

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 23 August 1983

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

PETITION: MARIHUANA

A petition signed by 121 residents of South Australia praying that the House reject any legislation that will legalise or decriminalise the use of marihuana was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister of Labour (Hon. J.D. Wright)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Industrial Court—Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, 1972—Workers Compensation Rules—Consent (Amendment)

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on—

- i. Proposed Development in the District Council of Berri.
- ii. Proposed Development in the Town of Loxton.
- iii. Proposal to Acquire Land for Road Purposes, Hundred of Comaam.
- iv. Proposal to Acquire Land for Road Purposes, Keith-Mount Gambier Road.
- v. Proposal to Construct a Cell Complex at Bordertown Police Station.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

Crown Lands Act, 1929-1983—

- i. Surrenders Declined Return,—1982-83.
- ii. Closer Settlement—Return, 1982-83.
- iii. Remissions Granted—Return, 1982-83.
- iv. Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1934-1940—Disposal of Surplus Land—Return, 1982-83.
- v. Pastoral Act, 1936-1980—Pastoral Improvements—Return, 1982-83.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Road Traffic Act, 1961—Regulations—Clearways.

By the Hon. R.K. Abbott, for the Minister of Education (Hon. Lynn Arnold)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Fees Regulation Act, 1927 and Stock Medicines Act, 1939-1978—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Water Resources (Hon. J.W. Slater)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Sewerage Act, 1929-1981—Regulations—Fees.
- ii. Waterworks Act, 1932-1981—Regulations—Fees.

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. T.H. Hemmings)—

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Dog Control Act, 1979-1981—Regulations—District Council of Wakefield Plains District.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PRISONS

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

Leave granted.

The **Hon. G.F. KENEALLY**: I am pleased to be able to report to this House that Cabinet yesterday approved a start

on planning a new medium security prison in South Australia. This major decision is directly in line with the policy of the Australian Labor Party made public before the last election. It is yet another indication of the resolve of this Government to reform the physical structures of our antiquated correctional institutions.

Only last week I announced the start of a new minimum security institution next to the Women's Rehabilitation Centre. We are, of course, already committed to a new remand centre where there had been unacceptable delays caused by the previous Administration's decision not to go ahead with the site previously selected at Regency Park, even though the Chief Secretary in November 1979 agreed on the Regency Park proposal.

Yesterday, Cabinet addressed the problem of relocation of medium security prisoners from Yatala and Adelaide gaols. There is a clear lack of suitable and secure accommodation for such inmates. We are approaching this matter responsibly and not making announcements about costs or firm completion dates before all the relevant planning has been done, and we are able to establish such details. What we have done is to authorise a start to planning for accommodation of up to 160 inmates. We will be looking into that type of accommodation and its most effective layout. We have also embarked on a programme of consultation with the community on a site.

I have made an early statement to the effect that I would welcome inquiries from local government authorities within, say, 100 kilometres of Adelaide. The experience of some regional centres in Australia is that having a small secure prison can be quite an economic asset. The people in Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier and in the settlements near Cadell have long since come to terms with institutions there. There are some clear economic advantages to be gained as prisoners have to be fed and prisons maintained and serviced, with consequent generation of employment and activity. Obviously the Government would prefer to site any new institution where local inhabitants are agreeable.

I stand ready to hold talks on this matter with any country town within reasonably convenient distance from the metropolitan centre where, by and large, family and friends of inmates and families of staff members are most likely to be located. We are not going to be rushed into making premature decisions on this institution by people demanding we give instant answers to all matters as yet unresolved. We are going to have to slot this project in carefully with construction of the urgently needed remand centre, with Treasury considerations very much in mind. However, we do concede that the medium security prison is also urgent. Funds have been set aside this financial year for initial investigations. As with our new minimum security institution, I would call for a declaration of support from all members of this House, in recognition of the serious need which was quite apparent before the serious fires at Yatala.

QUESTION TIME

STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr OLSEN: In his discussions last Thursday with the Prime Minister and Senator Button (Commonwealth Minister for Commerce and Industry), did the Premier propose any measures that the State Government will take to help implement the Commonwealth Government's five-year plan for the steel industry? When he announced the Commonwealth's plan to assist the steel industry on 11 August, Senator Button referred to the impact of State taxes and charges on the viability of Broken Hill Proprietary Company

Limited's operations at Newcastle, Wollongong and Whyalla. Senator Button said that both the New South Wales and South Australian Governments needed to do more to limit the impact of their taxes and charges on B.H.P. The *Financial Review* on 12 August reported that Senator Button was still involved in talks with State Governments to extract agreements on State charges. The supply of energy, in particular, has a major impact on B.H.P.'s costs. Other State taxes and charges which have a significant impact on the company include pay-roll and fuel taxes and water rates. I therefore ask the Premier whether, in view of Senator Button's statements, these matters were raised during their discussions last week and, if they were, whether the Premier has put forward any proposals for limiting the impact of these taxes and charges on B.H.P.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is a matter that Senator Button and I discussed, but not in any great depth. The Senator has agreed to come to South Australia. In fact, he will be going to Whyalla, we hope, in the first week of September where he will be discussing the steel plan, particularly as it would impact on Whyalla, with the company, with unions, with Government representatives, and with those involved in the community but, the details of the plan have not yet been finalised. The response to it has not been finalised as yet. The target date for it to come into operation is 1 January 1984.

In regard to what assistance the State could provide in terms of special relief for B.H.P., we are certainly prepared to look at it, but I point out, as the Leader would know, that B.H.P. already enjoys some concessions. In fact, its whole operation is established as a result of an indenture of this Parliament, with certain provisions. There have been certain modifications by agreement over time in respect of certain of those charges since then. I think I should make quite clear that, for instance, power and water supply to the Whyalla area is very expensive. Unlike Newcastle and Wollongong we have to pipe water from the Murray River over a vast distance.

Mr Olsen: Something is being done about that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is true; by agreement, B.H.P. has been paying more than the indenture provides. The indenture rate, of course, is quite ridiculous in terms of current-day costs. Some negotiations have been going on between the Government and B.H.P. over the actual cost of water, but it is a very costly commodity to put into Whyalla. Remember that we are also committed to the filtration scheme for the northern towns, a very big capital outlay to improve the purity and health properties of the water supply in those towns.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: That difficulty applies to country towns.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That creates some difficulty, as the Deputy Leader interjects. We lose money; that is, we subsidise country water supply to a very large extent. On pay-roll tax, again a significant item, but I remind the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do have a feeling that when I am attempting to give a serious and considered reply there is no great interest in the Opposition. For whatever reason they are not concerned to understand what I believe is very important to Whyalla and the State. The substance of the question is what assistance can South Australia provide to B.H.P.? The answer to that is, first, we have got to consider the extent of assistance already given, secondly, our capacity to give it and, thirdly, whether it is justifiable to give it in these circumstances. All of those are important matters for us as a community to determine.

I have been outlining under a number of headings what the preliminary position is, and in response to my doing that, attempting to answer the question, I just get ludicrous interjections. It just shows how foolishly the Opposition regards these matters of State. However, I will not be deterred; I will continue to assume that it was a serious question and answer it accordingly.

I move now to pay-roll tax. In New South Wales, for a couple of years now there has been a levy on pay-roll tax which is quite substantial. We have not applied that in South Australia and there are, of course, distinct advantages for B.H.P. in relation to that matter. So, the whole question is very complex and is one that will be the subject of discussion and negotiation. The Government in this matter will be acting on behalf of the total community, bearing in mind the value of the B.H.P. steel operation and what is possible within our financial resources and desirable in terms of public policy to ensure that this steel plan works.

HUTT AND BROUGHTON RIVERS DAM

Mr GREGORY: Can the Minister of Water Resources investigate the feasibility of a dam being built to store waters of the Hutt and Broughton rivers? A constituent of Florey who has friends in this area has discussed with those people and has had raised with her the feasibility, raised some time ago by a resident of the area, of building a dam which would create a huge area of stored water.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am pleased that the honourable member has asked that question. He has sought information on the matter previously. It is a matter to which consideration has been given over some period of time. The construction of a dam in the Spalding area, to the north of Clare, to store waters of the Broughton River has been under consideration for some time and the matter has been investigated on a number of occasions by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. Various proposals concerning storage of water in that area have been put forward. A recent proposal which was considered by the Engineering and Water Supply Department was submitted in 1981 by an engineer from the Clare district, Mr Springbett. That proposal was fully considered by the department, but it was concluded that the dam would transport silt down the river system, making the water too saline for use in the northern regions water supply system.

It was also considered that the proposed storage would be too large when compared with the expected yield from the small catchment area. The Bundaleer Reservoir, which was constructed in 1899 and which has a capacity of 6 370 megalitres, overcomes two of the disadvantages associated with the suggested dam: first, a flush of silty water is allowed to pass over the weir, thus reducing the silting of the reservoir; secondly, saline flows during the winter and summer months are not collected but are permitted to flow down the Broughton River. Use of this system means that only the better quality water is captured and stored.

I also point out for the benefit of members of the House that the Bundaleer Reservoir currently exploits effectively 80 per cent of the proposed catchment area of the dam that was proposed. Storage figures for Bundaleer showed that that small reservoir was often less than half full for long periods of time. I am prepared to ask the department to investigate the proposal further, but it would appear that it has been demonstrated clearly that it would be cheaper to augment supplies for the Iron Triangle region by increasing pumping from the Murray River, at least until the turn of the century.

SANTOS LIMITED

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Premier had any discussions with Santos Limited about relocation of some of its senior staff to Sydney, and, if so, what is the result of the discussion? If not, will the Premier investigate the matter? I have been informed that Santos intends to relocate some of its senior executives from Adelaide to Sydney. It has also been put to me that this may be associated with the recent ownership changes in the company. Last month Ansett Transport Industries sold its 14.86 per cent share in the company to Bridge Oil.

I understand that the South Australian Government has investigated this change of ownership. That was indicated earlier in the context of the Santos (Regulation of Shareholdings) Act, which limits to 15 per cent individual shareholdings in the company. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether this investigation has been completed, and, if so, whether it revealed any breach of the Act and related to any decision by Santos to relocate some of its operation in Sydney.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier, there is one matter that I should raise concerning the tendency that has begun to appear in the House (which was perhaps highlighted by the last question that was asked) of incorporating two questions into one. A multiplicity of questions is out of order: in particular, to begin with one emphasis and end with another is out of order. Since I did not call the honourable member to order, I call on the honourable Premier.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I think I made it clear in the explanation. I know the two matters to which you refer, Mr Speaker. Quite clearly, I am talking about the relocation of the Santos operation to Sydney and I am suggesting that it may be linked with the other matter I raised, which was the shareholding in Santos. Clearly, I linked them together in the question as the reason for one may be contingent upon the other.

The SPEAKER: The point I make is not that I am criticising the explanation, because I can understand how the explanation would link back to the question, but it would seem to me (and I will check the *Hansard*) that in effect what the honourable member did was to pose two questions. I will certainly check that.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I will answer the Deputy Leader's first question and not the question he asked at the end of his explanation, although the two are linked. Yes, I am aware, as is my colleague, the Minister of Mines and Energy, of some of the future corporate planning of Santos. It has been brought about by Santos' expansion, particularly in relation to its Queensland operation and some of its financial operations, rather than any change of ownership. The company has advised us that it will be opening an office in Sydney. It will not be a major establishment, and there is no question of a change in the headquarters operations. It involves one or two of the functions currently conducted from Adelaide, particularly in regard to the Queensland operations. Naturally, if such a move involved any kind of transfer of resources out of South Australia, or lack of commitment to this State, the Government would take a very serious view of that indeed. The company has been at pains to ensure us that that is not the case. It is simply the natural expansion of what is probably one of the most successful resource companies in Australia. It is a real tribute to South Australia that not only do we have the resource and an active Government involvement but we have the head office of a company which at the moment is looming so large in general corporate circles in Australia, and there is no intention of that changing.

