

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 9 August 1983

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

PETITIONS: MEAT SALES

Petitions signed by 294 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation to extend the existing trading hours for the retail sale of meat were presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold and Mr Peterson.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: MARIHUANA

Petitions signed by 202 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation which will legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana were presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick and Messrs Becker and Klunder.

Petitions received.

PETITIONS: POLICE HANDGUNS

Petitions signed by 2 509 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reject any change in policy on the wearing of exposed handguns by the Police Force were presented by Messrs Becker, Mathwin, and Meier.

Petitions received.

PETITION: FINGER POINT SEWERAGE

A petition signed by 1 635 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to immediately restore the Finger Point sewerage project to the public works list with a view to completion by 1986 was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: TARPEENA POWER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 247 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide an emergency power generator at Tarpeena to supplement the permanent ETSA service to safeguard the township's water supply for fire fighting and sanitation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: BUS ROUTE 29

A petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to alter bus route 29 back to the route prior to the Sunday 3 July 1983 change was presented by Mr Plunkett.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Superannuation Act, 1974-1981—Regulations—Part-time Employees.

By the Minister for Environment and Planning (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—

- i. Crown Development Report by South Australian Planning Commission on Proposed Acquisition and Transfer of Land by Commissioner of Highways.
- ii. Regulations—Watershed Councils.

By the Minister of Lands (Hon. D.J. Hopgood)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Crown Lands Act, 1929-1983—Section 5 (f)—Statement of Land Resumed.

- ii. Geographical Names Board of South Australia—Report, 1982-83.

- iii. Real Property Act, 1886—Regulations—Caveats.

By the Minister of Transport (Hon. R.K. Abbott)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961-1981—Regulations—Declared Hospital for Blood Analysis (Boomeroo Centre).

By the Chief Secretary (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Psychological Practices Act, 1973—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Community Welfare (Hon. G.J. Crafter)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act, 1983—Regulations—Returns.

By the Minister of Recreation and Sport (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Racing Act, 1976-1983—

- i. Regulations—Betting Tickets.
- ii. Greyhound Racing Rules—Fighting and Failing to Pursue.

QUESTIONS

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

Mr IVANOV

In reply to Mr OLSEN (4 August).

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: First, let me say that the Leader of the Opposition has been selective in his quotes and has purposely taken 'absolutely no' out of context. When I said 'absolutely no' I was replying to the strong implication in the question of 2 June, and subsequently acknowledged by the member for Davenport, that Mick Young had given me information about Combe and Ivanov prior to my making a statement to the *Advertiser* on 25 April 1983. I stand by that answer.

In reply to the **Hon. MICHAEL WILSON** (4 August).

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: The reply is as follows:

1. When Ivanov made contact with my office on 21 April 1983, he sought an appointment that same day. He made no prior appointment. He expected to see the Deputy Premier of this State at a few hours notice. I called and will continue to call that a sloppy way of doing business. Mr Combe's call on 21 April was simply to alert my office staff to the fact that Ivanov would be making contact to try and see me on that same day. The call by Mr Combe can also not be termed as making a prior appointment, since the calls by Combe and the contact by Ivanov all took place within the space of a few hours.

2. In my reply on 13 May where I said 'to the best of my knowledge, I do not know what Ivanov wanted to offer me, because I did not contact him, nor did he contact me', I was referring to the state of my knowledge when I first heard about the matter on 25 April. My Press Secretary advised me on 25 April that Ivanov wanted to invite me to the Soviet Union, and this was later confirmed by Combe that same day. I accordingly advised the *Advertiser* reporter that the first I had learnt of the offer of a visit was on 25 April some four days after Ivanov made contact with my office. When I said that I did not know what Ivanov wanted to offer me, I was relaying the simple fact that I was unaware of Ivanov's reasons for wanting to contact me until I had been given the information on 25 April by my Press Secretary.

On being made aware of the purpose of Ivanov's visit, I thought it might have had something to do with a conversation I had with David Combe, some two months prior, about my interest in visiting the Soviet Union, and I accordingly rang Combe to find out what he might know about the matter.

In reply to the **Hon. B.C. EASTICK** (4 August).

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: As I pointed out in the House on 13 May, my recollection of the discussions that took place at the lunch on 2 February was that everyone talked about David Combe's recent trip to the Soviet Union. In the course of those discussions I expressed my interest in going to the Soviet Union, but I thought that the Soviets had me on the black list. Combe then offered to see if he could help get me an invitation to the Soviet Union. In stating to Combe my interest in visiting the Soviet Union, as I recollect, it was I who first raised the question of Combe helping to arrange the details. There is thus no inconsistency between what I said in the House on 13 May and Combe's recollection of our discussions in the statement he released to the Hope royal commission. Combe's offer to assist with arrangements was made in the face of my expression of interest. From my memory, it did not occur the other way around. That is, he did not say he could arrange to get me a trip to the Soviet Union and was I interested? His offer of help followed my indication of interest in visiting the Soviet Union. Again, I am being asked to have perfect recall about a conversation that took place some six months ago, so I do not pretend to have the situation word perfect.

In reply to the **Hon. H. ALLISON** (4 August).

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: This question absolutely astounds me. It starts from the assumption that Mr Combe had to mention the call for it to exist. How ridiculous! The simple answer is that, when my Press Secretary contacted me on 25 April with a request for a comment from the *Advertiser*, he advised me at the same time of Ivanov's phone call to my office on 21 April. I rang Combe after talking to my Press Secretary. I had tried to ring my Personal/Appointment Secretary to get more details about Ivanov's call before ringing Combe, but I was unable to contact her. The reason I told the *Advertiser* on 25 April that Ivanov had contacted my office on 21 April was that my Press Secretary confirmed Ivanov's statements that he had. That Ivanov had indeed contacted my office on 21 April was also confirmed by my Personal/Appointment Secretary when I returned to work.

The member for Mount Gambier's question is based on the false assumption that I had not been told by my office of such a call before I spoke to the *Advertiser*. The call by Ivanov did exist, and my statement to the *Advertiser* was the truth. If the member for Mount Gambier had read the transcript of the taped telephone conversation with Combe even more closely (and I am sure he has been up all night reading it), he would have read a comment by me that I quote, 'didn't know till now because my office never passed

it on'. That is, I was saying that the first I heard of the call was on 25 April, four days after Ivanov made the call, because my office staff did not pass it on at the time the call was made because I was on sick leave.

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (4 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: A note was kept on a piece of paper by the Deputy Premier's Personal/Appointment Secretary of two calls made on 21 April, one made by Mr Combe and the other by Mr Ivanov. The note is dated and gives the following details:

1. The message from David Combe referred to the 2 February luncheon when the Deputy Premier mentioned that he would like to visit the Soviet Union. When David Combe got back to Canberra he spoke to the embassy, and the message came back that the Deputy Premier would be welcomed to the Soviet Union as an honoured guest. Mr Combe said that a Mr Valeriy Ivanov from the embassy would be in Adelaide that day and would like to speak to the Deputy Premier. He was staying at the South Terrace Travelodge.

2. The note shows that Mr Ivanov telephoned the Deputy Premier's Personal/Appointment Secretary, explained that the Deputy Premier was on sick leave, and that it was not possible to see him. She explained that it was possible that she would speak to the Deputy Premier later that same day at his home and she would pass the message to him. If it was not possible to ring Mr Ivanov that same day, the Deputy Premier would ring him in Canberra the following week.

Later that same morning a telephone call was received by the Deputy Premier's Personal/Appointment Secretary from a person identifying herself as Mr David Combe's secretary, who asked whether Mr Ivanov had been in touch with the office. The Deputy Premier's Personal/Appointment Secretary confirmed that he had, and explained that the Deputy Premier was on sick leave and that she had been unable to contact him to pass on the message. That second call from David Combe's office was not noted down on the piece of paper referred to previously in my explanation.

In reply to the **Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON** (4 August).

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Two members of my staff spoke to Mr Ivanov. Ivanov first spoke to Miss Anne MacMahon, who then transferred the call to Miss Margo Carmichael. Miss Carmichael explained to Mr Ivanov that it was not possible to see me as I was on sick leave, but that she might be speaking to me later that day at my home. She told Mr Ivanov that, if it was not possible to make contact that day, she would ask me to ring Mr Ivanov in Canberra the following week. Miss Carmichael was unable to contact me at my home on 21 April. I was first advised that Mr Ivanov had rung my office by my Press Secretary on 25 April, some four days after the call by Mr Ivanov was made.

In reply to the **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (4 August).

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In my answer on 13 May I expressed my uncertainty as to whether Combe had spoken directly to Ivanov about the possibility of my visiting the Soviet Union or whether he had spoken to someone in the Soviet Embassy who passed it on to Ivanov. In answering the question I was being asked to recollect one passage out of a long telephone conversation that had taken place some two and a half weeks prior to the question being asked in the House. I was honest enough to admit that my memory on this point was uncertain. I was emphatic, however, that Combe had passed information on to someone at the embassy and that the contact could well have been Ivanov, but I was not sure of this. I must admit I am puzzled why the Opposition places such importance on this obscure point. The fact of the matter is that the Combe/Ivanov link had

already been front-page news for two days when I was asked the question referred to in the House. What possible motive could I have had for attempting to conceal such a link in the face of this public knowledge?

Before I close on this answer I want to point out how deceitful these questions are. The Deputy Opposition Leader mentions that there were three occasions when Combe mentioned his contact with Ivanov in my conversation with him on 25 April and infers that this point was therefore one I could not fail to have remembered. From a reading of the tape transcripts, the actual reference to Combe seeking Ivanov's assistance was mentioned three times, but it occurs in one short passage at the start of the conversation and must have taken Combe all of 60 seconds to say. That is why I said in the House on the last occasion that I no longer trust the Opposition in relation to this matter.

In the face of all this high-sounding talk, it was to my utter disbelief that when they had the opportunity to do so the Opposition refused to debate the issue with me. What an amazing state of affairs! This was the Opposition which had publicly and repeatedly demanded my resignation and had demanded an urgent sitting of Parliament to debate the situation. When the crunch came the Opposition backed off. It took the coward's way out.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: Mr IVANOV

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: In accordance with my undertaking to the House, I have prepared considered replies to the various questions raised in this place on 4 August by members opposite. In accordance with Standing Order 130, copies of the answers have been lodged with the Clerk.

It is only two weeks ago that the Leader of the Opposition put pen to paper and in the strongest terms demanded that the Premier 'arrange to have a new session of Parliament opened as early as possible next week' so that this whole issue could be debated as a matter of urgency. The Leader of the Opposition was so concerned about my alleged wrongdoing that he in fact wrote to the Premier on two separate occasions and in his letters he listed *ad nauseam* the charges against me and the so-called evidence of my guilt.

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave has been granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I issued two separate challenges to debate the issue on the first day of Parliament but Opposition members refused to take up these challenges. Instead, they simply asked even more obscure questions. I ask you, Mr Speaker, why should Opposition members want to ask yet more questions? Was their case against me not good enough?

By refusing to debate this issue when Parliament last sat, they have clearly admitted that their case against me was not up to scratch and that their so-called evidence was manufactured. The Opposition was forced to dig for more dirt because they had nothing to go on when they made their original allegations. Talk about dishonesty! The Opposition has given a new meaning to that word. The public now knows that the Leader of the Opposition has been totally dishonest from the start.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Is this a Ministerial statement?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The answer is in *Hansard*. The general public now realises how the Opposition Leader has distorted my public and private statements. The public knows that the Leader has selectively quoted from my

answers so that he could misrepresent and take out of context what I had said openly and in all honesty to this House. The whole thrust of the Opposition's attack is flawed; there is absolutely no logic or truth in its case against me.

The Leader of the Opposition stated in his letter to the Premier on 21 July that the motive for my so-called lies and evasions was to 'distance' myself 'from the expulsion of Mr Ivanov when he made his statement to the *Advertiser* and gave his answer in Parliament on 2 June and that 'others have reached the same conclusion'. What utter rot!

If my motive had been to distance myself from Ivanov, why would I invent a lie to tell the *Advertiser*, which in effect would tie me even closer to Ivanov. If I had wanted to distance myself from Ivanov, I certainly would not have made up a lie that Ivanov contacted my office on 21 April. That would have been totally illogical on my part. But then nothing that Opposition members have put up has been logical, because they are not prepared to accept the plain truth of this matter. The fact is that Ivanov did contact my office on 21 April 1983.

I also had no motive to conceal the link between Ivanov and Combe when I replied to questions on 13 May. In one answer I expressed my uncertainty about whether Combe had arranged directly with Ivanov to contact me about a visit to the Soviet Union, or whether he had done it through the Soviet Embassy, which had then arranged for Ivanov to contact me. When I answered that question in the House on 13 May, the Combe-Ivanov link had been front-page news for two days running. The Prime Minister had previously named Combe as the Australian Labor Party contact in Federal Parliament on 10 May, three days prior to my answering the question in the House when I am supposed to have evaded the issue of Combe's association with Ivanov.

In the face of all this publicity about Combe and Ivanov, what possible motive could I have had for being deliberately uncertain on such a point? No motive at all! I simply had a less than precise recollection of a long telephone conversation with Combe which had taken place 2½ weeks prior to this issue being raised in the House. I thought Australians gave people a fair go. The Opposition expects me to have perfect recall of every telephone conversation I have.

I consider that I have been shabbily treated in this affair by a dishonest Opposition. In conclusion, I repeat my challenge for a full debate: I want to set the record straight. The Opposition should either put up or shut up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have considered the text of the Ministerial statement and have taken into account the fact that leave was granted. I must indicate that the form of the Ministerial statement is somewhat unusual.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: To say the least!

The SPEAKER: Order! I shall consider what might be appropriate guidelines for the Standing Orders Committee to recommend.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I wish to inform the House of some recent developments in the Correctional Services area. First, I am pleased to be able to advise that a meeting of Correctional Officers at Yatala Labour Prison earlier today, after considering the Government's written response to a series of demands that followed a fire in C Division

on 3 August, decided to continue work. A further meeting between the parties is to be held on 23 August.

Secondly, this House should now be aware that the fruits of considerable labour within the Correctional Services Department, with the help of other authorities, principally the Public Buildings Department, in the form of detailed planning for the future of Yatala are now apparent. There is now in existence a plan for that institution in the form of a model, plus audio-visual presentation supported by documentation. The Government has begun a programme of consultation with all interested parties. For the present, the plan is merely a proposal.

The Government has not committed itself, preferring to await response from the community, including the Enfield council, prison officers, and prison interest groups before deciding that the direction of the plan is the best direction. I would hope to see active public debate on the future of Yatala.

There can be little doubt in the minds of those who view the presentation that this alternative is realistic and probably within State budgetary limits as the development proposed is spread over a number of years. I give great credit to the Executive Director, Mr John Dawes, for initiating this most constructive planning.

Members will soon have an opportunity to see the audio-visual presentation. This presentation will be on a busy round this week, being scheduled for showing to people with a very great interest in the future of Yatala, like the Correctional Services Advisory Council and the Enfield council. The audio-visual show is regarded by the Government as an ideal way to condense the main outlines of the plan and offer it in a way that is easy to absorb. Our past experience with such plans suggests to us that there is unlikely to be 100 per cent acceptance of all ideas put forward, but we certainly commend the plan for most earnest consideration and see it as a most positive contribution to a most difficult problem.

Thirdly, as was revealed yesterday, the Government has provided some high-level assistance to the Correctional Services Department in the form of Mr John Burdett. Contrary to some media interpretations of this help, Mr Burdett is in no way replacing or overriding the Executive Director, Mr Dawes. He is there primarily to assist Mr Dawes especially in co-ordinating the part to be played by the Public Buildings Department, the Public Service Board and Treasury.

Now, finally, I want to add one more item of information about progress we are making in the reform of the correctional system. This week Cabinet endorsed the issuing of a discussion paper on the State's parole system. I have gone on record a number of times saying that I see serious deficiencies in that system. As a consequence of this, we are shortly to issue this paper outlining what are shortcomings of the system, plus suggestions for legislative revision. This paper will be widely circulated later this week to relevant interest groups and individuals.

QUESTION TIME

CONSOLIDATED ACCOUNT

Mr OLSEN: In response to the Deputy Premier's offer, in due course we will be pleased to take him up on a debate on the matter. Is the Premier planning a large deficit on the Consolidated Account at the end of this financial year, or does the Government plan even more revenue-raising measures during 1983-84? Last Thursday, the Premier announced what amounted to half of his Budget—the major revenue raising measures he will ask the House to consider as part of the Budget debate. Media commentators have said that

the Premier drew up the announcement in haste to take attention away from the behaviour of the Deputy Premier. That conclusion has been confirmed by the confusion which has arisen over rises in cigarette prices to cover the doubling of the licence fee payable by sellers of tobacco products.

Nevertheless, the Opposition assumes that Cabinet decided on these revenue-raising measures with specific end-of-year Budget targets in mind. On the basis of the figures presented so far, the revenue-raising measures announced—

The SPEAKER: Order! As the honourable member well knows, he is now proceeding to debate the matter. I ask him to continue with his explanation.

Mr OLSEN: In asking the question specifically related to the Budget deficit, the figures and statement tabled by the Premier in this House indicate that those measures announced to the House will bring in \$50 000 000 during the rest of the financial year, whilst the Premier indicates that the deficit as at 30 June last was \$63 200 000. As well as this short-fall, the Government will also have to consider the budgetary implications of implementing some of its election promises, particularly those which involve the employment of more public servants. The figures available from the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that the number of people employed by the State Government increased from 98 100 at 30 December 1982 to 100 100 in April this year—a rise of 2 000. That will add something like \$45 000 000 to the public sector salary bill in a full year.

Whilst I appreciate that State taxation is one of only four components of revenue raising by the Government, the information presented so far by the Premier suggests either that he is planning a large Budget deficit at the end of this financial year, or that there will be further revenue-raising measures needed after the Budget. Will the Premier clarify those two specific questions?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The question went on at some very considerable length by way of explanation, into which the Leader put a whole lot of questions that I cannot possibly canvass. As I understand it, his basic question is, 'Is the Premier planning a large deficit?' The answer in relation to what sort of end-of-year result we are anticipating in 1983-84 will be made known to the House and the public when the Budget is brought down. The second part of that question is quite a relevant question, namely, 'Why are revenue measures being introduced at this time ahead of the Appropriation Bill?' The answer to that is quite simple.

I refer the Leader to the practice of previous Premiers of this State—Sir Thomas Playford, Mr Dunstan, and his own predecessor, Mr Tonkin—who took this step for the same sort of reasons that I have taken it in certain specific instances. The reason is that the revenue measures are the subject of separate Bills but, in the case of two of those measures (the tobacco franchise and the petroleum franchise), the tax is payable from a certain date but must be collected in the month preceding that date, as it is based on sales for that month. As a result, those who are going to pay the tax need notice of the fact that they must begin to collect it.

The intention of the Government, as I announced quite clearly in the package on Thursday, is that those amounts be payable from 1 October. That means that collection starts from 1 September. In order for the collection to start from 1 September, notice must be given to those who are to collect, and legislation must be put in place before the actual Appropriation Bill by way of the separate Bills which cover those revenue measures. That is precisely what is being done. There is no other way to do it successfully.

In relation to the confusion (I am not sure whether that is the word the Leader used, but I think that that was his implication) surrounding the tobacco tax, let me make quite clear that the Government's position has been that the increase should apply from 1 September, and no earlier, and that those companies which may have moved precipi-

tately to begin collection are doing so contrary to both equity and the desires of the Government. That has been spelt out to them clearly in a letter from me today, and I have received advice that they are prepared to accept the Government's stand on this matter. I might add that a similar situation arose under my predecessor, the Premier of the Government of which the honourable Leader was a member in 1981. However, he seems to have forgotten that. That is the reason.

In terms of the broad shape of the Budget, all I need to say in relation to the revenue measures is that in this financial year, they should yield of the order of \$40 000 000. If one bears in mind that we are carrying over a consolidated deficit of some \$63 000 000, one will see that those revenue raising measures in themselves fall well short of the deficit that has occurred in 1982-83. Therefore, the House can be well assured that, whatever overall Budget result is being sought for the 1983-84 year (it will come out as part of the Budget presentation on the Appropriation Bills, as it always does), nonetheless, the revenue measures which we have proposed in that package were announced at the first opportunity to Parliament (I do not know what the Leader would have said if I had announced them outside Parliament), so that they became public at that time.

Those measures still fall short of that recurrent deficit. In other words, if there was a total stand-still situation over the next year, and one was using only those measures as a set off, we still would not be able to get rid of that inherited deficit, the reasons for which I have already dealt with at some length. I am surprised that the Leader keeps drawing attention to it. That will be a millstone around our necks for some considerable time. The revenue measures which I have proposed are the revenue measures which are needed by way of separate legislation and, as I say, the Appropriation Bill with the expenditure side will be brought down at the appropriate time.

SEACOMBE AND DOVER HIGH SCHOOLS

Mrs APPLEBY: Will the Minister of Education provide information at this time about the outcome of the Seacombe and Dover high schools situation of suggested declining numbers? In April this year, the school councils of Seacombe and Dover high schools were addressed by the Southern Regions Education Director. Members from each school were asked to address themselves to the decline in number of students by 1986. The schools were given a number of options to consider, and were asked to submit their responses for consideration.

Both schools held public meetings, and much community misunderstanding was prevalent, including rumours that one of the schools would be closed. This situation is affecting not only the schools, parents and teachers of the named schools but the parents and students of primary schools who must make decisions about their future educational needs. My constituents would like to know what decisions will be made or when to allow them to make their educational choices with the facts before they decide for their children going to high schools next year.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, I have received a significant number of indications from people who have children going to the Dover and Seacombe high schools or who proposed to have their children going to either of those schools. The honourable member is correct in commenting that there have been some misperceptions about what the discussion stage that we have been through has been about. In fact, the discussion phase that the two school communities have been through has been to examine options that the

two schools might consider to respond to what might appear to be a trend of declining enrolments in both school communities. There was no intention that the one option that would be practicable would be the closing down of one of the schools and its forced amalgamation with the other. I can say that, as a result of the discussions that have taken place (and I thank the officers of the Education Department who took the time to discuss this matter with school communities), there is no proposal to amalgamate one school with the other at this stage, and parents can quite happily enrol their children at either Dover or Seacombe high school knowing that those enrolments will be at the school of their choice.

I would hope that both school communities would pursue with a degree of active interest what I hope all schools in South Australia would pursue, that is, seeking out where there can be co-operation between schools in particular geographic localities so that they can maximise the benefit of education resources that are available. We have a number of very good examples of this in South Australia, and I believe that we can extend that to other parts of South Australia. That can be done without jeopardising the identity or spirit of individual schools. Dover High School and Seacombe High School will not be amalgamated, but I hope that those schools, together with all other schools in South Australia, will actively continue to examine ways in which education resources can be better used in a spirit of equality and co-operation.

DEPUTY PREMIER

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: As the Premier has admitted that his Deputy gave incomplete information to this House, why did he not ask the Deputy Premier to resign?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On the channel 10 television news on 27 July, the Premier said:

I'm clear in my conscience. I don't condone the misleading of Parliament. I'm suggesting to you simply in this case that the answer that was given was not complete.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Earlier, of course, the Premier admitted that the Deputy Premier had fudged his answers to Parliament. As the Premier supported a predecessor, former Premier Dunstan, in dismissing a Police Commissioner for having given incomplete information to the Government and to Parliament, I ask why he has not applied the same standards to his Deputy, and what additional evidence he requires for him to dismiss the Deputy Premier?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I really think the Deputy Leader is trying to work this to the absolute ultimate, for no good purpose for either the workings of this Parliament or for public affairs in South Australia. It is about time the Opposition got down to some of the serious business in hand and stopped trying to chivvy continually around this issue. My statements have been made quite clearly. What the Deputy Leader has done here is to pick out a very small section of quite an extended interview. That very small section was devoted to a particular aspect, a very small and minor aspect, which in no way touched on the question of whether the Deputy Premier should resign: in no way at all. In that instance I was agreeing with the statement that, if one simply looked at it on the surface, it was unclear as to what the Deputy Premier was saying. The situation there, of course, is that the Deputy Premier, in all those matters

of substance, had given this House more information than the questions themselves demanded.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: He was quite open. I can remember the atmosphere in which those questions were answered, the jocularly that was around at the time. The Deputy Premier was quite forthcoming about it.

He made it clear that Mr Combe was his contact with the Russian Embassy but said that he was not sure, he did not know exactly if it was Combe who had spoken to Ivanov or whether he had gone through another party to the embassy. He said he did not know. He was obviously unclear; there is no doubt about that. He said so to the House. The conversation had taken place some 2½ weeks earlier. It was a substantial and lengthy conversation. However, I would suggest even further that the point itself was totally trivial.

I confess that, in responding at the end of a fairly extended interview, I used a most unfortunate word, a word which certainly has gained great currency recently. Let me make clear, as I have done so since, that the sense in which I was using that word was one that suggested the matter had been left open and unclear, and indeed it had, for the very sound reasons that the Deputy Premier has discussed. I was in no way, by using that word, attempting to imply that the House had been misled or that lies had been uttered, the sort of nonsense that we keep hearing from the Opposition both inside this Chamber and outside of it. Okay, I should be a little more careful perhaps in understanding the dictionary definition of words, and perhaps for my sins I should hand back my Tennyson medal in English Literature. Really, if that is to be the point on which the resignation of my deputy hangs, I just do not know what has happened to public affairs in South Australia.

GUARD DOGS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Local Government state whether there is sufficient power in the Dog Control Act for local government to ensure complete control over the security of guard dogs? Certain local councils have called for an urgent study of the use of guard dogs following a fatal attack on a pet family dog recently. A council has expressed the view that the Dog Control Act does not provide sufficient power to the council to control and regulate the security of guard dogs. Concern has been expressed at the savage way in which the woman's dog was killed. Does the Minister concede that there is no need to strengthen this legislation?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I thank the honourable member for his question. My department is aware of the incident which prompted it and officers are presently examining the Dog Control Act to determine what actions are available to the council involved. As it presently stands the Dog Control Act does not specifically provide for the control of the security of guard dogs. I have arranged for the matter to be examined by the Dog Advisory Committee with a view to making recommendations for the Act to be amended as necessary or for additional regulations to be prepared.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) ACT

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to amend the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act to allow the increased taxes to be raised to be paid directly into General Revenue rather than into the Highways Fund? Section 31 of the

Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act requires the Government to pay into the Highways Fund all licence fees payable under the legislation. This ensures that this form of taxation is used directly for road maintenance or construction purposes; in other words, taxation raised from motorists is spent directly on facilities for motorists. However, I have been informed that the Government has decided to increase the rate of this tax by 66 per cent in order to boost General Revenue rather than to provide additional funds for roadworks.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: From the Notice Paper the member will note that I plan to introduce a Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act Amendment Bill today, and from the explanation and the Bill itself the honourable member will get an answer. However, I am prepared to answer that in advance of the notice. There will be an option, the ability to apply the funds either into general revenue or direct to supplement Highway Fund amounts. We are really talking about accounting procedures here. Especially when we are involved in a programme such as the Bi-centennial Roads Programme, in order to take advantage of those sums the State must provide matching grants and a matching programme. Either this is done from a specified revenue source or, alternatively, one ensures that the general revenue position is such that one can find the funds to supplement the Highways Fund. It is really a question of where the amounts are designated as coming from, and that will be made clear in the Bill. That flexibility will be available in relation to the measure I will introduce later today.

TOURISM FIGURES

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Tourism say whether it is a fact that recently released statistics have shown a slight but measurable down-turn in the major tourism indicators in South Australia for the March quarter? If that is so, can the Minister say what he considers to be the reasons for this down-turn? I understand that the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics bulletin on tourism accommodation provides somewhat worrying statistics on room occupancy. For example, the overall room occupancy rate for the March quarter of this year was not quite 52 per cent, compared to 60 per cent for the March quarter last year. On the other hand, site occupancy figures for caravan parks were stable: 26.8 per cent for the March quarter of 1982, the same as for the March quarter of this year. Apparently, the March quarter showed a general down-turn throughout Australia, with only Victoria showing a gain. As tourism is one of the brightest potential areas for economic growth in this State, will the Minister say what are the reasons for these statistics I have quoted?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I heartily agree with the honourable member as to the potential of tourism concerning our economic growth, and I thank her for her question, all members being aware of her keen involvement in the tourism industry. Like her, I was initially puzzled by those figures. Closer analysis by the research people at the Travel Centre, however, as well as a knowledge of the 1982-83 Budget of the previous Government, puts those figures in a clearer and far more acceptable light. It is true, of course, that there was a general down-turn, whether that is judged by room occupancy figures as presented by the Bureau of Statistics or by rooms sold, involving a set of figures subsequently worked out by my own research staff.

The argument is not really concerned with any dispute over the actual figures. There can, however, be argument as to the weight that can be given to four factors that almost certainly affected tourism in the quarter referred

to. First, a Federal election was held in March, and it is fairly generally acknowledged that such elections generate uncertainty until the election result is known. Secondly, there were disastrous bush fires in the hills and the South-East, and many people in other States believed that tourist destinations such as Mount Gambier had been wiped out. This belief, of course, was ill founded, but nevertheless it existed.

Thirdly, 1983 is a non-festival year in Adelaide, and it is well known that the Adelaide Festival of Arts has a beneficial effect on hotel, motel and guesthouse room sales. It is therefore not quite fair to compare festival and non-festival years. Fourthly (and this is perhaps where we come to the heart of the matter), in the months preceding the quarter there was no television advertising campaign. The money allotted by the previous Treasurer for this purpose had run out. In fact, the lack of such provision by the previous Minister and that Administration was such that I had to request a special grant of \$300 000 from the present Treasurer to enable the planned television advertising campaign in other States on behalf of South Australian tourism to go ahead. Despite the tight restraints, the Treasurer agreed.

