Government than has been the case with any previous Government in this State.

We initiated the rationalisation of the planning and environment administration by merging the Department of Urban and Regional Affairs with the Department of Environment, forming one Department of Environment and Planning. I am pleased to say that that department is operating efficiently and constructively in one central location. Prior to that move the two departments were scattered throughout the metropolitan area and there was a very real need to bring them together in a central location.

The previous Government also achieved a reduction of Government involvement in areas of activity best carried out by the private sector, and I refer to two in particular. First, we restructured the Land Commission into a land trust, acting as a land banker. We renegotiated the debt with the Commonwealth and reduced it by some \$55 000 000, enabling the Land Trust to become profitable and the private sector to be given responsibility for the

maintenance of land holdings. Another example was the Tonkin Government's offer of the North Haven project to the private sector, to enable both a faster rate of development and less demand on Government funds. I am pleased to see in the *News* tonight that a sale has finally gone through.

I am rather surprised that it took so long, because negotiations were well in hand when we moved out of government in November last year. It seems rather surprising that it has taken so long for the sale to proceed. I believe that it is appropriate and important that the private sector be given responsibility for this area. I am pleased that the present Government has continued with the previous Government's decision to offer the North Haven harbor to the private sector.

The previous Government also reconstituted the Environment Protection Council to allow for greater community representation. When we came to office, the council membership contained a large representation from the Public Service. It was important that we were able to bring people in from outside the Public Service. That is what we did in providing advice and the opportunity to become involved in matters that were of interest to the Government in relation to environmental protection.

The previous Government also enacted the new planning legislation and restructured the State Planning Authority into the three-member Planning Commission and set up the Advisory Committee. The main purpose for that was to achieve a more streamlined process for planning approval and to give legislative force to the requirement for environmental impact statements on development projects of major economic, environmental or social importance. Both areas are recognised as being extremely important when it comes to planning legislation, and I will be saying a little bit more about that later. However, at this point, I will be watching the implementation of that legislation with interest to ensure that it does what was intended.

That intention is to achieve a more streamlined process for planning approvals. I am sure that the present Minister recognises that need as well, and I would hope that, as a result of the submissions that have been made to the review committee, which the present Government has set up to study the implementation of the legislation, and as a result of a report from that committee to the Minister, he will act quickly to introduce any necessary amendments to achieve those purposes.

While in Government we also authorised a number of important metropolitan supplementary development plans, and I will give two examples. One involved the control of shopping centre development. When we came to office in 1979 there was much controversy about retail development in this State. Much of that controversy was removed as a result of the introduction of a metropolitan supplementary development plan relating to the control of shopping centre development. Another example concerned the control of the urban sprawl. Also, we were able to provide much assistance to local government in the preparation of local supplementary development plans, and we now recognise, under the new legislation, the importance of such plans.

One of the other achievements that gave me much satisfaction was to see the introduction of a departmental corporate plan. I mentioned earlier that, when we came into Government in 1979, the department lacked policies and direction. I can remember the previous member for Hartley, as the then Minister for Environment, making that statement in reply to a question I had asked while in Opposition prior to 1979, that there was a need for a new direction and new policies.

The departmental corporate plan that was brought down as an operational manual for the Department of Environment and Planning sets out how the departmental officers should

operate to meet Government policies in a positive direction. That was certainly an achievement as far as the department was concerned, as it has made it much easier for senior officers to ensure that the department runs efficiently. Also, we were able to introduce a management information system and programme performance budgeting. It was important that that system was implemented, and I am pleased to say that we now recognise that it is working well.

We introduced a document explaining the strategic planning issues for Adelaide in the 1980s. That document 'Planning Metropolitan Adelaide through the 1980s' is an important document. If members have not had the opportunity or taken the opportunity to look at it, I suggest that they make contact with the department and ask for a copy of that publication. We introduced a publication dealing with quarterly land monitoring reports. Because of the limit on time, I will just run through in point form many of our other achievements. I refer to the publication of quarterly land monitoring reports as well as environmental assessments of major projects that were proceeding at the time. We saw the integration of environmental and planning decision making within the one agency. I refer to the release of a development prospectus for urban land at Golden Grove, and I will be particularly interested to watch future developments in that northern section of the metropolitan area.

We saw the implementation of major urban redevelopment at Port Adelaide; the position of planning co-ordinator was created in the Department of Environment and Planning; and we saw a complete overhaul and restructuring of the National Parks and Wildlife Service with the regionalisation of field operations of the National Parks and Wildlife Service into four regions, resulting in what I believe is much improved management and performance.

We saw a strengthening of the law enforcement section to implement improved control of the taking and trafficking in fauna. Those who have been in this House for some time would recognise the sensitivity of that subject. We established a protection management unit to help combat the annual fire problem. We constructed the fire tower on Mount Lofty at a cost of \$150 000 to facilitate early fire detection. I might say that that fire tower has proved its worth so far in the fire spotting that has taken place from that facility.

We established 12 regional consultative committees across the State to facilitate rural community participation in park management, and I am pleased that the present Minister for Environment and Planning has indicated that it is his intention that those committees should continue, because they have served the State well. I have found them to be invaluable in the advice that they were able to render to me as Minister at the time.

We also saw the dedication of the major extensions to the Gammon Ranges National Park, which is one of the most important national parks that we have in this State. We saw an acceleration of programme preparation of park management plans. When we came to office that was a matter of great concern in that we were not able to properly manage the parks and reserves that we had under the control of the Government because of the lack of forward planning. Those plans were accelerated to enable us to look more closely at the need for forward planning in the management of those parks.

We saw an accelerated programme of grants in the Wildlife Conservation Fund for research into wildlife. We saw the production of policy manuals, one on national parks operations and one on wildlife management. We saw the introduction of the vegetation retention scheme for assistance to landholders in conserving native vegetation, the computerisation of the animal registration scheme, and a continued programme of capital works directed towards park development and protection. A great deal of development took

place in the three and a quarter years we were in Government. We saw the continued programme for development works in national parks, including the swamp aviary and walking trail constructed at Cleland Conservation Park, and the establishment of infrastructure for park management in regional locations.

We purchased Troubridge Island to protect both the built and natural heritage on that island, and I am pleased to see that it has only very recently been made a conservation park. We saw the establishment of a community information service within the department to encourage community awareness of environmental issues. That is an achievement of which I am very proud indeed.

As I said earlier, there was a very real need for more information to be made available on the workings and the responsibilities of that department and I am pleased that, as a result of many of the publications being made available, the people of South Australia are now more aware of the responsibilities that the Government has within that department.

I was particularly pleased to receive only this week the March edition of the environment and planning magazine, which is very worth while. For those people who have received it, I would suggest that they read it. I might point out that it is rather ironic that, when the first edition of this publication came out, there was a foreword in it, with me as Minister. The then Shadow Minister made some comment about that fact and asked whether it was intended that future publications would have a message from the Minister in them. He was rather cynical. It is rather interesting to see, now that we have a March edition that has come out under the Labor Government, that there is a message from the new Minister in this publication. I am particularly pleased that there has been much more emphasis placed on the need for more information to be provided in this publication.