WATER RESOURCES

Mr KLUNDER: Given a recent newspaper report which states that there are comparatively high salt levels in South Australian water supplies, and that medical knowledge indicates that high salt content may have a detrimental effect on health, can the Minister of Water Resources indicate whether any action is being taken to reduce the salt level in our water supply?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am aware that an article appeared in the press in the past few days relating to the high salinity content of South Australian water supplies compared to those of other States. The article was based on the conclusions of a working party which submitted its report to the National Health and Medical Research Council. I would not dispute that there is a high salinity content in South Australia's water supplies in comparison with those of other States. That article accurately quoted the figures, although in relation to the Tod River salinity level, the water from Tod River is not normally used for drinking purposes. Perhaps undue emphasis was placed on the significance of the source of sodium. However, from a health point of view, the significance is placed, although it can be disputed, on the effect of salt intake in relation to high blood pressure, and, of course, the correlation between high blood pressure and the problem of hypertension. That is in dispute. I do not profess to be an expert in medical matters, and perhaps I should refer that part of the question to my colleague the Minister of Health.

However, it is also important to remember that it is not only salt intake in regard to water supplies which is important but also salt intake in relation to food. One should compare sodium intake in relation to water supplies and in relation to some of our processed foods. Indeed, the matter of processing water supplies is a difficult process. It is very difficult and expensive to take salt out of water. Although the proposal may appear inexpensive, our source of supplies is such that, unfortunately, we have to provide that opportunity to people. Although we do not really relish it, we have probably no option in regard to South Australian water supplies.

I think that it is important to note that, although the report is directed primarily to reducing salt intake through food, water is the only commodity in which specific levels are recommended, despite the fact that at most sodium contributes only a small proportion of the total intake. In addition, although in theory the control of water quality supplies should be relatively easy through Government agency, in most instances (as I have pointed out) supplies are not available, while the removal of sodium from water is most difficult and expensive. In the absence of positive measures, therefore, to control salt intake in relation to water supplies, I would suggest that the most positive measure from a health viewpoint would be to control the more obvious sources of dietary sodium, that is, the removal of sodium from food rather than from water supplies.

SANTOS LTD

Mr OSWALD: Can the Premier say whether or not the investigation into ownership of Santos has been completed and, if so, has any breach of the Santos legislation been revealed? Some time ago the Premier announced that the Government was investigating a change of ownership—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr OSWALD: With your leave, Mr Speaker, I will put the explanation again.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr OSWALD: Some time ago the Premier announced that the Government was investigating the change of ownership when Ansett Transport Industries sold its 14.86 per cent stake in the company. There was newspaper speculation regarding possible breaches of the Act, and the Melbourne *Age* reported that Bridge Oil had paid a premium to control the company.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I sympathise with the problems that the member had in delivering his explanation, although I would have thought that, as a pharmacist, he would have seen some examples of handwriting in the past. As to the question, at the time of the ownership change the Government did announce that it would be investigating the implications of that, and the Minister of Mines and Energy referred the question to the Attorney-General for a Crown Law opinion and also an opinion from the Corporate Affairs Commission. As the House knows, the shareholdings of that major resource company are governed by an Act of this Parliament and have certain restrictions on them. To date the report has not been received, so I am not able to comment further.

WATER SUPPLY

Mr FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Water Resources comment on the flow of the Murray River in South Australia following the Queensland floods and the more recent heavy rains in certain parts of Victoria?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I hope that the member for Alexandra will take an interest in this reply.

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The member for Hanson is quite right: the member for Alexandra would not know where the Murray was. If he pays attention to this answer he may be enlightened as to where the Murray River is. I thank the honourable member for the question. I am sure that he has an interest in the Murray River, although it does not flow through his electorate of Henley Beach.

Mr Mathwin: He has to drink the water, though.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We all have to drink it. The high flows in the Murray River at present are the result of heavy rains in the catchment area of Northern Victoria late last month and of floods in New South Wales and Southern Queensland in early May. The flow in the Murray is expected to peak at 42 000 megalitres a day in late August and early September and, although these flows are much higher than South Australia's entitlement, they are not expected to cause any property damage except in perhaps having a minor effect on low-lying tracks to a number of shack sites. As a matter of comparison, entitlement flows in the Murray River in South Australia under the River Murray Waters Agreement amount to 4 000 megalitres a day in August and 4 500 megalitres a day in September.

Mr Becker: Can we use all that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: We will not use it all because, if the member for Hanson listens to the rest of the answer, he will learn that much of that water has already flowed out to sea. As a consequence, the Murray River mouth has been cleared and salinity in the lower lakes of Alexandrina and Albert has been somewhat reduced. I am pleased to report that as a consequence and despite the fact that some members opposite (as well as some members of the press) were particularly vocal during the late summer about the

fact that the Murray River was going to run dry, that did not eventuate, nor is it likely to eventuate. I am pleased to report that the Murray River is in good shape.

However, at the moment there is turbid water flowing down the Darling which we cannot control. Visiting Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla last weekend prior to a country Cabinet meeting at Port Augusta, I noticed the turbidity of the water supply in that area. That is one problem that we cannot resolve at the moment, but I assure members opposite that that matter is being redressed by the construction of the Morgan filtration plant that will service those towns.

INDUSTRIAL INCENTIVES

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier consider providing for South Australian industries incentives designed specifically to help them retain contract work in this State? A constituent of mine, the principal of an engineering firm based in South Australia, has informed me that recently contracts for two engineering projects have been awarded to firms in other States for work to be undertaken in South Australia. The first of these contracts relates to mechanical handling equipment for grain silos to be supplied to South Australian Bulk Handling Co-operative, the contract for this work having gone to a Victorian company. The second relates to the building of the pilot plant at Roxby Downs, where structural steel and material handling equipment is required, the contract in this case having been awarded to a Western Australian firm. My constituent has been told that the Western Australian Government is paying the cost of cartage for contract materials supplied for interstate work, from any point in Western Australia to the border between Western Australia and South Australia, and that other incentives also apply. Additionally, although not in South Australia, the new Yulara tourist centre being built at Ayers Rock has recently let five construction contracts, three of which have gone to Western Australian firms but none to South Australia, despite our closer proximity to the construction site. My constituent believes (and I share his belief wholeheartedly) that South Australian firms are just as efficient and proficient as those in other States, but they cannot compete on cost, a point supporting the belief that Governments in other States are providing subsidies for their engineering and manufacturing companies. Will the Premier determine whether his Government can implement industrial incentives to ensure that South Australian companies are not disadvantaged?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the honourable member would know, substantial incentives are provided by the South Australian Government under existing schemes, but it has become apparent in recent years that these schemes need to be reviewed. It is questionable whether all of them are cost effective, especially whether they are flexible enough to meet specific market conditions and contract needs. As a result, for some time now the Government has had in train a complete review of the incentives being offered to industry in an attempt to introduce such flexibility and free them to more adequately provide the sort of support needed.

We must be careful in this area, because we do not want to get into a kind of Dutch auction with the other States in relation to incentives. There comes a point at which subsidies and assistance become counter productive, and we have touched on that aspect before in this House regarding State preferences. While, in theory, one could argue that a rigidly enforced preference by State Governments and State instrumentalities to local production is desirable, if such preference is enforced too rigidly the impact will be to discriminate against businesses seeking to find markets in other States.

because the retaliation of such States as Victoria and New South Wales, with infinitely larger economies and larger demands, would prejudice our industry far more greatly than the support we might provide for them.

We have with Victoria an agreement which I believe is to our mutual benefit and which reduces the impact of State preference. At present, however, there is considerable concern especially in relation to New South Wales and Queensland, where extremely rigid State preference applies, thus denying South Australian firms access to markets. We in South Australia will survive only if we can get into these other markets: we cannot survive in terms simply of our own market, because of its size. If the honourable member will supply me with details of the firm and some of the background to his question, I shall be happy to have it investigated and to bring down a specific reply. Having had mixed success, our wide range of incentives at present needs review and must be adjusted in the light of what is being done in other States.

DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS

Mr MAYES: My question is directed through the Minister of Community Welfare to the Attorney-General in another place. Will the Minister investigate and report on the rights of persons in *de facto* relationships to sue for property and maintenance? A report in the *Advertiser* on Friday 19 August, at page 10, under the headline 'Injustices to *de factos* require action: report', states:

Serious injustices and anomalies in the law governing *de facto* couples must be corrected by legislative action, according to a report issued yesterday by the New South Wales Law Reform Commission. The commission recommends that rights to sue for property settlements and maintenance, and several other legal rights similar to those enjoyed by parties to a marriage, should be extended to partners in *de facto* relationships . . . The main limitation is that legal solutions to property and maintenance problems can be sought only if the *de facto* relationship has been going a specified time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will undertake to have this matter referred to my colleague in another place for his report. Obviously, this is a matter that the Attorneys-General are discussing, and it also touches on the work of the Department for Community Welfare in some other respects. I have been discussing with the Attorney-General the impact of the proposed amendments to the Family Law Act on matters relating to the work of that department. This area of the law was a topic for debate during the Constitutional Convention in this Chamber last April, and it was the conservative political Parties in this country that voted against amendments and references of powers in this area to clarify this most important and disturbing anomaly that exists in the law.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT HOUSES

Mr BAKER: Will the Minister of Transport explain his policy with respect to maintenance and upkeep of houses owned by the Highways Department? The Minister informed me some time ago that 900 houses and other dwellings were owned by the Highways Department, which is in fact one of the largest owners of public dwellings in South Australia. I have 10 in my electorate. I recently contacted the Minister about the state of one of those dwellings and found that it was in a state of transfer and was being sold.

There is another instance of a property in the process of being demolished. However, over the space of three months that property has been left in a state of disrepair, and I understand that the previous tenants also did not maintain

it. I ask this question because, as the Minister is well aware, if these properties are not maintained they not only devalue the area around them but also cause certain hazards involving, for example, vermin and fires.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Government's policy on houses owned by the Highways Department is to maintain those houses in the best possible condition. If houses are required for road purposes, they are rented out on the understanding that in the future they may be required for such purposes, and that occurs from time to time. A full-time maintenance gang in the department maintains these houses to the best of its ability. If the honourable member is concerned about a particular house, I would like to receive any relevant information from him, and if there is a problem I will do all I can to rectify the matter. I am not aware of the instance to which he has referred, but if he would like to write to me about the house in question I undertake to examine the matter for him.

VIDEO INDUSTRY

Ms LENEHAN: I address my question to the Minister of Community Welfare, who represents the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place. Will the Minister initiate an investigation into the practices surrounding the video industry? I raise this matter in response to complaints that have been put to me by my constituents about some practices that have recently arisen in respect to the video boom. The concern of my constituents has been given further credence by an article that appeared in the August edition of *Choice* magazine. In an article entitled 'Surviving the video boom' it is reported that the New South Wales Department of Consumer Affairs has recently completed an investigation into the video industry. It was reported that the same people who used to be involved in the shady side of the secondhand car market are now moving into the video market, as car sales level off and video sales go up.

Two problems in particular which have been brought to my attention are, first, the problem of buying a life membership in a video lending library but finding that the life membership is for the life of the company rather than for any other concept of life. The second problem is in respect to the over pricing of what could be termed video packages, where people are sold the idea that they are getting a very good deal when in fact they are getting a video recorder, blank tapes and access to a video library at a much inflated price. My constituents have requested that we in South Australia clearly identify any unlawful or shonky practices that are springing up in respect to the video industry in South Australia.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her question. It concerns a matter about which I am sure we have all received representations along a similar vein. The video industry is an incredible growth industry in this country and, I suppose, unfortunately it is only to be expected that associated with the rapid growth of an industry of this nature there would be some undesirable practices by unscrupulous persons operating within that industry. I shall most certainly have the matter referred to the Attorney-General for his investigation as a matter of urgency.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr GUNN: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy say whether the Government has given consideration to removing the unfair anomalies that currently exist in relation to charges for electricity in certain country areas? The Minister

would be aware that in certain parts of South Australia people are required to pay 10 per cent above costs charged in Adelaide for electricity and that in other parts of the State they must pay an even higher impost in some of those areas administered by the Outback Areas Community Development Trust.