We have resumed interstate T.V. advertising to ensure continued promotion of our State and its attractions. What result that spending will have has yet to be tested. However, feedback from local operators already clearly indicates a recovery.

In these fairly cynical days we have found yet again that, if we do not sing our own praises, nobody else will. In tourism, promotion is extremely important. It is also important for us to be able to estimate how cost effective that promotion will be. Perhaps the previous Government's lapse will provide us with the chance to compare quarters with and without promotion, although I suppose it would be better to have the same quarter only in different years to give a proper comparison.

Finally, I should add that our efforts in tourist promotion will not be confined to paid T.V. advertising plus supporting publicity from our Travel Centre through the print media. We now have adapted video into the service of tourist promotion, without any drain on the State Budget. We must all hope that, with adequate spending on T.V. commercials, with help from video machines and from other means of promotion, greater use will be made by the tourist of rooms we have available in this State.

STATE'S FINANCES

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether the Government intends this financial year to transfer capital funds to support the recurrent account? During last year's Budget debate the Premier (as the then Leader of the Opposition) said in this House on 31 August:

The assault on the building and construction sector through the unprecedented transfer of capital funds will stand as one of the greatest errors in economic management of this Liberal Government.

Despite that criticism, the Premier's statement in this House last Thursday shows that his Government transferred \$51 900 000 from the capital account to reduce the deficit on the recurrent account for 1982-83. This amount was almost \$10 000 000 more than budgeted for by the previous Government.

The SPEAKER: As the honourable gentleman well knows, he is now debating the matter. I am most reluctant to call him to order, especially as I think he is approaching the end of his explanation and in view of my earlier comments about a Ministerial statement. However, it is my job to uphold the Standing Orders, and I would ask the honourable

member to refrain from debate and maintain his factual explanation.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I will not repeat myself. This additional amount was achieved by decision of the Government to scrap or delay major public works projects such as the Finger Point sewerage scheme, the Cobdogla irrigation scheme, O'Bahn, and other projects. I therefore ask the Premier, in view of his persistent criticism of the action of the previous Government whilst he was Leader of the Opposition, whether he intends to continue this financial year with the practice in which he indulged last year.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Premier, I think it is quite clear that in view of that explanation it will be necessary for the Standing Orders Committee and me to carefully consider where the guidelines are between the facts, which make up the explanation, and the arguments which go towards a debate.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think I heard you correctly when you said 'in view of that explanation'?

The SPEAKER: Yes. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The audacity of such a question I find quite amazing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing wrong with audacity in Parliament. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The answer to the honourable member's question as to this year's Budget, and the results and arrangements for it, will be revealed, of course, when the Budget is tabled. I would ask the honourable member to be patient until that time. However, I cannot refrain, in responding to the question, from repeating again that its sheer audacity staggers me. The question has been asked often recently in view of the deplorable financial situation in the State Treasury: 'How was it that the Tonkin Government managed to survive over the three years of its office and produce what, in cosmetic terms, looked like balanced Budgets?' The simple answer to that question is that it was done by the device of using capital funds to prop up the recurrent expenditure. As was pointed out constantly, not just by people on my side of the House but also publicly by the Hon. Mr DeGaris, and I suspect privately (and I can think of one or two members with an understanding of public finance), great disquiet was expressed about that method of patching up Budget results.

The problem is that eventually it catches up with you and reserves run out, eventually the Government runs out of deferrals, and eventually one has to start spending the capital funds allocated. Over \$100 000 000 was taken out of the capital works programme and put into propping up the recurrent Budget to paste over the appalling financial mismanagement of the previous Government. The member for Light now has the audacity to stand up and say, 'Are we going to continue this practice in light of what we have done this financial year that has just finished?'

I remind the honourable member that we inherited a Budget that had yet another \$42 000 000 provided for just such a transfer—to provide just such a cosmetic result. As my statement in December proved, it was very clear that, unless there were massive retrenchments in public sector employment and a cut-back in services, an even greater transfer would take place. In fact, we have contained that to around about an extra \$9 000 000 or \$10 000 000. The honourable member says that that involved deferring, for instance, the Finger Point sewerage scheme and one or two other items. We would like to spend the money on those schemes. We are attempting to raise finance to give us that capacity. I doubt that we will get much assistance or co-operation from members opposite. We have had the guts

to try to raise revenue to do those things and not to patch it up and paint it over as the previous Government did.

In relation to the result for 1982-83, it was laid down in the Budget provided by the Tonkin Government. That Government was doing it yet again. I was not aware of any protests by the member for Light about it or from too many on that side of the House. Members opposite accepted that Budget and rejected our criticism of this method of patching up the recurrent expenditure. We inherited it. We came to office in November and did an urgent review. Half the financial year went by before we had a chance to do anything about it. While I will not reveal what the Budget will show, as it is in a state of formation, I will say that it is our intention that this practice will be eliminated as soon as possible. The consequences of that sort of patching by the State has been to bring us close to the point of bankruptcy.

FUN PARLOUR MACHINES

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise whether the Government has given any consideration to a licensing system in relation to the siting and use of coin-operated fun parlour machines? If not, will the Minister give consideration to examining such a proposal? For some years I have been most concerned that these machines have, in my opinion, a detrimental effect on young people who play them. The machines lure teenagers into hotels, create financial hardship for young people and, I suspect, are a bigger menace to society than the possibility of the introduction of poker machines. I point out to the Minister that I would guess that the machines turnover millions of dollars and go to sources which, in real terms, provide no real benefit to our society as a whole. Authorities are not aware of how many of these machines are operating in the State, what sort of money the machines turnover, or whether the machines operate properly.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I share the concern of the member for Whyalla about the proliferation of amusement machines in South Australia. Particularly, the House and the member for Whyalla will note that only recently it was necessary to take action under the regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act to declare certain machines, such as video draw poker machines, instruments of unlawful gaming in one section of the amusement industry scene.

I believe that the question raised by the honourable member is worthy of serious consideration because, in relation to the video draw poker machines, officers of the Department of Recreation and Sport and the gaming squad of the Police Force had no idea just how many machines were in South Australia, where they were located, or to what extent and for what purpose they were being utilised until, of course, they were told by certain people that many of them were being used for unlawful gaming. Of course, the question which the honourable member has asked is a general one, not merely in relation to video draw poker machines. The former Minister would remember on-line bingo machines, and poker machines themselves were declared instruments of unlawful gaming under that section. The question that the honourable member has asked about amusement machines relates generally to coin-operated machines and pinball machines in South Australia.

Quite honestly, I believe that the question raised by him ought to have serious consideration. Therefore, it is my intention to have that matter investigated to determine whether there should be some registration or perhaps licensing of all amusement machines, so that the authorities know the extent and for what purpose they are being used. I will take the matter into consideration and advise the honourable member accordingly.

YATALA PRISON

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Is the Chief Secretary aware that the person he appointed manager at Yatala, Mr Robin Maslen, was never able during his eight weeks in the position to establish how many inmates were being held at any time in the prison, nor did he have adequate regulations for running the prison and, if so, what action is being taken to remedy the situation, and will that action now include proclamation of the necessary sections of the new Correctional Services Act as a matter of urgency?

During an interview last night on the A.B.C. television programme *Nationwide*, Mr Maslen made a number of points about the running of Yatala Labour Prison. Referring to numbers of prisoners in the gaol at any one time and their security classification, he said:

The system is in such chaos that I don't have any figures about that.

Referring to the Act and regulations which governed his work, Mr Maslen said:

It took me four weeks to find them and get them up to date in the prison. There are no standard procedures for operating the prison, or those that are there are archaic and need rewriting.

He was then asked whether in fact there were no set rules for running the prison. He replied:

That's correct. They are being made up each day as we go along to meet each solution.

Therefore, I ask the Chief Secretary what action has been taken in view of the circumstances Mr Maslen has revealed, and whether that action will include the urgent need for the introduction of regulations and the proclamation of the Correctional Services Act passed by Parliament some 18 months ago? If not, one can only presume that the Chief Secretary is deliberately delaying the implementation of that legislation.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I have not heard a stronger condemnation of a Government by a member of Parliament than that which the member for Murray has just placed upon his own Administration which, for three years, was in control of the Department of Correctional Services in this State. His present Leader was Minister of Correctional Services for nine months of those three years. Yet the honourable member explains to this House that an officer who was in charge of the Yatala Labour Prison for a short time did not have any working regulations at all, and that there were no standard procedures to which Mr Maslen could refer. Mr Maslen is absolutely correct. When I came to office I was shocked to find that at Yatala, our major correctional institution in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.J. KENEALLY:—these standard procedures had not been provided for. That is a condemnation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Todd to order and I call the honourable member for Glenelg to order.

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker. I wish to raise the point that on that occasion I had not said a word, and I would therefore ask that the use of the name of the member for Todd be withdrawn, because it was an incorrect reflection.

The SPEAKER: Order! In my view, I distinctly heard the honourable member for Todd.

Mr ASHENDEN: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker, that is not correct, and I would stand by that.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: On a clarification of a point of order, Mr Speaker, if the Chair intends to warn

a member, is that warning given immediately after the member has transgressed? I have an accurate recollection of the series of incidents that have occupied the last few moments.

The SPEAKER: I did not warn the honourable member. I called the honourable member for Todd to order. In fact, I called two honourable members to order, the member for Todd and the member for Glenelg. I did so not immediately after they had spoken, because at that stage there was a great deal of conversation in the House that was quite outside Standing Orders. The Chief Secretary.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I was explaining to the honourable member for Murray the sort of chaos that the Liberal Government left as an inheritance when it vacated office. It is also true to say that the previous Government had no capacity to give a quick response in regard to the number of prisoners held in individual institutions, although that capacity had been provided for the Government prior to 1979.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: We have now appointed an officer who is able to provide that information. We now have a research capacity that hitherto was not available. I believe that it is absolutely critical to the running of an efficient and secure prison system to have clear and concise standard procedures available. This ensures that prison officers are aware of their duties, their responsibilities and their authorities. It also ensures that the prisoners who from time to time occupy an institution are aware of the rules that apply. That information was not available at Yatala. I will tell the honourable member what it is that the Government proposes to do about that.

In addition to the fact that there were no standard procedures for Yatala, the general departmental instructions (D.I's) were totally out of context: they were of no use at all. In most prison systems one needs something like 200 departmental instructions up and running. We have given priority to that, because that establishes general policy guidelines within which a prison has to operate. We are turning out those instructions at the rate of about one a week. Forty of them are now off and running, but we need something like 200. They do not set the procedures for the individual institutions: that will need to be achieved by management at the institution itself. It is not my role, nor is it the executive director's role to set the standard procedures for individual institutions. We need (and Mr Maslen was quite correct in this) a management structure at Yatala where the manager has the time available to him to sit down and develop those procedures.

Until we do that we will always have the possibility of problems. The regulations have nothing to do with that problem; nevertheless, we do have problems with regulations. The honourable member's colleague, now the Leader of the Opposition, was in office for nine months but did not have those regulations and the Act proclaimed during that time. When I came to office there was a rough draft of the regulations. Those regulations—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: We had a working party working on them. Alex Stewart—

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Alex Stewart had left the department before I started. We did have a rough draft, I am acknowledging that. I do not know why the honourable member is getting so excited.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: The finished regulations were in your hands by January of this year.

The SPEAKER: Order! I call the honourable member for Murray to order.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I hope the regulations will be available in a few short weeks. We are not delaying them.

I was anxious to have them some months ago, because some good reforms are included in that legislation which passed this House in 1981. Of course we would like to have them up and running, and their introduction has not been delayed deliberately. Of course we will change some aspects of them, and that applies particularly to the parole system.

Many of these regulations will be of great assistance in the running of the system in South Australia. I have heard the honourable member's suggestions for fixing up the system. He says that there must be segregation and the regulations and the Act must be promulgated, but he does not say how that segregation should be done and which of the regulations should apply. He just generalises. The honourable member is an intelligent member of this House and a dedicated shadow Minister of Correctional Services and I admire him for that. He has worked hard on it, but he should be more specific about his complaints, because the segregation that he suggests would cost millions of dollars and we are planning for that and the regulations to which he refers, although never specifically. I think he should tell me to which regulations he is referring when he is complaining about ways of overcoming the problems at Yatala.

ORANGE JUICE

Mr MAYES: Will the Chief Secretary obtain from the Minister of Health a report on what consideration has been given by the Government to revising legislation to provide for improved labelling of orange juices offered for sale in order to provide greater information to the public? I refer to an article in the *National Times* on 31 July 1983, headed 'Orange Juice—Let's squeeze out the truth', which states:

Buying orange juice may be easier than peeling oranges but until the Federal Government and all of the States improve labelling provisions in the Health Acts consumers may never know what it is that they are really drinking. In fact, up to 80 per cent doesn't come from freshly squeezed oranges as most people imagine . . . All that most orange juice companies do is mix this imported concentrate with 25 per cent Australian concentrate to avoid paying sales tax and then add water and a few chemicals before packaging . . .

In the meantime, there is no independent check on the quality of imported concentrates . . . At present, consumers have no way of knowing that most orange juices contain 9 to 11 per cent sugar or about the same as Coke, Fanta, and other soft drinks. Consumers also have no way of knowing how much of the orange juice preservatives, sodium metabisulphate, sorbic acid and benzoic acid are in these drinks.

All have been found by the Australian Medical Association to be a factor in illnesses such as skin irritations, asthma and other allergic responses. These problems can be quickly and easily solved by changing the food and drug regulations without amending Health Acts in every State. Consumer groups would like to see reforms that include:

Enlarging the words showing the percentage of pure orange juice to the same size type as the word orange.

Stating if the juices are made from freshly squeezed oranges or from concentrates.

Where the concentrate was made.

The amount of each preservative used.

Sugar content.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I commend the honourable member for resisting the opportunity to squeeze every drop out of that question, which is one of importance. I am not sure whether the question should be referred to the Minister of Health or to the Minister for Consumer Affairs, but the appropriate person will have the question referred to him for immediate attention and a report.

COMMUNITY WELFARE

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare institute an independent inquiry into the circum-

stances behind the alleged actions of community welfare officers in cases involving child welfare and the removal of children from parental care? Regarding several specific cases, the Minister has received considerable correspondence this year and over the past few months particularly a number of public allegations have been made that reflect upon the Minister, his community welfare officers, and other Government agencies.

An independent inquiry should be commenced to establish guidelines to indicate clearly the separate areas of Ministerial and departmental authority and to establish the rights of parents. It is obviously in the best interests of the Department for Community Welfare and its staff, as well as the public, to have these matters investigated quickly and cleared up. The inquiry should establish whether the reported actions of parents and the department were taken not only within the law but within the spirit of the law, the main aim of which is to protect children but which also gives high priority to family unity. As the Minister is well aware, several public meetings of concerned parents have been held since April 1983, with over 200 parents attending meetings at Angas Street, Adelaide, and at Salisbury High School. The problem, which is not an isolated one, should receive urgent attention by the Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. He has explained to the House that this is a concern of a group of people in the community. It has existed for a long period of time, indeed, during the period of the previous Administration. I understand that the previous Government did review the department's activities in this area and did have its own internal committee look at this and the procedures under which officers of the Department for Community Welfare now operate are those which were formulated by the previous Administration. Unsolicited, the former Minister has spoken to me about this matter and I thoroughly concur with his handling of similar cases during the period of the previous Administration. I have attempted to act in a similar way during the period of my Ministry. These are most complex and difficult situations in which officers of the department have to operate, and it is true that a small group of people, for various reasons, have decided to raise these issues in a very public and vocal way, I think quite sadly to the detriment of improving human relationships between very disturbed people.

I assume that it was the television programme *60 Minutes* during the weekend on which the honourable member is basing his call for a further inquiry into this matter. I would suggest that the honourable member might like to pursue the factual situation concerning these cases referred to during that television programme. The senior officers—

An honourable member: Weren't they truthful?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: No, they were not truthful. I am prepared for the honourable member to have a full briefing on this matter from senior members of my department to explain the story. The Director-General of the Department for Community Welfare was interviewed by a reporter from that television programme for over an hour, during which he explained in some detail the department's policy with respect to handling of these cases by officers of the department, but the programme did not report that. I must cast grave doubts on the way in which that programme was prepared and presented to the public of this State. I want to allay any fears that might be abroad in the community about this matter. The department was under scrutiny in one instance through the use of bugging devices; in that instance the department acted very properly and that was conceded by the producer of that programme.

The purpose of an inquiry to which the honourable member has referred is not relevant in the circumstances. Many

of these cases have been reviewed by the Ombudsman and indeed by the courts. I suggest either that each case has been reviewed independently of the department or that the opportunity to have it so reviewed has been available. Further, I have set in train procedures whereby the Ombudsman can review complaints against the department as of right, and I have reviewed the instructions available to officers of the department when dealing with such cases. Further, the amendments introduced during the term of office of the Tonkin Government have now been proclaimed and provide further protection for families in these circumstances. Therefore, I see no basis whatsoever for the call by the honourable member for an inquiry.

CARAVAN PARKS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Local Government say whether the Government will carry out a needs survey concerning the quality of caravan parks in this State and the standard of accommodation they provide? In March last year, I asked a series of questions on this subject, and on 23 March received the following reply from the then Government:

The Government has not conducted a survey into the long-term residency in caravans and it does not intend to instigate such a survey at this stage.

Further, in the *Sunday Mail* of 26 June 1983, an officer of the Salvation Army at Ingle Farm (Captain Ken Wilson) made the following statement:

Parks are charging families exorbitant rents on on-site vans. We have families paying up to \$100 a week to live in a caravan. It is not unusual with the demand for accommodation at present. In one case a family of six was living in a three-berth caravan and three children were sleeping in cars.

Although I do not intend to reflect on the owners of these caravan parks, I wish to know whether the Government will carry out a survey of such parks and the accommodation they provide.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am aware that problems such as unemployment, housing costs and marital breakups may be causing an increasing number of people to seek alternative accommodation, such as caravans. I am most concerned that caravan parks have adequate provision for the health and welfare of residents, whether short-term or long-term. No comprehensive surveys have been carried out in recent years on the quality of caravan accommodation and on conditions and problems in caravan parks in South Australia, particularly for long-term residents. The Victorian Minister of Housing announced in June that the Ministry is carrying out a review of caravan parks in that State. This review will include an examination of problems concerning long-term caravan residents. Although I understand the South Australian situation as to the number of people involved as long-term caravan residents is not as severe as in Victoria, I intend to examine the results of the Victorian study before deciding whether further action is required in South Australia regarding this matter.

TOURISM TAXATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Does the Minister of Tourism recall his answer to my question of 19 April, in which he undertook to consult with the South Australian Tourism Industry Council prior to increasing any State taxes that would have an impact on the tourism industry? Does he recall writing to the council in May, reaffirming his undertaking to consult with the industry prior to the Government's increasing any State taxes affecting the industry?

Does he recognise that taxes on liquor, petrol, tobacco, insurance and financial transactions affect the tourism industry? If he does recognise that, why did he breach the undertaking he gave to the industry by failing to consult with it before the announcement of new State taxes was made last week?

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I gave the council a verbal commitment at a meeting that I attended with them and that commitment was confirmed in writing and in this Chamber. The understanding I have with the council is that, if the Government was going to introduce an essentially or directly tourism-related tax (I should not canvass that, or I will be accused of canvassing tourism taxes), I would take up such a matter with the council.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: The suggestion that cigarette tax, petrol tax or other taxes are exclusively tourism-related taxes and should be discussed with the tourism industry was never contemplated, and the industry council is well aware of that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: FRIENDLY TRANSPORT COMPANY

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT (Minister of Transport): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Last Thursday in this House I responded to a question from the member for Unley concerning the Friendly Transport Company. In that reply, I said that the Friendly Transport Company property was required for the building of the Emerson overpass. In fact, a strip of land approximately 7ft wide is required from the front of that property for the widening of South Road. The construction of the Emerson overpass is a part of the general upgrading of South Road near the Friendly Transport Company but does not directly impinge on the property.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (PETROLEUM PRODUCTS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Standing Orders having been suspended, the Hon. J.C. Bannon (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act, 1979. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Members will recall that last week, when announcing the actual financial results for 1982-83, I informed members of the House that, because of the serious financial situation facing the State, the Government had no alternative but to implement a number of revenue measures. This Bill relates to one of those measures. It has been introduced at this time not only because of the need to gain the revenue as quickly as possible but also because the industry needs time to arrange its affairs, including increased prices, so that it will be in a position to pay the increased licence fee which the Bill imposes.

The petroleum industry has a particular problem in that it has to seek approval of a price increase from the Petroleum Products Pricing Authority, and it needs time to do this before the new prices come into effect. Specifically, if a higher licence fee is to operate from 1 October, the industry needs to have in place a price increase during the month

of September, and it needs to be able to go to the P.P.P.A. sufficiently early in August to get the necessary approval and make the necessary arrangements.

The Bill proposes to increase the monthly licence fee payable by the holder of an A class licence under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act. No increase is proposed in the basic fee of a class A licence or the fee for a class B licence, both of which are \$50.

The proposal is for the prescribed fee under section 18 of the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) Act to be increased from 4.5 per cent of the value of motor spirit sold to 7.5 per cent and from 7.1 per cent of the value of diesel fuel sold to 9.8 per cent, both with effect from 1 October 1983. It is proposed to hold the value determined by the Minister at the present level of 33.4c a litre for motor spirit and 36.65c a litre for diesel fuel. Thus, the increase to the consumer should be contained to 1c a litre for both motor spirit and diesel fuel.

All other States, with the exception of Queensland, impose licence fees of this nature which have an impact on the consumer. However, even after this change, the cost to the consumer in South Australia will be less than that in New South Wales and Tasmania, assuming no other change is made in the other States. The revenue to be obtained from the proposed increase is estimated to be about \$15 000 000 in a full year. The October announcement should yield revenues of about \$11 000 000 in 1983-84. The legislation is designed to give the Government some flexibility in the application of the increased revenue which can be made available either to the Highways Fund or to meet the Government's general budgetary commitments. A similar situation applies in New South Wales. However, in that State, all revenues obtained in this manner form part of the general revenue. However, there is provision in this Bill to enable some of the increased revenues to be paid to the Highways Fund to meet urgent and essential needs which may emerge in the roads area from time to time, but the fund is also guaranteed an income from petroleum licence fees of an amount no less than that received in the 1982-83 financial year.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 18 of the principal Act. The percentage fees payable in respect of a class A licence are increased, in relation to motor spirit, from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent and, in relation to diesel fuel, from 7.1 per cent to 9.8 per cent. Clause 3 repeals section 31 and substitutes a new section which determines the manner in which moneys collected under this Act are to be dealt with.

Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 31 of the principal Act. The effect of the amendment is to guarantee the Highways Fund an income, from petroleum licensing fees, of an amount no less than that received in the 1982-83 financial year. If circumstances warrant it, the Government could decide to pay more to the Highways Fund.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUSINESS FRANCHISE (TOBACCO) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill is a further measure designed to help overcome the serious financial problems which presently confront South Australia. This revenue is currently collected as a licence fee on retail and wholesale tobacco merchants, with

the bulk of receipts received from wholesalers who pay a fee for a particular month's licence based on 12½ per cent of the value of tobacco sold in the month falling two months prior to the licence month.

As with the licence fee on petroleum products, it has been the consistent practice in the past for the industry concerned to be able to increase prices one month before the new licence fee comes into effect. This permits the industry to accumulate the funds necessary to meet the higher licence fee. It is proposed that the licence fee with respect to monthly licences from October 1983 be calculated as 25 per cent of sales in the relevant antecedent period. The first licence fee based on the increased rate would be payable with respect to August's sales.

Unfortunately, some sections of the tobacco industry saw fit to increase prices immediately. I believe that this was unreasonable and that price increases to the consumer from 1 September 1983 were appropriate in the case of an increase in the licence fee effective from 1 October. The industry made certain representations to me through the officers who conducted the negotiations. After considering those representations, I came to the view that a price increase from 1 September would be a reasonable approach. My latest advice is that that has been agreed to by the industry. The full year revenue gain from this measure should be around \$17 000 000. The proposed October commencement would enable revenues of about \$13 000 000 to be achieved in 1983-84. The impact on cigarette prices would be around 17c per packet.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 11 of the principal Act. It increases the component of a licence fee which is based on the value of gross turnover from 12.5 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier) brought up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare the draft Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor:

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the Speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.

3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's prayer for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Mr MAYES (Unley): I move:

That the draft Address in Reply as read be adopted.

It is with pleasure that I have the opportunity to so move, and I would like to turn my attention to two issues. First, I would like to deal with the financial measures announced last week by the Premier. In particular, I would like to look at the position taken by the Opposition in regard to these measures, and to put forward a hypothetical position as to what Opposition members would have done had they been

in Government and faced with a deficit situation on the Consolidated Account of over \$100 000 000. If they had taken a position not to increase taxes (albeit a position with which their former Premier had not apparently agreed) we would find that there would have been, of necessity, a decision by the Opposition to sack about 3 500 Public Service employees, including teachers, nurses, agricultural officers and a whole range of people involved in important community services and activities. In my opinion, that option was being seriously canvassed by the then Government as the only alternative it had. If we look at the deficit situation as announced by the Premier, we now find a deficit of about \$57 000 000 coming from a recurrent \$109 000 000 deficit, minus a surplus in capital account of \$51 000 000. If the \$6 000 000 from 1982 is carried over, there is an accumulated deficit to go on for next year of \$63 000 000.

That, as the Premier has said, cannot be carried on by this Government, given decisions taken by the previous Liberal Government, into the future because it would run this State into a situation of bankruptcy. Here we have the Opposition indicating its disapproval of the measures announced by the Premier in order to maintain essential Government services. My message goes out to those people in the community for whom services are provided by this Government. I refer to such services as teaching; education; hospital services provided by nurses, doctors, speech therapists and occupational therapists; agricultural industry services provided through field officers; vital water and sewerage services; and electrical services. All such services would be affected by a decision taken by the Opposition not to increase the revenue base. The only alternative (and I believe I am reasonably qualified to comment) would be to sack 3 500 employees.

So, the public, and particularly the public servants in the community, ought to think carefully about what alternatives they may have faced had a Liberal Government been elected in November 1982. I believe, from information supplied to me, that the Opposition (the then Government) was seriously considering that option. People should not kid themselves that it was not doing so. We have, of course, a contradiction between what the Leader of the Opposition now says and what the then Premier said at the Premiers' Conference, as follows:

Quite frankly, we are facing enormous Budget problems. We face major increases in taxation and charges over and above the cuts that we have already very successfully made.

Services were cut by some 3 500 employees from 1979 to 1981-82. That is something of which I would not be proud, and it is something to which the people I contacted in my electorate were finding it more and more difficult and frustrating each day to adjust.

While out canvassing, I had numerous complaints about the quality of education and health care deteriorating, as well as complaints about the waiting list for public hospitals, the quality of the water supply and the breakdowns that were occurring because of cuts being instituted by the then Government.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr MAYES: So, we ought to look very carefully at this matter. The member for Mallee makes a comment which I do not think is worth repeating but which challenges my comments. He will have the opportunity to reply to them if he can, but I challenge him to query any of my figures, and I will debate them with him. Those figures I have put forward can be verified and justified. The situation we would face as a community, had the Liberal Party got into Government, would be massive cut-backs in services. What hypocrisy for the shadow Minister of Education to stand out on the steps of Parliament House and address my constituents from Goodwood Primary School, saying that

this Government had caused cuts, when his own Leader had said that very day that 739 additional jobs should be cut from the public sector—739 teachers. This Government had provided 230 additional teachers. The shadow Minister had the audacity to stand out there and tell those people that this Government was acting irresponsibly. I have never seen such an act of such gross hypocrisy in my life. I quote from the article appearing in the *Advertiser* on 3 March headed 'Premier accused of trade-off', as follows:

Reduce public sector by 739 jobs, says Olsen.

That is just the beginning; in my opinion, another 3 500 jobs would be cut off in the public sector area. I believe that that would have a catastrophic effect not only on community services but also on employment and the whole consumption effect in South Australia. I challenge any member of the Opposition to dispute that or to say that that would not bring South Australia to its knees, because an additional 3 500 people on the unemployment market would force this State into a situation where there would be a lack of confidence and a massive demand on State services. It would not only cut off employment but also raise the need for housing, as well as public health services and social services through community welfare. It is a very circular argument. In addition, the consumption effect, the community effect and confidence in this State's economy would collapse if that approach was adopted. That is the alternative we are facing if we adopt the approach suggested by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Lewis: Where did you learn your economics?

Mr MAYES: I learnt it in probably the best school in this State—one that you did not attend. I will not bother with such a trivial question from across the floor.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the honourable member that the word 'you' is not permissible.

Mr MAYES: I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer to the honourable member for Mallee. If these cuts had been instituted by the Opposition, if in Government, it would lead to a further drop in education. I do not believe that, as a country, we can afford any further setbacks in our level of education. This State dropped from being one of the highest in terms of retention rates for 15 to 19-year-olds in secondary and secondary-related education to being the lowest in Australia over the last three years of a Liberal Government. The last statistics put us at a 38.2 per cent retention rate. America has a 75 per cent retention rate for 15 to 19-year-olds. No wonder we are finding it difficult in an age of technology, when we need our young people to be the best educated in the world, for our economy to continue to grow. In my view, education is the best investment. We will find that such a policy to cut back again in public sector expenditure, in education in particular, would put us behind the eight ball. We would not be in a situation where we could survive in such a competitive market place, and that would be a most short-sighted attitude.