We also saw, during the term of the Tonkin Government, the publication of numerous pamphlets and environmental guides; the productions to which I have just referred, a journal on environment and planning programmes for public information; production of a number of films on vegetation retention, sand replenishment and urban landscape; films on wetlands and national parks, and so on. We conducted workshops in conjunction with the Education Department for geography and natural resource management teachers. We saw the completion of the Thorndon Park Recreation Development at a cost of \$1 700 000 and I was pleased that, during my term as Minister, we were able to hand that development over to the Campbelltown council.

We saw the divestment of the Belair Golf Course and caravan parks at Brownhill Creek, Kingston Park, Belair and Fort Glanville to councils and private enterprise in order to achieve a fast rate of development while at the same time reducing demand for Government resources. I am sure that the majority of people in this State would recognise that those areas were not high priority ones in terms of Government responsibility through the Department of Environment and Planning.

The Tonkin Government implemented a programme of grants for small boat facilities throughout the State in association with local government. We saw the construction, after 19 years of talking about it, of a restaurant at Windy Point, a restaurant which has been constructed in a manner that is not detrimental to the environment and which is already a leading tourist attraction and a facility that will serve the State very well indeed. We also called tenders for the dredging of the lower reaches of the Onkaparinga River at Port Noarlunga and Old Noarlunga to maintain the health of that river. We certainly recognised that there was a need for action to be taken after many years of inaction

on the part of previous Governments. The Tonkin Government made \$200 000 available for the cleaning up of the Onkaparinga River.

The Tonkin Government was also responsible for the establishment of stage 1 of the open range zoo at Monarto in conjunction with the Murray Bridge council and the South Australian Royal Zoological Society. I am very proud of that achievement and I am sure that in years to come that too will become an important tourist attraction for South Australia.

In Government, we carried out a major programme of European heritage building assessment for listing on the State heritage register. We carried out regional heritage surveys and allowed grants for restoration projects. I am pleased that some 440 items of European heritage are now included on the State register. Eighteen surveys of towns and districts have been carried out and many of those were carried out during the term of the previous Liberal Government. We saw the enactment and proclamation of the South Australian Historic Shipwrecks Act of 1981 and the declaration of shipwrecks under that particular piece of legislation. We saw the introduction of the Aboriginal Heritage Act Amendment Bill into Parliament, the aim of that Bill being to extend protection to all significant Aboriginal sites and items.

The Government has indicated that it is its intention to revamp, or modify, the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I will be interested to see what it does in relation to that piece of legislation. I hope that the Government recognises the importance of this legislation and, if it has to be reintroduced in a modified form, that that reintroduction, the ensuing debate and its passing both Houses is facilitated because there has been a need for some time for improved legislation in this area. We saw the commencement of the greening of Adelaide project and although the present Government tried to receive some credit for that project it was introduced during the time of the previous Government and was very well and healthy when we moved out of Government.

In fact, it was one of our policies to expand that programme from the greening of Adelaide to the greening of South Australia project. I hope that that is something which the new Minister will take up in the near future. We saw the active participation in the development of a national conservation strategy. I was pleased, as Minister, to be able to host a very successful State seminar for that purpose. I am pleased that, in recent times, reference has been made to that seminar as being one of the most successful held in Australia regarding conservation strategy.

We saw the adoption of a strategy for management of off-road recreation vehicles. It is rather interesting that, in its policy, the present Government makes no mention whatsoever of the need to take any action in regard to off-road recreation vehicles. We saw a comprehensive investigation of the wet lands conservation; a major review of alternative strategies for the protection of beaches in metropolitan Adelaide against storm damage; and the adoption of a metropolitan management plan for the control of works within the metropolitan coastal district. That project had been talked about for a number of years by previous Governments, particularly the Dunstan Government, but no action had been taken.

We saw the continuation of major sand replenishment programmes for Adelaide beaches and the development of expensive new protective works at Henley Beach. We saw major expenditure on coastal protection projects throughout the State at a cost of well over \$1 000 000 per annum.

The Tonkin Government arranged for completion of extensions to the herbarium at the Botanic Gardens, the renovation of the Botanic Restaurant and the plant propagation house and liaised on the valuable work carried out

by the Botanic Gardens Board. I was particularly concerned to learn of the enormous damage caused to the Mount Lofty botanic gardens by the fire of 16 February. I understand that about \$350 000 to \$400 000 worth of damage has occurred in that garden. I know that much work has been carried out by officers and gardeners in that garden. It could have been (and I am sure one day will be) a major tourist attraction. It was an important part of the State's heritage and incorporated some older gardens. I hope that it is not too long before we see the redevelopment of that garden.

We arranged for the purchase of the Beechwood property at Stirling in order to add four hectares of nineteenth century heritage garden landscapes to the botanic gardens. That action has been recognised in other States as being an important contribution to that garden. We saw the introduction of clean air legislation into the Parliament. Again, I will be interesting to see whether the present Government continues with that legislation or whether it is prepared to allow it to drop off at this stage. It is important that clean-air legislation be introduced and debated as quickly as possible. We were able to implement a major upgrading programme for air-quality monitoring equipment, equipment that was very much needed in this State. We saw the maintenance of the objectives of the beverage container legislation and the production of a series of television commercials, The Good Neighbour Campaign, which play an important part in public education.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: You lost Government though.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: It is all very well for the Minister of Housing to say that we have lost Government. We are very much aware of that. However, it is important that we let the people of South Australia know exactly what was achieved by the previous Government so that they know the record that the present Government must face during its one term of office in this State.

Let us hear from the Minister at the end of that one term about the achievements of his Government. I suggest that the achievements will not be half as good as the record to which I refer. The Good Neighbour Campaign had the important aim of increasing community awareness of the desirability of minimising pollution impact on neighbours. The programme has proved to be most successful. We gave support and much financial assistance to KESAB, which is a very worthy organisation in this State. When one looks at the way in which that organisation has progressed through voluntary contributions, one recognises the important work that is now being done to keep this State the cleanest in Australia with much assistance from KESAB. We also brought about the establishment of an operational satellite image processing system in order to monitor changes in the environment, such as vegetation cover.

That programme has been recognised interstate and in other countries as being one of the most up-to-date programmes for this purpose. We saw the application of remote sensing techniques for the monitoring of vegetation retention, the application of remote sensing techniques, the resource survey component of national parks management plans, and so I could go on. When one looks at the policies of the present Government which came into office last November, one sees that it has very few new initiatives. In fact, many of the policies that the Government has introduced are very similar to those that were introduced by the former Government in the previous election.

The Hon. T.H. Hemmings: That is not true.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: If the Minister reads his own Government's policy and that of this Party for the 1979 election, he will realise how close the two policies are. I refer to some of our policies that were outlined during the election campaign last year, particularly in regard to the Botanic Gardens and the need for a new conservatory.