The Minister would recall that during the last session when this matter was raised in the House he indicated that the Government would be looking at this matter and that also he may be in a position in the relatively near future to bring down a report. I understand that this matter has been referred to a group within the Electricity Trust or in some other Government department for examination to see whether a fairer arrangement can be arrived at.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: As a result of the honourable member's explanation one is tempted to muse that there is hardly any question left to answer, because during his explanation he provided a good deal of the answer to his own question. However, the honourable member also asked me whether I have given consideration to the unfair anomaly that exists in relation to electricity charges that apply, in particular, to a good deal of the area that he represents. It is true that I have given consideration to the anomaly, as he puts it, that exists. However, at this stage I would not necessarily confirm his words that it is an unfair anomaly.

The attitude and the approach that I took to the matter was that after examination of the facts relating to this area it seemed to me that there was a possibility that the base charge that applies and the quantity allowed before there is an increase on a step basis in the tariff per kilowatt hour might bear reviewing. From memory, I think the quantity concerned is 1 300 kilowatt hours. I made some approaches to ETSA to see how this figure had been arrived at and also when it was arrived at. Those inquiries are about to bear fruit, as the honourable member suggested in his explanation, and when I receive all the information I will be happy to give him, and the electors he represents, a further report on the matter.

SKATING CHAMPIONSHIPS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport advise whether the Australian Roller Skating Championships are to be held in South Australia this week and whether the venue for that championship is to be a new circuit at the Parks Community Centre? Also, to what extent has the Government been able to provide assistance for the venue for the South Australian Chapter of the Australian Federation of Amateur Roller Skating?

Mr Becker: It's old news.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is not old news at all. If the honourable member listens to the answer he may be able to learn something.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It is true that the Australian Roller Skating Championships are to be held in Adelaide this week. There is a new venue at the Parks Community Centre, and I hope that the member for Hanson will attend on Saturday next at 10 a.m., as I will be officially opening that circuit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am particularly interested in the comments from the other side because the South Australian chapter of roller skaters approached the previous Government on two or three occasions without success. They did approach this Government and I was in a position to afford them a grant of \$30 000 and therefore the circuit

has come into being. For the benefit of members opposite who apparently are not very interested in sporting activities in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know who the official spokesman is for sport over there; there seems to be a lot of confusion in that regard. The 1986 World Roller Skating Championships will be held at the Parks Community Centre circuit. It is not only in the interest of sport but in the interest of tourism that the Government has provided this grant to assist roller skating. I will probably go down in history as 'generous Jack, the roller skaters' friend'. I would hope that some members opposite will attend these events and, who knows, they may even have the desire to compete in the championships.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Australian championships are to be held at the Parks Community Centre and I invite all members of the House to attend. It is a growing sport and, indeed, I invite all members of the public to attend the venue and see for themselves how sport can be developed with the assistance of the State Government.

MEADOWS COUNCIL

The Hon. W.E. CHAPMAN: Did the Minister of Local Government or an officer, to the Minister's knowledge, give senior representatives of the Mount Barker and/or Strathalbyn council assurances that one or both of those councils would receive specified increases in Grants Commission funding this year if one or both of those councils were to accept the Meadows annexations recommended by the select committee of this House and later ratified by both Houses of the Parliament? If the Minister did give those undertakings, or is aware of an officer in his department giving those undertakings, will the committed finance contained in those undertakings be upheld, and can he assure the House of the councils' receipt accordingly?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: This is a very serious question.

The Hon. W.E. Chapman: Dicken it's not!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Last Thursday details of the Commonwealth Government's allocation to the South Australian Grants Commission for the 1983-84 financial year were gazetted in accordance with the South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act, 1976. I understand that, as a result of primary discussions with the councils in that area, certain commitments were made by officers from my department without either my knowledge or the knowledge of the Grants Commission. When I receive the full report from the South Australian Commission of allocations to all councils in South Australia I will make a full statement in this House.

OLYMPIC DAM

Mr PETERSON: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether the Department of Environment and Planning will be taking any steps to protect the area around Olympic Dam during the forthcoming protest action at that site? It has been forecast that between 600 and 1 000 people may be camping in the area for about two weeks or more. Obviously, this will mean many vehicles, many camp sites, and much rubbish to dispose of, and it could be expected that many people camping on the site would be using camp fires. Of course, this will result in serious damage to the

fragile scrub in that area. There has been a great and growing emphasis upon protection of the environment in South Australia over the past few years. Will the actions of protesters at that site and resultant matters be policed?

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I have to be perfectly frank with you, Mr Speaker, and the House and admit that there are not the resources available to me or this Government adequately to protect that fragile environment from that number of people: there are just no two ways about it. Indeed, nor are the legislative controls that operate in that area of sufficient strength to be able to do all that we would really want to do. However, I guess that I could probably (if I felt that this is what should happen) turn over half the staff of the National Parks and Wildlife Service to patrol the area during the time that these people are in occupation. That is about the size of the effort that would be needed in order to give it proper protection.

I want to say to the House and the people who will be going to this area that the best possible construction that one can put upon the activities of these people is that they are concerned about the environment in a global sense and, therefore, should be similarly concerned about the more localised impact that they may have on that environment. Therefore, I appeal to people who may be going to the area for what they see as high-minded reasons to ensure that they minimise their impact on that local environment in all that they do. I thank the honourable member for the opportunity he has given me to make that appeal.

GRANTS COMMISSION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Can the Minister of Local Government advise the House when he first learned of the undertakings given by his officers to representatives of the Mount Barker and Strathalbyn councils in respect of the South Australian Grants Commission undertakings, and what was the nature of the undertakings that his officers gave to those councils?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: It is rather strange that the member for Coles does not really realise what is going on. She has been fed questions by people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I think that I made the point very clear to the member for Alexandra that I was not aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: When I receive the allocation under the provisions of the Act from the South Australian Grants Commission for allocations of moneys to all councils in this State, I will make a statement in this House. Until that time I will not make any statement whatsoever.

OPAL MINING

Mr GROOM: Following representations made during the visit of the Minister of Mines and Energy to Coober Pedy, has he been able to find any means of resolving a problem caused by the high cost of bulk distillate which is apparently diminishing efforts to locate new opal fields at Coober Pedy?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: During a recent visit to Coober Pedy representations were made to me about the high cost of distillate and its effect on exploration for new fields in the area. The matter was raised at a meeting in Coober Pedy held at a wellknown watering hole in the evening, and

somewhat to my surprise at one stage there appeared to be more Liberal members of Parliament in attendance than there were miners. However, as the evening went on there was a much greater attendance of miners, so the proportions were reversed. Perhaps I should add only that I did not receive any questions from the Liberal members of Parliament who were present.

I have been asked about the cost of distillate and its effect on exploration for opal. I suppose it would come as something of a surprise to most members to realise that this is a very important matter in relation to the future of opal mining in South Australia. Most current mining operations are north of Coober Pedy and, in general, opal levels in these areas are deeper than 40 feet. To work these areas by open cut requires bulldozers in the Caterpillar D9 class, which at this depth consume about 400 litres of diesel fuel a day, and with bulk fuel at 44c a litre the high costs of exploration are obvious when operating at that level. The areas to the south of Coober Pedy are generally more shallow, and the opal horizons (sometimes referred to as levels) are seldom below 25 feet. This, of course, allows a wider range of more cost effective machinery to be used.

The problem is that much of this prospective ground to the south is within the boundary of the Woomera prohibited area. As a result, I have written to the Minister for Defence, Mr Scholes, urging him to review the present access arrangements in that area and to give favourable consideration to varying the boundary of the prohibited area to open up prospective areas to opal exploration. Miners have occasionally been granted permits in the past to explore within the prohibited area as far south as the area known as Teal Waterhole, but the conditions attached to the permits have only added to the cost burdens of what is already high risk exploration.

I sent the letter to the Minister only recently, and I am still awaiting a reply. In due course I hope I will be able to make an announcement to the benefit of the House and certainly to the benefit of miners in the Coober Pedy area in relation to opal mining.

SUNDAY MARKETS

Mr BECKER: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs in another place whether officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs are keeping a close eye on the operations of Sunday markets and growers markets being conducted at weekends in Adelaide? Two weeks ago the Deputy Premier opened the Brickworks Market, at Torrensville. I was there, and I thought it went off well; I even obtained some fudge at a stall.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BECKER: The East End Sunday Market was also opened a few weeks ago. Much publicity has been given to the operation of these two markets. An article in the *News* today states:

I'm selling these wine glasses not for \$49.95, not for \$29.95, not even \$15.95 . . . who'll give me \$5 for these beautiful Italian glasses?

I understand that a very smart operator, called Shanghai Charlie, has come to Adelaide to attend these markets. I would not buy anything from Shanghai Charlie if it was the last thing I ever did but I am concerned that people such as Shanghai Charlie, who are renowned entertainers and spruikers, can induce gullible people to buy things they do not want. I also understand that many of these articles are not necessarily what people think they are, and that there is difficulty in obtaining cash refunds. I have been told that some of these articles are not new but seconds.

Mr Oswald: They fell off the back of a truck.

Mr BECKER: I would not say that they fell off the back of a truck, as the member for Morphett has said, but I do believe that some members of the public believe they are obtaining bargains when in fact they are not. I want to know how the operation of some of these characters associated with these markets—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think I have been extremely generous.

Mr BECKER: I think you have been too, Sir; thank you very much.

The SPEAKER: I ask that the explanation be wound up.

Mr BECKER: Also, some people have expressed to me concern about hygiene conditions at the growers markets.

The SPEAKER: Order! I must draw attention to the last thing that the honourable member said. I drew attention to that earlier today in Question Time when I said that honourable members must not put in a new question at the end of an originating question. That is a most undesirable practice, and it will cease.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I think we have probably heard here from Shanghai Charlie in Question Time—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Becker interjecting:

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I do thank the honourable member for the question, although I am not quite sure whether the people who are obviously in good faith conducting new approaches to marketing, particularly of primary produce, would. I think great advances have been made in that area and those developments that have attracted substantial capital are most desirable indeed. However, as with the earlier question from the member for Mawson, obviously from time to time there are those people who do trade in the market place in our community and who do practise undesirably in one way or another, although the example the honourable member has given of \$5.95 for a set of glasses does not seem to be an outrageous price to pay for Italian glasses.

An honourable member: Are they fair dinkum or are they Italian?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I guess there is a line to be drawn from *caveat emptor* in the market place and circumstances whereby there should be intervention by the State. That has always been a matter of deep concern within the community and within this Parliament. Officers of the Department of Consumer Affairs are vested with powers to investigate such matters. I am not quite sure where they keep their eyes from time to time but obviously this is within their competence. I will have the matter referred to the appropriate Minister for his officers to give their consideration to the matters raised.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. In the 10 years I have been in this Parliament I cannot recall a single Tuesday on which the Speaker, at the beginning of Question Time, has not read out a list—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The honourable member will resume his seat.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: I rise on a point of order. I want to know whether there were answers today to Questions on Notice.

The SPEAKER: I can assure the honourable member, as I have already assured him in person, that there were no answers given to me today. There is no point of order.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: Where are they?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 18 August. Page 367.)

Mr RODDA (Victoria): I support the motion and commend the work being done by Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan. Sir Donald and Lady Dunstan have become a popular pair as Her Majesty's representatives in this State, and have discharged their duties in a way that has the undoubted approval of all South Australians. A previous speaker in this debate referred to His Excellency's great love for Australian Rules football and, although that is true, I point out that His Excellency shares his favours with others sports, including horse racing. As an experienced fly fisherman, His Excellency has been seen frequently in one or two spots not usually visited by our Viceregal representatives. South Australians are fortunate in having His Excellency and Lady Dunstan to fulfil the Viceregal function in this State.

I join with other members in expressing condolences to the family of the late John Coumbe, a former member for Torrens and a Minister of the Crown with whom I had the privilege of serving in Cabinet. John Coumbe was a Parliamentarian of high ideals who rendered valuable service to the State. He will be greatly missed both in his family circle and in the community at large.

I am delighted to see that some of the main metropolitan and country roads are being repaired, as some of them are 40 years old. I refer especially to those highways running from the city to the South-East, including the centres of Naracoorte and Mount Gambier, near the Victorian border. Because of the increased road traffic they have had to bear, those roads have become worn out. My colleague (Hon. Michael Wilson) was active, when in office, in having money appropriated to renew those roads, and plans are now under way to completely rebuild the road between Naracoorte and Mount Gambier. That road is more than an access road: it joins two important centres and is the corridor for the movement of much freight to and from the sea port of Portland, in Victoria.