It is all very easy to advocate no increases in taxes: It appeals to the public at large and to their pocket. I am telling the public and public servants in the community not to be fooled by that, because those cuts would mean a definite cut-back in our community lifestyle, affecting our quality of education, consumption within a community and our economic well-being. Those measures, as unpalatable and unacceptable as they may be, are essential for us in order to maintain our budgetary situation, our services and our economic stability in this State. It was bad enough for the Leader of the Opposition to suggest on 3 March that 739 jobs should go but, if we faced a situation where we continued to have no increase in revenue base and a continuation in services, the State would go into bankruptcy. No doubt exists that within three years we would not be

able to meet our wages bill. The alternative would be to cut back on capital works—an area of stimulation. The building industry would collapse.

Hugh Stretton, an eminent historian in this State, has referred to the mixed economy and the way in which it entwines together. If we cut back on capital works as a consequence of the State Government's actions, there would be a major down-turn in the economic activity of the building industry and in employment and a consequent downward spiral in economic activity. We saw, in the period of the last Liberal Government, some hundreds of people being under-employed in the public sector area—skilled tradespeople and workers who were not put to their full potential because of the philosophical view of the previous Government. Those employees were faced with watching work, which was normally performed and had been performed by the department for 30 or 40 years, being placed out to the private sector. In many instances (and I can cite them) that work had to be re-done by those very employees who saw it panned out to the private sector. There are various examples in the Department of Marine and Harbors, the Public Buildings Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department where that occurred.

Mr Meier: What are some of the examples?

Mr MAYES: I can refer the honourable member to several examples if he will bear with me.

Mr Lewis: That has stopped now, has it?

Mr MAYES: West Lakes is one example to which I can refer. I do not wish to be side-tracked, but I will refer to that. At West Lakes, the retaining banks were originally built by the private sector. The concrete slabs were provided by a private company. The Department of Marine and Harbors had the responsibility of maintaining the lake after completion. After five years, the department has had to replace 1 200 slabs which have been eroded by salt water. That is an example of what has happened in this area. There are other examples relating to public works in the Engineering and Water Supply Department where major pipeline work was undertaken by private enterprise. That pipeline had to be relaid.

Mr Lewis: When was it first laid?

Mr MAYES: It was laid during the period of your former Government. There are numerous examples where we can find that this sort of activity has occurred, where work was put out to private enterprise, at the expense of those employees who are under-employed in the public sector. As a consequence of that, we find that this Government now has to relocate its priorities and endeavour to bring those employees (who had performed work for the department for periods of up to 30 or 40 years as skilled trades people) back into the public sector.

Mr Lewis: You are reflecting on the tradesmen in the private sector, are you?

Mr MAYES: No, I am not. I am not being side-tracked. What I am saying is this: the former Government took away that work, provided no work for many of those employees, under-employed them, cut back services and, as a consequence, built up an enormous budgetary deficit over that period. I believe that that is a situation of mismanagement.

To develop my argument I am saying that, if a Liberal Government was elected in 1982 and had to entertain that particular philosophical approach, we would find that it would have to sack employees. It could not retire them: they have gone through the voluntary retirement process and the 59-year-olds had been offered all the incentives they could be in the way of early retirement packages. They had endeavoured in every way to employ natural wastage and, as they went on with their philosophical stance, these under-

employed employees continued to grow. That is the point of my argument. If they were in Government, the only alternative now would be to sack employees, because they had exhausted sacking employees if they defaulted in a workers' compensation situation, and sacking them if they committed some minor misdemeanour under a disciplinary Act. Therefore, they would have found themselves in a situation where they would have to adopt a decision of sacking public servants and cutting back on community facilities and services. In itself, that would lower confidence and expectation in the whole of the economic community throughout South Australia. This Government is committed to maintaining those services, jobs and the economic confidence of this State.

Finally, having made that point, I think that it is very relevant to repeat to those people in the community the only alternative available which, I believe, would be adopted by a Liberal Government. The only alternative would be to cut services and sack people. For the people in my electorate of Unley, that would mean cuts in education, teachers at each school, the quality of health, police services, and the whole range of services provided throughout the community.

Mr Lewis: That is more in your mind than in reality.

Mr MAYES: The Deputy Premier has drawn to my attention the fact that the previous Government had budgeted for over 700 employees to be dismissed. That is not in my mind: it is a fact. Further, there would have been 3 500 in addition who would have been budgeted out of work because of the financial situation to which the former Premier alluded when he made that statement at the Premiers' Conference last October.

I turn now to another important point which had a major impact on me personally during the previous election campaign. I refer to the Electoral Act. During that campaign, I was subjected to what I regard as an outrageous and disgraceful third-party act. I refer to the placing of an advertisement in one of our daily newspapers, namely, the *News*, which attacked me in what I believed to be a very misleading and discriminatory manner. That advertisement appeared on 2 November 1982. I am taking action against the persons involved in this advertisement. I wish to draw this to the attention of the House, and I think I will receive some support from other members. I know that I have received some comments from members opposite regarding that type of advertisement. I believe that that sort of advertisement ought to be prevented from being placed in any newspaper during any election campaign.

I think that the *News* is involved in this. That advertisement not only misled but also made certain statements which I regard to be libellous and defamatory. The situation which it purported to present was that I was not telling the electorate of Unley who I was or what I did. What an absolute and outright lie! I clearly made available to everyone in the electorate of Unley exactly who I was, exactly where I was employed and exactly what I did. I hid nothing from them and I never endeavoured to do so. Yet, the advertisement appeared on page 25 of the *News*—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not wish to pick up the honourable member all the time. However, a while ago the honourable member used the word 'lie'. Again, that is an unparliamentary remark and I would ask the member to withdraw it.

Mr MAYES: I will withdraw that.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member for Mallee is quite out of order.

Mr MAYES: I will replace that with the word 'untruth'. The advertisement commenced as follows:

This man has been knocking on doors in Unley. He's told the electorate everything about himself except what he was doing before changing his image to run for Parliament!

Then there was a photograph which had appeared on my electoral advertisement. Under that appeared another photograph which had been taken by the *News* at some stage during 1981. It was put in a very poor light by using a decreased number of dots on the photograph, so that it appeared to be not the sort of photograph everyone would like to have in their front living rooms. To that photograph was attached to the words:

This man is also Kym Mayes—Acting Secretary of the Public Service Union when he led the first devastating, full-scale Public Service strike in South Australia's history and was involved in various other industrial actions . . . what he was doing before changing his image to run for Parliament!

This advertisement alleges that I was not telling people what I was doing. In my view, it is very misleading and very destructive. As I have already indicated to the House, I will be taking it up as a personal matter and pursuing a redress through the appropriate channels. It went on with various claims under a further heading as follows:

P.S. claim 'will send us broke' . . . This is the sort of man Bannon wants around him.

It was authorised by Mr Vin Murphy, P.O. Box 766, Port Lincoln, South Australia, who, I understand from inquiries, has been a fisherman. I wonder what is his interest in the electorate of Unley.

The other point I wish to make about this advertisement before turning my attention to the direction I would hope the Electoral Act should take in the future relates to preventing this type of advertisement. The *News* used a photograph which had been provided by me and my campaign committee as a publicity photograph without my authority. Again, I think that that is a serious matter and, as I have said, a matter which I will be taking up through the appropriate channels.

Mr Lewis: Have you already issued proceedings?

Mr MAYES: It is interesting to note that Mr Vin Murphy is a fisherman, although I think perhaps he has sold out his fishing licence, I would venture to say, at some enormous fee. If his pleading of poverty has been heard by the Minister of Agriculture, I wonder if the Minister should take into account the fact that this gentleman has the sort of money to splash around buying full-page advertisements in the evening newspaper. I would imagine that it costs about \$2 000 to place a one-page advertisement in the evening newspaper and in the afternoon run of the *News*.

I now wish to turn my attention to the matter of what should be done in regard to the South Australian Electoral Act to prevent this sort of scurrilous and outrageous attack on individuals. I have survived it, and survived it well. I obtained a large majority of 2 000 votes in what was predicted as a marginal electorate and one that was predicted by the press as likely to go to the Liberal Party. I think it augurs well in regard to people like Mr Vin Murphy that I did survive, because it shows that democracy does survive and will continue to survive the gutter tactic approach made by people like Mr Murphy. Other advertisements appeared that had other names attached which I regard as being a similar sort of gutter style politics. I believe that we must look at a form of reform to the Electoral Act which would provide that this sort of advertisement be culled out and prevented from being placed in any of the major newspapers, or in any advertisement in any newspaper, on television or broadcast by means of any other media form that might communicate misleading and scurrilous information about anyone, whether it be me or any other candidate from either side of the House. There are provisions in section 148 of the Electoral Act which provide for penalties if a person is

found to be exercising undue influence on the electorate. Section 148c provides:

At any time between the issue of the writ and the close of the poll publishes or exposes, or causes to be published or exposed, to public view any document or writing or printed matter containing any untrue statement defamatory of any candidate, and calculated to influence the vote of any elector, or verbally makes any such untrue statement.

Such a person is guilty of undue influence. Section 152 of the Act refers to the penalties that apply if there is undue influence, as follows:

Illegal practices shall be punishable as follows:

(a) bribery or undue influence by a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year:

(b) any other illegal practice by a fine not exceeding one thousand dollars, or by imprisonment not exceeding six months.

Perhaps the penalties could be reviewed as well. My search through all of the Acts applying in South Australia as well as the Commonwealth Acts in regard to political advertising indicates that there is a similar theme throughout. Although it varies from State to State, a State, for example, may refer to the criminal code where a penalty may be enforced under that code, but there appears to be little in the way of any protective measures for candidates from the sorts of advertisements that were used against me and some of my colleagues on this side of the House. I might point out that it is more of a pattern applying to those on this side of the House than to those on the other side.

Mr Lewis: But you have sued him?

Mr MAYES: This is an important issue and one that I think is very relevant to all members of this House. The remedies for libel and defamation are available to candidates who believe that they have been damaged or wronged by any act of any outside or third person who may have endeavoured to influence the electorate. However, the process is very slow. I think that might answer the question from the member for Mallee. The process is very slow. I have now been waiting for 2½ years for an outcome of an action to be heard in regard to another matter similar to that which I have raised. Therefore, I do not expect that the action that I intend to take (for which I will be instituting proceedings) will actually rush down the road. I have found it to be tortuous and very slow going through the process of receiving a return for damages or any compensation as a consequence of such action.

The point I make is that it is all very fine after the event, but what we are faced with is a situation that applies prior to the event. I am concerned about future candidates. As far as I am concerned it does not matter what I have chucked at me, because I can cope with it, as I have coped with it before. If ever I was vulnerable it was in 1982, but I am now past that point. Some other members may not have experienced this, but I refer to the effects that it has on other people. The impact of it did not affect me personally because I expected it: I was ready and waiting for it. We were disappointed that we got it, of course, but we were expecting it. But it had an effect on my family and my wife. Its impact was far more obvious and more measurable on her than it was on me. She was the one who got the news from the reporter concerned, who, again, feels very aggrieved about the way his article was dealt with by his own paper, and I refer to Mr Frank Jackson. My wife got the news from him that there was an advertisement against me in the daily paper. She had to find me when I was on the campaign trail and advise me and the former member for Unley, Gil Langley, what action was being taken. Unwisely, I think, the *News* did not abide by my solicitor's request to withdraw that advertisement after the lunchtime *News* had been put on the stand: the *News* continued on with it. Hopefully, it will suffer the consequences of doing so.

Another important fact is the impact on the electorate. There is an old saying that if you throw enough mud some of it will stick. I believe that applies to this situation. Candidates ought to be protected from such scurrilous and outrageous attacks to which a number of my colleagues have been subjected and to which the former Premier, Des Corcoran, was subjected in 1979. I have spoken to the Attorney-General about this matter on numerous occasions. I have a proposal which I believe could alleviate some of these problems. It needs to be debated by members on both sides of the House, having regard to what remedies ought to be instituted. I would hope that in the near future the Government will look at remedying the situation and altering the Electoral Act to provide for an administrative structure that may prevent as best we can in the practical situation prior to an election campaign this sort of thing from happening again.

I propose that we should institute a procedure for vetting by the Electoral Commission all electoral advertising. If the Electoral Commission's decision is disputed then that dispute could be heard at an appeal level through a panel, similar to the procedure that applies to the Boundaries Commission. Perhaps the appeal could be chaired by a judge of the Supreme Court. That would be a simple way of overcoming the problem. Of course, there would have to be a whole range of administrative steps taken to provide correct and proper regulation of any such mechanism. Such a proposal would have to be carefully examined by all members in an attempt to eliminate a situation that I believe is very harmful to the democratic system. We are talking about the community's not getting an accurate as possible message about candidates and their policies.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion. I take this opportunity to express sympathy to the family of the Hon. John Hurtle Coumbe, the former member for Torrens. I did not know Mr Coumbe, but his record shows that he had a long and distinguished career in this House. My sympathies go to his immediate family.

During the past few days we have heard from members of the Opposition expressions of mock horror about the recently announced revenue raising propositions that the Government has been forced to enter into because of the parlous state of the budgetary situation. I wish to refer briefly to this situation in the context of how strategies proposed by the former Liberal Government affected my electorate.

Henley Beach at the time of the last State election was the most marginal seat in the State. This situation was created because of the narrow victory of the Liberal Party at the 1979 State election. During that campaign the Liberal Party and the local Liberal Party candidates promised that if they were elected they would cut taxation and by cutting taxation they would bring untold amounts of prosperity to the South Australian economy. Indeed, my political opponent toured the district in a car with a flag fluttering from the top with the words 'Vote Liberal and cut taxes' printed on it. This vehicle and this message was given a considerable amount of television publicity.

When local Liberal candidates were asked to explain how they were going to achieve these taxation cuts they referred to the infamous Proposition 13 introduced in California which slashed property taxes by 57 per cent. The strategy announced by Liberal Party candidates was to cut taxation and to finance the taxation cuts by severely reducing the Public Service especially in the education field. I refer to the local newspaper *West-Side* printed in August 1979 which stated:

It has been proved that lower taxes can bring prosperity to both government and taxpayers, Hanson M.P. Heini Becker claimed this week. He said he would not subscribe to the incomplete statement by A.L.P. candidate for Henley Beach Mr Ferguson in the *West-Side* concerning effects of Proposition 13 in California on 1 August. The public sector is surviving and working adequately and the private sector is booming and jobs are more plentiful. Sixty-five per cent of Californian voters approved Proposition 13 last year.

The forecast of huge unemployment among civil servants, that education would collapse, crime increase and welfare services wither away; did not happen. Proposition 13 slashed property taxes by 57 per cent and cut State income by about \$6 000 million a year. At the end of the first financial year, the expected deficit was a \$3 000 million surplus. Some community services were trimmed—earlier closing times for libraries, less lavish parks and fewer elaborate evening classes and schools offering optional extra subjects.

Those benefits can easily be returned as business is booming and personal incomes have risen. Retail sales are up 14 per cent and during the year another 552 000 jobs have been provided which more than amply covers the reduction of some 100 000 jobs previously held by public servants. However, he said he was not advocating retrenchment in the government sector. It has been forecast that by 1985 student numbers in primary schools in South Australia will fall by 15 000 and there could be a surplus of 7 000 teachers, most of whom will never have had the opportunity to teach.

Surely it is wrong to be training teachers who will never have a chance to obtain a job in the teaching field? We must look at ways and means of employing these people and the theory behind Proposition 13 can and will work. Twenty-three American States have now adopted the principle of Proposition 13. The message is that 22 000 000 people in California have proved that Proposition 13 works and that pledge to ease the tax stranglehold and let people retain more of their money is not a recipe for calamity.

From the foregoing we can clearly see that the tactics involved in that election were to bring untold amounts of prosperity to South Australia by cutting taxation, and those taxation cuts were to be financed by cut-backs in the Public Service. I refer to the two sections suggesting earlier closing time for libraries, less lavish parks, and fewer leisure evening classes and schools offering optional extra subjects. Also, the question was posed whether we should do away with teacher training altogether. That is how the cuts would be financed.

As a result of the 1979 election campaign, the seat of Henley Beach changed hands and for the next three years we saw the Liberal Party Administration squeezing down in the field of education. As a result of this, we saw the first strike ever held by the teachers in this State, and we also saw the Education Department cut back on the number of school assistants in the Henley Beach Electoral District. Indeed, I had the most extraordinary experience of being asked to address school meetings, as a defeated candidate, on the subject of cut-backs in education services and staff. Community services in the district were severely cut and changed. The Department for Community Welfare and other welfare agencies were taken out of the Henley Beach area. Worthy organisations that were and are helping the less fortunate members of our community had their budgets slashed by over 50 per cent. Despite the Public Service cut-backs, State charges continued to rise, and now we see a deficit of more than \$60 000 000. The previous Administration used every spare dollar available from various funds, and this Government now has to increase taxation substantially in order to provide essential services, including education and welfare.

Both those services are essential in a district such as Henley Beach, which may be described as an average South Australian electorate. I hope that the revenue increases are treated in the way that they should be and that we hear more honest expressions from members opposite on those increases. The Government is faced with a situation of either drastically reducing welfare and education services and sacking teachers or, unfortunately, increasing taxation.

In His Excellency's Speech, we find the following passage on the development of tourism:

My Government recognises the great potential that tourism has for generating economic activity and employment and is engaging in an extensive and sophisticated promotion of this State's holiday attractions in Victoria, New South Wales, New Zealand and Japan. Much of this activity is being undertaken in co-operation with private tourist and travel agencies.

It has been one of my more pleasant duties since being elected to this Parliament to have been elected as a member of the Australian Labor Party Parliamentary Committee on Tourism. The vigorous development of the tourist industry is a key part of the Government's strategy to revive the South Australian economy and create jobs. A survey conducted by the Bureau of Industry Economics indicates that tourism is extremely important to the South Australian economy. The results of that survey suggested that in 1981-82 tourism was worth \$720 000 000 to South Australia. The Government sees the further development of tourism as being very much a partnership between the public and private sectors.

The committee with which I am involved has been gratified to see many developments and initiatives commenced in the tourism area during the current financial year. In February this year a sale agency was opened in Perth. Elders Travel was appointed as a general sales agent to spread the word in the West about South Australian tourism. At the same time, a press and radio advertising campaign was mounted in Western Australia to promote the services of the South Australian Government Travel Centre. The appointment of a Perth agent is an important step for tourism in South Australia. As a neighbouring State, the Western Australian market is a logical one for development by South Australia.

The sealing of Eyre Highway has made the east-bound trip more appealing to many motorists and there is keen competition among coach companies which operate package tours across the Nullarbor. Development of the Western Australian market will benefit all of South Australia. Motorists travelling to Adelaide will be encouraged to detour to such places as Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, the Flinders Ranges, the Mid North and the Barossa Valley. In the past, Western Australians who wanted holiday information on South Australia either had to personally contact individual tour operators or write directly to the South Australian Travel Centre in Adelaide. Potential travellers now have the facilities they need in Perth and because Elders have branches throughout Western Australia, country based tourists can also be serviced with information on events and bookings in South Australia. The Elders company, which is incorporated in South Australia, already acts for the State Government in Tokyo and Hong Kong.

In February, the Minister of Tourism was able to announce that the marketing package and advertising campaign was well under way. The promotion has since been launched and the 'Let's enjoy' campaign has commenced. No doubt, many members have seen and heard the press, radio and new style of posters and brochures used in the campaign. Surveys have shown that the best potential market place is Victoria. One of the main objectives of the plan has been to achieve through advertising a greater awareness of what South Australia has to offer. Under the present Government, last year's allocation for advertising and promotion has been increased to \$1 250 000 but that still falls short of what is required. In March this year the South Australian Government Travel Centre established a representative in New Zealand. A co-operative marketing campaign has been established involving the South Australian Travel Centre, the Australian Tourist Commission, Qantas, and private operators in New Zealand.

Other initiatives that have taken place in this State include a review of the Licensing Act, funding for the development of tourist roads has been increased and Government support of the tourism and hospitality industry training committee has continued. The Government is examining means of making finance available to the tourism industry on flexible terms and conditions, and the Government has sought Commonwealth financial assistance for the development of a number of key tourism projects for 1986. The Government has supported strongly the formation of the South Australian Tourist Industry Council. It is evident that co-operation and co-ordination within Government departments and with private enterprise have improved since the formation of the council.

In May of this year the Minister of Tourism announced a reorganisation of regional manager responsibilities. Regional tourist managers have been appointed and are responsible for the Fleurieu and Lower Murray, Riverland, Mid North and Yorke Peninsula, Adelaide, Barossa Valley, South-East, Eyre Peninsula, Flinders, Far North and Kangaroo Island districts.

I am pleased to say that the department is looking for an influx of Japanese tourists. The recent announcement that a Japanese national will be trained in South Australia and then employed in his own country to promote South Australian tourism is welcome news indeed. Japan has an expanding economy and surveys show that there is a growing number of affluent Japanese seeking new overseas holiday destinations. Unfortunately, the Japanese market is relatively untapped by Australia, despite the dominant trading position that Japan enjoys in this country.

At present, Japan accounts for an annual 5 per cent of overseas tourists visiting Australia, yet a study undertaken by the Australian Tourist Commission several years ago showed that these visitors were individually by far the biggest spenders; their average expenditure was more than double that of other overseas visitors to Australia. Unfortunately, the same survey showed that Adelaide welcomed only 8 per cent of the Japanese tourists visiting Australia. The Government, in conjunction with the industry and with the Commonwealth, wants to mount a vigorous marketing and publicity campaign to sell Adelaide and South Australia as a potential tourist attraction for the Japanese as a gateway to the outback. The Travel Centre is organising carefully planned familiarisation visits by Japanese wholesalers, tour operators and the travel media.

The South Australian Tourist Conference held from 7 June to 9 June at the Australian Mineral Foundation can only be described as a resounding success. Many ideas were exchanged and will doubtless be utilised for the future development of the tourist industry in South Australia. A sophisticated video system, which allows customers to see a region and its attractions before deciding to take a holiday, has been installed at the Travel Centre. South Australia is the first State in Australia to introduce this new technology and, in doing so, is leading the rest of Australia in what may undoubtedly result in a tourist video boom. Video machines can be likened to a push-button juke box, delivering pictures as well as sound. Headphones will allow the public to use the machines without disturbing others.

The Government has located these machines in the South Australian Travel Centre office and units have been located in Melbourne, Sydney, Perth, and Auckland. Other machines will be located in appropriate shopping centres, transport arrival areas, hotel lobbies, and so on. These machines are set up with tapes showing what is on offer, and all that consumers have to do is to make their selection from an index, push two buttons, step back, and look at where they could be going. Video will never replace the travel consultant; however, it will reduce the demand for expensive colour

brochures, and will ensure that the same constant sales message is delivered to interested customers. When people have viewed the video and have made a decision, they can ask for the exact cost, package, and brochures from the travel consultant.

On Thursday 14 July a new office of the South Australian Travel Centre was opened in Sydney. The opening of that office was held at the beginning of an extensive advertising and promotional campaign that will continue for about 12 months. The office is located in a prominent position to catch the attention of the thousands of people who are strolling by, whether office workers or shoppers during the day, or theatre goers and people who are out and about at night. The street-front display windows of the new office have obvious benefits for promotional work. It is expected that this office will become widely known as presenting everything that is tourism in South Australia. People wanting information on regions such as the Flinders Ranges or Kangaroo Island will automatically go to this office.

The television campaign in Sydney features a series of different advertisements with the emphasis on the range of unique holiday attractions in South Australia, and this campaign will be spread over six months. The November and December commercials will include reference to the 1984 Adelaide Festival, coinciding with the release of the Festival programme brochure. One of the most exciting advances on the tourist scene was the Premier's announcement of the Porter Bay marina that is to be established at Port Lincoln. The State Government has approved the first stage of the \$27 000 000 marina and tourist resort development for Porter Bay.

The South Australian Government has entered into joint venture agreements with the Port Lincoln council and local investors. These agreements will provide for the initial development of an aquatic centre and community facilities, the redevelopment of an existing caravan park and holiday village, plus the acquisition of land which will be developed as a marina. It is envisaged that the project will involve long term expenditure on:

A land-locked marina complex, involving some 31 hectares of international waterways and residential blocks.

Provision of safe harbour facilities for the entire commercial fishing fleet of Port Lincoln, which is Australia's biggest tonnage fishing fleet. Recreational and pleasure boat facilities will also be provided to answer existing and future needs. A total of 150 berths will be provided.

A major tourist resort complex, comprising 130 units, from cabin accommodation through to luxury marina-frontage apartments, ultra-modern resort facilities and water-front areas with a general fishermen's wharf theme.

A major recreational/aquatic community centre to serve the local community plus visitors.

Construction of the first stage is expected to commence in the next few months and, pending final approval of the feasibility studies, the entire project is expected to take several years to complete. The project is expected to create 1 300 jobs during the construction phase with a further 800 being provided in the long-term operation of the project.

The tourism industry on Eyre Peninsula, and Port Lincoln in particular, is expected to receive a major boost as a result of the development, which will be of world-class standard. Port Lincoln council and the community are strongly united behind the projects. Initial expenditure is expected to be around \$500 000 and includes site planning, surveying, development design, documentation of works and negotiation of contracts with tourist operators, the fishing industry and private developers.

In June 1983, 100 tourism officials, including 70 travel agents from New Zealand, as well as national and state marketing experts, visited South Australia on a two-day

mission to explore ways of selling South Australia to New Zealand holiday-makers. They attended a conference in the Barossa Valley and were taken by a specially chartered train to Tanunda. The two-day conference was called Matinz '83—marketing Australian travel in New Zealand. It represented the largest contingent of New Zealand travel executives ever to visit South Australia. New Zealand is Australia's biggest tourist market. However, the world recession has tapered off visitors crossing the Tasman.

A further visit of world travel planners and consultants took place in Adelaide in the first week in August. The overseas delegates were from America, Canada, Europe, United Kingdom, New Zealand, Japan, and South-East Asia. This conference is conducted annually, and this year was jointly co-organised by the Australian Tourist Commission, the South Australian Department of Tourism and the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau. The conference provided an opportunity for overseas planners to discuss first hand with key members of the Australian travel industry what is on offer in South Australia. The delegates visited the Flinders Ranges, Barossa Valley, Kangaroo Island, River Murray and other areas in South Australia.

All the advertising and marketing to which I have referred has been both exciting and justifiable in 1981-82. It is estimated that travel expenditure in South Australia was worth approximately \$720 000 000. The primary examination of the impact of this expenditure on the State economy has been recently completed. The main findings of this analysis are:

Tourism directly sustains over 25 000 jobs in South Australia.

Tourism sustains (directly and indirectly) a little over 9 per cent of the total State development. It is directly responsible for 15 per cent of retail trade employment, 48 per cent of employment in hotels, restaurants and entertainment, 13 per cent of employment in transport, and 2 per cent of employment in communications.

At a minimum, tourism generates over \$100 000 000 or 5 per cent of the State Government receipts. This estimate does include company tax or sales tax revenue.

If tourism continues to grow at a rate of 5 per cent per annum for the next five years, approximately 7 500 new jobs will be created.

It is my hope that the State Government will continue its strong support of this very important industry.

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I support the motion. Since His Excellency last addressed this Parliament the death has occurred of one of our former most distinguished members, Mr John Coumbe. Tribute was paid to Mr Coumbe in this House on 15 March, but I again record my personal regret at his passing. John Coumbe served this Parliament for 21 years and was Minister of Works, Marine, Labour and Industry, and Education, as well as Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Since the opening of the previous session in December, South Australia has experienced its worst natural disasters—the bushfires and floods which affected so much of the State and took their toll in so many ways. This House should record its thanks to His Excellency for his tireless efforts to visit so many of the devastated areas and learn at first hand of the personal tragedy experienced by many people and the acts of courage and bravery demonstrated across the State. That spirit of courage and dedication is still being displayed by people who are rebuilding their lives and properties from the ruins left by those two terrible disasters.

I have taken the opportunity to speak early in this debate because I believe South Australia is once again at a political, economic and social crossroad. The announcement of major increases in State taxation made in this House last week by

the Premier has highlighted a fundamental difference in economic management between the Liberal and Labor Parties. At the outset let me say that I do not believe that the rises announced last week by the Premier were necessary. They could have been minimised by firm economic control, and responsible management of Government departments. I remind the House that on 2 February this year the Premier circulated a minute to Ministers which said in part:

It is disturbing that some agencies appear to have adopted interpretations of the Government's policies and acted on them without specific Cabinet authorisation.

And, further on, the Premier said:

In particular, it appears that different interpretations have been placed on the Government's policy on staffing.

In essence, the Premier was saying to his Ministers that they had lost control of Government spending and that staff was being employed without authorisation, and consequently departments were exceeding their Budget allocation—a clear example of bad administration and of bad economic management at Cabinet level. This lapse in firm economic control led to substantial overspending by departments and the immediate escalation of the State deficit. The result of that inability to apply basic management disciplines is now becoming patently clear.

In recent months, and more particularly in recent weeks, we have witnessed in this State changes which have led to a substantial deterioration in lifestyle and peace of mind of the overwhelming majority of South Australians. These changes have not been confined to any single social or economic group. They have created concern and uncertainty in widespread and diverse sections of the South Australian community—urban and rural, elderly and young, the wealthy and the disadvantaged, the individual and the group, the radical and the conservative. The first and most fundamental change has been the massive and inexcusable increase in State taxes imposed by the current Labor Government.

I repeat to this House two passages from the policy speech of the Premier (then Opposition Leader) made before the last State election. These passages have been widely quoted in the media in recent days and they will be quoted a great many times more before the next election. This is what the Premier said about State charges:

... We will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Yet only 20 days after assuming Government, two of the three specific charges referred to by the Premier in his pre-election policy speech had been increased substantially above the rate of inflation. Since then, the list of increases has become a sad reflection on the honesty and credibility of the Premier. He attained power on a deliberate and calculated policy of deception and false hope.