Under the board of the Botanic Gardens, much has been achieved, including the establishment of the Mount Lofty and Wittunga Botanic Gardens. In the Adelaide Botanic Gardens only one conservatory is used to house high quality tropical displays. Although valuable, it has been found to be inadequate for exhibiting those plants, which should be seen by the public. We indicated at the time of the last election that we would begin the construction of such a conservatory. I believe that it is important that the present Government make a similar commitment.

I refer to development management with the introduction of the new Planning Act in order to achieve a more streamlined process for planning approval. That legislation recognises the importance of ensuring that environmental factors are considered with technical, economic and other relevant factors in the planning, construction, operation and rehabilitation phases of all significant development proposals. The monitoring, forecasting, research, and consultation involved in the preparation of statutory and advisory planning documents is also vital for sound planning. In our election policy last year we referred to a number of areas in regard to appropriate development management.

I also mentioned earlier the need to look closely at the continuation and, indeed, expansion of the greening of Adelaide programme, which was started in 1981 as part of the South Australian 150 Jubilee. When the Liberal Party came out of Government, more than 20 000 trees had been planted on 21 major projects throughout the metropolitan area. In this year's State Budget a special tree planting programme allocation of \$38 000 has been made, representing an increase of some \$18 000. It was the Liberal Party's intention to expand the Government's emphasis on tree planting programmes by extending the successful greening of Adelaide programme to a greening of South Australia scheme. To do this, we intended that a South Australian tree council be established to provide a focus for co-ordinated Government and non-Government interests.

I am sure that the Minister, now that he has come into the Chamber, would recognise the importance that so many people place on the need for increased vegetation and revegetation. With the number of organisations that are already responsible in that area, I am sure that there is a need for a co-ordinated approach in regard to those matters. I could say much more about the policies that the Liberal Party had in regard to that portfolio.

I want now to briefly say a little about the responsibilities that I have as shadow Chief Secretary. I acknowledge at the outset the willingness of the present Chief Secretary to provide me the opportunity to become more familiar with that portfolio. In the short time since I have been in Opposition, I have had the opportunity of visiting the Yatala Labour Prison, the Adelaide Gaol, and the Metropolitan Fire Service. I have also spent some time with the police, learning, therefore, more about the workings of those areas which are all part of the responsibility of the Chief Secretary.

I find it rather incredible that the new Government has a Minister responsible for both tourism and the duties of Chief Secretary. While the Opposition recognises the importance of the tourism portfolio and the responsibilities of that Minister, I suggest that the Chief Secretary's portfolio is also vitally important. The Opposition recognises that in this Government the tourism portfolio is the senior portfolio. It is already being proven that the present Minister, with both those responsibilities, is finding it fairly difficult to cope. I think that that will be proven in time to come.

In relation to the responsibilities regarding police, the Opposition recognises that the South Australian Police Force is the best force in Australia. The Liberal Government was keen to ensure an appropriate level of staff and resources in that department so that the police were able to continue

to provide a high level of service to the South Australian public. During the three years of the Liberal Government it significantly increased the active strength of the Police Force, and 144 more police officers were on active duty as at 30 June last year than there were three years previously. Adults were recruited in that year to ensure that the active strength of the force was not diminished. The Government at that time was keen to maintain a vigorous on-going recruiting programme and to continue to improve back-up services where appropriate. In 1981, the South Australian Police Force was subjected, as we are all very much aware in this House, to a spate of false allegations of corruption.

The Liberal Government at that time was conscious that the protracted investigations and malicious rumours had a great effect on the morale of the service, and in order to protect the police from irresponsible allegations again we made it known at that stage that we would introduce legislation to provide an independent avenue through which members of the public could lodge complaints against police officers. I am aware that the present Government came into office with a commitment through its policy to introduce such legislation also. Again, I would say that it is vitally important that that legislation be introduced so that we can debate it and so that legislation to introduce the independent element can be implemented.

In the annual report of the Commissioner of Police for the year ended 30 June 1982 which was tabled in this House yesterday, a number of matters are brought to the attention of the Minister and of this Parliament by the commissioner. I refer particularly to the last paragraph of his foreword, and I quote:

In concluding this brief commentary, I am moved to express optimism that the department will capably respond to the challenges confronting it during the ensuing year. However, I would be failing in my obligations to the Government and the community if I omitted to voice concern about our capacity to continue to provide a customary high level of service. Recent years of austerity are beginning to take their toll on the adequacy of existing resources to meet essential needs. The demand for more staff and some extension of police powers are high on the list of priorities. More particularly, however, there is an increasingly urgent necessity to address our equipment requirements—especially to begin replacing a deteriorating telecommunications system.

That need has certainly been brought to my attention, and I will be doing everything I possibly can while in Opposition and when we return to the Government benches to ensure that that facility is provided, because we certainly recognise the necessity for adequate communications.

As far as correctional services are concerned, as I said earlier, I have had the opportunity to visit both the Yatala and Adelaide Gaols, and I am looking forward in the near future to visiting some of the country gaols as well. During the three years of the Liberal Government we achieved more in the correctional services portfolio than has any Government at any other time. The Liberal Government brought the correctional system into the 1980s: it made substantial changes to parole proceedings, reconstituted the Parole Board and introduced the fixing of compulsory non-parole periods. We replaced the automatic one-third remission of a prison sentence for good behaviour with a system of conditional release. This means that the prisoner is no longer absolutely free if he is released early because of good behaviour. If he commits a certain offence while on conditional release, in most cases he will be returned to the gaol to serve the remaining portion of the original sentence.

We also achieved a new Correctional Services Act which allows prisoners legal representation and improves the system for dealing with offences committed in prison. It is rather interesting that 12 months has now passed since that legislation was passed by both Houses of Parliament, yet we have not seen the regulations, and consequently the Act has not been proclaimed. That is a matter that I will be referring

to on future occasions in debate in this House. The Liberal Government also significantly upgraded security in the prisons and installed sophisticated television monitoring and surveillance equipment, as well as a radio communication system which provides two-way communication within each institution and also contact between those institutions and escort parties while travelling.

The Hon. M.M. Wilson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Yes, it is particularly pleasing to see that we have both Ministers with the responsibilities to which I have referred—of environment and planning and of Chief Secretary—now in the Chamber with us.

We also established a full-time dog squad to detect drugs and to aid security. We employed 40 extra staff to remedy serious deficiencies which were allowed to develop by previous governments, particularly the Dunstan Government. We saw that the creation of these positions was vital to ensure adequate security to protect the community and to protect the staff and inmates. We also introduced other security measures, including the upgrading of fencing, the 24-hour manning of towers, the installation of metal detectors, and so on.

I suggest that, despite the present Chief Secretary's comments in the House earlier today, no other Government has instituted so much change in such a short time as that achieved by the previous Liberal Government. South Australia now has the lowest escape rate in mainland Australia, and it is important that it should stay that way.