Yesterday, I spoke to Mr Andrew Rooney, who is the Highways Department engineer for the South-East, about what appears to be a dangerous situation on some of the access roads used by people wishing to turn off the highway to reach their properties. Mr Rooney assures me that certain work remains to be done on what is now a virtually completed section of about 8 km south of Naracoorte. This section of the road runs through a fairly closely settled rural area. The shoulders of the main road are reasonably extensive but, where an access road runs off to service a property, in some cases the shoulder that provides the left turn off the main road should be constructed wider to enable the sign posts to be set back farther from the carriageway in order to enable a vehicle leaving the line of traffic on the main road to turn off in safety.

In this respect, I point out that the highway is used by many drivers, including mothers taking their children to and from school, and even though there is a speed limit of 110 km/h on country roads, many vehicles travel faster and constitute a danger to a smaller vehicle turning off the main road because in some places the sign posts are placed so as to preclude the turning vehicle getting off the carriageway easily. In addition, traffic coming from the opposite direction creates a hazard for the smaller vehicle turning off the main road. More space must be provided on some turn-offs where

the position existing at present is dangerous, and Mr Rooney has assured me that steps will be taken to remedy the defect to which I have referred.

I have in mind especially access to the properties of Mr Robert DeGaris and Mr Robert Haggett, whose property is on the right of the main road. Drivers wishing to have access to that property must turn across on-coming traffic on the main road, and broader shoulders on both sides of the main road would afford an opportunity for both up and down traffic to turn off with much less difficulty. In the case of the turn-off to Mr Haggett's property, a broader shoulder is required to enable drivers coming from the access road to join the traffic on the main road. The Minister must have these defects rectified so that nasty accidents will not occur on the main road. About three months ago there was a fairly nasty accident on the road that is now under construction. The same situation occurs on the old road because of the great increase in traffic and the higher speeds of vehicles using that road. Indeed, three serious accidents have occurred over the past 18 months and more will occur if the situation is not redressed.

Another matter of concern in my district has been the destruction by bush fire, a holocaust that claimed 15 lives. The salvage operation following the destruction of forest areas has been a credit to the forestry officers, the contractors and all other people who were engaged on it. Commendable co-operation was received from the Tasmanian authorities and personnel, and the expertise that has been gained from the salvage operation will be the basis of a valuable resource in future, especially in respect of the swamps and the lake area at Millicent.

We in the South-East are grateful for the speed with which arrangements were made to rescue that timber before it became susceptible to blue mould. Work is well under way. Areas now have to be clear-felled of the smaller growth, which will be burnt, and these areas will be replanted. However, there is still the grim reminder of the bush fire as it affected those areas.

His Excellency referred to the way in which the Australian public responded to the Bushfire Relief Appeal, the Premier's Fund, the Lord Mayor's Fund and other funds, which raised \$11 500 000 to help the fire victims, and this was appreciated by everyone in my district. However, as though to add insult to injury, we saw just after that fire the horrendous flooding in the Barossa Valley, which put us high on the national casualty list.

I commend the Government, particularly the Minister of Community Welfare (Mr Crafter) and his officers, for what they did in providing on-the-spot emergency relief first for people who lost their homes, some of whom were left only with the clothes in which they stood, and also for implementing plans of action to rehabilitate those people on their properties. We have since seen hundreds of kilometres of fences built, sheds replaced and, of course, fodder reserves made available and strategically placed throughout the district. It was akin to a big army operation. Fodder was provided for the surviving stricken animals from the fire, for which everyone was most grateful.

Three weeks after the fire the season broke, which caused some dismay because it is not usual in that part of the country to have a March opening that continues. However, I am pleased to say that it has continued and has become one of the best seasons we have seen in the South-East.

Mr Barry Greer and his staff held weekly meetings with people who were not familiar with what was required under the assistance scheme administered by the Government, and that, too, started well. Some 50 or 60 officers of the South Australian Police Force made Mount Gambier their headquarters while they carried out a complete assessment of the damage, and this was a most helpful adjunct to the

voluntary services provided. Six months having elapsed since then, results have flowed from applications for assistance under the National Disasters Assistance Plan, and it is distressing to many people who applied but did not qualify for such assistance. In addition to that disappointment, carefully selected and culled breeding flocks, graded over a long period and representing valuable assets, have now been lost.

Replacement of livestock is expensive and must be done from available sources. This was brought about by a situation occurring right on top of a drought being experienced throughout most of southern Australia. Valuable breeding cows had to be replaced by store steers, yearling cattle, and a similar situation applied in respect of sheep. Animals of inferior quality often had to be purchased; their mating was unknown; and, although there will be a cash-flow resulting from these actions, incomes will not be as high as they were in the past. Another hazard arises in that no grazier would know or could be expected to know of any disease carried by replacement stock, and such a hazard is always present when restocking takes place on a large scale.

Insurance cover is a matter involving the individual grazier and, although some were fully covered, others were only partly covered, and some had no insurance at all. The generous response to the fire appeal gave some cash in hand to all fire victims, which was helpful. However, many properties have had to start virtually from scratch. I draw to the attention of the Minister and the Government the many anomalies existing in the Government guidelines incorporated in the National Disasters Assistance Scheme. This aspect of assistance entitlement differs from grazier to grazier, farmer to farmer and property to property. I direct the special attention of the House and the Minister to what is happening.

Some victims were well off, with high equity and valuable properties, while others had valuable properties with a high debt ratio, these properties being roughly of equal value. In looking across the spectrum of such enterprises in our society, there is always a mixed bag of equity: Ash Wednesday brought that to the surface, with all its indignities and many anomalies, when reasonably well-off people lost capital equipment and had to fully restock their properties when their cash-flow was virtually nil.

Under the National Disasters Relief Assistance Scheme, a person who has a 10 per cent debt structure or less against his or her total asset value of their enterprise is debarred from qualifying for such assistance. These people have had to go to a bank or other financial institution and borrow thousands of dollars, on which they have to pay high interest rates, for restocking and refencing, and to raise living and carry-on funds.

I have seen cases in my district where people have worked hard, saved and paid off properties. They have been very careful and caring without having to draw on outside funds, but they have lost the bulk of their livestock, fences, sheds and some of their plant and, because of low debt commitment of less than 10 per cent, they have been refused assistance under the scheme.

I have talked about one case with officers of the Minister's department but, whilst they were full of sympathy, under the guidelines nothing could be done to help. Because the land, livestock and capital improvements were paid for, there were little or no capital resources on which to call, and those people now face a big interest burden and have to meet current demands with today's financial restraints.

Those people have their backs to the wall, although they will survive. Over the fence there are people in a similar situation, having had their properties razed, their livestock and sheds destroyed but, under the guidelines and with their higher debt structure, they are able to obtain from the

Government scheme financial assistance at about 4 per cent interest. Therefore, that interest rate becomes very important in this situation.

The new Minister of Agriculture went to the I.A.C. in Melbourne and said his piece about this, and I understand that the I.A.C. has made some recommendations to the Federal Government, which is where this matter lies. Although I think that it might be too much to hope for, I hope that the Federal Treasurer addresses himself to this matter tonight.

I can assure members that many people are suffering hardship because of the high interest structure that they must maintain. Also, in some cases it is not easy for them to borrow money on the open market in the situation in which they find themselves. This matter is causing a lot of heartburn and lowering the morale of these people, particularly those who see their neighbours, although in virtually the same situation, obtaining assistance. Even though the people concerned were careful and prudent before the fire, they have now lost everything. They may not have had big piles of money in the bank but they had a virtually debt-free asset, and they are now experiencing hardship.

The matter of correctional services is causing a lot of heartburn in South Australia at the moment. I suppose that that is an understatement, because it is causing more than heartburn. I listened with great interest to the Minister's announcement today about the building of another low-security prison within a 100-mile radius of the city. That is something that must be done. I cast my mind back some 18 months to the time when I was the *piece de resistance* of criticism in this House and in the press concerning the shocking situation in relation to prisoners. I think that we should be quite open about the fact that over many decades Governments have not addressed themselves to the requirements of an increasing population and the errant people who offended against society and who must pay their debts to that society. The old and run-down prison buildings have caused some problems. I am not growling about the flak that I received at that time, because we all know that under our system it is the Minister who takes the responsibility.

I have not made any statements about this matter recently, and I have been upbraided privately by a number of people about that. Recently a group of people came to see me in my office, criticising me for sitting back and letting this matter go by. Perhaps there was some poetic justice in regard to their statement that 'Keneally is getting a free ride', although I do not think it matters much whether Keneally gets a free ride or Rodda gets a free ride. This is a very serious matter that faces South Australia.

Some people have been very outspoken about my actions. I resigned on 4 March, although it was quite some time before that when the then Premier and I had some discussion about the matter. I believe that young people must be given an opportunity to take part in the Government of the State, whether it be in the Liberal Party, the Labor Party or in any other Party. I made it quite plain that when I had discharged my obligations to the legislation pertaining to my portfolio areas in due time I would retire and afford the Premier a chance to bring another person into the Cabinet. On 4 June the Premier did that and chose the member for Rocky River (John Olsen). Subsequently, the member for Rocky River was chosen to lead the Liberal Party, and he is now Leader of the Opposition. I think he is well qualified for the job. He has had business experience, and he is a young man who knows what it is to be involved with a business and to sit across a banker's desk and argue for the funds needed to run such a business. That makes him an ideal man to run the State. There have not been many people in this Parliament over the years who have had those qualifications.

The present Leader of the Opposition has laid down the Liberal Party's policies in regard to this vexed question of correctional services. My colleague the member for Murray, who is the shadow Minister, has discharged his duties of shadowing the Chief Secretary very well. In his speech made last Wednesday night, the member for Murray dealt with this matter at some length and highlighted the attitude of members on this side of the House in regard to matters concerning correctional services. I point out to my critics that, whilst I am pleased to be a back-bencher in this Parliament, my role as such is to support the shadow Ministers, and I do not intend to give the press a chance to say that I am over-shadowing them. That is not my role. I have had my day in that area. I am sure that in due course those shadow Ministers will assume office and carry on the not easy tasks assigned to them.

In all fairness I admit that the present Chief Secretary does not have an easy task. He was my 'publicity officer': that was the way he did his business and so perhaps it is not for me to criticise. In regard to the matter of correctional services and the criticism that has been made, I want to make some general comments. The South Australian system of correctional services is currently in disarray. It is very sad to see what has happened. I know of the difficulties that confront the officers involved and the people in charge. The member for Murray pointed out the other night the concerns of the public about this matter which fairly put the viewpoint of Opposition members. Regardless of the political persuasion of a Government, the problems arising from attempts to effectively improve correctional services are many and varied. There is an urgent and rational demand by the community to be safely protected from law breakers. However, we have humanitarian responsibilities and obligations to ensure that those who do transgress are dealt with fairly and justly and that they are rehabilitated so they do not further transgress. On the matter of rehabilitation, however, we should not get lost in flights of fancy about all of these people coming easily to heel and being paragons of virtue.

Their aim is to make a living in the easiest way possible and they are not fussy about who they put over a barrel to achieve that. So, when the long arm of the law finally reaches them, they deserve their just deserts. Unfortunately, with human beings being as they are, there is no single way one can guarantee 100 per cent rehabilitation for lawbreakers. As long as the human race is master of this earth there will be individuals readily prepared to live outside the rules of the majority. Whilst we must always bear this in mind, the safety of the community at large must be viewed as a major concern. That may sound fine but it is not going to be without difficulties. Even considering the conflict aroused by the two opposing schools of thought on the correctional services, there are those who demand harsher treatment and those who demand freer treatment. I believe that the Minister has been a little more lenient than I would have, and there has been a noticeable deterioration since the Liberal Government took a temporary break from power in November last year.