In the past eight months bus, tram and train fares have been increased by this Government by an overall average of 47.6 per cent, with those who travel long distances to work being the most savagely hit. Water and sewerage rates have leapt by between 22 and 26 per cent. Housing Trust rents are set to arise from October. Not one of these increases—not one—was below or equal to the rate of inflation. Yet, eight months ago the Premier promised:

We will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

Those increases I have already outlined are the most publicised and discussed, mainly because they hit the most people. However, there are a considerable number of other State charges and payments that have increased since the Bannon Government assumed office. For the information of members of this House—and I am sure members opposite would like to be able to inform their sub-branches of the full, telling impact of the economic policies of this Govern-

ment—I will detail other sources of backdoor taxation which the Premier promised not to impose.

I have already referred to hospital charges, Housing Trust rents, bus tram and train fares, electricity charges and water and sewerage rates. However, here are some others which have been gazetted:

E. & W.S. Department fees for certificates to land brokers and land agents up 33 per cent.

Fees for well drillers' licence up 100 per cent.

Fees for supply of water under the Irrigation Act up 28 per cent.

Veterinary surgeons' registration fees up five per cent.

Hairdressers' registration fees up five per cent.

Waste management fees up 25 per cent.

Architects' subscription fees up between eight and 10 per cent.

Hairdressers' Registration Board fees for sitting members up between 11 and 13 per cent.

Pastoral leases—rentals up 50 per cent.

Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act—licence fees up 18 per cent, drivers' permits up 82 per cent.

Racing Act—Trotting Control Board fees—a wide schedule of fees increased between seven and 71 per cent.

Number plate fees—increase 10 per cent.

Government supervisors at race meetings—fees up 67 per cent.

Trotting stewards fees—up between 15 and 30 per cent.

Nurses' registration fees up between 400 per cent and 1 400 per cent.

Chiropodists' annual licence and subscription fees up 13 per cent.

Fishing licences—increase of between 33 per cent and 50 per cent.

Physiotherapist licence fees—up between 11 per cent and 20 per cent.

Sitting fees for advisory committee members of the Food and Drugs Act have risen by various amounts.

Pilotage fees under the Harbors Act up by various amounts.

A wide range of Government forms and publications have risen in price.

Post mortem fees up 30 per cent.

There is an old saying—only two things are certain in this life, death and taxation. This Government has even been able to levy a tax in terms of the dead.

In all, in the past eight months, at least 27 State charges or cost items have been increased. These rises have been levied during a period when most South Australians have been subjected to a wages pause. I have no quarrel with the wages pause. I believe that it has been and continues to be a vital circuit breaker in the upward spiral of wages. In fact, the Liberal Government has been a firm advocate of the wages pause since last September. However, it is hypocritical and deceitful for a Government which has given albeit tacit, lukewarm approval to the wages pause, to pursue a policy of high taxation while expecting average wage earners to make do with existing levels of income.

The increases in fees and charges I have just outlined will have a devastating overall impact on the State's economy. They push up other costs and charges in a wide range of community activities. Those increases are not restricted to the area of direct impact. For example, it is impossible for taxi operators to absorb an 18 per cent increase in licence fees and an 82 per cent increase in the cost of drivers' permits, not to mention higher fuel prices because of yet another tax increase by this Government. In the end, we all pay.

As if those increased charges were not enough, the Premier last week announced a new taxation broadside against the long-suffering taxpayer. In a brief statement to Parliament,

Mr Bannon announced increases in the price of tobacco products; petrol and other petroleum products; liquor licences, which push up the price of all forms of alcohol-based drinks; and stamp duty on general insurance. He also introduced a new tax—the financial institutions duty. Let me again remind the House of the words of the Premier before the last election:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

There can be no misunderstanding, no fudging of that statement. The increased levels of taxes on tobacco, liquor, petrol and stamp duty will affect all South Australians in some way. The introduction of the totally new financial institutions duty is also going to hit the pockets of every South Australian from December. Financial institutions duty will affect South Australians every time they visit their bank, building society, credit union or finance company to lodge funds to either cheque or saving accounts, or make loan or credit card payments. Those people who have their wages or salaries credited direct to an account at a financial institution, together with those who obtain goods on terms from department stores, will also be liable for the new tax.

The structure of the financial institutions duty is designed so that it appears to the public that the duty is being imposed on them as a charge by the financial institutions instead of a direct Government tax. A further deceitful measure by this Government. The tax will certainly mean higher costs to borrowers and lower returns to investors.

I call on the Premier, prior to releasing full details of the new tax, to abolish stamp duty on cheque forms, rental business duty and credit business duty, an inequitable duty that penalises borrowers who must incur higher rates of interest. These moves will at least minimise some of the impact of f.i.d. The Premier must also ensure that exemptions from financial institutions duty are granted to a wide range of charitable, religious and non-profit community organisations. I call on the Premier to detail those prior to the introduction of the measure into Parliament.

It is essential that f.i.d. legislation should incorporate steps to eliminate multiple taxing of receipts of non-bank financial institutions. I remind the House that before the last election the Premier gave an assurance to sections of industry that the f.i.d. would not be introduced, at least without the fullest consultation. In May of this year the Premier told business men at one of his own business lunches that f.i.d. would not be introduced until the current investigation into South Australian taxes was completed. I trust that those business men clearly understand the undertakings that are given at those lunches by the Premier. His track record to date has not been too good.

Without a word of warning the Premier has again broken his word, forcing companies to redraft their 1983-84 budgets because of the increased tax burden imposed by the Government. In outlining the roll call of increases in State taxes and charges imposed by the Bannon Labor Government, the question remains: 'Why did the Premier so blatantly and callously disregard his election policy promise not to increase taxes or introduce new ones?' The answer, curiously, lies not in South Australia but in Victoria. Before the last Victorian election which saw Labor win government, the Labor leader, Mr John Cain, said in his policy proposals: 'We don't see any need to raise State taxes in any area.'

Once again I repeat the words of Mr Bannon before last year's South Australian election: 'The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.' We find a remarkable similarity in the utterances of the two Labor leaders. In Victoria, Mr Cain claimed his proposed Victorian Development Fund was 'the difference

between them and us' and would enable the fully-costed A.L.P. policies to be implemented.

However, the *National Times* in its 18 April edition last year exposed this strategy by the Victorian Labor Government for what it was: frank dishonesty, outright political chicanery. The article stated, in part:

Last week's Labor Government announcement about Victoria's unexpectedly bad financial position was planned by senior Cabinet Ministers 12 months before the Party took office. Three senior Cabinet Ministers—Treasurer, Rob Jolly, Health Minister, Tom Roper, and Economic Development Minister, Bill Landeryou—

There is a bit of cloud over his head at the moment: something like the Deputy Premier in the South Australian Parliament, I would suggest—

all agreed in early 1981 that the best way to defuse expectations about rapid Government action on campaign pledges was to announce that the 'Liberals had left the State in a worse condition than was imagined'.

Within weeks of coming to office, after promising not to increase State taxes, the Labor Government in Victoria increased State taxes by 32 per cent, according to figures prepared by the Taxpayers' Association. Last week South Australia heard a similar tune. Only the piper was different, but in both cases South Australians and Victorians have been led down a road to much higher State taxes and charges when they were promised the very opposite. Indeed, today the Premier refused to indicate to the House that he would not further increase State taxes, charges or revenue measures in this financial year. Also, he is going to use Loan funds for repayment of recurrent debts because he will have to raise money from somewhere to pay a further 2 000 public servants who are to be employed.

This strategy exposes the hypocrisy of the original promise by Mr Bannon on taxation and illustrates just how desperate he was to win Government. The Bannon Government won office under false pretences. It ran a campaign of deception and half truth and that strategy is still being adopted. Eight months later and the Enterprise Fund has still not emerged (the economic saviour of South Australia). The taxes announced last week alone will increase the weekly costs of an average family of five by \$6 a week.

The major rise in charges imposed over the past eight months (water and sewerage rates, electricity charges, bus, tram and train fares, gas charges and hospital fees) will add a further \$6.50 a week to the average household's running costs—this by a Government which pledged not to increase taxes and to keep charges to a minimum. Perhaps the most repugnant aspect of these rises is that they hit hardest the sections of the population which can least afford them. How increases of this nature can be absorbed by families which are already struggling to live with dignity and pride has been ignored by this Government. The impact of these increases in taxes and charges will cause tremendous and growing hardship and difficulty for tens of thousands of South Australians. The recent tax rises will mean an extra \$84 000 000 to the Government in revenue in a full year. The increased charges will cost South Australians a further \$90 000 000 in a full year. Between now and the next election these increases will transfer more than \$500 000 000 from the pockets of South Australians into the coffers of the Government and its agencies.

Taking the full-year cost of taxes as an example, this is \$84 000 000 which is no longer available for consumer spending. It is \$84 000 000 which will be given to the Government by taxpayers who could and would have otherwise pumped it back into the consumer economy. Eighty-four million dollars a year is the equivalent consumer purchasing power necessary to buy 8 400 new cars or 168 000 new washing machines—products, I remind the House, manufactured by South Australians in South Australia. The

potential loss of consumer spending power of this magnitude is devastating to the South Australian manufacturing sector.

Economic recovery in South Australia will depend largely on the confidence of consumers to spend their wages and savings on goods and services. That consumer confidence is not yet evident. Certainly, at the end of June the average savings bank balance per head of population in South Australia stood at \$2 233 compared with less than \$2 000 a year ago. This increase in the amount of money being withheld from the market place is a clear indication of the lack of confidence consumers have in the current economic performance of South Australia.

Improved seasonal conditions may generate some additional expenditure but this alone will not be sufficient to promote economic recovery. The imposition of new and crippling taxes will only add to consumer uncertainty about the economic future and retard the consumer recovery South Australia so desperately needs. The spin-off result is that private firms will have less money to fund production expansion and, inevitably, less money and demand to employ new workers.

In the tourist industry alone these new taxes and charges will have a crushing impact at a time when tourism in this State has experienced considerable growth and therefore job generation. So the impact of this bout of taxation madness by the Government extends far beyond the hip-pocket nerve of the log-suffering taxpayer.

One area of industry which has been hit particularly hard by the escalating charges being imposed by this Government is the housing industry. I am reliably informed that the cost of building an average house in South Australia will rise by a staggering \$5 000 by the end of this year. This means that a house at present under construction costing \$40 000 will cost \$45 000 to build by the end of this year. May I again quote from the Premier's policy speech before the last State election. At that time Mr Bannon said:

The A.L.P. believes that home ownership is central to our South Australian way of life. But increasingly home ownership is coming under real threat. It also makes economic sense to help our people build. The A.L.P. will give a boost to housing, not only to provide more homes but also to stimulate the depressed building industry and through it our economy.

There are other less obvious but equally disturbing effects of these unprecedented rises in State taxes and charges. Because of South Australia's relative distance from the centre of Australia's consumer markets along the eastern seaboard, it is imperative that South Australian industry is able to maintain its cost competitiveness with manufacturers in other States. If industry in South Australia is forced to meet a substantially increased taxation burden, then it is quite obvious its competitive position is eroded. Under the previous Liberal Government the relative State tax position of private companies and private individuals improved dramatically.

Recent figures have shown that South Australians have been paying the lowest State taxes of any people in Australia. In 1981-82 (the latest period officially assessed) State taxes actually fell by 5.4 per cent, an achievement not matched by any other State or any other Government in recent times. That was a tremendous record by a Government grappling with the enormous difficulties of recession, inflation and high interest rates, but it was a Government that performed in this way—the statistics prove it.

Yet initiatives largely taken by this Government and the Labor Government in Canberra will push up the cost of building a new house by \$5 000 in just a few months. The reasons are there to see:

- a 10 per cent tax on cash payments to subcontractors;
- unions forcing subcontractors into agreeing to minimum costs for various aspects of construction;

more stringent requirements for foundation footings; increased workers compensation premiums (in the past 12 months premiums on an average house have risen from \$150 to \$2 100);

amendments to workers compensation passed in this Parliament in July will add further to those premiums; the latest round of tax increases, particularly petrol, stamp duty and the Financial Institutions Duty will be a further burden; and the rising cost of land.

These increases will be magnified when the wages pause ends and workers in industry are granted pay rises. The inflationary impact overall will push up the cost of a wide range of building materials and labour. The end result is an increase in the construction of a modest house of up to \$5 000 in less than six months. The spin-off impact of these increases on supply industries is difficult to estimate. The Government has contributed significantly to this price spiral, and the Premier's reference to housing in his policy speech has become nothing more than another broken promise.

The fall in the levels of State taxation under the previous Liberal Government was no fluke. It was achieved with the abolition of death and gift duty, significant exemptions for stamp duty and pay-roll tax, and the scrapping of land tax payments on private homes. In the same way as these reductions improved South Australia's competitive position, the new tax levels and higher charges imposed by the Bannon Government in the last few days, and over the past eight months, will erode this critical competitive edge.

Already Government imposts across Australia are surging ahead compared with private industry. The Institute of Public Affairs in Victoria recently published the results of a study which showed Government charges and prices across Australia in the 12 months to March this year increased by 18.3 per cent. In private industry, prices increased by only 10 per cent—another example of pace-setting by the Government! That disparity is unacceptable and demonstrates the extent to which the wealth of this country is being siphoned away from private industry, and therefore private individuals, to Government enterprises. One of the key reasons for this increased cost of providing Government services is the inadequate control over efficiency and cost. Governments are essentially accountable to no-one.

In a recent speech to the Insurance Underwriters Association I made the following observations:

Further reductions in taxation can be achieved again by both Federal and State Governments, and the immediate result, if coupled with continued wage restraint, would be to improve Australia's competitive position and increase job opportunities. Sadly, it is doubtful that a single Government will impose these spending disciplines during the Budget season, and a chance for more rapid economic recovery will be lost. It is vital that South Australia's competitive position is improved compared with other States. We do not have the large and diverse industrial base of the Eastern States, the tourist bonanza of Queensland's sun-dollar, or the mineral wealth of Western Australia. We are still developing and, to keep existing South Australian industries buoyant, or even solvent, we must take every advantage against our wealthier competitors interstate. Again, I fear that the chance will be lost in the coming State Budget.

That speech was made on 22 July. How quickly those predictions were proved correct. What the Premier is doing is setting the rate of Government expenditure and then raising taxes to match that spending. It is not enough to criticise the Government for imposing the new taxes or to predict their impact on South Australia's economy. We must look behind the taxes to find out why the Government has been forced to impose such Draconian imposts. True, the Government inherited a small deficit from the previous Administration. Earlier I tabled documents available to us, legitimately, as the Government of the day after the last election. Those documents (including our election policy

promises) indicated a deficit at 30 June this year of \$13 100 000, and the Premier has never challenged that figure: indeed, he knows that he cannot. Bush fires and other natural disasters have added to that small deficit, but that overall deficit remains modest and manageable in the context of the total Budget.

Why, then, was it necessary for the Government last week to raise revenue totalling \$84 000 000 in the first full year and \$244 000 000 over the period leading up to the next election? The answer lies in the following three directions:

1. Poor administrative procedures by Ministers who have allowed Government spending to mushroom. In the first five months spending above Budget estimate was running at \$26 000 000. (That is the Premier's figure, tabled after he had been in office for five months: departments overspending by \$26 000 000.)
2. The transfer of construction work from private firms to Government construction authorities, such as the Public Buildings Department, the Highways Department and the Engineering and Water Supply Department.
3. Massive increases in the size of the State Public Service.

It is this last point that highlights another fundamental difference between the economic management techniques of a Liberal and a Labor Government. In the three years of the previous Liberal Administration the number of public sector jobs was reduced by more than 4 000 by attrition, not by any sackings. Even using average weekly earnings, this works out to a saving of something like \$70 000 000 in a full year. It would be interesting to know what the deficit would have been had the Liberal Government not applied that policy over its three years. Based on the Education Department's estimate that it costs \$22 500 to employ each teacher, this figure rises to \$90 000 000 in a full year.

I again remind the House of those figures. Under the previous Liberal Government 4 000 public sector jobs were abolished without a single retrenchment, providing a saving to the South Australian taxpayer of \$90 000 000 a year. Since the Labor Government came to office, the number of people on the public pay-roll has increased by 2 000. In just eight months taxpayers in South Australia have been asked to meet the cost of employing an extra 2 000 public servants. In December last year, the first full month of the Bannon Labor Government, there were 98 100 State Government employees. In April 1983, according to the latest figures available from the Bureau of Statistics, that number has risen to 100 100—an increase of 2 000.

The cost of employing the people to whom I have referred will approach \$45 000 000 in a full year. It may be that the number has been swollen by job creation scheme funding provided by the Federal Government, but that would have only a minimal impact on the overall number. South Australia is returning to the days of economic madness practised by the Dunstan Labor Governments of the mid-seventies. It was a formula that failed then, in more buoyant economic times, and it will certainly fail now.

If Mr Bannon is so convinced that the rapid expansion of the public sector work force will improve South Australia's chances of economic recovery, why does not he write to the New South Wales and Western Australian Premiers criticising their attempts to cut back public sector job numbers in those States? South Australia is already the inflation capital and unemployment capital of Australia—two dubious honours it has gained since this Government came to office eight months ago. I might add that South Australia's 'inflation capital' crown came to us only a month ago as a result of this Government's actions, principally because of the rises in hospital charges early this year.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The others haven't even bitten.

Mr OLSEN: Exactly. South Australia is now about to inherit another crown. South Australia has the third highest proportion of State Government employees as a percentage of the overall work force. A staggering 17.4 per cent of the South Australian work force is employed by the State Government, compared with only 14.8 per cent in New South Wales and 15 per cent in Victoria. While jobs in private industry are being lost in South Australia faster than in any other State, the number of people employed in the Public Service is rising faster than in any other State. Only Tasmania and Western Australia have a higher percentage of workers in the Public Service than South Australia, and both those States are taking positive steps to reduce their Public Service numbers.

The Federal Treasurer, Mr Paul Keating, recently said economic recovery in Australia was being led by private industry. Yet, in South Australia private industry is still pruning staff and in many cases reducing productivity. That process will be magnified by the latest round of tax increases. If the Arbitration Commission agrees to a substantial national wage increase in its pending determination, further job losses must follow in South Australian industry. Yet the State Labor Government supported the A.C.T.U. case for a 4.3 per cent wage increase.

Despite the moderate and conservative exterior displayed by the Premier and his Cabinet and back bench—no doubt another ploy devised by the Victorian Labor Government—Labor is quietly implementing radical socialist reforms into South Australian business and commercial life. I refer specifically to the Minister of Fisheries, who wants fishermen to share excess profits with their 'comrades' in the crew—without mentioning what happens when the same fishermen have their substantial investment placed in jeopardy by industrial action, illness or unfavourable fishing conditions. The Minister of Health has received a report which, if adopted, would make major strides towards the nationalisation of the dental profession in South Australia. The State Government Insurance Commission has been granted a totally unfair trading advantage by being allowed to sell insurance through post offices in South Australia.

The State Government is again allowing the majority of Government construction projects to be carried out by Government construction authorities rather than private firms. This move will inevitably mean private firms will be forced to reduce staff because of the cut in available contracts, and in some cases firms will either close down or leave the State. The work can be done by the public sector only to the exclusion of private firms, and with the employment of additional public servants.

The transfer of funds from the capital works account to the recurrent account to pay Public Service salaries will cost jobs in private industry. It is patently absurd to argue that Government construction authorities can do the work cheaper or more efficiently. But, as Mr Keating indicated last week, the economic recovery of this country—and this State—is in the hands of private firms, not bigger government.

I refer to an example of action taken by a past labor Government which has significantly increased the State Budget deficit and the deficit of the State Transport Authority. Between 1974 and 1976 the State Labor Government, under Mr Dunstan, took over the operation of Adelaide's 15 privately operated bus services. These operators recorded 40 per cent of the total kilometres covered by Adelaide buses. The per kilometre cost of operation of these private bus services was substantially below those incurred by the State Transport Authority, as it is now known. In 1971, the running cost per kilometre of the Government bus service was 37.58 c. The average running cost per kilometre of the

private operators was just over 20c, with at least three operators returning a per kilometre cost of less than 20c. Private operators were able to operate at two-thirds the cost of a Government-run service. The private operators returned a profit, and the Government services recorded a deficit.

The centre for South Australian Economic Studies at the Adelaide University, in a report on the take-over of the private buses, draws this conclusion about the phasing out of private services:

Examination of the S.T.A. financial data therefore reveals that the take-over of private bus services resulted in a dramatic increase in the cost of providing bus services in metropolitan Adelaide. While private operator labour, remuneration and work rules applied, S.T.A. operation of ex-private services brought down unit costs.

However, the spread of S.T.A. work rules and conditions pushed up the cost of operation of ex-private services. Consequently, the loss of uniquely private operation features of ex-private routes led to an increasing overall cost of operation of Adelaide's bus system. Effectively, what resulted from the take-over of private operations was a fall in productivity (as S.T.A. work rules were introduced) and the higher wages of S.T.A. employees spread to ex-private employees. The impact was that the cost of operating Adelaide's bus system rose.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: As I understand, it was against the advice of their own officers.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, and certainly the taxpayers of South Australia have been paying dearly for it since that time, and will continue to pay dearly. Later the report concludes:

... Government production of ex-private services was achieved at the cost of a greatly increased deficit. Even social service objectives may have been better met by subsidies to private operators than to the S.T.A.

These findings by an independent assessment are a condemnation of the Labor Government which in 1974 accepted and publicly advocated that the Government could provide a better and more efficient bus service than private operators. At the time, the private operators fought to retain their services. They were viable and profitable operations which serviced a significant section of Adelaide at no cost—other than fares—to the public. But, it has been by no means the last move by the A.L.P. to interfere and involve itself in South Australian industry.

Other more recent examples have included the Riverland Cannery, the Government Clothing Factory, and the Frozen Food Factory. The Liberal Party believes that there is no need for the Government—any Government—to become involved in enterprises already being provided by private industry in a situation of fair competition where community needs are being met. Yet this Government is once again moving in the direction of intimidation of industry—or interference. The justification is merely the burning desire by this Government to become involved, to interfere, to restrict, and to control. The example of the S.T.A. take-over of the private bus operators provides a clear enough warning of the costs involved in such folly.

I have outlined some of the basic errors in economic management that the Bannan Labor Government has made since coming to office and the impact that those decisions are having on specific areas of the community. In doing so, I have been able to highlight the clear differences between the Liberal and Labor Parties. They are becoming clear now, and the public is vocal in its disapproval of this Government's approach. The *Advertiser*, in yesterday's editorial, said:

The proposed higher taxes announced by the Premier, Mr Bannan, last week could be a body blow for the State's economy, as industry and commerce seek to sustain the fragile recovery.

The News was even more direct, as follows:

First reaction against Mr Bannan's latest range of tax and charge increases was indignation from the taxpaying families struggling with tight household budgets. But there is another group on the economic firing line. Virtually all these increases will be a direct charge on business. They will hinder any possible growth. They

will directly contribute to South Australia's already record inflation rate, which may well add to unemployment. The election of Mr Bannon last November is proving to have been a very expensive decision.

Between 30 June and 10 July this year, I made a privately funded visit to South East Asia, Malaysia, Hong Kong, and Japan. The major aim of that visit was to establish contacts with leading business people and Government officials in areas where South Australia already has strong links, that is, those who have had investment here or future potential investment in South Australia.

During the past three years, it is clear not only that we have built up, especially in Japan, enormous goodwill for South Australia but also that we have developed links with major companies which hopefully will be translated into significant developments in the future. I found, certainly during my overseas visit, that past trade missions and exhibitions by all States in the Asian region had not resulted in significant benefits.

There has been a lack of follow-up action, and more detailed work needs to be done to target particular areas for trade development within Asia. Most States now have some form of permanent officer representation in Tokyo, Hong Kong or Singapore. The only South Australian representative in the region is provided on an agency basis by the Elders office in Tokyo, an arrangement which appears to work satisfactorily.

An alternative to permanent representation has been devised by the Western Australian Government and involves an officer of the State Industrial Development Department visiting Asia four times a year to assess trade prospects and maintain liaison between Western Australian companies and Australian trade officials based in Asia. That certainly has benefits in that that person can keep regular contact with those companies in Western Australia and can relate to developments overseas. That is something that we in South Australia should be working towards.

It is clear that the sister city relationship between Adelaide and Georgetown, Penang, has established an enormous amount of goodwill for South Australia. While benefits have been largely intangible and revolve around tourism and group exchanges, I believe that there are perhaps some prospects for developing, particularly when South Australia celebrates its 150th birthday, as Penang will celebrate its 200th birthday in 1986.

The Hon. D.C. Brown interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I believe that 120 was the end result of the great Dunstan promotion to sell stainless steel sinks.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Double stainless steel sinks.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, what a double benefit to South Australia. I believe that the State Government should encourage a representative committee, including the City Council and the private sector, to review our ties with Malaysia, particularly our sister city relationship, to see whether the sesquicentenary celebrations in 1986 may be of some benefit in regard to interchange between the two cities. The current policy on uranium mining and export by the Federal and State Labor Governments is causing some uncertainty in Japan. It is fair to say that not only is there uncertainty but also there is total confusion in relation to Australia's position.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: That is understandable.

Mr OLSEN: It is certainly understandable: I do not believe that even the Labor Party understands the policy. Discussions with a number of major Japanese companies with interests in resource development indicated widespread confusion. There is no doubt that Japan looks to Australia as a long-term and reliable supplier of nuclear fuel in both yellowcake and enriched forms. Japan is co-operating in the provisions of technology for other Australian resource developments, including coal gasification and petrochemicals,

and is dependent upon a supply of uranium. If we do not supply that uranium, if we do not satisfy that market (which will become available from 1990, because currently America, and Canada supply those markets), other countries will do so, particularly other countries that have not entered into safeguard agreements as Australia has done. The increase in nuclear power's share of Japan's total generating capacity will increase from the present 11.3 per cent to 15 per cent by 1990.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: I suggest that the member for Mawson get her head out of the sand and take a trip to Japan to see the world-wide economic realities. The increase in actual capacity will be about 70 per cent. Eleven nuclear reactors are under construction in Japan at present, and work will begin on another nine reactors before the end of the decade.

An honourable member: Who paid for your trip?

Mr OLSEN: Certainly not the taxpayers and certainly not a result of the tax slug which the Government is applying on the taxpayers of South Australia to fund inefficiency in government and an increase in Public Service numbers.

An honourable member: Yes, but who paid for it?

Mr OLSEN: As a matter of fact, I have a plastic Diners Club credit card, and there is a lot sitting on that at present.

Mr Becker: It wasn't a deputy freebie to Russia?

Mr OLSEN: No, it certainly was not a Combe/Ivanov arrangement. Several Japanese countries are currently investigating major investment projects in Australia, including Asahi Petrochemical. That project was put forward by the former Liberal Government to bring to fruition a petrochemical plant for this State, bearing in mind that it had to get together a consortium of end users to make it viable. Unfortunately, because of uncertainty about the future of this project, negotiations have been at a standstill since February and are unlikely to resume until later this year, principally because the Government has indicated to Asahi that the 213 million cubic feet of gas that was previously reserved for power requirements for the project may no longer be available.

About 213 billion cubic feet of gas which successive Governments, both Liberal and Labor, have always held in reserve for such a plant, has been withdrawn by this Government. I refer also to the Sumitomo project involving the gasification of Wakefield coal. The feasibility study, which was undertaken on the initiative of the former Minister of Mines and Energy and now Deputy Leader of the Opposition, to look at the viability of the project, will be completed later this month. It is encouraging to see that that feasibility study will be completed prior to the report to the Minister of Mines and Energy on the establishment of a new power station in South Australia to meet the supply and demand curve when it comes on-stream in 1992.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: I wish the shipping service was so hopeful.

Mr OLSEN: Yes, there is a lack of action on the part of the Minister of Transport. We have seen little promotion of a scheme or contract that was all but signed at 6 November last year.

To return to the gasification of Wakefield coal, the indications are that that process can be developed to gasify the coal. The estimated cost of a plant to provide enough gas to generate 600 megawatts of electricity is about \$125 000 000. Commercialisation of the project will be established by 1985. That project has the capacity, with the feasibility study proving it up as economically viable (those are the indications), for us to use that Wakefield low-grade brown coal at the Lochiel power station, not only to meet the need for accumulation of electricity to meet the demands of South Australian consumers from 1992 but also to supplement the gas supplies of this State which are guaranteed

only to 1987; whereas the former Labor Government guaranteed the gas supplies to Sydney to 2006 without looking after its own constituency.

In addition to my concern about resource development, in Japan I was involved in discussions about the tourist industry. It would be unlikely to see a direct Tokyo-Adelaide connection in the foreseeable future, because passenger traffic would not justify it. However, I believe the Premier promised such a connection in his policy speech. South Australia must look to producing more literature in Japanese and increasing its emphasis on promoting South Australia to Japanese travel agents. It is interesting to note the comments by the shadow Minister of Tourism in the *Advertiser* above the comments of the Minister of Tourism calling for that initiative to be undertaken in South Australia—a positive initiative which will help tourist development in that region.

Future exports of l.p.g. from the Cooper Basin is another issue. Idemitsu already has a five-year contract for the supply of 1 250 000 tonnes of Cooper Basin l.p.g. Idemitsu and a number of other major Japanese companies including, C.Ito and Shell Sekyu have tendered for an excess 20 000 tonnes of l.p.g. production from the Cooper Basin next year. Japan will need increasing amounts of l.p.g. for power generation: it is estimated that over the next 10 years the Japanese electrical capacity fuelled by l.p.g. will increase by about 90 per cent. That information clearly indicates that our future prospects and markets are in that area, and that the natural resources in this State are a positive asset.

The prospects for investment by Japanese companies in mineral and petroleum exploration are considerable. A number of indications of interest were given and, as I have mentioned, before progress can take place there needs to be predictability in terms of Government policies at both State and Federal levels. It is not clear that that is forthcoming.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Entrepreneurs want a sense of direction.

Mr OLSEN: Indeed, entrepreneurs do want a sense of direction and predictability as well as decision making in Government and not confusion in decision making, particularly when Asahi is involved in a billion dollar development for this State.