Finally, I refer to the Metropolitan Fire Service, which is the third responsibility under the Chief Secretary portfolio. The Liberal Government's primary objective was to continue to protect life and property by providing the most efficient fire-fighting service throughout the urbanised areas of this State, and that was achieved. The Liberal Government recognises this and reorganised the South Australian Fire Brigade, changing it to the Metropolitan Fire Service and making it directly responsible to the Minister. I suggest that the new administrative arrangements are most efficient. I hope that the present Labor Government will continue to provide the fire service with the necessary support to ensure that the South Australian public receives the best possible protection.

The previous Government certainly placed a high priority on the construction of a new fire headquarters building and, of course, construction of that facility is taking place. We also gave priority to upgrading equipment to ensure that public safety is maximised, and a five-year capital works programme was commenced to achieve that desired result. Manning levels for the fire service have been reviewed following receipt of the Cox Report. It was our intention to pursue that as part of the five-year capital works programme.

Members on this side of the House recognised that the method of funding the fire service was inadequate because those who do not insure against fire and property damage enjoy the same protection as those who do insure. Therefore, while in Government, we established an expert committee to examine the present funding arrangements and to make a recommendation to the Government on a more equitable method of funding in the future. I can only say that the responsibilities undertaken within the Chief Secretary portfolio saw much achievement, and I believe that South Australia is a much better place as a result of the responsible attitude shown by the Liberal Government in regard to that portfolio.

As I said earlier, I will be most interested indeed to follow the progress of this Government and to see the current Chief Secretary executing his responsibilities in that portfolio. I support the motion, and I am pleased that I have this opportunity this evening to bring to the notice of the House and to place on record the Liberal Tonkin Government's

achievements in the portfolio areas of environment and planning and of Chief Secretary.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): First, I wish to congratulate the A.L.P. on winning the last election to take the Treasury benches. It is not a result that I would want to see, but the Labor Party had the opportunity at the time to win with its team. More particularly, I suppose that most Governments in these times find some difficulty in staying in power as a result of the world situation, and Australian Governments would be no exception. Whoever takes over the Treasury benches has the task ahead of attempting to stay in power, in the hope that the world economic times will improve during their term of office if they want to survive. If that is not the case, then the fickleness of our society is such that the people may say, 'We have tried you, you have failed', and they will throw any Government by the board regardless of its track record in attempting to solve problems.

I give the Tonkin Government credit for being a stable Government which worked to try to stabilise the economy of this State. I believe that that was achieved. If we look at the overall result, particularly at the recent Federal election, honourable members will see that South Australia did not have the same reaction against the Liberal Party as did most other mainland States. The A.L.P. now has the opportunity to see what it can achieve between now and whenever it decides to hold the next Federal election in 1985 or 1986.

I congratulate you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on your appointment, and the member for Playford on his election to the most senior office in the Parliament as Mr Speaker. I know that you, Sir, will do your best to be fair in the running of the House. That is the only way that it can operate in a sane and proper fashion, giving a reasonable image to the public. Although we may be politicians who subscribe to a particular philosophy, when it comes to the operations of this Chamber it is important that we know that fairness does prevail.

Next, I pay a tribute to the four former members from this side of the Chamber who were defeated at the last State election. I refer to Dr Billard, Mr Bob Randall, Mr Dick Glazbrook and Mr Ivar Schmidt. I will not go through their individual qualities, but these four men came here dedicated to a cause and determined to work for the betterment of the community that they represented and the total South Australian community. They gave of their best. In such tough times, if a Government is to survive, it depends on its members. These four members were victims who fell by the wayside, either on a temporary or a permanent basis, according to their attitude to the Parliamentary scene in the future.

I hope that each of those former members sets out to come back to this Chamber. I am sure that being here and going out before coming back again would make them better politicians (if that is possible, because they were all very capable). They would have a better understanding of the sort of fight that needs to take place, and perhaps the individuality of each member would come out more compared with coming into the Party scene for just one three-year term, as they did.

To their spouses, their helpers and workers in the electorate, I express my thanks for the work they did for those four members and the Liberal Party. In the future they will have the opportunity of developing incentive to reorganise and be more determined. They will have the benefit of not being in Government. Governments make mistakes, electors blame Governments, and sitting members have difficulty in surviving in marginal and other seats. Regardless of where boundaries may be drawn in the future, there will still be marginal seats or areas, and the opportunity will exist for those former members to come back, because those

who have taken their place will be in the hot seat in three years time.

There are two people who have passed on to whom I wish to pay my respects. The first is John Coumbe, who was a guiding force to me in the early stages when I came into this Parliament and he was a man who had served for some time. He had some knowledge of the scene, and, of course, his counselling and help was of some benefit to me as a young man coming into this Chamber. I regret his passing, even though I know that in his mid-50s he had a serious heart attack when he was a Minister. He overcame that and worked hard for the community as a Parliamentarian and as a Minister even after that incident in his life. I wish all the best in the future to his wife and children. I know that their memories will be good memories which they will treasure all their life of a man who served not only his family well, but the community.

The Hon. Cyril Hutchens and I had only one or two similar views and they were the age for drinking and the age of majority to some degree. I think that the Hon. Cyril Hutchens supported the lowering of the age of majority in some areas back to 18 years, but not in relation to alcohol. At the time of his passing I mentioned my regrets. He was a man who had very high principles, a man who stuck by his word, a man who could be trusted when one spoke to him in confidence about any issue. If he thought that you were on the right track, even if you were on a different side of politics, he would say, 'Stick to your guns, because you will win in the long term.' He was respected by all sides of politics, and out in the community, whether it be business, the trade union movement, or whatever else it might be.

I wish to turn to the age of majority which we changed federally. The Liberal Government did it and the State Labor Government did it in the early '70s. At that time I was ridiculed to a large degree by most politicians on both sides of politics in this State. I said that if we lowered the age to 18 (the age I was fighting for was 20) we would put a lot of young people out of work. People can go back and read my words. I said, 'Who would employ a young person on full adult wages at 18 years of age if they could employ someone older and who had more experience?' Nobody believed that it would happen. It has happened, and it is happening around us all the time. People prefer to employ males or females of 30 or 35 years of age, who have had experience in the job, rather than take on an 18 year old who has had no experience whatsoever and pay him full adult wages.

So, we find that there is a choice for the employers, and the choice is one of young people not being able to get work experience. It does not mean that there will be any more people employed: I am not suggesting that. I am suggesting that more young people would have had the opportunity to prove themselves and obtain experience by the time they were 20 if 20 was the age of majority for full adult wages.

Turning to the building industry, if a 15 or 16 year old wants a job as a builder's labourer, the employer has to pay him full adult wages; it is not on. However, if there was an opportunity under that award for people to employ at a lesser amount, many of these young men—and there are some women who wish to work and do work as builder's labourers—would get some work experience and have the opportunity to prove that they could do as much as others who have had experience and who are older.