The question of parole is one that has never been accepted by the present Chief Secretary. When I introduced the Bill he opposed it. I view with some concern what is now proposed by the Chief Secretary. My Bill provided an incentive to an inmate to do the right thing, and current events have distorted the whole concept. The radical element of Yatala has entered upon anarchy and practising arson, and the end result has been consequences which the whole community has to bear. It is my strong view that soft lines, red phones and listening to radical people who have offended against society will only put the administration there further into the mire; it defies description. I do not think that

changing the name of Yatala Labour Prison to perhaps the northern suburbs accommodation facility for individuals wishing to live in a micro-society will alter the nature of the people housed there, or the need for such a facility to exist. It will do little to alleviate the complaints of the inmates.

There has been talk about building a new centre and I was privileged last week to see the video. The only problem is, how can it be speeded up? We are looking at something like the life of three Parliaments to get that concept off the ground. It has to be started and there need to be some fairly deep understanding and stiff decisions made to achieve that, because when you think about time, it only took eight years from the time the Americans put Commander Shepherd in outer space to have Neil Armstrong on the moon. However, there will be some problems in our prisons in the meantime. One only has to remember what some of those crusading young journalists had to say when I was Chief Secretary. I remember only too vividly the centre spreads in the *Advertiser* and the screaming and breast beating that went on. The situation has not improved despite the royal commissions and the many reports we have received. It has not improved the situation one iota, and we have seen it come to this awful fruition of our valuable places being burnt to the ground. There is a lot that one could say on this matter of corrections, but I do wish the Government well in getting on with the major buildings which are needed to house the prisoners. I would like to see the community service orders given full impetus and all the finance needed to keep the young person out of the institution and provide some more secure facility for the difficult people. We can be assured that they are going to be with us, as sure as hens lay small eggs.

We do not deny the right for people to express their points of view, but we saw this horrendous business which took place over a dam in Tasmania only a few short months ago. Having been through the ordeal of going through prisons, I was surprised to see people who are little more than professional stirrers, practised and skilled in their line of business—

Mr Mathwin: Rent-a-crowd, they're called.

Mr RODDA: I was not really surprised; I should be used to it but there were the same individuals with loud mouths, long whiskers and face fungus performing in Tasmania. We have heard today that a number of police officers have to go to Roxby Downs and the Minister has been asked whether he can protect the fragile bushland. He says he cannot. I would hope that those same people would be a little more considerate in what they are doing. There are some very sincere people concerned about some of these matters and they have been joined by these sorts of people.

In relation to mining in this State, the Government will enjoy a subvention from the pipeline at Stony Point of about \$50 000 000. That is a practical input of money from the development of resources. It is a copper mine at Roxby Downs and one of the most valuable copper mines in the world. I wish to pay a tribute to the Deputy Leader, the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy, as the then Minister of Mines and Energy, for the many hours of work he did in this regard. I also have spent many hours talking with him. There was the great argument in relation to Redcliff as a proposed shipping site, which was transferred to Stony Point, and this is all part and parcel of the development of the Cooper Basin. Now there is the Kokatha argument about Canegrass Swamp and this action is something that runs foul to the development of this country. We are living in 1983.

I am not a scaremonger; I am one of the people who served in the war, and I do not believe that that is a safe form for human beings to live in. We are on a long line in

the South-West Pacific, and when I was flying aeroplanes there were people living in bark huts and rowing canoes. There are sophisticated people to our north and one should not be wasting time arguing about Canegrass Swamp. If one gets into an argument with some of those people, whether on Canegrass Swamp, or Pitjantjatjara lands, they will cut off your head whether it is black, brown, white or brindle. We have to develop our country, look after it, stop arguing about it and use some common sense. The Government recognises the sacred sites and now there is suggestion of a caveat in the agreement. I find Mr John Tregenza a gentleman who should know better; he is an educated person. He should be doing things other than taking those poor souls up there and having this argument.

I want to pay a tribute to the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy for the work he did and the long hours he spent developing the Department of Mines and Energy. There is a member of my Party upon whom fortune did not smile when in Opposition. Of course, the process of selection did not go his way. However, he probably did as much as anyone did on this side of the House in this important field of the development of our mines and energy resources. I am talking about the Hon. Richard Geddes. He was the shadow Minister of Mines and Energy for quite a number of years. He travelled overseas. He went to New Guinea and to the north. He gathered an enormous amount of information about mining and the potential of it. He talked to experts such as mining engineers, and it was unfortunate that he did not have the pleasure of gracing this place. However, such are the forces of democracy.

Nevertheless, I want to pay a tribute to Dick Geddes and place on record the wonderful work he did for South Australia, especially in the field of developing policies for the exploration of our mineral resources. Due credit has not been given to him, and I am pleased to do it now.

I turn to another important matter. My colleague the member for Coles has thrown herself wholeheartedly into looking at the question of tourism. A couple of weeks ago she said that travellers in South Australia spent something in the order of \$720 000 000 in 1981. Approximately \$97 000 000 was spent on accommodation; \$97 000 000 was spent on fuel, namely, petrol and oil; \$86 000 000 was spent on airfares; \$67 000 000 was spent on grocery and food provisions; \$60 000 000 was spent in restaurants; \$49 000 000 was spent on general shopping items; \$39 000 000 was spent on clothing and footwear; \$30 000 000 was spent on drinks consumed at restaurants; \$35 000 000 was spent on entertainment, bus and coach fares; and the balance was spent on entertainment. Therefore, the honourable member's statement underlines that tourism is an industry which can create many jobs.

Of course, the one thing about tourism that contrasts with the profession I follow is that, if one has to shift things in the grazing industry, they have to be carted and loaded. However, tourists come and empty their pockets in a few seconds: they move quickly. Therefore, it behoves us to enter into capital expenditure and to have somewhere for them to lay their heads. We have plenty of nice things for them to see, and they should be developed. I am not unmindful of the fact that the present Minister of Tourism has been in my district and we have had discussions. He is also working in the South-East and, of course, we have that input from Victoria. It would be wrong of me to say that we are completely isolated. Tourists spend quite a few dollars in helping out South Australia because it is a nice balance for them to bring people to the western districts. They can look at the Naracoorte caves, the Blue Lake and Adam Lindsay Gordon relics. Of course, they can sample some of the delightful Coonawarra wines whilst *en route* through the district.

In the short time available to me, I would like to talk about my district. Despite the ravages of the fires (which have caused us lots of problems), we are having one of the most bountiful seasons that I can recall and, indeed, people older than I have never seen a season like this. These are early days: we are only entering spring. However, I am sure that the Deputy Premier must be quietly smiling from ear to ear when he looks at the rainfall reports and the wheat forecasts. We know that we have to get through approximately another six weeks, but we will probably have the greatest wheat harvest we have ever had, and that is money for the coffers.

The only odd thing is the fat lamb market. Whilst these choice animals have never been better (they were selling at high prices last year; they were getting \$33 or \$34 for them), they are at about half the price they were last year. The housewives should be getting some cheap choice lamb. I suppose that the city dwellers should say, 'Good for us.' It is good for them, but it is fairly bad for the capital expenditure that these people have put in. For example, Dawkins' rams cost the world. I think that Martin Cameron has a couple. However, for some reason (I think that it is the forces of commerce working) the fat lamb graziers are getting it in the neck.

The wool cut is very good. Some people are shearing and they seem to have recovered from the wide comb argument. I saw some flocks which were not wonderful. I see the honourable member for Peake smiling when one starts talking about wide combs. However, he, too will be pleased to know that some of those graziers were shearing last week and I can assure the honourable member that it was not mud or water: they were cutting 17½ pounds of very good wool. He probably would not have any trouble collecting union fees in that area.

Mr Plunkett: I hope that they used narrow combs.

Mr RODDA: I was not looking at the combs. However, whatever they were using they were getting a lot of very fine and valuable wool. The pleasing thing is that the wool cut is high. I suppose that a lot of sun has shone on the animals. The beef industry looks very well. There is a lot of fat cattle grazing on those pastures. We are all hopeful, but one can never be sure about too much because, despite how the paddocks look, sometimes they empty out fairly quickly. I understand that the Naracoorte meatworks will be back in full swing in a few weeks. Of course, the smaller meatworks over the border are also busy and there is a waving mass of pasture from where I live through to Victoria and down through the south coast.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

Mr RODDA: The member for Light referred to fat lambs. I think that the price is right in all primary production but fat lambs. The fat lamb may last 16 weeks, but if the grass seed gets it, then one is in some trouble.

Last weekend I was in Lucindale attending a wonderful fund raising occasion for the school. I have been in Parliament for 19 years and my predecessor (Mr Harding) was there for nine years. His dear wish was always to have a new school built at Lucindale. Twenty-eight years have gone by and they still have the old timber-frame building which has been painted. They are a wonderful group at Lucindale. I refer to the parent body in conjunction with the school council and the small works department (as it calls itself). The place has been painted. Perhaps that is why they still have this old school. However, I remind the Government that a new school is long overdue. Whilst some of the buildings look very spick and span, they are inadequate and are due for replacement.

I know the people of Lucindale; they are long suffering and they do appreciate nice things. They have established an oval and attractive grounds, and the sheds for their

livestock and agricultural courses are spick and span. A solid construction school would complete a wonderful centre of education. It is a pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I have enjoyed the comments already made by some members and I am sure I will obtain valuable information from all the speakers who have yet to make their contribution.

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): I thank His Excellency the Governor for his Speech in opening this session of Parliament. I add my regrets to those of His Excellency on the death of the Hon. John Coumbe. John was a sincere, earnest and hardworking member of Parliament. He was a former Minister of Labour and Industry and then of Education, and I think he earned the respect of all people who dealt with him. Certainly, I found in my dealings as Minister of Industrial Affairs that John was held in high regard by people in industry.

The first State Budget of the Bannon Government is to be handed down next week. It will be an important document both for South Australians and for the Premier. Although it is often popular to describe the State Budget in the simple terms of our own house-keeping, in reality a State Budget is much more significant; not only does it determine the level of Government expenditure, and therefore determine the taxation level on industry and individuals, but also the Budget will clearly set the priorities for Government expenditure. The more the Government spends, the less we as individuals have to spend. The more the Government spends on general community services, then the less money it has to spend on stabilising and developing the economic base of the State. It is therefore appropriate that in this Address in Reply speech, I examine the present and future industrial prospects for South Australia and draw attention to the thrust that I know my electorate would want the Government to take.

Australians are naturally preoccupied with trying to minimise the effects of the national and international recession. Attention has been focused on the wage freeze, limiting imports, new tariff barriers, job creation schemes and various other short-term remedies. However, as we now realise, the best any of these will achieve is a cushioning of the severe impact of the economic recession.

Whilst it is important to give attention to these short-term remedies, and that was the main objective of the national economic summit in April, it is even more important to look at what affect the longer term implications of the recession, technological change, automation, and changes in world trade will have on the future nature, size and structure of Australia's industry.

What occurs in South Australia will, of course, be partly determined by what happens nationally, but that does not mean this State cannot influence significantly how it fares in comparison with the rest of Australia. By understanding what significant changes are occurring it is possible, with astute leadership of the State, to establish new directions and strategies for our economic development.

During the next three to four years, a number of factors will cause major permanent changes to our manufacturing and other industries. The first of these factors is the present economic recession. We have lost thousands of jobs during the past year and many manufacturing companies have reduced the scale and scope of their operations. When recovery comes in 1984, many of the jobs already lost will not be recreated. Companies will increase production, not by returning to previous employment levels, but through increased automation, greater efficiency, and increased imports. Therefore, unlike previous recessions where recovery has led to a sudden jump in demand, stock shortages and increased production and employment, this is not

expected to occur this time. Recovery will be very gradual and will not lead to a sudden improvement in jobs. Even the Federal Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations is anticipating a further rise in unemployment and no improvement at least until 1984-85.

In 1971, 25 per cent of all employees had jobs in manufacturing industry. By February 1983 that level had dropped to 19 per cent. During the next few years that percentage will be reduced substantially further. The present recession is speeding up the permanent loss of jobs from manufacturing industry, where more people are employed than in agriculture, mining, construction and building combined. Over 24 000 jobs have been lost already since our manufacturing work force reached a peak in 1974.

Changes in the manufacture of metal products highlight the dilemma. South Australia was the leader for such products, with 85 per cent of our production being exported interstate and overseas. In 1972, 22 per cent of all our employment was in this sector, but by 1982 this had dropped to 9 per cent. The recession is also forcing a major rationalisation of existing manufacturing companies, so Australia will have fewer and larger companies, but employing fewer people.