Another aspect that came to the fore involved manufacturing industry costs and the importance of maintaining our manufacturing industry on a competitive basis. This was as evident as was the need to maintain production levels. Failure to compete will see industry relocate or phase out their Australian operations and shift some off-shore to obtain lower labour costs associated with higher productivity, economies of scale and significant South-East Asian Government tax holidays. There is a clear warning to Australia to take that on board and moderate wage claims. Actions of union officials seeking large increases for their members today will see a sacrifice of jobs tomorrow.

My trip to South-East Asia was invaluable. I had discussions with companies at the presidential level. Those discussions were both frank and open and certainly indicated a desire by Japan to become more closely involved with the development of our resources in this State. We have to expand the economic base of this State to meet the goods and services requirements and expectations of people in this State. We have to do it with a country such as Japan that has high technology which it can offer in return for assistance in developing our State's resources. It was an invaluable trip in that regard.

Shortly after I made arrangements for the trip—in fact, a matter of days after it became known to the Premier, when as a matter of courtesy he was apprised of where I was going and the people with whom I was having discussions—a telex left the Premier's office establishing discussions and appointments with exactly the same companies

with which I was to have discussions. I am pleased that the Premier has acknowledged that the programme that was set up was valuable, so much so that he wants to follow suit in September of this year.

An honourable member: We do not mind him being a follower; he will never be a leader.

Mr OLSEN: He has not proved to be one yet, has he? Indeed, the one with the power base is the Deputy Premier, Jack Wright, not the Premier of this State. Clearly, if the Premier has discussions with those companies he will see the folly of his Party's anti-uranium policies as they relate to this State—if he has an open mind—and he will have to come back encouraging the development of our State's resources so that we can provide, as I have referred to, that range of community services and facilities that we otherwise would not be able to provide.

Today I have touched on a number of points which are vital to the economic development of South Australia. Without sound economic policies and without increased investment both from inside and outside Australia, genuine and widespread economic expansion will not be possible in this State. It is the aim of the Liberal Party to develop positive policies which will attract that investment and increase job opportunities in South Australia when we return to the Treasury benches in up to 946 days from today.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I support this traditional debate on the motion to adopt the Address in Reply. Let me say that we were all grieved at the death of the Hon. John Coumbe. We extend our condolences to his widow and to the members of his family. He made a very significant contribution to the affairs of this State during the period of former Liberal Governments. He was a well-respected member of those Governments and of this place. I have not struck anybody on either side of politics who did not speak well of the Hon. John Coumbe. At the personal level, he was widely recognised as a gentleman. He suffered, as we well know, some great sadnesses during his life, but he bore those sadnesses with great fortitude and was one who was much admired on many counts.

I want to deal with the Speech of His Excellency in opening Parliament: it was a pretty thin affair. If members look at the tenor of his Speech, they will see that there is precious little in it to give us much hope for this beleaguered State—very little, indeed. I want to deal particularly with the matters for which I am responsible in Opposition, but as a general comment this particularly thin Speech holds out precious little comfort to those who want to see this State get back on a firm economic footing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course. I can think of tourism, for instance. The reference is that we will keep going with what the former Minister of Tourism undertook, and I could say the same thing about the areas for which I was responsible in the previous Government. If we look across the whole gamut of Administration there is precious little here that is new, but a fair bit about which to be concerned. Let me mention one or two matters of parochial interest before I get on to these matters of pressing State-wide importance, because these are mentioned in this order in the Speech. The State suffered dramatic bush fires—the sort of bush fires that may occur only once in a lifetime.

We certainly hope so. However, there are some major lessons to be learnt as the result of these bush fires, and a great deal of responsibility rests on the shoulders of Government (in other words, the present Government). As has been pointed out by one or two notable C.F.S. commentators and others who know, this fire could have been far worse. In fact, it was only an act of God that there was not enormous devastation in the Adelaide Hills. If this fire got

up into the Belair and Blackwood area and if the wind had not changed, the devastation would have been enormous. It is all fine and dandy for the present Government and the present Minister for Environment and Planning to adopt that attitude in relation to Government land in the hills face zone.

Mr Becker: Does any of the land have fire breaks?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I can speak with some authority on what has happened to the hills face zone over the past 30 years or so that I have lived in the hills. We have now reached the position where the hills face zone is sacrosanct. One would be a complete and utter Phillistine if one ever suggested that what has happened in most other major cities I have visited around the world should happen in the hills face zone, that is, building houses there. That is complete heresy. However, in my judgment that would be a small price to pay. I do not believe that it would make the hills face zone unattractive, particularly if it was done sympathetically and if there were greenery instead of dry grass in some areas. If it ensured protection to those dwellers on top of the hills, it would be very wise planning on that score, because there could be an absolute catastrophe at some time, perhaps in our lifetime and perhaps not, as a result of what we now have on the hills face zone, namely, an enormous amount of fuel which will burn if the conditions are similar to those which occurred on the latest Ash Wednesday.

I have personally lived through two fires, the first one 28 years ago on Black Sunday and the second on this last Ash Wednesday. As sure as I stand here, I know that there will be another fire. Lord knows when it will be but there will be another, and it could be far more disastrous than the last bush fire if Governments do not do something about some of these areas in the hills face zone. One involves Cleland Park and the other parks in the Horsnell Gully area, some of which are in my electorate and some of which are in neighbouring electorates. Another area which has more recently come under Government control is the Government reserve which now lies between Tea Tree Gully and Anstey Hill. The land is no longer grazed as it was previously. There is now an enormous build-up of material, undergrowth and scrub. There are narrow fire tracks seven feet wide with trees interlaced over the tracks, and nobody could send a fire unit down into such an area: it would be a death sentence.

In fact, when fire occurred, by the time it reached the brow of the hill it was more than a raging inferno. In fact, the fire unit was burnt on the road because of the intensity of the heat. Government has a major responsibility to ensure that adequate fire protection measures are undertaken in the hills face zone; otherwise, as I say, as sure as I stand here there will be a repeat, and it could be infinitely worse.

One may recall that it only happened once in Hobart where fires got down into the suburbs of Hobart, with enormous loss of life and property. It is interesting to note that, if it occurs here again in this fashion, it will bankrupt the State Government Insurance Commission. In fact, the State Government Insurance Commission, which was to be set up to compete on equal terms with other insurance companies, does not have to retain reserves as do other companies to possibly underwrite enormous losses.

The taxpayers of South Australia guarantee the State Government Insurance Commission, which is very interested in this matter and is putting out publications in regard to fire protection which I have read. I believe that the State Government Insurance Commission is embarrassed as a result of these fires. But the public is carrying an enormous financial risk, because it is the public that is carrying the State Government Insurance Commission.

I also want to mention the other disasters and catastrophies that were experienced in my electorate, and I refer particularly to the floods. The Governor's Speech gives the Government a good old pat on the back for its alacrity with the measures taken to alleviate the flood damage. In fact, there were many complaints from residents in the Barossa Valley. Following the floods, they sighted no-one except the most junior Minister (Mr Hemmings), who went up there and gave some undertakings to the Angaston council. He fronted up and said that the same guidelines as those which applied for the bush fires would apply. Then he disappeared, and for some time the residents saw no-one. In the event, the undertaking was not honoured. It took a couple of weeks for the Premier to bob up.

The Governor went up first, and the devastation made an impression on him. He was there three days before the Premier. I do not know where the urging came from to get the Premier off his backside to go and have a look and to be made aware of the enormous devastation that had occurred in the Barossa Valley, but eventually he went. So much for this hoo-hah about the Government's alacrity! In any event, after a couple of months following approaches to the Government by local members the guidelines in almost every respect were changed.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It was harder than pulling teeth!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I support what my colleague has said. As a result of approaches made on a whole range of matters, eventually almost all the guidelines were changed, including the level of Government support. After an enormous amount of work by many people, including the ministers fraternal in the Barossa Valley some changes were made. Indeed, it was unfortunate that the floods came hard on the heels of the graphic and dramatic bush fires.

I do agree with the sentiments in the Governor's Speech (one of the few things in the Speech with which I agree) that the response to the bushfire appeal was magnificent. I think \$11 800 000 was raised by public subscription, which made the Government's assistance look fairly paltry. That was a magnificent response. Unfortunately, coming hard on the heels of the bush fires, the flood relief public subscription was in the main, although not exclusively, subscribed to by local people, which was a great pity. Nonetheless, the people in the area affected by the floods and, indeed, the other people in my electorate affected by the bush fires have withstood the brunt of these disasters with great fortitude, and things are slowly being rebuilt.

I want to deal now with two matters of particular interest to me. First, though, I cannot let the opportunity pass without reinforcing the remarks made by the Leader when he so ably canvassed the matter of the Premier's financial double dealing—that is what it is. We all know that the Premier went to the election saying that he had accurate financial information, that he knew the state of the finances. In fact, that was reported in the newspapers, and it came over the radio. The Premier was quizzed quite closely as to how the Labor Party would fund its promises. I shall refresh the memory of the Minister sitting opposite, as a number of articles were published: I shall refer to one which appeared in the *Advertiser* on 4 November wherein this matter was taken up by journalists. The journalists themselves were wondering how the Government was going to finance its promises. The article, in part, is as follows:

Question: To fund your \$29 000 000 policy programme would you run to a deficit Budget or seek to increase your revenue?

Answer: We estimate that revenue collection will match the extra expenditure we propose.

Question: Do you have any aversion to deficit budgeting?

Answer: Providing they're planned, a deficit Budget is an acceptable thing, although one must be very careful at the State level.

Question: So your answer to an increase in revenue would be an outright 'no'?

Answer: In taxes? Increasing taxes, no. We believe our programme can be costed without a tax rise.

Question: But if elected would you perhaps use the Victorian Premier's excuse, that he was forced to raise taxes after promising not to, because he didn't know the Treasury was in such a mess?

This was prior to the election. The article continues:

As I understand it, Cain had been given certain information which proved to be wrong.

Ms Lenehan: The same thing happened here.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member should listen. The article continues:

But could that happen to you?

Did you receive crook information? The journalist is pressing his point. The article continues:

We've got the Auditor-General's reports, the programme and performance budgeting information, the Premier's own speeches on the economy.

Then comes a question:

But it does depend on the information you've got? Are you saying categorically the problem that affected Premier Cain can't affect you?

The journalist was quite persistent. The article continues with the answer:

To the best of my knowledge it can't.

The present Premier repeated that statement elsewhere. If I were allowed to use the word 'liar', I would. However, the Premier deliberately misled the public of South Australia to get into government.

Mr Ashenden: He fudged.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He did not fudge: he did worse than that. We have seen what the Premier and the Opposition have done to Roxby Downs, and I will come to that later. He has done such things before and did them in relation to the finances of this State. If I could, I would say that he lied to the people to win government.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): It is just as well that the honourable member cannot.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: All I can say is that he told complete untruths and this document bears witness to that. I was asked today to comment on the effect of this new tax slug by a representative of one of the local papers. There has been enormous revulsion and reaction to these tax slugs because of what the Government said previously. I reminded the journalist that the Government had said that it had accurate figures before the election, that it said it had the Auditor-General's Report, that it had access to programme performance budget papers, and that it was sure it had done its sums. The reporter said to me, 'Did they say that?' I said, 'Of course they did.' I reminded him about that and I hope that he takes the time to remind his readers about that.

Before I leave this subject I will turn to some other notable quotes that the Premier and his now discredited Deputy Premier made while in opposition. The first of these statements was made by Mr Bannon and appeared in the A.L.P. policy speech in 1982, as follows:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges—like transport fares, electricity and hospital charges—to be used as a form of backdoor taxation.

I know that I am repeating some things that the Leader has already said, but they bear repeating because they come to the very nub of the dishonesty of this Government. I will quote again from the A.L.P. policy speech of 1982, as follows:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes nor increase existing levels of taxes during our term of office.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That is when the audience applauded.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, they clapped like fury—they were quite excited. The public needs to be reminded of these statements, so I turn again to the A.L.P. policy speech where the Premier was talking about the former Government, as follows:

This Government will not get away with drip feed taxation or backdoor tariff increases.

Great stuff again. Turning back to the policy speech, it continues:

Higher electricity and water charges would further erode South Australia's cost advantage which is so vital for competitiveness of manufacturing industry.

We did not hear that statement today when Bills were introduced, when public statements were made yesterday, or when announcements were made about certain matters on Friday to take the heat off the now discredited Deputy Premier, who has been found out telling blueys. He has been found out cheating at school. He has been fudging, and so has his boss. When in Opposition the now discredited Deputy Premier said on 27 April 1981:

Apparently, the same people who do not want to pay taxes were quite happy about paying increased charges.

The Deputy Premier was referring to the former Government. The now discredited Deputy Premier also said:

Charges are being put up quite simply to pay the State's bills.

That is the statement of a genius if ever I have read one. What is the Deputy Premier saying now? Was the Deputy Premier misrepresented or misreported? In 1982 the Deputy Premier was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying:

The Tonkin Government was using electricity charges as a form of backdoor taxation.

Closer to home and since the last State election, the Hon. Michael Wilson asked the following question in this House:

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. Mr Bannon replied 'Yes'. The Premier also should be sacked for misleading this House. Not only did they tell deliberate untruths to win the election but, having won the election, they have continued to tell untruths. The Government is increasing State charges. It has said that it will not increase them while the wage pause is on. However, the wage pause is still on, unless the Government has received information to the contrary from the Arbitration Commission, but I doubt that. The Government has broken a promise that it made before the election. The Leader of the Opposition has dealt with that matter at length. However, I believe I should reiterate these things, because they go to the very heart of election promises, which were clearly dishonest, made by the Labor Party.

I firmly believe that one area where this State has—or had—a great future is resource development. I well recall attending a Ministerial conference one Friday in Western Australia. I took the weekend off to fly to the Pilbara and then on Monday I flew down to Kambalda as a guest of Western Mining to see what resource development had done for that State. If anyone has any doubts about what resource development can do to add a third tier to an economy, they should do that trip. The amount of construction work and the associated development of towns, water supplies, and so on is enormous. Once it is set up, the level of activity is quite staggering.

I also looked at the onshore work in relation to the development of offshore gas. South Australia was getting into that league. I well recall returning from that trip and giving a speech on this subject to the Adelaide Rotary Club. I said then and still believe that South Australia is about 15 years behind Western Australia. It would take this State 15 years to reach Western Australia's level of development and be on the map in these areas. Similar resources had

already been discovered in South Australia, let alone other developments which I believe we had every chance of finding through the record levels of exploration that were being generated in this State.

In relation to hydrocarbons, the Stony Point liquids scheme is now being taken for granted. That development is now generating in excess of 3 000 jobs and it will generate for the Bannon Labor Government something like \$50 000 000 in royalties, which will be a bonus. There are further areas of discovery in relation to that development. We could be on the world map in relation to our uranium resources and the processing of that material. I suppose honourable members were as interested as I to see the Premier at the Hiroshima rally. There has been a clear change in the Premier's thinking since June last year. The Premier was in the hot seat; if anything brought to the fore the absolute hypocrisy of the Labor Party's uranium policy, it was the Premier's performance. The Premier was going to bat for uranium exports and Australia's policy in relation to safeguards. The Premier was questioned by some of the CANE people, who maintain a hard line against uranium and Roxby Downs. The Labor Party must now contend with that. The Premier said that we have good safeguards and that our uranium will be used for peaceful purposes.

What has happened to the objections of the Labor Party in relation to disposal of waste, and so on, and the things its members used to throw up to us? They have closed the door on Honeymoon and Beverley, but the uranium oxide, the yellowcake from Roxby Downs is all right. That is an absurd proposition, a completely dishonest proposition. The Premier is going to bat for Roxby (he does it willingly), but how does he justify turning our back on these other developments? What does that do to other people who were spending money on exploration for this mineral in South Australia? It has turned them off. One of the partners in the Beverley development, an American, came to see me: they do not know what to do. The C.S.R. people at Honeymoon do not know what to do. Do they wait and see if this crowd get rolled? They are not allowed to sell yellowcake, but Roxby Downs can.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Where are they spending their money at the moment?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The interjection prompts me to mention this now. Two things are acting against the best interests of the public of South Australia and are inhibiting this State from becoming a major resource State in the Australian and world context. One of those is the Labor Party's uranium policy, which has sounded the death knell to the uranium enrichment facility (a billion-dollar facility), which in my view South Australia had in the bag. How absurd to suggest that Roxby can sell, over the life of it, enormous quantities of yellowcake but that we cannot refine or process it in South Australia, which is about the safest part of the uranium cycle anyway, into fuel for nuclear reactors for peaceful purposes, Dunstan pursued that; we had it in the bag. The Urenco people came to see us after they had been to see the Premier. They felt that they had had a good hearing. I showed them the press statement, and they said, 'What a sad document.'

The Hon. Michael Wilson: All those jobs down the drain.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: All those jobs down the drain: the supportive industry, the infra-structure, the replacement parts, the billion-dollar investment, all down the drain because of the absolute stupidity of the Labor Party's uranium policy; that is the first point.

The second point is the working out of land rights legislation in South Australia. I think members of the Liberal Party know, but let me tell the Government members of our experiences. We had negotiated for \$30 000 000 to be spent on oil exploration in the Officer Basin, a large geological

basin in the North-West of the State. My memory, and the clear memory of the negotiators when we negotiated the land rights legislation, was that there would not be large front-end payments for exploration, and the negotiators agreed. Unfortunately that was not sewn up in the legislation because nobody considered at that stage that exploration tenement came under the definition of a mining tenement, because the relevant provisions in the Act talk about mining tenements.

After the legislation was passed, more than \$2 000 000 was being demanded for Hematite (the exploration arm of B.H.P.) to move into these lands to explore for oil and gas. If anything would add to the resource base of this State it would be a major oil strike or a great new gas reservoir, hydrocarbon reservoir, in that part of South Australia. There had been an oil show in a well drilled by the Mines Department before all this hoo-hah erupted. With that \$30 000 000 in mind, they said that this was the end of the line. The negotiators offered up to \$600 000 for exploration. I am not referring to the Aborigines; you deal with white lawyers and French-Canadian anthropologists.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Did they turn out to be pikers?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not know what they think now, but in the event the company said, 'Right, that's it.' Nowhere else in Australia are these payments demanded. That \$30 000 000 is now being used to drill for oil off-shore from China. I saw an advertisement on T.V. Sunday night in which B.H.P. was advertising its efforts to help the nation.

An off-shore rig in the China Sea was referred to. That money could have been spent in South Australia (and it would have been spent here) employing South Australians, possibly resulting in the discovery of resources that would be of enormous benefit to the Aboriginal community and every other South Australian citizen. That is a tragedy for this State. Not only has the clock been put back three years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader in a sense has been addressing the Speaker for the past five minutes while turning his back on the Speaker. I hope that he will show the normal courtesy.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. There was a deputy deputy in the Chair a while ago. I did not see you return, and I will certainly extend courtesy to whoever is in the Chair. That situation is a tragedy for the State. Not only has the clock been put back three years but also when the Liberal Party wins government at the next election it will have the job of cranking up development. There is a lead time. The Liberal Party will not only have to undo the damage that will be caused over the next three years but also it will take 18 months or more to convince the investors and people who have been spending money in South Australia that they should come back here. That has delayed my dream, my firm belief that we could and should become a major resource State, which would give a third basic tier to strengthen the economy of this State. The Labor Party has turned its back on that issue in a disgraceful fashion.

A number of other matters in the resources area are of concern and show the deceit of the Premier. Members will remember that the Premier fronted up to the election, thumping the table and saying, 'I will negotiate with the Queensland Government to see that Jackson oil flows into South Australia.' I had a Question on Notice during the last session of Parliament, which sat on the Notice Paper and was answered only the day before we resumed. The question, in effect, asked what discussions the Premier had had with the Queensland Government in relation to Jackson oil, when those discussions were held, and what was the result

of the discussions—we would like to know. That question was a bit hard for the Premier. I received a phone call in this regard the day before we came back and I was told that the question would be answered by letter by this Premier who will ensure that oil flows into South Australia. That letter states:

Dear Roger—

we are all pally: when you want to take the mickey out of them, call them by their first name—

In reference to your Question on Notice, No. 206, the Government held discussions with the interested parties—

unnamed—

whose advice was that the decision which had been made by the Queensland Government could not be changed and that they were proceeding on that basis. In this case there was nothing to be gained by South Australia from further discussions with the Queensland Government.

I ask you! I was looking for the three kisses, but they were not there. What a fudge! It was stated, 'We will see that Jackson oil flows into South Australia. We will go up and put Joh in his place and tell him where he gets off.' The discussions were a waste of time, because the decision had already been made. I am told by a reliable source that, after the advent of a Labor Government here, Joh said, 'If there is a socialist Government in South Australia, no way will my oil go there.' The Premier did not even talk to Joh.

The other matter of grave concern relates to Roxby Downs. One aspect, which has not been highlighted and which gives me cause for great concern, is the possible intervention of the Federal Government to override clauses in indentures that were ratified by South Australia. Where has the Government been during the controversy of the past two or three weeks in relation to the building of the road and the pipeline at Roxby Downs?

They have their heads not only down but also under the desk. The company was crying out for support and the Government sent up a couple of observers. They have had no lead whatsoever. They have espoused the Roxby project—it is now their baby, or so Premier Bannon would have us believe. He is the man who only six or eight months ago said that it was a mirage in the desert. Now that the Government is in trouble—where is the Premier and his Minister of Mines or his Minister for the Environment? They are well and truly with their heads below the desk.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It disturbed me greatly. We have had the business about sacred sites, in this case led by a gentleman, John Tregenza, who is not noted for his right-wing politics.

Mr Gunn: Or his truthfulness.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He fronted up to the select committee. The member for Eyre was a member for that committee, as was I. We went up to Roxby, Andamooka, and so on, and took evidence from witnesses. Up front was John Tregenza and an Aboriginal who was reputed to be a member of the Koka tribe. Tregenza was a hostile witness, but nonetheless we managed to find that there was one sacred site. Initially Western Mining had been trying to negotiate on the issue of sacred sights. The Aboriginals bought in the French-Canadian anthropologist, Dan Vachon, who helped them find their sacred sites.

Mr Becker: French-Canadian?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, he came out to help them find their sacred sites. He went through and said, 'All clear.' He is a very good anthropologist, for all I know. At the time of the select committee there was one sacred site. The other two members, the present Minister of Mines and Energy and the Minister for Environment would not look at this one as they said it was too sacred. The Aboriginals told us to come and look so we got out of the bus and did

so. There was a circle of stones, some of which had been dislocated as cattle and sheep had been roaming the area. However, the company agreed to look after it. There was only one site. They knew the terms of the indenture. It was negotiated and it was public knowledge and known to the Aboriginal community and the Tregenzas of this world. They were to identify sacred sites by the time the e.i.s. was completed in order to have the sites protected. The company tried for two years to get the sites identified. The number of sacred sites went from one to 17 when the e.i.s. was being negotiated.

Members opposite could say that I am making a provocative speech, but I am only stating facts. Now that the road has been built, the number of sacred sites has escalated to 40. The companies are seeking to get on with this job which will be of enormous benefit. The Government has had a revelation. It has gone from seeing it as a mirage in the desert to seeing it as being of enormous benefit to South Australia. Where are the Ministers with their public statements to support the company in what it is trying to do? They are not here. More disturbing to me (as we have become used to this cowardice) is the Federal Minister, Mr Holding, stating that he would intervene at Roxby Downs. That matter did not get much prominence in the local press, but it did interstate, and an article appeared in the *Melbourne Age*. He said that he would legislate, in effect, to override clauses in the South Australian indenture. That makes the dam in Tasmania look like a Sunday school picnic. Where is it going to end?

I understand from my contacts in the industry that Mr Holding has backed off. However, it would be disastrous for South Australia and for resource development in this State or elsewhere if the ground rules, which are freely and exhaustively negotiated, are to be overridden with a stroke of a pen by a Federal Minister who knows b-all about the situation or the negotiations. He will negate at one stroke major sections of legislation ratified by this Parliament.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Before the dinner adjournment, I was making some points to the members of the Select Committee at the time of the Roxby indenture. The members for Todd and Eyre can vouch that everything I am saying is perfectly true. Before I leave this subject, I would like to move an extension of time. I do not know whether the Deputy Premier would allow that. Any remarks that I cannot manage to get in during my allotted time I will certainly reserve for the Budget debate. I have quite a deal of material relating to the industrial area.

However, before I leave entirely this question on the Labor Party's completely hypocritical stance in relation to uranium, let me quote again the Premier's words just prior to the State election when the Honeymoon and Beverley questions were being canvassed. The interview that I will quote was on 5DN just after the election, when Mr Bannon said:

... on that project, of course it was a matter of controversy earlier this year in terms of the indenture Bill but, with the passing of the indenture and coupled with a change in our Federal policy in July, the A.L.P. in South Australia, whether in government or out of government, is in a position where it can and will support the project, and that's been made quite clear to the joint venturers.

This is in relation to Roxby Downs. The interview continues:

INTERVIEWER: 'Mr Bannon why do you isolate Roxby Downs from the Beverley and Honeymoon uranium projects?'

Mr Ashenden: A good question.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is a very good question. I have come to realise that there are some very intelligent interviewers in this State. The interview continues:

BANNON: 'The thing about Roxby Downs that makes it quite clear is that it is a case where the mining of uranium is incidental

to the mining of other metals. Our relation to pure uranium mines, a policy at the national level, is that no new mine shall be established and that those mines which exist will be phased out.'

Of course, that is despite the fact that Roxby Downs would be the largest uranium mine in the world and would export enormous amounts. That is incidental. The interview continues:

INTERVIEWER: 'Could this involve the South Australian Government in compensation claims from mineral developers as signalled by the former Minister for Mines and Energy, Mr Goldsworthy?'

BANNON: 'I don't know if that's the case. It will depend, as I say, on the obligations that are there. I have made it quite clear that our Government will maintain commitments that have been entered into and, if for some special reasons there should be changes in that area, then obviously we'll discuss the implications of those changes.'

INTERVIEWER: 'What is likely to happen if there are any new uranium finds in South Australia?'

BANNON: 'If major finds are made in uranium, apart from adding to the glut on the world market at the moment in terms of known and improved reserves which make its mining less and less economic, those discoveries will obviously be noted and no further action will be taken on them in the short term.'

INTERVIEWER: 'You talk of exploration developments, Sir. Beverley and Honeymoon Mines are involved in that area and considerable expenditure has been done on them already.'

BANNON: 'I cannot comment further or specifically on those projects until I have had a chance to examine them thoroughly.'

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it is. The interview continues:

INTERVIEWER: 'You have stated your support for resource developers generally but in the instance of uranium specifically could you see that that even might go to other areas for development?'

BANNON: 'Yes, I could.'

INTERVIEWER: 'Does that concern you financially?'

BANNON: 'I believe that at the moment in terms of the state of the world market and what is happening with the whole future of nuclear energy in the world that is no short-term problem whatsoever. For the pure uranium mine there is simply not the market at the moment.'

INTERVIEWER: 'And if there were to be?'

BANNON: 'I would say that would be in a world situation where the nuclear energy option had been established to be safe; had been established to be acceptable. Now, in that situation it may well be that uranium developments could occur in Australia but we are still a long way from that at the moment.'

What doubletalk! As I said earlier, here we have Roxby Downs, an enormous underground uranium mine which can go ahead. The markets are O.K. for that, but they are not O.K. for Beverley or Honeymoon.

In relation to the question of markets, all reputable indications are that the markets are there. They are being written now. As I said earlier, South Australia has not merely lost three years: it has lost five years and maybe longer.

Finally, before I leave this subject, let me refer members to that very excellent publication called 'Johnny Green's Journal' put out by the South Australian Chamber of Mines.

Mr Ashenden: An excellent publication.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: It is an excellent publication, and I think that all members received a copy of it. I draw it to the attention of members, particularly the Minister of Mines and Energy, the Government spokesman for this matter—a Government which has been so loud in its condemnation of this area and which has been spouting so much nonsense in relation to markets. As the Leader found out, and can bear testimony to, as a result of his recent visit to Japan, the Japanese want to do business with us. They think we are lunatics to not do business with them, and I believe that we are. I draw the attention of members to the April 1983 edition of Johnny Green's Journal. On page 8 there is an article headed, 'Can South Australia afford to pass up these uranium job opportunities?'. The cartoon at the top is quite interesting, and the article states:

Roxby Downs also contains half the western world's known uranium reserves: she's a goer.

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Members would be well advised to read this publication. Reference is made to mining at Honeymoon and Beverley and a further reference is made, 'Sorry, but they only contain uranium.' This very excellent journal then goes into the employment ramifications of the Government's decision to let Roxby Downs go ahead but not Honeymoon and Beverley. I shall summarise the article. It contains the following information in regard to uranium projects and jobs:

Honeymoon: pilot stage completed; operation, 35 jobs pilot stage; 70 jobs full production; service industry, 250 jobs [in total about 400 jobs]. Beverley: construction stage, 100 jobs; operation, 100 jobs; service industry, 400 jobs.

In excess of 1 000 jobs have been wiped out overnight by the Labor Party which assumed office on the promise to create work. A uranium conversion plant also got the chop. Mayor Jones of Port Pirie, a member of the Labor Party, had great plans. He gave evidence to the Boundaries Commission, and at that time he said he was a member of the Labor Party and that he supported its submission. The article contains further information, as follows:

Uranium conversion plant: construction phase, 200 to 300 jobs; operation stage, 200 jobs; service industry, 600 jobs.

The Labor Party slammed the door shut: these are the people who were going to create employment. In regard to a uranium enrichment facility, as I have said, we had it in the bag until they came and saw Premier Bannon. 'A sad statement' was their comment when they read his press release as a result of that visit. The Premier slammed the door shut there. The article contains further information, as follows:

Uranium enrichment plant, up to 600 jobs during the construction phase; operation, 300 to 500 [depending on the number of modules built]; service industry, 900 to 1 500.