On the age for drinking, the Hon. Cyril Hutchens and I argued quite strongly that we would find our young people more oriented towards drinking if the age were lowered, and that it would give some problems. That was also laughed out of court. In the first instance, we won the vote in the House, with some members from the Labor Party and some from the Liberal Party going against the Liberal Party prop-

osition in 1969. The Attorney-General, Mr Millhouse (now Justice Millhouse), introduced into Parliament a Bill to increase the turnover tax for the licensing fee for licensed premises and at the same time lowering the age for consuming alcohol on licensed premises.

The age was to be 18. I wanted to vote against it. I was told at the time by the then Attorney-General that it was not possible for me to vote against that because, if I defeated the Bill, the Government would be defeated on a financial measure. I asked for the Bill to be split into two and I was told that that was not possible. I asked the then Clerk of the House, who was kind enough to refer me to some previous examples, and I found that it was possible to split the Bill; so the Bill was split. When the Bill was split in two it enabled those of us who wanted to see the age of majority different from 18 years to move in that direction. We did move for it to be 20, and that vote was won in the House by 18 votes to 17, as some people were paired.

In the next year, the A.L.P. won Government on 30 May 1970; it had the numbers in the House and immediately moved to decrease the minimum age for drinking from 20 to 18. There were enough people who had fallen by the wayside who were supporting the 20-year idea for the 18-year age limit to succeed.

It was only a few years earlier that we changed the hours for closure of hotels from 6 o'clock to 10 o'clock and then we subsequently let hotels open until midnight or even later, to 2 o'clock, 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the morning. We also allowed hotels to move into the entertainment field which had not been the case before, with cabarets, discos and any other form of live entertainment that they could afford to supply to their customers. Therefore, the area of entertainment moved away to a large degree from the theatre or the local community hall into the hotel. With that move came the point that there were young people 18 years of age who had friends of 16 or 15 years of age who wanted to stay together. They all ended up in the hotel together and they still do. They were drinking alcohol in hotels at the age of 15 and even 14 years of age. It is impossible to police.

One proposition to solve this problem would be to introduce identity cards. Some people would say that that would be a terrible suggestion but, unless we go to that system, we will never be able to police that law. I do not really object to people at the age of 18 drinking in hotels. That is their decision, but I think there are problems when people aged 14 and 15 years are in that environment when the parents sometimes do not know or do not care.

Greater efforts will have to be made, for example, in stopping income tax avoidance. At the same time we should be taking steps to stop those people who exploit the social security system and the other areas of Government aid. Quite often the people who are doing that are very rich people and not the people who perhaps deserve the opportunity to be able to get a little more. Quite often, people can well afford to go without exploiting the system by using two or three different names. There was one case in Sydney where a person used 11 different names to collect social security benefits. If we had identity cards I think that would be also eliminated, as would the illegal migrant situation, and many other areas. However, it is a frightening thought to us in Australia to talk about identity cards because we think it brings back Big Brother, and it is a frightening area in that context. In the long term, I believe that we will go to identity cards. This will occur because people want to exploit the system.

Referring back to the minimum age for drinking, I point out that Cyril Hutchens, a man whom I respected, supported me in a move on the minimum age for drinking alcohol and I would like to say to his family that I appreciate the

sincerity, his work within this Parliament and the friendship I developed with him.

I wish to speak about the bushfires but I am not going to talk about the suffering, as those things have all been mentioned. I would like to make a contribution towards the areas where changes have taken place, the risk increased and the apathy increased and the knowledge that is available but perhaps not being made use of, in the hope that, if the Government feels inclined to make an inquiry, then one of the Ministers, preferably the Premier, who has the responsibility, may bother to read it and think about it in terms of the knowledge that has been passed down over several generations of the problem that fire poses on a bad day, regardless of what part of the State one may be in, particularly in the Hills.

There is no doubt that the Hills is a fire-prone area at any time in the summer, particularly with a north wind. If the wind is reasonably strong it is a vulnerable and dangerous area in which to live, if one has not taken the necessary precautions. Our early settlers realised very quickly that the eucalypt is a highly flammable tree on a hot day. So, if one went through the old properties, particularly up to the late 1940s and early 1950s, one would find that most properties worked in an intensive way for production of fruit, vegetables, dairy farming and so on, had homes in the middle of a clear cultivated area or, if they had water, the green patch they used to irrigate was always on the northern side of the home or building. That was not by accident: it had been learnt by the experience that that was the danger area. So, they were conscious of it.

Another thing they did was to use mainly trees from the northern continent—English trees, deciduous trees and non-eucalypts. Pines are not as dangerous as eucalypts. They burn more quickly giving less heat intensity. By using deciduous trees that are green and full of foliage in the February/March period as well as January, to some degree (which is the time of greatest fire risk in the Hills), the tree would not only not burn but would scorch and stop radiant heat hitting the property thus causing the timber work to catch alight even if the flames did not reach it. Some people argue that the move to beat that and to help eliminate the problem of timber around windows catching alight is to use metal or aluminium window frames. That is no good if one has blinds behind, as steel or aluminium take in heat quickly and become very hot. That heat is then intense enough to set something alight inside if it is touching the window. Wooden frames are as safe in a fire as metal frames and we need to be conscious of that.

The early settlers also learnt, if we look at most of the properties, to put homes close to the water available. If a permanent stream existed, the properties were in the valley. They did not have the pumps we have nowadays and did not rely on the type of pump we have nowadays. In some gardens and orchards they have hand pumps. During a fire, and in the summertime when they had finished spraying and they were not using the equipment, that pump with an old wooden cask as a water supply would be filled with water. The pump would be available and, if a fire came, a husband-and-wife team could possibly save the home because they had a hand pump. They could pump the water in reasonable supply for the initial stopping of the fire at the house after the main flames had gone by. A house does not catch fire immediately. Quite often it is just starting to burn after the fire has gone past. So, they had a supply of water under pump pressure.

Many people in the Hills now have a reticulated supply of water from the E. & W.S. Department. What happens when everyone turns on a tap at the same time? Virtually everyone cannot even get a trickle. People complain because there is no pressure. However, there is no way known that

the E. & W.S. Department can supply suitable water pressure to every tap in every household when there is a fire. It is no good people in the Hills saying that they want better water pressure, because that is not possible—the cost would be prohibitive. That is the first thing that people in the Hills should have learned.

Secondly, many people thought that they could obtain a supply of water from an electric pump on a reserve tank; but what happens when a fire comes through and there is no electricity, perhaps because a burning tree has fallen on to the power lines? Others thought they would use a petrol motor to provide them with a water supply. However, the most flammable type of fuel that one can use on a hot day is petrol. Another problem with petrol motors is the vapourisation of fuel, when the liquid does not flow through to fire the motor properly: the motor may not start or it may not continue to operate after running for some time. People may want to go to the expense of obtaining a diesel motor, which is less likely to catch fire if it is operated in a reasonable manner and is more likely to continue to operate. Another thing that has happened in recent times (and I direct my comments to you, Mr Speaker, because I believe that Para Hills is part of your district) is that there has been a trend for people to plant native trees, in the belief that Australians should plant native trees and that native trees look better than other trees. I do not believe there is much difference in the appearance of eucalypts, oaks, elms, liquid ambers, or stringy barks—they are all green and are very attractive. However, some species are more fire-prone than others.