I have highlighted changes in manufacturing because it is the biggest industrial sector and the most unstable at present. Agricultural and mining sectors are extremely important, but more stable and very dependent on our natural resources. All industry however requires the Government to establish the right environment before it can flourish.

The second of the factors affecting the size and nature of our industry is technological change, and especially the introduction of new electronically-controlled automated equipment. As Australia pulls out of the recession, manufacturing and service companies will expand by investing in new equipment rather than employing more people. In most cases machines are seen as cheaper, more reliable and with better quality control, and certainly are much more flexible than people. Fierce international competition will force local companies to adopt this strategy. Although the work force will be smaller, it will need to be more highly skilled. Unskilled workers will be replaced with technicians and engineers, who will not be office sitters but out amongst the machines.

South Australia will be hit particularly by the rationalisation of the motor industry, which will occur as a result of the Federal Government's motor vehicle policies announced 18 months ago. The crunch point for these new policies will be 1985-86. Proposed reductions by G.M.H. at Woodville have already been announced, but that is only the tip of the iceberg. The number of component manufacturers will be reduced, they will become more specialised and will automate, and they will reduce employment. There is still speculation that at least one of the five major vehicle assemblers will withdraw from Australia by 1986.

Rationalisation and automation in the whitegoods industries of South Australia is another factor bringing about fundamental changes. The Closer Economic Relations Agreement with New Zealand and further phased reductions in tariffs on whitegoods are imposing new pressures for automation and rationalisation. One significant change is the extent to which one company, with a household name in South Australia, has scaled down its operations and transferred some functions to its parent company in N.S.W.

Then there are local factors that will pose barriers to our future development. Our population is small and we are some distance from the major eastern markets. We are growing at a slower rate than are other mainland States. Some of our cost advantages have decreased or disappeared. Our workers compensation is the second most expensive in

Australia. This is one area where State Government policies can have a big impact.

So, things are difficult in South Australia, but that does not mean that we should throw in the towel or adopt an atmosphere of defeatism. After all, it was out of similar circumstances in the late 1930s and the 1940s that Sir Thomas Playford created the thrust towards the manufacture of consumer goods for a country growing quickly in population and standard of living. Similar new opportunities exist today, provided we seize them and exploit them.

High-technology industry is one economic sector that has continued to grow at astounding rates, despite the global recession. In Australia the industry is still in its infancy and an enormous development potential exists. During 1980 the State Government prepared a strategy to be the focal point of this development. Technology Park Adelaide was conceived as a means of attracting a group of high-technology industries and concentrating them into one location where they could help each other and establish a close link with the South Australian Institute of Technology. The results have been outstanding.

By the time Technology Park Adelaide was officially opened last year, 30 per cent of the land was allocated to actual or potential tenants. Some of the tenants have been announced and include Duntech, a hi-fi sound-equipment company, and the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. Others are very well advanced in their negotiations. One venture which the previous Liberal Government initiated, and which should be announced shortly, is 100 000 square feet of building for an international manufacturer of electronic equipment for specialised purposes.

To accommodate small but rapidly growing tenants at Technology Park, a multi-tenant building was devised. I am pleased to see that the new Government has continued this building project. Australia has very little in the way of electronic research. One project that seemed vital to our objectives in 1980 was the silicon-chip design unit being created by the C.S.I.R.O. This State was fortunate that the leader of this unit (Dr Craig Mudge) was a former South Australian and chose Adelaide as his preferred location. This man and his unit now form the nucleus of Australia's thrust forward into the electronic era.

At about the same time, the Tonkin Government heard that Raytheon International, one of the largest manufacturers of computer terminals and electronic defence equipment in the United States of America, had taken out a lease on a factory in Sydney. With some friendly assistance and persuasion, the company cancelled its lease and instead established operations in part of the old Philips factory, at Hendon.

The next part of the jig-saw was to promote South Australia to those high-technology companies in the U.S.A. which would be investing in new plants in other countries. Following a visit I made 14 months ago to the Industrial Development Research Council of U.S.A., the Government decided to engage Graydon and Associates to promote South Australia as a location for specific types of new industry. After all, we have a skilled work force, better industrial relations, and a life-style that is hard to better. That initiative could become one of the most secret success stories ever. Apparently, the response from U.S.A. companies has more than doubled our initial estimates. I would expect several announcements within the next six months as a direct result of this initiative that the Liberal Government took.

Over the past few years, the foundations have been laid for what should be the most fundamental shift in our manufacturing base. It is only the beginning, but the opportunities are enormous. Apart from new electronic industries, mining research and development and biotechnology are ideally suited to South Australia. Then there is the scope to develop

the computer software industry. These are the people who write the instructions for the computers to follow. The secret to the Apple computer's success has been the large range of software written for it, ranging from accountancy functions to inventories of goods, to computers games, to educational programmes.

The South Australian Government should establish a working party to devise the best financial incentives needed to attract and encourage the development of computer software groups in this State. The requirements are different from those for other industries. The groups need risk finance to carry them over the period of writing and marketing their product. There are none of the tangible assets that can be leased or used as security, as in most other businesses.

In the more conventional manufacturing sectors, our success as a State will depend upon our ability to offer the most attractive economic conditions. This means a lower wage structure, better industrial relations, a lower tax structure, cheaper indirect labour costs, such as workers compensation, and a co-operative skilled work force. On some of these points we already score well: on others our record is poor. For many years we dragged our feet on industrial and commercial training. Our main industrial training was limited to apprenticeships which in turn were restrictive on age, sex and range of trades. The new Industrial and Commercial Training Commission, established in 1981, removed those barriers and opened up the scope for other forms of industrial training. There are still huge gaps in the training we provide. Most jobs are so-called 'unskilled', which reflects more the lack of training available than the level of skill required to carry out the tasks effectively. Transport drivers, storemen, shop assistants, service people in the tourist industry, taxi drivers and machine operators are but a few of the jobs neglected through lack of training.

I challenge the Labor Government to adopt the Youth Employment Training Scheme promised by the Liberal Party at the last State election. The scheme recognised that there are those for whom formal training is either inappropriate or unattainable. The scheme would provide a contract for training to people under the age of 22 years. The contract would be between the trainee and the Government, but the trainee would be assigned to outside employers. The two years of training and work experience would include a formal off-the-job training component. Trainees would be paid the equivalent of apprenticeship wages by the employer. It was expected that 2 000 young people could enjoy full-paid work experience in the first year of such a scheme.

In the traditional manufacturing industries, new opportunities still exist. A major food processor negotiated with our Government to establish the largest such plant in Australia; that factory is now being built, although no public announcements have yet been made. The plant will help meet the growing demand for 'fast' foods. The large West German Liebherr Group of companies will shortly start construction on a factory at Parafield to assemble heavy earthmoving equipment and cranes. This \$10 000 000 development will be one of the most significant new industrial manufacturing projects in South Australia since Chrysler set up its engine plant at Lonsdale. Again, that is an opportunity created by our mining developments. The almost complete absence of manufacturing companies to service Australia's rapidly growing oil and natural gas industries still amazes me. Until a company named Gearhardt established at Gepps Cross in 1982, all drilling rods in Australia had to be threaded overseas.

Service industries now employ the majority of our work force, yet South Australians have neglected such industries. The successful launch last year of a new Australian merchant bank, with its headquarters in Adelaide, called C.C.F. Australia, was the first step to retain more investment funds in

South Australia. Recently, G.H. Michell and Sons has formed another Adelaide-based merchant bank with an American partner. Many more other opportunities exist, so long as enthusiastic, creative leadership is provided by the Government to a responsive private sector.

Some claim that our concentration on manufacturing industry is now a major disadvantage. I dispute such negative thinking. Our manufacturing base is one of our greatest assets, as those States without it will find it far more difficult to establish in the 1980s than we did in the 1950s and 1960s. However, that asset must be well managed, or it will be lost for ever.

In those troubled industries such as steel, motor vehicles and consumer products, the impact of competition and rationalisation can be minimised, provided that the companies are encouraged to adopt new technologies, new markets and automation, and that the trade unions moderate wage demands and maximise productivity. Again, it will require carefully planned strategies developed by the companies with support, encouragement and understanding from the Government.

Whilst I am a strong advocate for encouraging high technology industries, far too much expectation has been placed on so-called 'sunrise' industries, especially by the new Federal and State Labor Governments. The real revolution in technology will occur within existing manufacturing companies, where people are already employed. These companies are the ones that should be encouraged to adopt new technologies. Failure to do so will lead to their demise.

This need highlights one fundamental mistake made by the Premier, whilst I understand his desire to have the broad responsibility of State development under his control. It is a most unfortunate mistake not to have a specialised department with its own Minister, responsible for industrial development, especially manufacturing industry. Every State of Australia, except South Australia, now has a separate Minister and Department of Industrial Development. South Australia did have it, with the Department of Trade and Industry and the Minister of Industrial Affairs. Premiers are too busy to deal with the constant problems of industry and to formulate new development strategies. Recent history records that those Governments in which the Premier took sole responsibility for industrial development performed poorly in expanding their industrial base. If agriculture, mining, tourism and housing all deserve separate departments and Ministers, why not manufacturing industry? Already I have heard many manufacturing companies complain about their recent neglect by this State Government.

As part of his Budget strategy, the Premier has already announced substantial increases in a range of taxes and the imposition of a new tax. Unfortunately, it appears that far more thought was given to how to minimise the political back-lash from such tax increases than to what their effect would be on the economic development of the State. It is ludicrous and short-sighted for any South Australian Government to tax the transport industry when that industry is the life-line carrying our manufactured goods to the markets interstate. Yet an extra fuel tax was imposed.

Last week the Premier rushed off to Canberra to stop the introduction of a wine tax, as it would have hit South Australia's wine industry. Yet the Premier himself announced only two weeks ago that he will impose a higher liquor licence fee, which will collect an extra \$8 000 000 a year from this State's beer and wine industry. The new financial institutions duty, possibly at the highest level in Australia, and the increased stamp duty on insurance will add tens of millions of dollars a year to the costs of South Australian companies, making them less competitive and eroding their low cost structure.

But that was not the only damage inflicted. The cost of water was increased by 22 per cent in July, to be now the most expensive in Australia; public transport fares were increased by an average of 47 per cent, and electricity charges by 12 per cent. During the past 12 months South Australia has had the dubious honour of having Australia's highest inflation rate. These increased charges and taxes could well produce the same result next year. It all goes to underline the need for policies to be made in the context of developing the State's economy rather than on a political basis.

Apart from initiatives already mentioned, the 1983 State Budget must pay attention to other key problems. The building and construction industry is facing a very difficult two to three years unless funds for capital works are substantially increased. During 1982-83, \$52 000 000 was eventually transferred from capital projects to help reduce the huge recurrent deficit in running Government. The deficit on recurrent expenditure should be met by trimming the costs of Government, not by increasing taxation. Several key construction and building projects have been delayed, deferred or scrapped. These include the Finger Point sewage treatment plant in the South-East, the second half of the O-Bahn busway to Tea Tree Gully, the Happy Valley water filtration plant, various irrigation rehabilitation schemes along the Murray River, the Berri bridge; the north-south transport corridor, and the relocation of the remand centre. A glance at the tender calls of the Public Buildings Department in the *Advertiser* each Saturday reveals the dearth of new projects in the past six months. Last Saturday the list comprised two swimming pools, five cleaning contracts, some canvas awnings, stage equipment, a few transportable houses, and contracts for the redevelopment of the South Australian Museum. That listing is not an exception. Imagine the concern in an industry which has traditionally received about half of its work from the Government!

The Government should release immediately a list of major construction and building works projected for the next five years. This would give the industry some knowledge of what to expect. Such a list of projects for three years was published in early 1982 by the former Government, but obviously that list has been substantially amended. Hence no such list basically exists. The efforts of the Federal and State Governments to create jobs would be better directed through increased capital works than through short-term job creation schemes. The construction of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway line would permanently create employment in Whyalla's steel industry, Port Augusta's concrete sleeper plant, and with pipe and culvert manufacturers, as well as construction jobs on site.