Where else are we going to get these sorts of developments? In which other areas of South Australia is this a possibility? The total number of jobs in the construction phase on which the Labor Party has turned its back is 900 to 1 000; in the operation phase, 700 to 900; and in the service industry, 2 150 to 2 750. Thousands of jobs have been lost in South Australia as a result of that decision. However, we believe that that will change.

The other article to which I want to draw the attention of members (although Liberal Party members have obviously recognised the worth of this publication and would have read these articles) is that contained in the July 1983 edition of Johnny Green's Journal. On page 13 there is an article headed 'Australia's Nuclear Nonsense'. Again, it is an excellent article, and it refers to the operation of nuclear reactors in other countries and to those countries getting into the business. Argentina is referred to as operating one power station and having two under construction; Belgium has five operating, with two under construction; Brazil has one in operation and is constructing two; and Bulgaria is operating four and is constructing one. The Communist countries do not have the inhibitions that Australia has in relation to nuclear energy. They know that it is the most economical form of producing energy. Canada is listed as operating 13 power stations, with 10 under construction; Cuba has one under construction; Czechoslovakia is operating two and has six under construction. The Czechoslovakian Consul said that that country is one of the leading countries in supplying nuclear materials for peaceful purposes.

I will give figures relating to nuclear power stations in a number of countries, the first figure being the number of nuclear power stations in use and the second the number

under construction. They are as follows: Finland, 4 (operating); France, 32 and 27; East Germany (communist Germany), 5 and 8; West Germany, 15 and 9; Hungary, 1 and 3; India, 4 and 6; Italy, 3 and 3; Japan, 25 and 10; Korea, 2 and 7; Mexico, 2 (under construction); Netherlands, 2 (operating); Pakistan, 1 (operating); Philippines, 1 (under construction); Poland, 1 (under construction); Romania, 2 (under construction); South Africa, 2 (operating); Spain, 4 and 11; Sweden, 10 and 2; Switzerland, 4 and 1; Taiwan, 4 and 2; United Kingdom, 31 and 10 (the unions in the U.K. are not hung up about the uranium question; they know they will freeze and starve if they shut them down); U.S.A., 80 and 61; U.S.S.R. (the communist home), 40 and 23; and Yugoslavia 1 (operating).

When is the South Australian Government and the Labor Party going to face reality and acknowledge that we are in the nuclear age, need nuclear energy, and are going to get it? I am sorry that the premier missed my earlier remarks when I referred to his fancy footwork at the Hiroshima rally where he said, 'We know that uranium from Roxby Downs is under safeguards and that it's going to be used for peaceful purposes.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Of course, the uranium from Beverley, Honeymoon and other places is going somewhere else!

Mr Ashenden: That's incredible, isn't it?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: We know that it is absurd. This excellent article, whose facts are statistically verifiable, sets out the risk involved in man-days lost per unit of energy output in relation to coal, oil, nuclear, natural gas, ocean, thermal, wind, solar (space heating, thermal, photovoltaic), and methanol. It states that the safest fuel is natural gas and the second safest material, by far, is nuclear, which has the best safety record of any major conversion for electricity devised by man.

Mr Ferguson: Like Three-Mile Island!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Three-Mile Island is a case in point. If the honourable member had taken the trouble to read the President's report, he would prove the point. If the honourable member reads the report of the President's Committee, on which there were doctors, unionists and many others, he will see the conclusions that nobody was physically harmed.

Mr Ferguson: It hasn't killed anybody yet; it takes 20 years.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member had read that report he would not be making such uninformed and inane interjections. I have read the report, and its conclusion is clear: nobody was physically harmed as a result of the Three-Mile Island accident.

Mr Ferguson: At the moment.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Full stop. Radiation levels were measured. If the honourable member has had an X-ray in the past 10 years he will have received a bigger dose of radiation than anybody received at Three-Mile Island. In the event the evacuation proved to be quite unnecessary. There was a degree of hysteria which caused considerable psychological damage, but if the honourable member takes the trouble to read the report of the President's committee which investigated this matter thoroughly (and which, as I said previously, included every man and his dog), he will find that what he is saying is absolute nonsense. Let the Government argue from facts. The problem with this nuclear debate has been that the Government has never been prepared to deal in facts. Cain has never been prepared to do so, either, and now Premier Bannon is in the unfortunate position that the facts apply to one situation but not to

another—that the facts apply to Roxby Downs but not to Honeymoon and Beverley.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Different kinds of uranium.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, different kinds of uranium oxide. The only point is that they are going to sell more uranium from Roxby Downs than from the other mines.

I commend to the Government the excellent journal from the Chamber of Mines, because it will help to provide some of the facts which unfortunately, because of pressure from the left wing of the Labor Party, the Government is not prepared to face. If the Government was to face facts and if its members saved up their overseas study allowances to travel around the world, they would see what is happening in any of these countries. The Deputy Premier is keen to visit Russia—while he is there he should look at its nuclear industry.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: I don't think he's so keen now.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not think that the Deputy Premier is so keen to make his travel arrangements with the same agency. He is probably more interested in the Government's travel bureau. The Deputy Premier is probably more interested in dealing with a reputable travel agency instead of going on the cheap via Mr Ivanov.

The SPEAKER: Order! Quite clearly that is an offensive remark under Standing Orders. I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Which remark is offensive, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: The offensive remark was that the Deputy Premier, according to the honourable gentleman, was allegedly seeking a trip on the cheap from a foreign power. I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw that remark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I withdraw, Mr Speaker, because I want to get on with my speech.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not going to accept a situation where a withdrawal is made and I am then laughed at. Either the matter is withdrawn or it is not. Is the Deputy Leader withdrawing the remark or not?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I made it perfectly clear that I was withdrawing the remark so that I could get on with my speech. That is what I said. I cannot make it any clearer.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw the remark without adding anything extra.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker, I want to raise a number of matters.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Damn it, I have withdrawn the remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the Deputy Leader to withdraw the remark.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: For the third time, Mr Speaker, I withdraw. May I get on with my speech?

The SPEAKER: Order! I accept the unequivocal withdrawal, but I do not accept the petulance with which it was done.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Mr Speaker—

Mr Trainer: Just withdraw the remark.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Ascot Park is warned.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to raise a number of other matters in relation to industrial relations. I have about the same amount of material left to deal with in relation to that subject. I will show the Government in precisely the same light as I did with my remarks in relation to the resource industry. Quite clearly, I will have to reserve the bulk of my remarks in relation to this matter for my

Budget speech. However, in the time left to me I will introduce the topic. During the previous session of Parliament we saw that the Government was keeping some of its election promises. The Government was quite selective in relation to the promises that it kept.

As I pointed out earlier, as did the Leader, the Government chose not to keep its promises in relation to the level of taxation. It promised that it would not introduce any new taxes or even raise taxes and charges during its term of office. The Government had accurate financial information which gave the present Premier the ability to confidently make that promise. However, the Government is keeping some of its election promises. The promises that it is keeping are a pay-off to the unions (including professional unions) that so blatantly supported the Government prior to the last election. Those unions broke new ground.

The Public Service Association and the Institute of Teachers blatantly waged political campaigns on behalf of the Labor Party. Of course, we know that the actions of that union and association gave a great deal of offence to many of their members. Of course, the pay-off was there in the form of the promises that have been kept. A major part of the reason for the tax slug visited on the South Australian public in the last week is to keep those promises. It is that area of the Labor Party policy that it will implement. We have seen industrial legislation before the House which will be to the distinct disadvantage of the public in relation to employment prospects in this State, and I refer to amendments to workers compensation and arbitration and conciliation legislation.

We have some fleeting mention in the Governor's Speech in relation to the Government's proposals. The Deputy Premier has embraced the Cawthorne Report as his bible. The Cawthorne Report was commissioned by the former Minister, the Hon. Dean Brown, and it was a report to get information to the Government. The Liberal Government had a clear policy in relation to compulsory unionism: we would not have a bar of it—never would and never will. So, some aspects of the Cawthorne Report no doubt would have been implemented by a Liberal Government, but those aspects of the report which run counter to our strongly held policies of course would not have been implemented. The Deputy Premier has embraced this Cawthorne Report; it is now his bible. It received a mention frequently during the last session and it received a mention in the Governor's Speech. The Governor's Speech mentions the fact that the Deputy Premier is now going to take up his bible (the Cawthorne Report) and he is going to enact it—put the provisions into legislation. I will bet that happens—particularly those parts which the Deputy Premier thinks will enable him to institute the closed shop, the compulsory unionism policies and so on. We have seen plenty of that during the life of this Government, which is breaking new ground in relation to the teaching profession and in relation to compulsory unionism. We saw it previously in connection with teaching assistants. The Government is breaking new ground where the heads of departments have to supply lists of non-union members to unions.

Not only is the Government trying to force people back into these unions (people who resigned for conscientious reasons, because they did not like the fact that their organisations had become blatantly political) but also it is trying to threaten people that, if they do not rejoin, they will not be promoted in their job. This is an attack on the very basic freedoms that any enlightened democratic society should enjoy. They are the promises the Labor Party will keep, the promises to the people who spent their members' money to get them elected on false pretences. They will not keep them to the general tax paying public. They will not keep them to the people who have to balance the weekly budget, but

they will keep them to those groups, and the rest of the community will pay.

I want to canvass in a later debate a number of matters in relation to the industrial scene but, as I say, my view is that the public of South Australia will rue the day that they elected this Government. Government members have turned their backs on the very areas which could have done something to broaden the base of the economy in this State, and they won the election in a most cynical exercise, through raising the expectations of the public in a quite dishonest way.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I welcome the opportunity to speak in this Address in Reply debate. First, I congratulate the Government on the proposal for Yatala, and it is a proposal (and I stipulate open government) made so that we can get a feeling from not only the community at large but also the trade union movement. This contrasts to the drivel we have just heard from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition whose attitude (and God help the trade union movement should he ever become the Minister of Industrial Affairs) is like a bull at a gate: charge through, belt them around the head with a big stick, and if they do not lie down, then kick them again. It is one that I hope we will never see in this State, should the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, God help us, ever become the Minister of Industrial Affairs. In respect of the Cawthorne Report, it is rather interesting, when one reflects on what took place in the past three years, that the previous Minister of Industrial Affairs would not even provide us with a copy of the Cawthorne Report so that we could have a look at it.

He could not allow that to happen. He said, 'Let's give them the old mushroom treatment: keep them in the dark and feed them . . .'. We all know what that means. Quite clearly, the Deputy Premier has the right approach in respect of the Cawthorne Report. All members on this side, and I suggest all members opposite, now have a copy of the Cawthorne Report and can see what Mr Cawthorne said in relation to the need for better industrial relations and conditions in this State.

In referring to problems in the community, it is rather interesting to reflect on the problems faced in Queensland. I hope that another State shortly will be joining the Labor Party ranks. Even old Premier Joh will not talk to the newly elected Leader in Queensland: he would not even let the Leader into the Cabinet.

Mr Ferguson: Another Labor Government.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed. I will be happy to see, after this split, that another State in Australia will join the ranks and will get with the strength. I refer now to unemployment, about which I am (as I suggest is every member of this House) concerned. This issue was brought rather forcefully to my attention last Friday. Like many other members of Parliament, I am approached from time to time by people who come to my office or telephone me expressing concern that they or members of their family want a job. We all do our best to help the unemployed to obtain a job.

I received a call last Friday from a man who, in rather colourful Australian language, said that he wanted a job. He is no different from the 750 000 who are looking for work in Australia: in fact, the latest figure is 830 000. The man has a problem that makes it even harder for him to get a job—he has a back injury. I know the family well: try as he might and try as I might, nothing could be done to assist him. However, he was not idle because of his back injury: he decided to go back to university to study, but despite a couple of degrees, he still cannot get a job.

While we are considering discrimination in regard to employment for the disabled, perhaps we should look at this area a little more closely in respect of positive discrimination for people who have educational qualifications and special abilities but who cannot find work. This chap, his three young children and his wife are living on a Housing Trust estate, and the full circumstances pertaining to his case would make any person's heart bleed.

I was rather interested, in reading through some of the speeches given by our Minister of Community Welfare, to note that on 5 July this year, at OARS, in Halifax Street, the Minister made the following comments, which typify the problems in the community:

Take a middle-aged man who loses his job in a factory. The chances are he will join the 9 000 South Australians who have been out of work more than two years.

That figure has increased. He further stated:

He will become one of the long-term jobless. The social impact on that man and his family is enormous. He will face personal pressures as his self esteem deteriorates in direct proportion to his realisation that there is no other paid employment available.

Chances are his relationship with his wife and children will worsen. Certainly, as the months go on financial burdens will grow—difficulties with house and car payments, the grocery bill will be bigger and the food supply will be less. The potential for him to seek welfare services, ranging from counselling to budget advice, emergency financial assistance to housing, will increase.

Those remarks, coupled with my previous remarks, typify the sort of problems that we are experiencing in the community. I am aware that the Federal Government announced a programme in August of this year for 70 000 jobs to be created for the unemployed within the community. However, much more needs to be done to overcome the problems in our community, particularly in South Australia. I wish to touch on that matter shortly.

To give an illustration of the sort of problems I have, as indeed have some of my colleagues representing the north-western suburbs, I quote recent figures obtained from the local branch of the Department of Social Security at Woodville. There are 35 777 people out of 93 000 people in that district on various forms of social security benefits. Like many of my colleagues, I door-knock and go to the local delicatessen, supermarket and business areas of my community and see this problem more and more. Small business people tell us that they are in trouble financially and have difficulty in repayment of their loans to the bank. Some months ago I highlighted this problem within my electorate, and the Premier agreed to carry out a survey into the special needs within that area of the north-western suburbs. It disturbs me greatly to see these problems almost daily within the community. I understand most readily the aggressiveness of many young unemployed adults when they say, 'It is all right for you, Mr Hamilton, you've got a bloody job; I haven't.' In many cases the words used are even stronger than that.

It gives me no great pleasure to speak on the following matters, but I will do so because of my belief that the project is essential to Australia and is of benefit to South Australia. In particular, I refer to the Federal Government's attitude regarding the Alice Springs to Darwin line. It is my belief that this project should go ahead as quickly as possible. Like many others in the community, I see the benefits that would accrue to South Australia. The booklet put out by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry in South Australia gives me more than a deal of concern. I quote selectively from the report as follows:

Between 1 800 and 2 160 jobs [will be created] over the course of the project.

Members can say that that is for a rail link between Alice Springs and Darwin, but it involves a massive investment based on 1983 figures of about \$540 000 000. Of that, about

\$60 000 000 will be spent on rolling stock to provide additional waggons on that line. I suggest that much of that \$60 000 000 could be spent in South Australia with various firms to manufacture rolling stock. Additionally, about \$105 000 000 will have to be spent on rails and fastenings.

South Australia should and could get a percentage of that expenditure and work if this project proceeded. Similarly, if the sleepers were manufactured in South Australia we could attract additional business, because about \$76 000 000 would be spent on concrete products, and that wages component is \$37 700 000. On communications, expenditure of about \$18 000 000 will be involved. Within my district and in the Hendon complex are a number of firms with the ability and expertise to provide the necessary equipment for this project.

The other, and most important, aspect of the project concerns the benefits that would accrue to the Federal Government. In that respect, I quote from page 25 of the report, which provides:

Government fiscal drawback of construction expenditure: Some part of the expenditure on the rail project returns to levels of Government in the form of taxes and charges. This return has a particularly pronounced effect in the wages, salaries and supplements area and in the gross operating surpluses of companies. In addition, there are the returns in the area of sales taxes, pay-roll taxes and other charges and duties which accrue to either Federal, State or local government. Moreover, there are further transfers and drawbacks of expenditure with the employment effect of such projects.

Transfers occur from amounts previously paid in such areas as social security payments (unemployment benefits) and drawbacks occur from individuals previously unemployed and receiving benefits and now employed and receiving taxable income.

Wages, salaries and supplements will amount to \$317.27 million, on 1983 prices. The expenditure share of this category amounts to \$317 million, representing the largest expenditure area. On the basis of a 2 000 job project for a period of six years, this would amount to an average annual wage cost per individual of \$26 439. As this figure is inclusive of labour-on-costs (annual leave, workers compensation, long service leave, etc.) which in trades areas will amount to between 30 and 40 per cent addition to the paid wages bill, such a figure would be reduced to between \$15 863 and \$18 507 per annum which, though a 'ball-park' figure, can provide some basis for a taxation analysis.

Tax on income, at present rates, on these amounts would result, on an annual individual basis, to between \$3 456-\$4 267 per annum or for the employees over the life of the rail project an amount of between \$41.5 million and \$51.2 million.

It can easily be seen from these figures that there is a tremendous amount to be gained not only by South Australia and the Northern Territory but also by the Federal Government if this project goes ahead. More importantly, as I see it, it involves the question of reducing the number of unemployed people not only in this State but in Australia. I refer to page 27 of the report headed 'Reduction of the deficit', which states:

In June 1983 the addition to the Federal deficit of one person on unemployment benefits was estimated (by the Department of Social Security) at \$8 600 per annum. The rail project has the potential to reduce unemployment levels in Australia by 2 000. The deficit reduction would therefore amount to a maximum of \$17.2 million per annum or \$103.2 million over a six-year period.

I would suggest that that is not an inconsiderable amount of money to the Federal Government. As I understand the report, the 2 000 job level is the minimum number of jobs that would be created. In addition, I believe that other areas would be beneficial to South Australia. I quote from page 33 of the report, a submission from P.G.H., Clay Bricks and Pavers, as follows:

The main benefits of a direct railway link to Darwin, as far as our company is concerned, would be:

- (1) An efficient and economical transportation system for our clay bricks, pavers and vitrified clay bricks.

This would enable us to extend our market and raise production levels to make greater use of our production capacity; thus securing employment for our existing workforce and creating new employment possibilities.

The submission from Adelaide and Wallaroo Fertilisers is as follows:

In 1982-83 deliveries of fertilisers to the N.T. totalled some 2 000 tonnes and our projections for 1990 amount to 25 000 tonnes and up to 50 000 tonnes by the mid-1990s subject to the completion of the railway.

We would estimate that if facilities were available to rail direct to Katherine . . . savings of approximately \$40 per tonne on fertilisers and stock food supplements.

Adelaide Brighton Cement put the following submission:

During the operational phase we estimate that 30 000 tonnes of ground limestone and 30 000 tonnes of lime per year could be supplied which could otherwise go to imports. Potential also exists for the supply of 20 000 tonnes of fly ash to Darwin each year. This is new business which is currently not viable due to the very high cost of transport associated with the existing system.

On page 34 of the report, Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort put the following submission:

Given reliable rail transport we would see the movement to southern markets of between 40 000 to 50 000 live cattle per annum. This development (fertiliser sales) in turn would see the growing requirement for agricultural machinery and general merchandise with a current approximate value of \$5 million p.a. increasing proportionately with the growth of the area.

On page 36 is a report from Morrie Gigney, who is the Assistant Manager of Australian National. In the 'Network' magazine of December 1982, Morrie is quoted as follows:

Traffic on the old narrow gauge line from Marree to Alice Springs totalled 142 000 tonnes per year . . . Since the opening of the standard gauge route to Alice Springs, the traffic has increased by 230 per cent and now 310 000 tonnes are being conveyed to and from Alice Springs and Darwin annually. The main traffic is in road units conveyed by the 'piggyback' method.

There is no doubt in my mind that if this project goes ahead more and more firms will be using this network. The report at page 36 further states:

The first train to use the standard gauge link departed Alice Springs on 4 December 1980 and in the remaining six months boosted the rail/road share of freight transport from 11 per cent to 21 per cent.

One of the other most important aspects of this report is as follows:

Tourism patronage since the standard gauge has increased 176 per cent. The number of tourists travelling in the Northern Territory doubled to around 400 000 between 1977-78 and 1981-82.

It is quite clear that this project can be not only beneficial to South Australia from the point of view of the jobs it would create: I would suggest that it could also be used for the sourcing of coal for the Channel Island power station that has yet to be built. The supply of coal required for that station could come from South Australia, and the present line from Tarcoola to Alice Springs runs through one of the largest coal deposits in the world. That is an area in which I would hope we could explore the possibilities at some time in the future.

If this line goes ahead, tourism trade is likely to increase. A greater variety of travel packages would become available and open up areas for tourism. I suggest that South Australia would benefit more than considerably from this scheme. Further, there would be cost advantages in regard to container shipping. I would suggest that the port of Darwin could become one of the major shipping ports in Australia. The turn-around would be beneficial not only to shipping companies but also to those manufacturers wanting to get their goods to eastern and Asian markets. Finally, in regard to the matter of tourism I refer to comments made by the Federal Minister for Sport, Recreation and Tourism reported in the *Australian* of 11 July 1983, as follows:

For every \$1 000 000 spent in Australia by foreign tourists, \$2 500 000 is created in gross domestic product. For every \$44 000 they spend, three new jobs come into existence.

Clearly, the need for this project to go ahead is of significant importance to all South Australians. Although the trade union movement, the Chamber of Commerce and the Pre-

mier are pushing for this scheme, I believe that many other South Australians should be getting behind this project and pursuing this with all the might that they can muster. Regrettably, if need be, they should be criticising my Federal colleagues for not providing the money necessary for this scheme to go ahead. I hope that we will soon see a change of heart by the Federal Government in this matter.

I turn now to issues that not only concern my electorate but are also of major concern to the tourism industry in South Australia. I refer to the statement made in the Governor's Speech highlighting the importance of Port Adelaide to the Government and the need to improve and upgrade the port. In my District of Albert Park, particularly at West Lakes, there is a potential to latch on, if I might use that phrase, to the Government's stated intention to upgrade tourism in Port Adelaide.

It was with some regret that I noted that the Government has not seen fit to provide money or a guarantee to enable a hotel to be built at West Lakes. This area provides one of the best aquatic lakes and rowing courses in Australia and also provides many other facilities. Since entering this Parliament in 1979, I have repeatedly stressed the potential for Football Park and surrounding facilities in that part of my district. I am still of the opinion that we could stage national and international events in that area, benefiting not only local people by way of employment but also tourists coming from interstate and overseas to attend such events.

In West Lakes there is no large hotel accommodation of a sufficient standard to cater for international and interstate participants and spectators who come to attend events staged in the area, including the Australian rowing selection trials, the Kings Cup rowing regatta, the Australian canoeing championships, national football championships, national marathon running championships, and international golfing events. I understand that an application has been made for the world rowing championships to be staged in this area in 1986.

I strongly believe that the potential of this area to attract not only tourists but also sportsmen to South Australia has not been exploited. I hope that in the next two years, or during the term of this Parliament, I see that potential come to fruition. Another facet of this area is the golf courses provided in this north-western part of Adelaide, and there are three excellent golf courses involved. I believe that we can attract tourists to this area from Japan and other parts of Asia, countries mentioned by speakers on this side of the House previously today.

Some years ago I visited Japan. I was amazed at the number of driving ranges for golfers on top of buildings and in other areas with the necessary space. I think that most people are aware that Japanese men are keen golfers. From my experience in Japan I believe that, perhaps in conjunction with golfing events in this State or as a package tour, we could encourage many Japanese people to visit South Australia and become involved in some of our championship events. We could also encourage some of the major Japanese companies to send their employees to South Australia. A number of companies come to mind, including Mitsubishi, which send their employees to South Australia quite regularly.

I now refer to an issue that I have raised in the local press and in this Parliament over a number of years; that is, my concern about the fretting away of concrete bricks around the West Lakes waterway. On 7 August this year I had discussions with an Alderman from the Corporation of the City of Woodville who expressed concern about the lack of regulations. I will not go into this question at any length; suffice to say that I am most concerned about the dangers for local residents, football fans and other persons visiting the area who walk around the surrounds of the lake. It

would only require one person to tread on one of the fretting bricks, have it give way, the person to slip on his back, and the Government would be up for a considerable amount of money. There are a number of issues that must be addressed in relation to this matter. In fact, the Minister of Marine has been looking at this issue quite closely, as did the previous Government (as I now know).

Another matter that I bring up every year, and I will continue to do so until it is resolved, is the need for a heated hydrotherapy pool in the Alfreda unit of the Western Domiciliary Care and Rehabilitation Service on Old Port Road, Royal Park. I will not provide all the figures for each successive year that I have been in this Parliament. The last correspondence that I received in relation to the need for this unit is expressed as follows:

Dear Kevin, Thank you for your continued interest in our rehabilitation unit, in particular your efforts to press for the provision of a hydrotherapy exercise pool are appreciated.

I am pleased to provide current statistics on clients who have recently attended the centre.

Referred Clients	1982-83
Males	170
Females	77
Total	247
Discharge Details	1982-83
Were fit to return to work	153
Further medical follow-up	40
Other (Pension, home programme, self-discharge, etc.)	54

As at 30 June 1983, 62 clients were registered with the unit and 52 clients were receiving active rehabilitation.

This increase in activity augers well for the future of the Alfreda Rehabilitation Unit but concerns this organisation as it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet the expectations of those referring agencies and Alfreda clients in terms of being able to continue to offer comprehensive rehabilitation programmes incorporating the hydrotherapy component.

I have had discussions with the Minister of Health, and I appreciate the time that he has provided to me from officers of his department to try and find ways and means by which we can hopefully gain sufficient money, perhaps in the next two or three years, to provide that facility. I believe sincerely that this facility is long overdue. Indeed, I suggest that the local West Lakes High School could allow many of its students to use that pool and be taught to swim at that complex, should it be built.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): I call on the honourable member for Bragg. I draw members' attention to the fact that this is the honourable member's first speech. I would ask members to give him the normal courtesy.

Mr INGERSON (Bragg): Mr Acting Speaker, I rise to support the motion. First, I would like to express my personal sympathy for the family of the late Hon. John Hurtle Coumbe, who served Parliament as the member for Torrens for 22 years.

I am very honoured and proud to be elected to the House of Assembly of the South Australian Parliament as the member for Bragg. I thank the Liberal Party and the members of the Bragg Electoral College for their endorsement as their candidate and consequently the constituents of Bragg for their support at the by-election—support which enabled me to increase my Party's majority by 3.5 per cent. This was a very pleasing result to all members of my campaign committee, to my supporters, and to me. I thank them personally for their efforts. We were pleased because, first, the previous majority was already very large (some 66 per cent) and, secondly, we were able to get an increase in support during the honeymoon period of a new Labor Government—support that, at that time, if translated across the State, would have returned a Liberal Government. Even though I have

been elected as a Liberal, I pledge my support, concern, interest and time to all constituents of Bragg.

I would now like to spend a few moments placing on record the performance and achievements of the previous and only other member for Bragg, Dr David Tonkin. He began his political career as a candidate in 1968, when he opposed, and lost to, Mr Dunstan in the seat of Norwood. In 1970 he was elected to the House of Assembly as the member for Bragg, the seat he held until his retirement in March 1983.

Dr Tonkin was shadow Minister of Health and Community Welfare from 1973 to 1975. On 25 July 1975, he was elected Premier of South Australia. During the term of his office as Premier, there were many significant achievements, some of which I will mention. The Roxby Downs indenture Bill was probably the most important Bill to pass the Parliament during Dr Tonkin's term as Premier. The Cooper Basin liquids scheme indenture Bill is currently, or in the near future will be, producing significant royalties for this State. The River Murray Waters Agreement enabled the River Murray Commission to take into consideration water quality for the first time, and Dr Tonkin was part of a Government that developed and continued with water filtration as an important part of the supply of water to the metropolitan area. In regard to tourism, the former Premier saw the completion of the Hilton Hotel project, which is very important for this State. Many international entertainers can show their wonderful talents to the people of South Australia at that international hotel.

The international airport was a long-term dream for this State and come true during Dr Tonkin's term. We saw the beginning and the development of the O'Bahn transport system for the north-eastern suburbs, and the connecting of South Australia, finally, to the total national standard gauge network, with a line through to Crystal Brook. There were the initiatives which developed Technology Park. Investment in mining and manufacturing increased to the highest level for the past 10 years: there was an increase of investment in mining of 1 200 per cent and in manufacturing of 18 per cent.

We saw State taxes decrease, the removal of land tax on the principal place of residence and the abolition of gift duties and death duties. Pay-roll tax in South Australia was the second lowest in Australia. The Charles Moore building was converted into law courts, and programme performance budgeting was instigated and developed in all State departments. Finally, the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Bill, a very significant Bill of its type and one which has been acclaimed not only in Australia but also worldwide, was passed. I am sure that these achievements will be remembered by South Australians for many years to come. In wishing Dr Tonkin and his wife Prue a happy, healthy and long retirement, I feel sure that I reflect the attitude of many members of both sides of this Parliament.

The electorate of Bragg is an inner city metropolitan electorate with a population at the 1981 census of 22 892. The electorate takes in the eastern suburbs of Eastwood, Dulwich, Rose Park, Toorak Gardens, Glenside, Marryatville, Heathpool, Leabrook, Tasmore, Hazelwood Park, Frewville, Glenunga, Fullarton, Myrtle Bank, and Highgate. Of those living in my district, 83 per cent are Australian born. The unemployment rate is exceptionally low at 2.5 per cent. The number of widowed people and those receiving age pensions is more than double the metropolitan average; 8 per cent more than the metropolitan average is over 75 years of age; 23 per cent more than the State average attend private schools; and 18 per cent more than the metropolitan average are in the professional-technical occupations. There is also a high percentage of State Government public servants

in the electorate. The population is an aged one, and there are 6 per cent more women than the State average.

Within the electorate of Bragg there are 14 nursing homes, seven being privately owned with 222 beds, and seven being church owned, also, interestingly, with 222 beds. The Julia Farr Centre, with 826 beds, is also in the electorate, with about 300 of those beds currently not being used.