I would like to make a prediction that if a fire starts on the northern side of Para Hills in about 10 years, at which time all of the trees will be above the rooftops, billowing out, that fire will race across the tops of the trees and through those houses so quickly that no-one will know what is happening. However, no-one is concerned: they do not believe that it matters. The trend has been to plant native trees, and people have thought, 'There are houses around us, asphalt and concrete. Our house will not catch fire.' When the native trees begin to burn, the oil in the eucalypt leaves explodes. Until one sees this occurrence, one cannot understand it. Bellevue Heights and some other parts of my district have been planted intensively with native trees. I do not say that people should not plant native trees, but if there is a balance between native trees and northern hemisphere trees, a break is provided and there is a lessening of the eucalypt oils and gases that can catch fire, thus reducing the possibility of a major fire.

Some Hills councils have stated that people must not excavate into the Hills to build a house, because it spoils the environment and does not look as nice as if one builds a house on the side of a hill. However, houses built on the sides of hills are usually built up with bricks or erected on wooden or concrete stilts sitting out from the hill. When the fire races up the hill it gets in underneath the house, which catches the full intensity of the heat. However, if a house is built into a cutting in the hill, the fire travels at such a rate that it skips over the top of the house and there is every chance that one can save that house once the fire passes. That is the difference.

Councils are now starting to admit that they were wrong and that they did not think of that aspect. The old-timers thought about the matter. They had only picks and shovels, horses and scoops: they did not have the machinery such as bulldozers that we have today. They worked hard, and excavated for a reason—because they realised it was safer for a house to be benched into the hill so that it does not catch the full intensity of a fire.

Six or seven years ago I said that the day would come, possibly in the 1990s, when young people would start saying

that we should allow building on the hills face zone and that there would be nothing ugly about properly developed gardens and trees planted in that zone. Many parts of the hills face zone are already built upon and look quite attractive. If this trend continued, using the right types of trees and homes, it would decrease the opportunity of any bush fire that started gaining momentum. People have said that that was a horrible suggestion and that one should not suggest building on the hills face zone. At that time I said that I was not advocating that happening at that stage, but that by the 1990s it would be advocated strongly.

A couple of decades ago people who owned land on the hills face zone grazed sheep, cattle, and in some cases goats, on that land. They did not make such money from those animals as it is not good country for grazing, but by the time the summer months came most of the dry grass and small foliage was eaten down including the olive trees and bushes that are not native to the hills face zone. But, at that time there was not the intensity of fuel available for a fire that there is today. Why have people stopped grazing animals on the hills face zone and on small, 4 or 5-acre allotments, in the hills? Because if they keep sheep, cattle or horses, dogs are allowed to roam, kill the sheep and disturb cattle and horses, to the extent where one finds horses impaled on railings, cut about with barbed wire and injured because they have been chased by dogs.

The Parliament made some changes in this area, and I give the Hon. Geoff Virgo credit for taking up this challenge. I supported the moves he made. However, the Parliament has not taken up the real challenge of allowing local government to control the dog menace. I am talking here about dogs belonging to irresponsible owners, not responsible owners. Because of this problem people do not graze small allotments any more and those allotments are left to build up a massive amount of fuel for fires. We should be conscious that that is another reason for the problem.

Decades ago farmers would get together and burn off paddocks of scrub between farms before summer. They would come to an agreement and two or three families would do a slow burn. They would not burn with the wind, but against it, on a reasonable day in early spring and sometimes in winter. One June my family burnt off a property in the Sturt Valley when it was considered to be too wet to burn. People used the slow-burn process to preserve the bush more than they do now. By doing a slow burn one does not destroy reptiles and small animals as they can go back down their holes in the ground and the heat is not sufficiently high to cook them underground. A slow burn does not kill native scrub and trees because the heat is not sufficient to do that, but the massive amount of fuel built up at a low level amongst the scrub land burns off. In the past slow burning was carried out on a regular basis with a different paddock being burnt off every couple of years. Nobody argued about that happening.

However, that is not done now, because somebody will complain about the smoke or that one is burning some native bush, and so on. However, just imagine what happened in the fires that we have had recently, when many of the small animals would have been cooked. In no way could they have escaped. In the main, birds would get away. Some owls and that sort of bird may not get away, but the others would have flown away. A lot of our natives would go. That applies more today than it did even when the Aborigines were here, because the Aborigines did burn out regularly; they did not pick the worst days to do it because they knew the consequences, and they had more knowledge than we do of that area.

Why do we do it with our national parks and areas that we try to preserve? Why do we not have slow burns, as the Deputy Leader said? Why have we gone on saying that we

must save every little bit at all costs, hoping that a fire will never come? We know that it will come. I give one example to the House; this relates to a residential area in Blackwood. Three people who live in Hannaford Road wrote to the Mitcham council, asking whether it would instruct the person living on the neighbouring allotments to burn them out or clean them up because they were full of flammable material. A letter came back from the council saying that it had no power. A C.F.S. officer and the council officers had inspected the property and, because it was native bushland, it was not considered to be flammable material that should be removed. So, there was bushland up to 8ft high right up against the peoples' houses, and they could do nothing about it because it was protected. What a ludicrous situation!

Some people have said—and I have heard it said in this House during the past couple of days—that of four houses in a row one will burn and three will stay. Unless one was there and inspected each of those homes before the fire came, one would never know because, if someone left a window open in one house and not in the other three houses, it would need only a couple of sparks to go through that window on to a bed, carpet or sofa and that house would go. If a house has eaves that are not covered, or if the gutters are full of leaves—any little spot where a fire can get hold—that is the beginning of the end. Quite a simple thing like that could cause such a disaster.

One could go to the old timers' homes. The oldest member of my family is nigh on 90, and when someone went to that home on that day and said, 'It is likely to come this way; it is coming in this direction', every window was closed and every bucket filled with water by a person nigh on 90, who knew that if it did come everything had been done that could have been done. Unless one inspected each house to see which one had the patch of bushland behind it, which had the best cared for garden, which had the debris around it or the wood heap stacked up against the wall, or whatever, one would not know, for instance that there was highly flammable material ready for the fire to begin to consume the home. They are some of the things that we will never know.