The State Budget must educate our community for the future. So that we can cope with the silicon-chip revolution, computer training must become a part of our schooling for all students, rather than a specialised subject for a few. The State Government has established six special technology high schools, and certain schools are specialising in computer training for interested students. That is necessary to teach a few people how to programme computers. But it is equally important to train all students in how to use computers. It will not be long before the need to use computers will be just as much part of everyday living as being able to read and write. However, this basic training is not being provided. It does not require a whiz-kid to use a computer, but it does require some basic knowledge of what a computer can do, how to issue instructions to it, and how to understand its answers.

Australia seems to be well behind other countries in this basic computer training. In Britain, educational programmes for the use of micro-computers are now readily available in schools. Computer Assisted Learning (C.A.L.) is being pro-

vided in schools. The B.B.C. has run two series of 10 25-minute television programmes giving a basic introduction to personal computers for both children and adults. Holiday learning programmes on how to operate computers have been made available. Personal computers will become as common as television sets, but people will need to be properly trained to use them effectively. It would be most unfortunate if future young Australians were computer illiterates through educational neglect.

The impetus developed by the previous Liberal Government towards understanding and adapting to new technologies has been lost since the change of Government. When I formed the Council of Technological Change in 1981 it was decided to publish a series of technological impact statements. Several excellent ones have already been produced. These statements highlight new technologies being introduced and the possible impact of them. Key areas of impact needing further investigation and action by the Government were proposed. It concerns me that no further technology impact statements have been released by the new State Government in the past 10 months. The South Australian Council on Technological Change has made an excellent start on preparing our community for the electronic age, but even that council seems to have been stifled in recent months. We should be encouraging broad community debate on new technologies rather than trying to hide the realities.

The Federal Government needs to provide additional funds for the universities, the Institute of Technology and the South Australian C.A.E. to enable those institutions to provide adequate training in the use of micro-processors. Last year the Council of Technological Change, in a report reached the following conclusion:

The situation is that:

- (a) equipment grants for existing certificate (diploma) degree engineering courses are seriously deficient;
- (b) under existing arrangements, Commonwealth funds are not available for shorter, intensive retraining and upgrading programmes.

The problem with the current funding arrangements is that almost all the existing funds are committed to paying salaries of existing staff and meeting other essential costs. A certain percentage of funds should be set aside to meet immediate changes in emphasis imposed by new technologies. Unless funds are provided soon, neglect in our training for the electronic revolution will become a scandal.

Residents of the Davenport District were deeply involved in the tragic Ash Wednesday bush fires. Generous financial assistance has been given to help those with losses. The main concern of residents in Belair, Upper Sturt, Crafers West, Mount Osmond, Greenhill and Skye now is that they are better prepared to defend themselves against a future holocaust. There are four specific items that these residents will be looking for in the State Budget.

First, they will look for more funds to finance the Country Fire Service units and their volunteers. Too many basic items are left to the hope that funds will be raised through donations. Secondly, funds must be provided to ensure that the Highways Department and National Parks can clear vegetation where necessary.

Thirdly, areas of Davenport have either no reticulated water supply or inadequate pressure. Half of Upper Sturt, Greenhill and parts of Crafers West are without mains water. The eastern end of Belair and most of Mount Osmond, have grossly inadequate water systems, so that, on a very hot day, there is nothing but a trickle. These are the very areas which face the highest fire danger. Lack of water will leave them defenceless against a major fire. Adequate capital works funds need to be provided to enable water services to be upgraded or installed where necessary.

Finally, the Budget should provide adequate funds either to purchase or lease a suitable aircraft. The C.F.S. has asked the Government for an aircraft to be on permanent stand-by during the fire hazard period. The aircraft should be a Bull Thrush 1200 h.p. two-seater model, fitted to spray fire retardants. Preliminary trials proved beneficial last year. Such an aircraft was used on the day after Ash Wednesday. I noticed that a number of people in the Hills, particularly at Carey Gully, greatly appreciated the assistance given by an aircraft in extinguishing fires and bringing them under control. During the off season the aircraft could be used for normal aerial spraying by outside contractors. I would ask the Premier to give very serious thought to the purchase of such an aircraft. I believe that that is an essential item to better prepare ourselves and to help protect life and property that would otherwise be damaged if such an aircraft were not available.

The Premier can be assured that the people of Davenport will be looking for a constructive and disciplined Budget that looks to the future development of South Australia rather than just solving the Budget blow-out through increased taxation and charges.

Mr GREGORY (Florey): I support the motion. The people of South Australia are currently experiencing a down-turn in employment in the manufacturing industry which is creating great hardship amongst workers in South Australia and causing considerable concern to the trade union movement in regard to its effect on its members. The focus of this concern is the Woodville plant of General Motors-Holden's because of the threatened closure of the plant. The current crisis could have a catastrophic effect on Woodville, South Australia's trade skills as well as South Australia's manufacturing capacity and ability to produce goods. A close examination shows that the closure of the Woodville plant would have a tragic effect on all of those areas that I have mentioned.

On the other hand, there are people who advocate that there should be no tariffs on imported vehicles. If that attitude was allowed to gain credence and support, it would mean the destruction of our manufacturing industry. Thousands of people would be thrown out of work. In the area of vehicle parts manufacturing in South Australia it would mean that 5 000 people would be put out of work and added to that another 27 000 people throughout Australia would lose their jobs. Such a plant is ancillary to the manufacturing industry in Australia which employs thousands of workers. If there were no tariffs on imported vehicles our manufacturing industry would be wiped out.

The introduction of export complementation in the vehicle industry has had a similar effect. It was supposed to provide work in Australia, the product of which was to be exported to other countries. We were supposed to gain, although we have not gained at all from that export complementation. It has cost us skills in the vehicle manufacturing industry, skills that are hard to replace.

The Woodville plant was the tool manufacturing plant for General Motors in Australia in the body-building area. I can recall a time when the tool room there employed more than 1 100 people. When I worked in the jig shop, 254 people were working there: now there are 50. I have been told that the high point of employment following my leaving that shop was a maximum of 351 people. Those skills have now gone: skills which were able to develop a body shape, which was quite complex, from line drawings. They were skills that allowed people to make tools and jigs from very simple sketches, but when used to produce the parts they allowed a car to be put together quite accurately with a minimum of fitting, and it all fitted. Those skills have gone and are now being imported from overseas.

Other areas have ceased to manufacture in Australia. Years ago we lost the ability to produce spark plugs. Many items produced for the motor vehicle industry are now being produced overseas. They are usually small bits and pieces manufactured by companies who employed people to manufacture quite complex tools which allowed a number of unskilled people to have gainful employment. They have now all gone. Toolmakers produce tools on the basis of being given a sketch of a piece of metal to be stamped, and when they make the die and put it in the press, if the wrong die is put in (in other words, the left hand instead of the right hand die), one could come back after half an hour and find 27 000 pieces of material surplus to requirement. All those skills are going. In essence, this is the result of bungling by the Federal Liberal Government which occurred from 1975 onwards.

That Government did not seem to care about the results of its policies in allowing two additional manufacturers in the vehicle industry to establish in Australia. It created a situation where there are now five manufacturers who cannot cope with reducing sales of vehicles in Australia. It was a decision made by Liberal politicians from Victoria who did not care about South Australia and, in essence, did not really care about Australia. When they made that decision, they thought that the crisis would go, but it did not. Now G.M.H. is reducing its employment.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult for the Chair to know who is speaking in this debate.

Mr GREGORY: The export complementation scheme is based on prices, but it is subject to price manipulation, and that can be used to our disadvantage. There is some feeling that this is happening now. Earlier, it was argued that tariffs should be reduced on the basis of making our industry more efficient and that, in reducing the tariffs, we would be able to purchase cheaper vehicles and cheaper goods from overseas. However, I do not believe that that will happen, because one has to appreciate that the free-on-board price of motor vehicles imported into Australia from Japan has not changed, and did not change, with the devaluation of the Australian dollar.

In other words, the price of vehicles delivered in Australia had no relationship at all to the cost of manufacture in their home country: it is based on a price to enable that country to gain a market and to keep its own people employed locally. People elsewhere have no concern for employment in Australia, and it is my belief that, if we were not to have a vehicle assembly or manufacturing industry in Australia at all, we would be paying the full price that they could charge and get away with. One only needs to look at the price of motor cycles to realise that.

If Australia wants to be an exporting country of primary materials, and if it continues with the policy of the previous Federal Government, that is exactly what will happen, and we have had the example where Australia would be exporting rural and mineral products but very little else. That would mean, with the low levels of employment in those areas, that there would be no chance for people to obtain work in the skilled areas existing in manufacturing industry. Should that happen, we would have to accept that our country would then emulate countries such as Africa and South America, where inflation is rife, unemployment levels are very high and poverty amongst the unemployed is horrific.

Such a policy takes the easy way out and does not look at the hard options of developing our resources and our people. I believe that our most important resources are our people. If we were to emulate countries such as Sweden, Austria, Holland and Japan, which can develop their manufacturing industries with very little in the way of natural resources (remembering Australia has huge natural resources

by comparison), Australia's standard of living would rise, people would be employed and all their skills would be utilised. That has not happened because of the policies of the Federal colleagues of members opposite when in Government.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GREGORY: Sweden has developed its natural abilities, for example, to produce aircraft. When the Australian Government was considering the replacement of its Mirages, the aircraft produced by Sweden was one of the contenders. That country's aircraft industry is able to produce a supersonic fighter, whereas Australia has not been able to do so. Sweden can produce specialised steels, having exploited its iron ore reserves. If Australia's iron ore reserves were put together they would probably be as big as Sweden's, yet our country has not been able or wanted to develop, or has not wished to compete in this area of producing, specialised steels.

Holland, a small country with very limited natural resources, has developed a very high level of skill in light manufacturing industry and in small shipbuilding design. Small ships built around Australia, such as dredges, tugs and service vessels to Bass Strait, were all designed in Holland and, if one wants the best in that area, one goes to Holland. Austria has utilised its people in order to develop a very high standard of living. Japan also has used its people and their skills to allow that country to gain eminence in the manufacturing world. One need not go into great length about Japan as even the more obtuse of members opposite would appreciate that that country is doing very nicely. All these countries have used the skills of their people to enhance their natural riches. They have used their people in order to become a force in the world. They have used those skills and have not denigrated their people.

Our Government is going to do those things. Our job creation schemes will use the skills of people unemployed at present so that those people can have dignity by earning an income until recovery takes place. We will have education programmes to train people so that they will have skills that can be used in the market place, and we will be encouraging research and development so that we can recover and our people can be employed. It gives me great pleasure to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply and join with my colleagues who have spoken in supporting His Excellency's remarks in extending our deepest sympathy to the relatives of the late John Coumbe, the former member for Torrens. John Coumbe befriended me when I first entered Parliament in 1970. We got to know one another extremely well, and I always looked forward to his cheery greeting 'Good-day' mate. How're things going? He was always wise counsel to me when the pressure was on in those very early days when I held a marginal seat and was endeavouring to consolidate it under probably some of the most sustained attacks ever made by a political Party on a member in this State to try to wrest back a seat which members of that Party believed was theirs. It was never theirs, and it never will be theirs, but at least the support and the encouragement I received from John Coumbe was a great help in those early days.

John had to work hard to establish himself in the seat of Torrens and to hold it, so he knew what it was like. No doubt his family also knew and also suffered because of the pressures placed on him at the time. Make no bones about it, Mr Deputy Speaker, I think that both you and your family would realise that the life of a member of Parliament today is not what the people think it is, and that those who do experience difficulties and have to take the hard knocks

are the families, certainly the younger members of those families. It should not be so, but unfortunately that is the system and the situation in which we live today. I well remember Bill Hayden saying (I think that it was in February when he was deposed as Leader of the Opposition) that a drover's dog could win the next Federal election in Australia.

Mr Mathwin: And he did.

Mr BECKER: How right he was. I agree with the member for Glenelg: he was dead right because the drover's dog won, and the performance we have seen from the drover's dog is one that I find absolutely unbelievable. If a drover's dog carried on in the way that the Prime Minister has—

Mr Ashenden: He would be shot.