In the electorate there are both public and private schools with six public schools, two private schools, (Loreto and Concordia), and three special schools for the disadvantaged. It is a unique electorate in that it has three major hospitals: the Glenside Hospital, with 546 beds; the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital, with 170 beds; and the Burnside Community Hospital, which is a private and general hospital.

We have very few major industries in the electorate. Amdel employs 200 people and is a provider of services and information to the mining industry. Because of the current down-turn in the mining industry, it is diversifying into the electronics area as well. The Electricity Trust has its headquarters in the electorate. It is interesting to note that a new addition is the computer centre for the South Australian Government being built in Conyngham Street, Glenunga. The main areas of employment within the electorate are retail and service industries. There are two main shopping centres: the Burnside Village, on Portrush Road, and the Arkaba Village, on both sides of Glen Osmond road, with extensive strip shopping on Fullarton, Glen Osmond, Greenhill, Kensington and Portrush Roads.

Many motels and restaurants are situated on the Glen Osmond Road (the main arterial road into the city from the Adelaide Hills) and on Portrush Road. Business offices have developed rapidly on Fullarton Road (at the Dulwich and Rose Park end) and on Greenhill road (at the Eastwood end). The electorate is serviced at local government level by three councils: Burnside, Unley, and Kensington and Norwood. Burnside and Unley councils oversee 95 per cent of the electorate. The services they provide within the electorate are exceptional, and both councils need to be congratulated on their services.

Of particular importance to the residents, the parks and gardens, in particular, Hazelwood Park reserve, being the largest, Tusmore Park and Ridge Park reserve, the two smaller parks. The electorate is currently a strong Liberal seat, having a two-Party preferred vote position of almost 70 per cent. Like all other electorates, it will be interesting to see whether the position, after the redistribution of boundaries later in the year, is the same.

Before I begin the main part of my speech, I bring to the attention of the House a matter that concerns me. In recent times two major developments have been opened in this State, although members of Parliament were not officially invited to the opening. I refer to the law courts development, in the old Charles Moore building, and also to the opening of the O'Bahn system. Both projects, I believe, are important for the State and all politicians should have been invited.

I believe the two major concerns today are economic management by the Government and unemployment. The previous Liberal Government produced a balanced Budget to Parliament in August 1982 and then, in its election campaign, its promises amounted to a deficit of \$13 000 000. The Labor Party's promises, costed out by many people, suggested a deficit of \$50 000 000. The Premier last Thursday (4 August) reported a possible deficit of \$62 000 000. He is blaming the previous Government for bad management and for the fact that he did not know the true position when he took over. It is very interesting, as a side issue, to note that the Liberal Party estimate of the Labor Party's election promises amounted to \$50 000 000—quite close to the now modified deficit. I find it hard to accept that the Premier—the then Leader of the Opposition—was unaware of possible

difficulties with the finances of the State—after all, he had access to Treasury, as Leader of the Opposition, the same as has any member of Parliament. He would have known the position as it was developing as he was shadow Treasurer. If he did not, he was remiss in his duty as the next prospective Premier of the State.

Furthermore, I cannot accept that, when planning their election strategy, the financial experts of the Labor Party were so unprofessional that they did not discuss the many financial options likely to occur, including a possible \$60 000 000 deficit. I believe contingent plans were developed for all situations in case the Labor Party won Government. Along with the economic promises that were made was the public centrepiece statement that 'there would be no increase in old taxes or any new taxes'. I believe that this was a deliberate platform to win votes—a deliberate confidence trick knowing full well the difficult position of the Budget and knowing that their promises could and would only be financed by increasing old and introducing new State taxes. After all, anyone with any business background knows that, if one increases one's expenditure, one must increase revenue to attempt to balance the equation. If you increase the number of people employed in the public sector by 2 000, as was done between December 1982 and April 1983 (as reported by the A.B.S.), then this will add approximately \$45 million in a full year or \$22.5 million in six months, not a bad sop to supportive unions.

Instead of blaming the previous Government all the time, it is about time that this Administration controlled its own expenditure. In difficult times the Government, like everyone else in the country, has to recognise that it must tighten its belt to balance the Budget. As it has chosen not to balance its Budget, the Government should stop fudging and accept the deficit as part of its economic programme and admit that the new taxes are necessary to fund its election promises. The new Government has increased 24 taxes or charges within the first seven months and last week announced four extra tax slugs. Provided one does not use gas or electricity, water or one's sewer, drive a car, ride in a bus, go to a hospital, rent a house from the South Australian Housing Trust, drink beer, smoke cigarettes, or save and bank money, then South Australia is a great place to live!

It is interesting to see a Government talk about support for small business, and then put up charges for electricity, water and sewer, and gas—taxes that reduce consumption and thus retail sales (beer, cigarettes, and petrol) and, finally, a tax on all cash transactions. Some support for small business!

These extra taxes and charges will force up the costs of goods and services and thus prices. It is opportune at this moment to remind the Premier of his comments when he was in Opposition. He said on many occasions that the Liberal Government was 'using State charges as back door taxation' and that 'this had to be done to compensate for loss of revenue to make up for financial mismanagement'. Pertinent comments in today's world.

The second major problem for this State is unemployment. Many people are now realising that the number of jobs in the motor industry, the white goods industry and supporting metals manufacturing industry will not significantly increase even when economic conditions improve. These industries have traditionally been large employers of people in South Australia. Therefore, we need urgently to find new people-oriented industries. The job creation schemes, short-term benefits schemes that have been introduced by the Federal Government, need to be applauded, but it needs to be recognised that these are short-term schemes, and that for the benefit of this State we need long-term schemes which produce long-term jobs. It is nothing new to say that the industries we need are in the service and high technology

industries, and in the longer-term mining industry. The easiest one to develop quickly is the tourist industry.

We already have the natural assets aplenty: the Barossa Valley, the Riverland, the Flinders Ranges, Adelaide city, the Fleurieu Peninsula and the South-East. We have excellent accommodation and many restaurants and hotels. This industry has a large multiplier effect throughout the community and particularly in small business, which is the people business. What is needed is maximum entrepreneurial support from the Government: we need more finance and to sell South Australia harder and better.

The tourist industry is principally one of small business. Technology Park is an excellent medium-term concept started by the Liberal Government, and now supported by this Government. I support this effort and hope that we will soon see South Australia take a lead in the promotion of this new industry.

For employment opportunities to improve in the medium-term, we need investment, but for South Australia to progress, we also need a Government that is consistent, encouraging and supportive. The Government needs to remove the uncertainty that is prevailing in the community and, in particular, in the mining industry. The best opportunity for growth of job opportunity is at Roxby Downs.

Earlier tonight we all heard the pros of Roxby Downs put forward to us. However, I would like again to restate some of the pluses of Roxby Downs. First, it is a development owned jointly by Western Mining and B.H.P., Western Mining being an Australian-owned company. It is a very large-scale, high capital, intensive investment industry which, in the long term, will produce up to 5 000 jobs. It has an ore body that is three times the size of Ayers Rock, with some 30 000 000 tonnes of copper. It is considered to be the biggest gold copper discovery in Australia. The suggested life of the mine is some 200 years.

The thing that is important about it, is that the turnover that would come out of the mine in any one year is equivalent to 25 per cent of the State Budget. To put it in closer terms, it is the same sort of cost of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, which employs 5 500 people. The Federal Government has put forward \$21 700 000 in its job creation schemes. Western Mining intends to spend \$350 000 000 during the construction period alone. 15 per cent of the ore body is uranium and, if marketed, it will produce 37 per cent of the revenue. As 10 per cent of the world's electricity is now nuclear (and by the year 2000 it is estimated to be 22 per cent), it is a ready market for South Australia to put its hands on.

Purchase of uranium for nuclear power station use is now being done by Japan, France, U.S.S.R., Western Germany, the United Kingdom, China, Morocco, and Spain. These countries are increasing their use of nuclear energy.

The other plus for the Olympic Dam development is the development of the town itself, which will have a population of some 6 000 to 9 000 people and will supply many extra jobs in its development. It will require people to build the roads and the infrastructure for schools, hospitals and all the other needs that a town requires. The multiplier effect suggested is some three to four times the number employed at Roxby Downs, namely, between 8 000 and 12 000 jobs.

The thing that concerns me about Roxby Downs is that the Government has recently approved the environmental impact study, and we now have a possible position of confrontation at the mine—a confrontation that should not be there. It is a minority group of people. The environmental impact study was available to them for up to nine months, and there has been no comment until now. I think that the Government has been tardy in not making sure that the developers, who have carried out their responsibility, are protected and are able to get on with the job.

We have an excellent opportunity to find more minerals in our northern areas if the Government would make clear its attitude to the uranium industry. The most difficult decision to follow was the disallowance of the Beverley mine, which seems horribly inconsistent with the approval of the Roxby Downs decision.

The other medium long-term project needed for South Australia is the completion of the North-South railway from Adelaide to Darwin. I noted the support of the member for Albert Park earlier, and I congratulate him on his enthusiasm for the project.

I hope that soon we will have a bi-partisan approach by this Parliament to ensure that we sell this project to the Federal Hawke Government. I hope that we soon hear about this soft approach. At least five years work and many long-term jobs are involved in this project.

Having looked at the demand side, I emphasise that there is an urgent need to have a look at the supply side of this employment equation. First, we need to encourage children to stay at school for a longer period and become better educated in what will be a high-technology future. Secondly, we need to investigate ways to encourage earlier retirement. The most important people area that needs support is the small business sector of the community. It is the sector that has had more promises of support, and less action from Governments, than any other group has had. One of the sector's biggest problems is that it is not organised, and therefore not a totally effective lobby. There are too many individuals pushing their barrows.

I would like to highlight briefly some areas of concern of small business. First, very few small business people, and in particular the wage earners within the small business industry, understand the concept of profit. They do not understand that unless small business is profitable there will be no jobs and certainly no wages increase. There needs to be an understanding of all involved in the industry as to why profit is so important to the small business sector.

There has been a continual promotion of claims in the workers compensation area by the unions. The insurance companies have been tardy in underquoting. At the moment we have a situation where workers compensation rates have gone up by astronomical amounts, and we have the problem of common law claims involving workers compensation. Pay-roll tax is a disincentive to employ, and it is one of the most significant problems of small business. Workers compensation, holiday loading, sick leave, penalties and maternity leave add up to some 50 per cent on-cost in the cost of employment. This on-cost rise over 10 years has gone from 35 per cent to 50 per cent today. It has been an astronomical increase in costs for small business.

Awards and industrial decisions made reflect the interests of large business and large groups of employees, but unfortunately those awards then flow on to small businesses where the problems involved are so totally different from those that apply in the large business area. Further, there is an inability to get finance for risk or venture capital. Even if it is obtainable, it is never at reasonable rates compared to those obtained by competitors in larger industries. In the area of agreements and contracts, most of the agreements are written to satisfy the large businesses rather than the smaller disadvantaged businesses.

Excellent training and education systems have been set up in management, but unfortunately small business men tend not to use them. Further, taxation at Federal and State levels disadvantages small businesses. With the multitude of licences existing, perhaps one day a Government will introduce one licence to cover all the needs of small business.

This sector, depending on the definition of 'small business', employs in South Australia between 60 and 90 per cent of the private sector work force. Thus one can say that South

Australia is principally a small business State. I look forward in this session to the promised initiatives of the Government and to the debates that will ensue.

I conclude by expressing concern, which is widespread and growing in the community, about two matters relating to law and order. First, I refer to the effectiveness and consistency of early release from prison on parole of criminals who have committed violent crimes. Prominent judges and the Australian Law Reform Commission have lately been critical of parole, the criticism being that the criminal seldom serves the full term of sentence before being released on parole. It is important that rehabilitation as well as punishment and deterrence be part of the process.

It can be argued that short-term parole periods can speed the process of rehabilitation. However, there are a number of examples of criminals who do not regard it as a privilege but simply as a freedom to commit a crime again knowing that they are likely to get away with it. Secondly, there is strong and frequent criticism of the leniency of sentencing in connection with the violent crimes of murder, rape, armed robbery and bashings, and this particularly involves criminals who have already been convicted of similar crimes. I call on the Government to carry out an urgent review of sentencing and the parole system.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I have had an opportunity to make a number of Address in Reply speeches and look forward to making a number more in the future. I want first to congratulate the member for Bragg on the speech he has just made. I know that it is the first of many excellent speeches that the honourable member will make, because he is going to be in this House for a long time, the only change being that after the next election he will be sitting on the other side of the House, which we all look forward to because he will then be taking his rightful place.

Members interjecting:

Mr GUNN: It seems that I am to get a considerable amount of help with my speech tonight, whether I require it or not. I would like to join with other members who have expressed sympathy to the family of the late John Coumbe. John Coumbe was the member for Torrens when I was first elected to this House in 1970. I always found him to be a helpful and hard-working member who was only too pleased to assist new members in this place.

I want on this occasion, while examining the Governor's Speech, to see how it affects the people living in my district. As all members know, I have a large district which has many problems, so I have gone through the Governor's Speech to ascertain what significant advantages will accrue in future to the people who live in the electorate of Eyre. We all know that people living in isolated country areas are penalised for living in those areas. They have not been given a fair go. They pay their taxes, but do not receive, as a matter of right, many of the facilities that people in large country towns and the metropolitan area take for granted.

I believe that it is about time that there was a bit of justice in this State for those country people who have been so badly treated for such a long time. These people should be given a fair go. I was elected to represent these people to the best of my ability, and I am going to do so with the strongest voice possible. I make clear that I do not believe that Governments have treated people in far-flung, isolated areas very well. Let us examine the situation that exists today. These people have to pay at least 10 per cent more for their electricity, bearing in mind that many of them have had to pay thousands of dollars (in some cases tens of thousands of dollars) just to have the electricity connected and that some people have not yet even been given that opportunity to have electricity connected to their properties.

If people in the metropolitan area were told that they could have the electricity connected to their homes but would have to pay \$20 000 for that right, there would be an uproar, and rightly so. That is not a fair crack of the whip. Many country people have also faced the problem of having no reticulated water on their properties. People west of Ceduna, and out from Hawker and other places, have faced that problem, and it does not appear that they will get much relief in the near future. We then come to the problem of education, about which I will say quite a bit tonight. I will also mention the problem involving the lack of adequate roads in country areas.

If any group of people have been over-taxed it is the motorists: the people who drive motor cars or semi-trailers. Not only are semi-trailer drivers taxed, they are also hounded by inspectors and other people from the time they start driving. They pay outlandish taxes and in many cases they drive over some of the worst roads in Australia. It is all very well for members to laugh, and many of them say that I am on my hobby horse again, but these people are South Australian citizens and they are entitled to some recognition. They are also entitled to receive a fair go. I could continue and mention a few more of their disadvantages. Most of them, if they are lucky, receive only one television channel, the A.B.C. A lot of them have only a restricted telephone service and do not have access to automatic telephones. However, that situation is improving because Telecom is installing many new exchanges, and I commend it for that. Many of their children must get up early in the morning to catch school buses and travel a long way to school. That also causes difficulties and problems.

I now wish to refer to some of these matters in detail, and I will explain to the House some of my concerns. The House would be aware that my district, like most parts of Australia, has suffered one of the worst droughts in the history of this nation. Fortunately, most of the State is having a very good agricultural year. Unfortunately, some areas of my district have not received adequate falls of rain. In the last few weeks there has been an improvement around Hawker and Quorn, but it has come quite late. It is still very dry in the Far North, and rainfall is urgently required.

I also refer to the mining industry and the fishing industry, which also operate in my district. Since becoming a member of Parliament I have endeavoured to achieve some justice for scale and abalone fishermen. In my judgment, those people who have spent all their lives in the fishing industry are entitled to receive some reasonable return for their licences when they leave the industry. In other words, they should be able to leave the industry with some dignity. In fact, the return from their fishing licences is their superannuation. In recent days we have learnt that the Labor Party has little or no regard for superannuation, given the way that it intends to treat superannuation in the future.

It was not until the election of a Liberal Government in 1979 that scale fishermen received their just reward in the form of the right to transfer their fishing licences when they leave the industry. The abalone fishery is one of the most difficult areas of the industry and an area where one could not expect a fisherman to spend all of his working life. Abalone fishermen did not have the right to transfer their licences, either. When one is faced with problems similar to one that was referred to me on one occasion, one would agree that the Liberal Party took the right decision when it allowed these fishermen to transfer their fishing licences. I refer to a situation where an abalone diver was killed by a shark, and his widow was left in a most difficult situation because she was not allowed to transfer the fishing licence.

I am perturbed at a letter that the Minister of Fisheries wrote to Mr Vandeeper, President of the Australian Fishing Industries Council (South Australia). I have not been critical

of the new Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Fisheries, because I believe that he should be given a reasonable opportunity to settle into his new position and look at the problems within the industry, consult with the industry and get himself well briefed in his portfolio. I do not wish to be critical of the Minister but, when my constituents are affected, as could well be the case from the Minister's comments in his letter of 1 July, I believe he should be criticised.

I do not really believe that the Minister has thought about these proposals. They have all the hallmarks of the problems that we faced in the fisheries industry between 1978 and 1979, when the principal fisheries officer was a Mr Kirkegaard. In my judgment, this document was chapter and verse from Mr Kirkegaard, because I had experience with that gentleman in these sorts of matters before. I believe that he would be the one who would put this up to the Minister. The Minister, of course, has to bear the responsibility for it but, if I was able to make a wager in this place—I know according to Standing Orders that I am not allowed to—I would wager that Mr Kirkegaard had something to do with this document. I wish to refer to the following sections:

The Government has considered a number of options for the reduction of licence premiums and the recovery of management costs. The major alternatives are:

- a. Make licences non-transferable;
- b. Increase the number of fishing units with compensating controls on effort;

The member for Stuart has been on that topic for a long time; I wonder whether he had anything to do with it. The document continues:

- c. Distribute profits from authority holders to a wider group of participating fishermen, i.e. skippers and crew;
- d. Introduce a transfer fee on first-generation licence holders;
- e. Increase licence fees to cover management costs.

That list of alternatives, which the Minister has put to the Australian Fishing Industry Council, is quite frightening when one examines the long-term effects of it, because the fishing industry is an important industry to the people of this State. Since that letter went out to the fishermen, there has been a great deal of comment in the press in relation to those matters. I sincerely hope the Minister and the Government will see the error of their ways and will not interfere with the existing management arrangements and structure recently set up, because I believe they are in the best interests of the people of this State and the fishing industry. It is essential that we have efficient and viable operators in the industry. It is no good reducing the size of boats and making all the operations uneconomic, because we ought to be encouraging people to go further out into deeper waters and carry out surveys to see what other fisheries are available.

For a long time we have been aware of the attitude of the Labor Party in relation to uranium mining and its associated processes. After the Labor Party was unsuccessful in preventing the passage of the indenture Bill last year, it was fairly obvious that when that Party came into Government it would probably be involved in a number of courses of action which could or might make life difficult for the operators at Olympic Dam. It has been my considered view for a long time that there are certain people who are hitching on to the coat tails of the Aboriginal people for their own devious ends. Having had the opportunity to examine and see at first hand over a long period how some of these people operate, what is taking place at Olympic Dam and those associated areas clearly indicates to me that these people are using the Aborigines to further their own devious aims. I am appalled that the situation has been allowed to develop to a stage where the future development of this

State is being impeded by this sort of behaviour. I, like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, was a member of that Select Committee, which took evidence at Olympic Dam and at Andamooka.

The Hon. J.W. Slater interjecting:

Mr GUNN: Yes, Olympic Dam, for the benefit of the Minister; Roxby Downs is really known as Olympic Dam. I do not know whether he has been there. It is a most interesting spot. I think he ought to go and have a look.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: I went over to the West Coast waiting for you to turn up.

Mr GUNN: For the benefit of the Minister, I was doing good things. I knew that he was in good hands in Ceduna and could not cause any problems. I knew that the Minister was in good hands, and I had other matters to deal with. He was shown around by very courteous and reliable people in whom I have every confidence.

Mr Mathwin: You knew what he was cooking.

Mr GUNN: Yes, I did, but I did not know what one or two other people were cooking, and I will come to them later. The Minister was very courteous (and I appreciate that), unlike one or two others I could mention, such as the Minister for Environment and Planning. He was most arrogant: I received an arrogant letter from him, to which I will refer later. Obviously the Minister's whiz kids were at their best.

The Hon. H. Allison: Did you tell him what to do with pelicans?

Mr GUNN: Yes, I might. I referred to the problems at Roxby Downs, because I believe that the majority of South Australians want to see that programme proceed. It is amazing that the State Government should sit idly by, without showing a bit of political courage, telling some of the European advisers who are influencing the Aboriginal people to the degree, in my judgment, that is beyond common sense that the nonsense has come to an end. The member for Stuart knows the people to whom I refer. They are hooked to the coat tails of the Kokatha people.

I suggest that, if anyone doubts what I say, he read the transcript of the evidence of the Roxby Downs select committee, because he would see that Mr Tregenza made a number of statements to that committee which were not correct. Questions were answered most adequately by the management of Roxby Downs at Andamooka. I sincerely hope that the Government will show a bit of courage and ensure that the road is completed so that the project can proceed as planned.

Like most South Australians, I heard the Premier use the slogan 'We want South Australia to win' during the last election campaign. That slogan was used all around the State, and the Premier was shown beaming in advertisements which stated, 'We want South Australia to win'. What has South Australia won? In the eight months since this Government has come to office, the price of cigarettes has increased by 18c a packet, spirits and wine by 3c, insurance by 2 per cent, beer by 3c a bottle, and petrol by 1c a litre. One recalls the performance of members opposite during the term of the previous Government: in relation to petrol prices, members opposite asked, 'Why isn't the State Government doing something?'

This Government has had the audacity to increase prices, and now we are to be subjected to a new tax. I want to know how far this new financial transactions tax will go. Will people who pay stamp duty on the transfer of a property have to pay this tax also? Will there be double dipping (to coin a phrase used by the Federal Treasurer) by the State Treasurer, as it would appear? I understand that, when this tax was introduced in New South Wales, a number of other taxes and charges were abolished. Will the Government move in that direction? The Joint Committee on Subordinate

Legislation was given evidence some time ago about the effects in New South Wales and it was stated that a number of taxes were abolished.

We all know that electricity charges have increased and that they will continue to increase. That was not the previous Government's attitude. I want to know when my constituents will receive justice in this regard: for too long they have been penalised for living in country areas. Water and sewerage rates and gas prices have increased, and one remembers the performance of only a few months ago when the previous Minister of Mines and Energy was trying to sort out the mess into which Mr Dunstan had got the State in regard to gas prices. Housing Trust rents have gone up, and we had had to sit in this House and listen for hour after hour to the member for Napier making some of the worst speeches that one would have to sit through.

He would go on, telling us that he would be a better Minister than the Hon. Murray Hill, and telling us what he was going to do, and yet he has presided over an increase in Housing Trust rents. Talk about a double standard by someone who has not kept his word. I suggest to the Minister of Housing and of Local Government that he take the trouble to get his officers to dig out those speeches and underline some of the comments he made, to bring them to his attention. It will show him what a hypocrite he has been.

I refer also to problems in my electorate. Education was one of the subjects that the member for Salisbury (the now Minister of Education) had a great deal to say about during the previous three years. He would stand in this House every week when Parliament was in session and bring in various resolutions telling the House what should be done in the field of education. I now suggest that he should keep his hands off little schools in my electorate. It has been brought to my attention that the Government intends to close a number of small schools in my area. I received today a letter from a constituent in Iron Baron, which states:

Dear Graham, We have had an official letter from the Education Department stating a proposal to close the Iron Baron Rural School at the end of this year. Letters and a petition are being formulated by the School Council and Progress Association, a copy of which will be sent to you as soon as possible. We are writing to you separately to stress a couple of points against this proposal.

The first one being that our school is also a community centre where throughout the day parents and friends drop over for a chat and make aids for the school. Every day there are parents here. It is the only place in Iron Baron that is available for this interaction. We believe that the closure would have a detrimental effect on these people. Money and donations raised by these people and also all people in our community, show in our school as it is very well equipped in all curriculum areas and the School Council consolidated fund has a bank balance of \$7 000 which approximately only \$3 000 is Government.

We love and care for this community school and protest very loudly at even the thought of its closure.

The second point is more of a question: how much Government money is spent in Iron Baron other than on our children's education? It is our belief that it has cost the Government very little to operate this school in comparison to what they receive from royalties and taxes from this town.

We would like you, Graham, to pass on an invitation to any member of Parliament interested, to visit our school and see for themselves the love, time and effort that has been contributed to our school by us for our children and ask them to stop seeing numbers and start seeing people.

We have written this letter to you, Graham, as we know you will do everything in your power to help us as you have in the past.

Looking forward to an Iron Baron Rural School in 1984.

The letter is signed by a large number of people who live in the area. The Chief Secretary would be aware of what a nice little town Iron Baron is and what a pity it would be if that school were closed. There is no justification for that whatsoever.

I have also received a letter from a number of pupils at that school. Members may ask why I am bringing these matters to the attention of the House. I have read through the Speech by the Governor and I will refer to a number of areas in my electorate in which I believe my people are not getting a fair go in isolated communities. The letter states:

Dear Mr Gunn, The Education Department wants to close our school. None of the children here want it to close. Their parents don't want their children to travel on a bus 50 km to and from school.

I hear you have helped people before in this town. Can you please help us to keep our school open? We want to stand up and be counted.

Yours faithfully,

It is signed by D.F. Lockwood (aged 12), J. Blackwell (10), Sarina P. (8), and a number of other students. Having visited that part of my electorate on many occasions, I believe there is no justification for that whatsoever. It is all very well for people to sit in the Education Centre and make decisions, but small isolated communities are entitled to a little consideration from the Government.

I understand that plans exist to close the Parachilna school. I would be interested to know what alternative arrangements the Minister has made for that school. He is already undertaking investigations into the school bus system in this State. Unless he wants to get a tiger by the tail, I suggest he tread carefully before he interferes with the school bus system.

If one wants to cause an upset in a local community, it is only necessary, from my experience, to start altering school bus routes to create the best disturbance that one will see in quite a while. Certainly, I hope that the Minister will look at those matters.

I have also received a letter from the Streaky Bay school council. One matter about which I have been concerned ever since I became a member of Parliament has involved seeking the highest possible standard of education in country schools. This is especially so for parents who cannot afford to send their children to Adelaide for secondary education. For that reason, I wish to ensure that country children are not in any way disadvantaged. For a long time the people of Streaky Bay have sought year 12 studies to be provided at the Streaky Bay Area School. This nice, well appointed school has new buildings and good staff. I received a letter on 26 July from the school council, which states:

Please find enclosed, for your use, the following documents concerning year 12 studies at Streaky Bay Area School:

1. Original submissions for 1984, but to be now considered in context with (a) updated figures in letter to ERO 10 May 1983.
2. Letters to the Minister of Education concerning year 12 studies at Streaky Bay Area School.

I should read some of the comments to the House. The Minister has obviously had the matter brought to his attention, and I hope sincerely that he is in a position to agree to the request because, based on the information brought to my attention and based on my personal observations, the school has the staff and requires only a limited amount of additional equipment in order to provide year 12 classes at Streaky Bay.

I point out to the House that little accommodation is available elsewhere in South Australia, other than in Adelaide, for students who wish to progress to year 12 standard. One of the problems that I encountered over a considerable period involved people coming to Western Ceduna to take advantage of the extra education facilities there, but unfortunately no board was available to students. That story can be repeated throughout South Australia. Obviously, it is most difficult to set up any form of hostel accommodation to meet the requirements of country students.

Indeed, there are only two solutions to the problem. One is, wherever possible, to provide education to year 12 stand-

ard, and the other is to assist parents who must send their children to Adelaide to attend private boarding schools, because these are the only institutions which provide the necessary facilities. It is disappointing to note the attitude of Senator Ryan. Indeed, the recent attack on 40 private schools is, I believe, only the first step, because there are in the Labour Party people who have a strong dislike for the private education system, although the basis for their dislike is beyond me.

I want now to refer to the problems facing my constituents at Coober Pedy in regard not only to water supplies but also to other problems. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House previously, but I raise it again now because these people are badly treated. I have a copy of the letter sent to the Premier on 2 August 1983 from the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association. The letter states:

My Dear Premier, I apologise for the liberty of writing to you on behalf of the Coober Pedy Progress and Miners Association Inc., and the people of Coober Pedy regarding our water supply in this town. The cost of water delivered to our homes is \$50 per thousand gallons, a cost so high that few families can afford the luxury of a bath or daily showers for their children. No family can afford to cultivate a small garden (a few families are managing the luxury of a few trees from the recycled water from bath and laundry tubs).

The E. & W.S. Department is retailing water to the public at a cost of \$35 per thousand gallons with a Government subsidy of more than \$4 per thousand gallons. The last two years a private concern has retailed water as well for \$35 per thousand gallons, and as a result the E. & W.S. Department of Coober Pedy enjoys no more than 25 per cent of the market. Both plants are using a very high salinity water for their reverse osmosis plants.

The water is approximately 19 000 parts per million, and so to prolong the life of their modules in their reverse osmosis plants they are using sulphuric acid, sodium hexametaphosphate, caustic soda and other cleaning chemicals.

We are very concerned with the quality of water provided because the water storage tanks have to be replaced every year. Lately at times we have had to put up with chlorine as well.

We are also faced, Sir, with very high cost of electricity—an average family pays over \$300 per quarter. We have also seen the price of explosives and fuel skyrocket by 200 per cent in the last three years. As a result the mining activity is at a very low ebb.

The C.P.P.M.A. has investigated the possibility of pumping water from the S.R.11 bore with a low salinity of 4 500 parts per million. The bore is situated 24 km north-east of Coober Pedy.

We have investigated the appropriate reverse osmosis plant to produce 200 000 gallons per day of potable water which will have no chemicals; plus, it will be a sterilised product.