All that we can do is to try to educate each and every one of us to try to understand. Even people like me who have lived there a long while do not always take all the precautions that we should take in relation to our homes. For example, I would not disagree with a Government making a law or a local council making a by-law saying that every household should have permanently on hand two knapsacks of whatever capacity, full of water. I did not have one in my home that day when the fires came. That frightened me, when I got home from my office and when I headed for home, because I knew in which direction the fire was initially heading. Fortunately for me, but unfortunately for others, the wind changed. Why should I or anyone in that area expect members of the C.F.S., the Army or the Fire Brigade to risk their lives when we are too careless even to have knapsacks with water, which is all that would be needed in some cases to save that home?

While I am on this point, I point out that the C.F.S. was not in a position to use some of the volunteers, either because of a lack of equipment, space on vehicles, or whatever. That is no reflection on the C.F.S. In a fire, many houses burn after the fire has passed. Sometimes it could be up to two or three hours after the fire has passed, or it could be 20 minutes: because a spark has landed somewhere in the home, it smoulders for a while and then catches alight, while the front of the fire could be miles on. There are examples of that occurring in every fire, and it was particularly so in the recent bushfires.

It would be wonderful, and I believe we will do it, to reach a point where we can be organised and have a back-

up gang. They would not necessarily have to comprise regular C.F.S. officers—they could be people who could carry a knapsack and travel behind the fire trucks. One person per home with a knapsack could sit and watch the fire, even if they did nothing else, to ensure that a fire did not begin at the home they were watching. At least they could wait until the owner arrived to take over. Talking about home owners, I have been doing some research on another subject from the 1880s onwards.

During my research I became aware of one of the other problems in the hills at the moment. In 1915 no fewer than 500 men fought a fire in the Crafers area. The ladies supplied eats and drinks, carting supplies backwards and forwards in horses and traps and all sorts of things. I wondered how in the world 500 men were transported to Crafers in 1915. They could not travel up from the plains quickly all at the one time—they would have to use a horse and trap, walk, run, or ride a bicycle with solid rubber tyres to get there. It then dawned on me that today nearly all the men and a large proportion of the women who live in the hills work in the city; they are not at home during the day. In 1915 the men and women worked on their properties in the hills. They were either cutting wood, growing fruit or growing vegetables. They worked their properties and were close at hand. Therefore, on most occasions, there was readily available at each house a couple to fight the fires.

I think we need to look at the human resources that are available. I will return to that later when I discuss the C.F.S. I believe that a fire would never have gone through a place like Piccadilly in the period between the turn of the century and up until 1955, because in that period land was worked with horses, hoes, shovels, picks, grubbers, and so on. There were very few tractors, which were introduced in larger numbers just after the war in 1945. In those days no piece of land was wasted and they had little trouble with flooding. It was all hard, manual work and I admit that it was not well paid. In fact, it was lowly paid on many occasions, and I suppose that the growers did not get much for their product, either. The rubbish was cleaned out of all the creek beds. There were no headlands (the end bits of pieces of ploughed land) because every bit of land was used. Therefore, there was no dry vegetation that could burn in a fire.

Therefore, in those days, you would not see parts of the Piccadilly area burn in a bushfire. However, the recent bushfire ran up the dry creek beds, which had not been cleared for years and which were filled with rubbish and dry material across the headlands which today are too difficult to work with a tractor and are covered with dry vegetation, carrying the fire through to the next stage. I am not saying that the fire would not have jumped over these areas and started spot fires, but it is obvious that in some parts, anyway, on this occasion the fire ran right through the valley where it would not have been able to do so in the past. So, that was another reason, not that the old timers did it deliberately to stop fires: it was just that their actions tended to have that result.

I do not say it in a manner derogatory to the Minister for the Environment, but at the Aldgate meeting he said that he did not see much benefit in fire breaks in the sorts of fires experienced on that day because the fronts moved so rapidly and jumped spot fires such vast distances that a fire break would have meant very little. He is correct in regard to the fire front. The fire break does little unless one happens to be at a spot fire when there is a wind change or break which gives a chance to attack that spot fire.

However, such fire breaks increase the number of people available to fight fires up front, because there is not such a need for them behind on the fringes. In other words, if there are enough fire breaks on the side or wings, one needs only a few men to keep the fire confined so that, if there

is a change in wind, there will already be an area burnt back and the fire can be contained in that area already burnt.

If one does not have fire breaks, while men are fighting up front, if there is a change in wind, the fire can come up again at the rear. I am sure that anyone in the C.F.S. would say that we need better, bigger, longer and more fire breaks. In its period of office the former Government allowed a fire break to be developed along Upper Sturt Road on the southern side of the Belair Recreation Park. A public outcry resulted about that action. A break already existed, but it was made bigger, wider and more effective, and I am convinced that that is the sort of fire break that we need around all the parks. We need fire breaks even bigger than that.

On this occasion the fire did not reach that break, but I refer to what happened on that day. I ask members to think about this matter later when they have a chance to digest it. Greenhill Road and the main freeway were closed, and there were hundreds if not thousands of people in Adelaide who wanted to get home to Hills towns, but only one road was open—Upper Sturt Road, which is about 20 feet wide, with bush on both sides for a vast part of its length.

I headed off just after three o'clock from Blackwood to go to the child care centre because I wanted to ensure that people did not take their children from the centre. I believed that that would have been dangerous, and then I intended to help where I could. On driving along Upper Sturt Road it suddenly dawned on me that there was a significant amount of traffic. Why was this? Further up I knew why, because I could see that the fire had cut off the freeway, and I already knew that the fire was at Greenhill. Everyone was trying to get home via Upper Sturt Road—one lane up and one lane down—and by 4.30 p.m. the cars were head to tail for eight kilometres.

The fire got to the top of that road near Crafers and just touched it without cutting it off but, if it had cut the road and Sturt Valley Road, which is a branch road, and if some unfortunate happening occurred with the fire starting at the bottom end near Belair Recreation Park, seven or eight kilometres of motor cars lying head to tail would have been involved. Where could they have gone? The resultant catastrophe would have been far greater than anything of which we could dream.

It brought to my mind that at some time I wrote to the then Minister of Transport (Hon. G.T. Virgo) about Shepherds Hill Road at the Botanic Garden corner. If ever that corner was blocked as a result of a major accident or some unfortunate incident, there would be no way out of Blackwood on Shepherds Hill Road.

There is no other road that goes around that point. That could also cause an embarrassment on a bad day. Therefore, I am convinced that we should take most of the undergrowth—I am not talking about big trees—from the road verges along all the Hills roads. The Upper Sturt Road needs to be widened in places where it is not expensive to do so. I have written to the Highways Department and to the Minister in the previous Government about that proposition.

We need to make the same sort of provision as regards Greenhill Road. That would be more expensive, but we need to do this so that, if people are trapped in motor cars, the road is cut off and there has been an accident farther down below because somebody else panicked, those people have a chance of survival. There is still plenty of bushland left away from the roads and away from houses. I would hope that we are prepared to take that sort of action, knowing that our native scrub and bush is something that we should treasure and preserve as much as we can.