We are maintaining at the moment a reticulated system to nearly 250 homes using salt water. It is therefore feasible for the association to reticulate potable water through the town at a minimal cost. We are ready to present to the Government the project for water reticulation for approval. Such a project will provide water under \$20 per thousand to the consumers, and it will also provide employment, plus will be beneficial to the tourist industry.

That briefly outlines the problems that my constituents at Coober Pedy are facing. I sincerely hope that the matters raised in that letter will continue to receive the Minister's attention. I know that the Minister has given this matter his consideration, and has officers working on it. From my experience, those officers have been most helpful. I understand that in the near future a deputation wishes to meet the Minister to discuss this matter further.

I do not know whether the Minister for Environment and Planning has some personal dislike of me, or whether his officers have decided that, for some reason or other, they should treat me somewhat differently or object to the questions which I have asked or the comments which I have made over recent times. My first experience of their lack of consideration occurred when the Minister recently went to Leigh Creek to launch a book dealing with living in a harsh environment. A large number of people received an invitation; the book was handed out and some copies were sold. However, I did not receive an invitation. I thought

that that was rather peculiar. I had a few words to the Minister and I wrote to the Premier about that matter.

Then the Minister brought down regulations restricting the control of native vegetation. I have been in contact with the Minister, and I placed a question on notice in relation to this matter. Obviously, the Minister must have some whizz kids or smart alics in his department who do not have a great deal to occupy their time or, in my view, they would not write insulting remarks to members of Parliament who only make representation on behalf of the people whom they represent.

This matter has caused a great deal of concern in my electorate. People are concerned that the restrictions may involve a blanket prohibition, and they want to know how these regulations will operate. I therefore wrote to the Minister asking him what would happen to people who occasionally knocked down trees or native vegetation in the course of their daily activities. Some of the comments that I received from the Minister in a letter dated 28 July are as follows:

People currently engaged in land clearing operations would need to apply to and receive consent from the South Australian Planning Commission prior to continuing clearance operations unless their activities are covered by one of several exemptions under the controls.

With respect to the illustration you gave regarding people running into trees with vehicles, you appear not have read the old limerick about 'the young lawyer called Rex who was sadly deficient in sex.'

For the life of me, I would not know why that was put in a letter from the Minister for Environment and Planning. The letter continues with a punch line (I do not think I will attempt to quote the Latin, but it states in brackets), 'The law does not concern itself with trifles.' The letter further states:

Where there was no deliberate design to contravene the controls no action would be taken, or if it were, the judge would apply the abovementioned principle.

I accept the latter part of that reply, but the reference to the young lawyer called Rex has nothing to do with the matter whatsoever. I would say that obviously some young smart Alec lawyer in the Minister's department is not adequately employed. I would suggest that it is about time the Minister checked carefully before signing these sorts of documents. The letter goes on to say:

Inspectors will contact all applicants prior to carrying out inspections.

That is good, and I hope that they do so. I want the Minister to raise the matter to which I referred, because I was quite amazed when I received that letter from him. During the term of the previous Government there was considerable discussion about the rights of pastoralists and the public in regard to pastoral leases. In view of the discussions that have taken place recently about the rights of the public to use roads in the Pitjantjatjara area and other areas of the State, I would like to read into *Hansard* the contents of a memorandum I have received, because I want to get some comments on this matter from the Minister. It is as follows:

To the Director, Outback Management:

Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980; Pastoral Act, 1936-1980; Access to State's pastoral lands; land use conflicts; Minute of Director, Outback Management dated 14 February 1983.

I have been provided with copies of six previous Crown Law opinions relating to public access to the State's pastoral lands and requested to provide a consolidated opinion on this issue. The previous opinions to which I have been referred are as follows:

Date

24 May 1973

10 January 1977

6 April 1977

11 May 1977

2 August 1977

13 March 1982.

The rights of the public to traverse, use and enjoy access to the State's outback unoccupied pastoral lands are governed by the Crown Lands Act, 1929-1980 and the common law. At common law the Crown is not in a less advantageous position than other land holders. That is, the public has no general common law right to enter upon Crown land (see *Williams v. Attorney-General for N.S.W.* (1913) 16 CLR 404 per Barton A.C.J. at p. 428). Of course, the Crown may either expressly or by implication authorise members of the public to enter upon Crown lands, and it seems that from the earliest times in South Australia the Crown has at least tacitly consented to members of the public traversing and enjoying limited access to outback unoccupied pastoral lands. In my view, however, the Crown has not thereby created any public rights with respect to this land, and it is free to reassess the extent to which it wishes the public to have access to this land.

If a decision is taken to place greater restrictions upon entry by members of the public onto Crown lands it would be necessary for action to be taken (e.g. by the erection of suitable signs) to advise the public of the restrictions. The Crown Lands Act, creates certain offences in part XVII thereof with respect to the unauthorised occupation or use of, *inter alia*, Crown land. In my opinion it may not be concluded that any use of Crown land not thereby made an offence is by implication rendered lawful.

The position is rather that some forms of unauthorised occupation or use of Crown land were regarded by the Legislature as sufficiently serious to warrant criminal sanctions: the civil remedies available to the Crown for trespass are not thereby interfered with. . . . This position is, in my view, recognised by section 294a of the Crown Lands Act which makes provision with respect to the courts in which civil actions for trespass on Crown land may be brought.

The part which I believe is important, and which I hope will apply to all Aboriginal lands in the future, states:

The rights of the public to traverse, use and enjoy access to the State's outback occupied pastoral lands (i.e. lands subject to pastoral leases under the Pastoral Act) are governed by the Pastoral Act, 1936-1980. By granting a lease for pastoral purposes under that Act the Crown gives the lessee the exclusive right to occupy the land so leased subject to the provisions of the Act and the terms and conditions of the lease. Neither the Act nor the terms and conditions of pastoral leases require lessees of pastoral land to allow members of the public to traverse, use and enjoy access to the leased land generally—although the terms and conditions of the leases do require the lessees 'not to obstruct or interfere with any public roads, paths, or ways, or the use thereof by any person' (see Pastoral Act, first schedule). I therefore advise that, without the consent of the holder of a pastoral lease, members of the public may not lawfully deviate from public roads, paths or ways for camping or other purposes. With the permission of the holder of the lease members of the public may so deviate provided that they only traverse or temporarily camp on the land. A member of the public will require not only the permission of the holder of the pastoral lease, but also the permission of the Minister, to occupy or use land leased under the Pastoral Act other than for the purpose of traversing it or temporarily camping on it (Crown Lands Act, section 272).

In summary the position with respect to the rights of the public to traverse, use and enjoy access to the State's outback pastoral lands is as follows:

- (a) Members of the public have the right to use the recognised public roads, paths and ways; . . .

That opinion has shed some light on a matter that has caused a number of people concern for a long time. I believe that those provisions, with one or two modifications, should apply to those areas where there has been some concern in recent times and where the public currently has to seek a special permit for access and has no right of appeal against refusal.

I understand that the House is going to be sitting for a considerable time during this session. It will be interesting to see the sort of legislation that this Government introduces. I sincerely hope that this Government will not make the same mistakes that the Dunstan Government made during its time in office and does not run down the economy. However, it has not got off to a very good start.

It is interesting to see the present Chief Secretary diligently going about his job, because if ever there was a person who has received justice over the past few months it is the Chief Secretary. If ever there was a person who stood in this House and heaped boxthorn bouquets on the member for Victoria when he was Chief Secretary it is the present Chief

Secretary. I do not think that, in his wildest imagination, he ever dreamed that he was going to get saddled with his present problems. I sincerely hope that, on reflection, he realises that the scurrilous comments he made about the competence or otherwise of the member for Victoria when he was Chief Secretary, and the reflections that he and his colleague the member for Elizabeth made about the system and about certain people, leave him in a position where he owes that member an apology.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Particularly when one considers his performance.

Mr GUNN: Yes. He has had two fires and escapes. One could go through the press and read out a list of happenings longer than the bench here, yet the present Chief Secretary has only been in office for eight months. One wonders what the next disaster will be in this area under the Chief Secretary's administration.

The chief administrative officer lasted only a month. I do not know what the real problem was, but it appears that all is not well. There have been strikes and threats of more action if certain demands are not met.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Now he is talking about rebuilding Yatala.

Mr GUNN: That is a proposal. I do not know how long it will take before we see concrete actually being poured at the prison. In dealing with this difficult problem I sincerely hope that the Minister looks for a long-term solution. I think we are all concerned about what is happening within our prison system. I know that it is not an easy area to administer and that there are large problems when many people are confined together. I understand that conditions at Yatala are far from perfect. There are always problems when people are locked up in inhumane conditions. I believe it is necessary to spend a considerable amount of money in this area, and I know that money is not easy to obtain at the moment.

If we are to rectify this problem, it must be given proper consideration and we must ensure that people are not trying to obtain short-term popularity when making decisions. We should ensure that correct decisions are taken to rectify these problems in the future; otherwise, we are simply kidding ourselves and the problems will not go away. I do not profess to be an expert in relation to prisons, but looking at the situation from where I sit I believe that the public is concerned and it is entitled to see some firm action in this area. I also believe that the public is entitled to receive some protection.

I am concerned about the current situation where a large number of people have been brought before the courts and in my judgment have not been dealt with properly. One of my constituents from Coober Pedy was shot; the accused person was given a pat on the head and was told that he was a naughty boy and that he should not come back before the court. I believe that is a disgrace for the legal system in this State.

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Didn't we appeal?

Mr GUNN: Yes, I approached the Attorney-General, but the appeal was turned down. People from that area are at a loss to understand that decision. Decisions of that nature have an effect on law-enforcement bodies in this State, particularly in a place like Coober Pedy. I am at a loss to understand that decision. I look forward to this session. I am not sure how many Address in Reply debates I have participated in. Many members would say that it is not a worthwhile debate, but I believe it provides members of the House with the opportunity to bring forward matters of concern to them and their districts.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What about fisheries?

Mr GUNN: Yes, I have spoken about fisheries. This has been a quiet speech and I have brought to the attention of

the House matters that have been of concern to me for a long time. I will close on the same note with which I commenced my speech. I sincerely hope that people who live in isolated communities such as those in my district receive a fair go in the future. I hope that they will receive electricity at a reasonable cost, that their water system is improved, and that they receive decent and improved roads. I refer to several roads, and I am sure that my colleague, the member for Light, would be aware of them. I refer to the Burra to Morgan road in the southern part of my district, the road between Ororoo and Hawker, the completion of the road between Quorn and Wilmington, the completion of the Stuart Highway, and roads on Eyre Peninsula where people have been promised the completion of a number of roads for some time. The road construction programme has been very slow. I cannot blame the Highways Department for that, because there is only a limited amount of money. However, it is amazing that funds can be found for other projects.

The Government can find large amounts of money to subsidise the State Transport Authority. It can find the money to build the O'Bahn scheme, to which I do not object, but it always amazes me that the further one gets from Adelaide it becomes more difficult to provide the funds to build these sorts of projects. I understand that today or yesterday the Premier announced that the Government will spend more than \$3 000 000 to build an arts centre at Whyalla called the Eyre Peninsula Arts Centre. That is not the correct name; it is Whyalla. How many people from Ceduna or these other parts will go there? Very few! I believe that, if one conducted a poll on Eyre Peninsula of those people outside Whyalla, a majority would rather see the money being spent on improving the road system or a number of other projects. I do not wish it to be said that I am opposed to the people of Whyalla or anywhere else in South Australia having access to reasonable arts facilities. I am 100 per cent in favour. However, I believe that one ought to look at priorities. I believe that, if people go around and ask the local government bodies on Eyre Peninsula, they would make the comments that I have just echoed here. I support the motion and look forward to the session.

Mr TRAINER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): I was delighted to hear and see a news release dated 19 July 1983 stating that plans were unveiled for a \$4 200 000 State aquatic centre. The State Government and the Adelaide City Council are looking at plans for the proposed \$4 200 000 world standard swimming centre to be built in the North Adelaide parklands but I wish to turn my attention to another swimming centre, a swimming centre in the electorate of Henley Beach.

The Henley Beach swimming pool has a long and cherished history. This year the pool will be 50 years old and it is only one of two filtered salt-water pools in Australia, one being in South Australia and the other in Queensland. The Queensland pool was actually modelled on the Henley Beach pool. Unfortunately, 50 years have taken their toll, and the pool is in a sad state of disrepair. An article in *The Advertiser* of 21 March 1983 stated:

The manager, Mr. P.G. Guster, said it was possible the pool could be washed away as the seaward side had been badly cracked in recent winters.

Adelaide's only foreshore pool is 50 years old and believed to be one of only two foreshore filtered salt-water pools in Australia.

Mr Guster said he did not believe there was any danger to pool users.

The Henley and Grange town clerk, Mr R.W.S. Donne, said advice had confirmed the possibility of destruction by storm.

The council had recently formed a technical sub-committee to consider upgrading the pool.

"It would be no good spending money on it if it's going to be washed away next winter," he said.

Costs of repairing or replacing it could be prohibitive.

The council in its wisdom decided to have consultants look at this matter. The consultants have brought down a report which has suggested that, unless Government or private sector funding becomes available, the council will be forced to close the Henley and Grange community olympic pool in 1983 in its 50th year of operation. The pool is unique in South Australia and it is one of the few public pools in the western region. It is operated by a board of management which recently commissioned B.C. Tonkin and Associates to undertake and investigate this matter. Arising out of the investigation by the consultants there were five possibilities.

The options are first, the closure of the pool; secondly, essential maintenance; thirdly, minor upgrading and renovation; fourthly, major upgrading and redevelopment; and, fifthly, construction of a new pool. Option 1 is likely to be unacceptable to the community and, even if the pool is closed, the cost of demolition is estimated to be \$100 000. Option 2 provides for an immediate band-aid treatment of the timber superstructure and duckboards, and this work would have to be carried out prior to the commencement of the 1983-84 season. The estimated cost for this patch-up is \$175 000.

Option 3 involves minor upgrading and renovation of the pool. One of the problems with this option is that the pool, plant, buildings, superstructure, and surrounds are all in comparable condition, so it would be difficult to substantially upgrade the visual amenity of the pool without carrying out a complete upgrading. The estimated cost of this proposal is between \$264 000 and \$350 000.

Option 4 would require Government or private sector funds. The council has received a redevelopment proposal from Sydney architects, who suggest that a \$1 200 000 investment is necessary to transform the pool. This, with the other associated costs, would involve \$1 700 000. Option 5 is the construction of a new pool, and, as with option 3, substantial Government or private sector funds would be required and the economic viability of such a proposal would be questioned. The estimated cost would be \$500 000 to \$1 500 000.

The Henley and Grange council, with which I have worked very closely since I was elected to this Parliament, and for which I have a great deal of respect in regard to the way in which it works and looks after its area of local government, has recently decided to offer to the Henley and Grange Swimming Club a 10-year lease and a grant of \$33 500. Members can see that the task of the swimming club is a large one indeed, because the minimum repair figure would be about \$250 000. Both the council and the club have approached me for assistance, and I have been in contact with the Minister of Recreation and Sport, who is examining the proposal at present. The problem is that the large sum involved would probably not be available from State Government resources.

Naturally, in a situation such as this, I turned to the local Federal member, Mr Scott, who has contacted his Federal colleagues. Following submissions from me and a deputation from the Henley and Grange council, Mr Scott wrote to the Hon. Tom Uren, M.H.R., the Minister for Territories and Local Government, seeking his assistance. A reply was received by him from another Minister into whose administration this matter falls. It states:

Dear Mr Scott, I refer to your letter of 21 March 1983 to the Hon. Tom Uren, M.P., Minister for Territories and Local Government, in which you wrote in support of a proposal for a job creation project at the Henley Beach open air swimming pool. Your letter has been referred to me for reply. I apologise for the delay in writing.

I have been advised that the Henley and Grange City Council, which is sponsoring the project, has made application for projects under the existing wage pause programme but has not applied for a grant in respect of the Henley pool. Applications for grants under this programme are still being considered. The council should write to Mr W. Bean, Executive Officer, Job Creation Unit, Department of Labour, G.P.O. Box 465, Adelaide, S.A., 5001 (telephone: 212 73433).

You refer in your letter to the Government's new job creation program. This program, the community employment programme, formally began on 1 July 1983 and will subsume the existing wage pause programme. I wrote to you about the new programme on 26 May 1983.

Staff of my department will be available to give assistance where necessary to potential sponsors in developing community employment programme projects. It is also the intention that the views of Federal M.P.s will be sought on projects that are proposed in their electorates. I have passed a copy of the papers which were attached to your letter to the Regional Director of my department in South Australia and asked him to arrange for council to receive some advice on how they may go about applying for a community employment programme grant. Thank you for your interest and support of a potential job creation project in your electorate.

Yours sincerely
Ralph Willis

The situation is that either the Henley and Grange council or the Henley and Grange Swimming Club can take advantage of the offer. The money is available and is ready, provided that they can produce all the necessary requirements available through job creation programmes. I do not wish to interfere with local government except to say to people in my electorate that the matter is now in the hands of both bodies. The money is available and it is a case for either body to make up its mind to apply for that money for the pool.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light): In the brief period of time available I want to give both a bouquet and a brickbat in relation to certain aspects of the Department of Transport. The bouquet is most certainly to go to the Minister's office and to his secretary. The brickbat is to go to the bureaucracy associated with changed aspects of the delivery of portable homes. It is a problem to which many members have addressed themselves over a period of time. Indeed, I have no doubt that the members for Stuart and Eyre, as well as others representing northern regions, following the recent sale of homes at Leigh Creek and Woomera, would have been concerned by the irresponsible attitude of some of the transporters who moved through, knocking over sign posts and guide posts along the road, incurring a great deal of cost to the South Australian public, and creating danger to the travelling public.

However, there are in this State a number of organisations which have developed a home package which has played a very significant role in providing housing for the populace of South Australia, not only for those that are purchased and placed on site in holiday areas as holiday weekenders, shacks, and so on, but also, in more recent times, there has been a great increase in the number of homes which have been used for full-time occupation. I congratulate the artisans, in the building area, who have given so much attention to this form of housing and who have played a significant role in giving a large number of people a most economic parcel and a home which they can call their own and in which they can bring up a family.

However, the recent actions of a certain bureaucratic group within the organisation sought to destroy overnight the arrangements which had existed for some time for the building industry to transport new homes to the site of

purchase or to the site upon which they would be deposited to complete the contract for purchase. Members will realise that the time from the date of application or signing for construction to the date of delivery is in the order of eight to ten weeks. Most certainly in the package deal into which people enter at the beginning of that period of time, a delivery and collection charge exists in regard to water, electricity, sewerage and whatever other facilities might be required.

Overnight, quite recently, one group in the road traffic area decided that it would forthwith, without any discussion with the industry, alter the arrangements that had existed for many years for the delivery of these packages. It is recognised that some of these packages are wide and that, in the passage along major highways, they do cause some disruption to traffic.

However, as part of the deal, it has become a feature that the delivering vehicle will be preceded by an appropriately marked and lit vehicle and that one or two, whatever the case may be, motor cycle policemen will escort the vehicle. All of this is provided at a cost, but that cost is recognised and can be obtained from the Police Department or from the contractor who undertakes to pick up the home and deliver it: the cost is written into the total cost structure.

To deliver to Murray Bridge, which is the issue that I raise now (although there have been a number of others), most recently this small group of people decided to send the delivery on a circuitous route that was to more than double the distance that the home would have to travel, to the extent that there would be an overnight stop at a hotel involving the driver of the prime mover, the escorting vehicle and for the motor cycle policemen somewhere between Adelaide and Murray Bridge.

The package deal price for the delivery of the house would increase between \$500 and \$650. There was no provision in the organisation's contract for any increase in the delivery cost: there was no way that a charge could be made by any one of the organisations—either by the builder or the deliverer to the purchaser. When that fact was pointed out there was a shrug of the shoulder and the comment, 'How much extra is it going to be—only \$500 or \$650? The owner can pay it.'

It is all very well for one to say that the owner will meet the costs, but the owner is going into a brand new house and, if that person is anything like the young people with whom I deal, some having been my own children and others being constituents (every member would have confronted the same sort of situation with young people moving into their first house), he or she is mortgaged up to the hilt, with every penny being accounted for in regard not only to the house being purchased but also to the drapes, carpets, garden, landscaping and other commitments. To suddenly impose an additional \$500 to \$650 is quite unreasonable.

The really critical aspect to which I refer is that there had been prior warning that in three or four months there would be a change to the method of delivery and that, in fact, it might be necessary for a change in the dimensions of the homes so that they fell within a tighter limit if they were to be transported on main routes.

Having forewarned that action would be taken in three or four months further down the line, for a Government department suddenly to decide to institute such a change overnight and apply the appropriate penalty is quite unconscionable in my view.

Further, one organisation which manufactured the building about which I spoke in relation to Murray Bridge (and the Murray Bridge council was completely satisfied that it fitted in with its building requirements and was prepared to accept the home) has over \$1 000 000 worth of homes for delivery until the end of October. The action that was being taken

would put into jeopardy the activities of the company because, if one multiplies the number of homes at about \$25 000 to \$28 000 each which are incorporated in more than \$1 000 000 of housing, one sees that there is quite a sizeable number. Some of them are far more distant than Murray Bridge and, therefore, the additional cost was to be quite a deal greater than \$500 to \$650. There was to be a major problem with costing which could not be allocated, and there was a question mark over the future jobs of a number of people in the manufacturing sector.

Common sense prevailed with the assistance of the Minister's Secretary, and I believe that the Minister is fully aware of it. I appreciate the very positive action that was taken. I do not appreciate that the directions given from the Minister's office were semi countermanded at the point that they were delivered.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: By whom?

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: By the department involved. However, very fortunately by follow through, the correct decision was reached and maintained almost immediately. That is where I give the bouquet.

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

Mr TRAINER (Ascot Park): I would like to make a few remarks about the most recent episode of *60 Minutes* put to air last Sunday (August 7). Sunday night being one of the few occasions that members can be assured of being home and hence able to watch television. I watched this programme and have done so fairly regularly over recent months. I have had a few qualms about some of its coverage, however, and I was particularly distressed by one story about a South Australian bus company that occurred a few weeks ago, about which I had some knowledge. After that case Sunday night, I have now lost all faith in the programme.

There is a role in the community for investigative journalism, and I have always been a supporter of investigative journalism because, not being wildly enthusiastic about the *status quo*, I am in favour of journalists probing into matters that often urgently need exposure to the public gaze.

But, in recent months, the investigative journalism of *60 Minutes* has deteriorated into pure sensationalism, a video equivalent of the gutter press. It now apparently has the journalistic ethics of what used to be called the yellow press.

More and more often, *60 Minutes* seems to be less interested in presenting a clear, thorough and professional exposition of the facts of a situation than it is in merely providing an entertaining show, a show having callous disregard for the facts, a show having callous disregard for anyone whose reputation is affected, and a show having callous disregard for anyone who gets hurt in the process of *60 Minutes* putting that sensationalised programme to air. The sole priority of the producers seems to be to achieve high ratings by callous sensationalism in order to maximise the advertising revenue. Thereby, the programme has brought investigative journalism into disrepute in its endeavours merely to produce a sensational and titillating show to draw an audience for the commercials associated with it. The episode last Sunday is a prime example of the journalist's old remark about 'not letting the facts stand in the way of a good story'.

I would like to deal with four matters in relation to the segment which appeared last Sunday entitled 'Have You Seen My Child?', a segment that was tantamount to a scurrilous attack on the professional social workers in the Department for Community Welfare—professional social workers who cannot defend themselves because they give more importance to their professional ethics as social workers than the people involved in *60 Minutes* apparently give to their professional ethics as journalists.

The four matters that I intend to raise, if time permits, although not necessarily in this order, are these: first, I refer to the distorted coverage given to the issue of runaway children in the segment itself. Secondly, I refer to the potential damage done to the Department for Community Welfare by the unfair programme, which gave so much coverage to activities which resemble those orchestrated by the loonies of the Festival of Light. I regret that those activities were also given coverage by the *News* and the *Sunday Mail*, although the *Advertiser* apparently took a more responsible attitude to this issue.

Thirdly, I refer to the damage done in South Australia on a previous occasion when *60 Minutes* applied its same sloppy research and sensationalised coverage to the bus charter company, Quest Tours, apparently not caring how much it hurt the new owners of the company who had rectified all the problems they had inherited on the purchase of it. Fourthly, I would like to deal with some of the contradictions inherent in the 'phoney crusade' conducted by *60 Minutes* in last Sunday's programme.

I point out that at one stage they were prepared to use bugging to gain what they had hoped to be juicy details for their exposé, yet only a week before the same programme had been indignant about such practices when it dealt with bugging. It was quite scathing in its approach to Dick Smith Electronics for having radio monitors on sale that could scan the air waves and listen in to private car telephone calls. Furthermore, on the previous weekend the programme had again covered the story of little Craig Dobson (I think that was the child's name), a 2-year-old who was bashed to death by his stepfather. The programme had been most scathing in its attacks on the Victorian Community Welfare Department and the Victorian hospitals regarding this little boy. It claimed that the department had not taken sufficient steps to protect him from a dangerous parental environment.

That story was covered twice: the first time a month or so ago, and again on 31 July when the programme dealt with what it believed to be a model child protection system in Denver, Colorado, in America, a system that it claimed would have saved the little Dobson boy had it been applied in Victoria. It is strange that *60 Minutes* needed to go to Denver to find such a child protection system as a model because it is excelled by the system that is used here in South Australia by the Department for Community Welfare. It is a system that has all the features that the *60 Minutes* programme advocated was wanted.

A 24-hour crisis care system exists here which provides immediate radio call-out to urgent cases. Child protection panels exist with a wider range of professionals than those in the model cited in Denver on the *60 Minutes* programme. There is compulsory notification of suspected child abuse. There was no reason for them to go to Denver, except to justify a junket on the part of a journalist. (Quite honestly, I cannot recall whether it was an American journalist hired for the occasion or whether it was one of the Australian programme's media stars who went there.) Nevertheless, *60 Minutes* was unaware that there was an even better model on their doorstep here in South Australia in the department on which they were at the time preparing their attack. That surely must be indicative of either exceptionally sloppy research or deliberate distortion. It is certainly contradictory to accuse the Victorian Department for Community Welfare of being wholly responsible for the death of the little Dobson child through not making the necessary infringements on the privacy of his family or on the rights of his parents, and then to run the sort of sensational rubbish that we saw last Sunday which more or less implied that the Department for Community Welfare is deliberately stealing children away from their parents.

Let us consider some of the matters raised in Sunday's programme, many of which were given quite a hammering by *Nationwide* last night in response. The *Nationwide* programme gave some attention to the other side of the story, as far as it could. The confidentiality of case notes naturally makes it impossible for the real story to be told as to the background of the unfortunate family situations involved. In this respect, social welfare workers are unable to answer back to defend themselves without breaching confidentiality and causing even more emotional damage to already disturbed children. However, at least *Nationwide* gave the social workers some chance to put some of the other side of the case as a balance.

Pru Goward's interview with Gerald Stone had him squirming as he tried to justify the lapses in journalist ethics that had occurred on *60 Minutes*. Consider the promotional piece that was put out by *60 Minutes* a few days before the programme went to air, the summary that goes to the newspapers in order to promote the programme. The one to which I refer is headed, 'Story One: *Have you seen my child?*' and is as follows:

When an angry teenager runs away from home you would think the job of family welfare officials would be to help the worried parents find their boy or girl and work out a reconciliation. Just the opposite, in the disturbing cases raised in this story. Parents in South Australia blame community welfare for making it too easy for kids to leave home after an argument and hide out so there's no chance of trying to persuade them back. They claim the department is so caught up in the trendy issue of 'Children's Rights' that the child can make up the wildest story about mistreatment at home and get immediate assistance to stay somewhere where their Mum and Dad can't find them.

Then comes the key point, as follows:

To test that claim, we sent a young actress to make up a story and see how quickly she could get assigned to an emergency hostel or foster home. Her story is based on one of the actual case histories.

That teaser did not mention that the activity in question involved bugging, despite what was said by *60 Minutes* during the programme shown on the previous weekend. The actress was fitted with a hidden microphone so that everything could be taped for the programme. Last night Stone had difficulty with Pru Goward in trying to justify bugging being necessary for research to show whether or not the

Department for Community Welfare had done what the parents on the programme had claimed.

As it turned out, it did not produce the results that I presume *60 Minutes* and the Festival of Light had hoped for. The recording revealed a typical genuine and compassionate response from a welfare officer who immediately contacted the fictitious parent, who happened to be the producer of that segment of the programme, a Mr Peter Wilkinson. He refused to come in until the next day so that the welfare agency was obliged to provide emergency foster care for the so-called child, the actress, particularly when she said that she had been on the street for five days.

That segment was dropped from the final part of the programme when it went to air, not because of any legal fears (because, after all, Mr Stone told us there were no legal complications with bugging the welfare agency) but rather because *60 Minutes* had decided not to let the facts stand in the way of a good story.

There is a lot more I would like to say about this matter on another occasion, and I may make a few remarks about it during the course of my Address in Reply Speech when I shall be able to go into some aspects of this matter in a little more detail. I will be able to mention, for example, some of the difficulties that were encountered by Quest Tours when that organisation was hurt by *60 Minutes*. Now it is the Department for Community Welfare that has been hurt by the cavalier approach to the truth taken on this occasion, and I call on Gerald Stone to apologise for his programme's lapse in journalistic ethics. The way this all occurred brings to mind a quotation from Kipling, once used by Stanley Baldwin when he referred to the press as having power without responsibility—the prerogative of the harlot throughout the ages'. In this case *60 Minutes* has been grossly irresponsible, and until a statement of apology re-establishes the programme's credibility I will have little faith in the veracity of anything on that programme. I suspect that my attitude will be shared by all fair-minded South Australians.

Motion carried.

At 10.22 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 10 August at 2 p.m.