However, human life and property are also important. Some people have said to me, 'If you lose your home, that's

the worst thing that you can lose apart from life or health.' Also important are the sentimental things you lose, such as presents and photographs which are the whole background to your life and which can be lost forever in a fire. They can never be replaced and I think that many people realise not long after a fire that they are the things that they really miss. Therefore, I would hope that we are prepared to take such action to do something to reduce the risk in the case of a fire on a bad day.

I refer now briefly to the Mount Lofty summit, the loss of the kiosk and the lookout tower, or the hot-box, in which the National Parks and Wildlife people found themselves. Most of the communications systems at the top of Mount Lofty were burnt out, and that should never occur. Surely all communication systems should be fireproof. We lost our communication system, and it threw everything into turmoil. On such a day, the last thing that one wants to happen is to lose communications.

I turn now to the lookout tower. There is no doubt that it is a lovely structure. When it was officially opened and people were able to look at it, some of my friends said, 'Don't bother to go up. If a fire starts it is the last place you would want to be.' I went up a few days later, had a look at it, and thought that I was glad that I was not working in it. However, if someone said, 'Here is a tower with 20 ft. high eucalypts and high trees underneath it right up to the framework', he would have been ridiculed by the press, the conservation movement and others. They would have said, 'You cannot cut down those trees.' What happened? Two people were up the top when the fire started and long before the fire got to them they realised what would happen. The glass started to crack.

Those people, who were possibly 20 or 25 metres up in the air in a big tower with scrub all around them, did the only sensible thing: they went down that ladder as fast as they could before the fire got too close and sat in the car park hoping that the car park was a big enough open space for them not to be burnt. They survived.

However, what happened to the kiosk alongside the obelisk the first part of which was built in the times when Mr Pollnitz was in charge of it, about seven years ago? The owner/operator of the business rented the building from the department and decided that he would remove some trees to make the property safe. The newspapers ran a front line story, 'Don't remove the trees! It's terrible!' People went up and protested, so the person did not remove the trees. Now there are no trees and there is no kiosk.

An honourable member: Where are the people?

Mr EVANS: One lady who lived there had all her belongings in that place; she was away on holidays at that time and when she came back everything was gone. For the sake of 40 or 50 feet of trees, or even if it was 100 feet, that building would still be there and the communication system would still be there. Those people were put at risk because we went overboard on the protection issue.

There has been some talk about people in the hills bringing in the Fire Brigade. In the areas of Stirling and Aldgate, I would prefer those people not to bring in the Fire Brigade. Maybe we need one or two more full-time C.F.S. people. If we had money available for fire fighting, I would hope that we could buy more equipment for the C.F.S., as there is a shortage of adequate equipment in some of those divisions.

When I talk of the C.F.S., one of the things I find disappointing is the rather small percentage of the population that is prepared to make a sacrifice to go and receive training through the C.F.S. and gain some knowledge and understanding of the use of equipment in times of major fires. I have exercised my mind on many occasions on how to overcome that. I do not know the most acceptable way for our society, but I would not object to some form of

national service, and I excuse carrying guns or learning warfare. I think there could be some form of training for all of us to be able to understand what would happen in fire, flood, earthquake or some other form of disaster that we may be confronted with in the future, as well as in first-aid whilst fighting fires. People could even be trained to fill sandbags.

I do not think it would hurt young people to undertake this and I know many young people would accept some sort of training for six months. If these people went on a camp, had to rise in the morning and go for a jog, to keep fit and to understand some form of discipline, then this would be a good thing. If we had a society that had this understanding, as do many other countries, then we would find that there would be more fit and able-bodied people, experienced people, to carry out the duties in a time of fire. If a person has never used equipment and has never been in a fire, it may be a frightening thing to know exactly what to do and where to move to be safe if one looks like getting trapped.

The type of clothes that people wear to fight a fire is important. One gentleman came to the fire in reasonably good clothes and thought he would do a little bit of fire-fighting near Crafers. The shirt that he took off to put out the fire was quite reasonable. When he hit the fire the shirt burst into flames more quickly than the other material, and he wondered why. The material was highly flammable and with the intense heat it was definitely the wrong type of clothing to wear. Imagine what would happen if people wore such clothes whilst attempting to fight a fire. Therefore, we need to have the education and understanding of the type of clothing that people wear when they are in those situations.

The other thing we experienced is in regard to P.V.C. pipes. They are modern and new but a large number of properties, even with rainwater tanks and reserve supplies in case of fire, had P.V.C. pipes. When the fire came along they disintegrated and the fire fighters had no means of transporting the water to the point of fighting the fire. Another lesson was learnt: either they have to be well underground or we should use something metallic that can withstand heat before it gives out and the benefit is lost.

In the area of control, a committee carried out an inquiry into fire brigades in this State and others. One thing that became evident to all members, regardless of whether they were from the present Government philosophy or the Opposition philosophy, was that we need to have all emergency services under one Minister. I refer to the Fire Brigade, the C.F.S., the State Emergency Service, the police, St John Ambulance—the lot. It would save a lot of conflict and we would have one Minister, in the case of a State disaster, being able to work with the administrator to achieve as much control as is humanly possible.

I believe that the vast majority, if not all politicians, believe that that is necessary. It is not easy to do. I hope the Government takes up the challenge in its three-year term, because it will be of some benefit in the case of an emergency, such as a fire. I would hope that that challenge can be taken up in the next three years.

I will close by putting on record my appreciation, on behalf of the whole community, of the efforts put into fighting the fire and the attempts to contain it. I refer also to the work put in after the fire by departmental officers in the jobs they were allotted to do during the subsequent days. I refer also to voluntary organisations such as Apex, Lions, Rotary, Red Cross, and so on, and also the people who offered to help clean up, pick up and distribute food to those who suffered loss. I refer to the police, the C.F.S., the Fire Brigade, the Army, and all others who worked. I thank them for their help.

It is not the last time that it will occur. In all probability it could occur again next year. One need only go to the State Library and track back through our history to find that it occurs every few years. There have been fires of some significance and occasionally major ones. I predict that the fires that occurred this time are not the worst that will occur. However, I believe that the losses can be lessened if we take the right precautions. I would not want to see it recur, but people living in the area know in their minds that it could occur.

I thank all people who have worked towards it. Referring those who have suffered in the floods, I ask the Government to look at as many areas as possible where flood control dams could be built, such as that on the Sturt Creek. It was built in the time of Frank Walsh or Tom Playford; it is one or the other—I am not playing politics. That dam collects the major thrust of the flood. It is not far from where the member for Mitcham lives. It holds the water and has a

pipe with a capacity to supply what the creek will take. It gradually releases the amount of water the creek will take but holds the surplus in the dam. I hope members will look at it, see how it works, and think about it in regard to other parts of the foothills and the hills, as I believe it would save a lot of flooding on the plains which occurs in a major flash flood.

I congratulate you again, Sir, on your appointment as Speaker and look forward to the latter part of the three years of your Government's term to see what eventuates.

Mr WHITTEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.6 a.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 17 March at 2 p.m.