Mr BECKER: I thank the member for Todd. I would not have put it in those blunt terms, but it is certainly the line on which I was working. An undisciplined dog would not carry on as we have seen the present Prime Minister carry on. Therefore, the Australian Labor Party and the people of Australia have learnt a very vital lesson: one cannot put into the most honoured position in this country, that of Prime Minister, someone as raw and green as the present incumbent. It has been a very incredible performance indeed.

In the last few weeks we have witnessed the tearing down of the traditional Labor Party in this country. Of course, what is happening is absolutely unbelievable. I have always found that, when the factions of the right and left in the A.L.P. brawl, one can always be assured of a good deal of blood-letting and the cries for blood seem to continue.

The tragedy of what has happened here is that the socialist left is endeavouring to destroy what was known and accepted in this country as the traditional Labor Party. However, if one goes back through history one will find that, in most established socialist countries, a similar situation occurs in political organisations claiming to represent the working class. Of course, that is the folly of the whole situation: we suffer, and the country suffers. The country suffers more than anything else, and it is the future generations that will pay, and pay very dearly in many regards, not only economically but also with their own futures.

It is absolutely tragic to think that young teenagers have a very slim chance of obtaining employment within the next 10 years. As the member for Glenelg reminds me, the political Party that now governs us cannot even keep its promises. It is absolutely dishonest. Mud has been thrown at us, and the member for Unley (who has just left the chamber) was a ring leader in a campaign prior to the last State election of criticising the Liberal Party.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: He was an endorsed A.L.P. candidate.

Mr BECKER: The Minister should realise that the honourable member was previously secretary of a white collar union movement which did much to undermine the operations of the Liberal Government between 1979 and 1982. One will never get away from that. As history will show in a few years time, the Government will be sorry for that performance.

Let us look at the situation in Canberra, where we now find a Minister in the name and style of Mick Young who is above the law. Of course, we know that the Labor Party supports the tort system in regard to its industrial relations policy.

Mr Mathwin: Don't do as I do, do as I say.

Mr BECKER: That is right. Mick Young broke a fundamental law when he revealed a Cabinet security leak to a colleague.

Ms Lenehan: Under which Statute is that?

Mr BECKER: That comes under the Crimes Act. The Federal Attorney-General is looking at that matter under the Crimes Act. Therefore, whilst no individual person has

been hurt, a business transaction has been damaged. Thousands of dollars have been lost somewhere along the line, but here is a person who has been very clever in manipulating his own colleagues in this State. Of course, we find that fools rush in. People such as the member for Hindmarsh, John Scott, and Blackbeard Senator Nick Bolkus—tear in to defend this 'Mick the mouth from the Port' so that they keep his portfolio open. What they fail to realise is that the former Minister has lost all credibility. No-one will ever be able to trust him again. He is the leak. No business person and no country that has ever had to deal with him will ever be able to do so in confidence, because he broke his word to his Leader and his Cabinet.

Mr Ferguson: Which word did he break to his Leader?

Mr BECKER: The member for Henley Beach can sit there, smirk and carry on. We will deal with him shortly.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I bet he can hardly wait.

Mr BECKER: We know the stupidity that goes on in relation to the Minister for Environment and Planning, who is another one who cannot keep promises and lets his own colleagues stumble all over him. He would rather play with his own little trumpet, or whatever it may be. However, it is the country that is suffering and, whilst the Labor Party wants to tear itself apart, let it tear itself apart: let it do what it likes.

Ms Lenehan interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Madam, I will deal with you shortly if you wish. I have plenty of subjects to discuss and plenty of time. I can deal with you if you wish and stop you chirping away on the back bench. We can soon wipe the smirk from the honourable member's face. I am not frightened to reveal certain things that have been told to me by her colleagues. I want to remind the House that the Federal Labor Government has been thoroughly discredited. Of course, it has all been the responsibility of those who were incapable of holding the various positions they were given. That is the proof in the pudding.

It gets back to what I said earlier: it will be the relatives—especially the children—of those who are the key players in this whole sad story who will suffer. It has even come close to home in our own Parliament. I certainly do not condone the practice of telephone tapping. However, as has been revealed in statements in the press, we find that one of the Government's own Ministers was implicated somewhere along the line. Whether or not he was seeking a free trip to Russia, I do not know and I do not care. However, the point is that the clumsy operation of the Federal Government came to the fore, as seen in this information. It is in the public forum: it has been bandied around, dealt with and interpreted in various ways and people are being hurt.

I do not have to defend anyone in the Labor Party. However, people are being hurt, and the system is being damaged. Of course, it is the country that is suffering and will suffer, as well as the relatives of the people concerned. Ironically, I can remember another situation almost 40 years ago in my own life when I paid the price, and am still paying the price, for something which had nothing to do with me. Yet the stupidity and ignorance of the allegations made were never proved before a court. Again, it was under a Labor Party Administration, which dealt with the security of this country. It demonstrates the clumsiness and the foolishness of such people who desire to lead but who behave in a megalomaniacal way in running this country. Let them get hold of the security of this country and, of course, the situation will be worse.

I have no time for ASIO; I will not stand up and defend ASIO. However, I fear what the Labor Party would put in its place. Since the late 1940s I have suffered because of the stupidity of the Labor Party. I will take that to the grave; I have suffered all my life because of it. That is an

example of the ignorance and crass foolishness of those who are making decisions, the megalomaniacs of the Labor Party. The Wright children, the Combe children and everyone involved in this situation will suffer in the same way. The sooner the Labor Party gets rid of Bob Hawke the better for everyone.

Mr Mathwin: He is on his way out.

Mr BECKER: I doubt whether he is on his way out. They would not have the courage to get rid of him and put Bill Hayden back in.

Mr Ashenden: Today's *Advertiser* says that Hayden's making his move.

Mr BECKER: I doubt that; there is far too much involved in that situation. It is a load that the Labor Party will have to bear for a long time, and a lesson that the Labor Party will have to learn to live with. I feel sorry for people like Combe and his family. Certainly Combe has suffered and the Deputy Premier has suffered, all because of the foolish handling of the whole situation by the inner six.

In this regard there is a message in a book written some years ago by Jan Sejna, about the Soviet plan for the subversion of the West by the highest ranking Communist ever to defect, entitled *We Will Bury You*. The book describes a plan for Britain and Australia, and some of its connotations are frightening. Among other things, it states:

In order to promote a swing to the left within Britain and force the pace of radical change, progressive forces must take over the trade unions and penetrate the Labour Party. First, however, the role of the trade union movement must be changed, so that it became accepted as a pillar of Government. In Communist jargon, the 'first power' is the Government and Parliament; the tactical plan for Britain was to organise a second, or alternative, power base on the left wing of the Labour Party, the Communist Party, and the trade unions—the last, of course, having been wholly radicalised. The Soviet view was that it was also essential to destroy the military and security organisations, including the Police Force.

That can be done in this country by cutting back severely on the Budget allocations for the security forces. We have already seen the Budget reduced for our naval air service. Our own military forces are being seriously affected by cuts in expenditure. Security organisations are under attack and, when security organisations and special branches of the police are under attack, problems arise. What they are replaced with is the real danger. The author continues:

We supplied the I.R.A. with light weapons, machine-guns, hand grenades, explosives, and field communications equipment. We thought the I.R.A. was asking for more than they could use, but we agreed to take five or six of their trainees in 1964 for a two-month course on political organisation and guerilla warfare. They were trained individually and not made known to each other in Czechoslovakia.

A country can be weakened through guerilla tactics. I think the most alarming part of the book, which is timely, is the section which relates to Australia, and which states:

For most citizens of the Soviet bloc Australia is a remote land whose only importance is as the destination for some relative who has managed to obtain permission to emigrate—

that is not so easy, and under Labor it is almost impossible now—

However, for the authors of the plan, Australia is the 'Strategic Hinterland'. It is both an integral part of the Western Alliance and the stepping stone to Asia. In Marshal Grechko's analysis of the major Warsaw Pact exercise named 'Vlatava' he said, 'Comrades, to forget Australia and treat it as a forgotten island would be a great strategic mistake.' And in 1967 Boris Ponomarev told us, 'Comrades, I can understand your view of Australia as a country of little importance to your concerns; I must tell you that you are wrong in this and that you have an important part to play in our operations against this country. You must understand that if we wish to control Asia we must first control Australia.' These startling revelations about the true Soviet view of Australia were clearly confirmed to me when I saw them set out in specific and unambiguous terms in the outlines of the strategic plan.

According to the plan, the neutralisation of Australia and New Zealand will follow the neutralisation of Western Europe. Like

Europe, Australia will advance to socialism and 'neutrality' step by step, and it will only be in the final stage that a revolutionary government will be established. In this respect the strategic plan estimated that the revolutionary process in Australia would be approximately five years behind the same series of events in Western Europe. In this process the strategic plan aims to exploit the internal forces in Australia by infiltration and deception rather than by a major military threat from outside. Because of the small size of the Communist Party of Australia, the plan called first for the exploitation of the extreme left of the Australian Labor Party, infiltration of the younger working class in the industrial areas, and, of greatest importance, subversion and control of the trade unions. At the next stage the plan called for the infiltration of the Liberal and Country Parties, followed by the compromise and overthrow of their established leadership. The final and most difficult target would be the military forces. The guidelines set out in the plan indicated that although the armed forces should be infiltrated by the intelligence services and the Party, the intention would be to achieve their neutrality in the final stage of revolutionary conflict rather than attempt to turn them into an instrument of the forces of the left.

Once Soviet influence is finally established, Australia would be used both as a base for further operations against the countries of South-East Asia and as an important element in the 'half circle of steel' round China. According to the timing of the strategic plan that I studied in the 1960s, the 'liberation' of Australia was to be accomplished by the 1990s. Undoubtedly this timing will have been revised. Nevertheless, the current state of tension which exists between the Soviet Union and China, and their surrogates in South-East Asia, make it likely that in the final years of this century the Russians will place an even greater emphasis on pursuing the objectives of the plan in Australia.

That gives some idea of the existing plan. The subversive groups are operating as they have been operating for many years to recruit those who will help them implement their master plan. Most people know that the Russian Navy is in the Indian Ocean at present, but the galahs on the Government side refuse to believe it: they are blind and stupid, because they are being used and, once they have been used by the subversive groups, they will be eliminated because they will have served their purpose of sabotaging their own country.

Fortunately, they will not be here after the next State election because the people of South Australia are waking up to those people who make promises and fail to honour them: for instance, their promise not to increase taxation. The Government will be dealt with severely indeed at the polls next time.

Members interjecting:

Mr BECKER: During my time as a Parliamentarian, Labor members time after time have fought elections on the basis of some of the most criminal deals I have ever seen. As Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, I enjoyed some of the work and the opportunity to investigate areas of Government administration where I believe there should be an attempt to cut down on waste and mismanagement in the public sector. In saying that, I am not attacking public servants: I am criticising severely the administration of the departments and those responsible for it. I have in mind especially the Minister for Environment and Planning who, as Minister of Education, came under a fair amount of criticism in respect of the Teacher Housing Authority, which was badly mismanaged under his Ministership. The authority, of course, was totally under-capitalised. Had it been properly established in the first place, it might have been able to play its proper role. While I do not object to the principle of the authority, it was a disgrace that it was not given sufficient working capital to allow it to fulfil its proper function. Had it done so, it would have provided satisfactory accommodation at a reasonable price for teachers who, I believe, are entitled to a good standard of living quarters, especially in our country areas.

Mr Mathwin: Was the Minister happy with your report?

Mr BECKER: No, he got teasy because he did not understand the report, which highlighted the faulty and inadequate administration that he was responsible for as Minister. He

was not a good Minister of Education and now he is in the 'struggles department' as the Minister for Environment and Planning. On page 26 of the Third Annual Report of the Public Accounts Committee for the year ended 30 June 1982, released in December 1982, the following appears (under 'Statutory Authorities'):

In February 1980 the P.A.C. wrote to all Ministers to obtain details on the cost of administering each of the statutory authorities under their control. The main objective was to establish what fees were being paid to public servants as members of Government appointed part-time boards and committees. On 17 June 1980 Cabinet approved the following policy:

•The carrying out of a review of fees for members of Government appointed part-time boards and committees.

Confining the appointment of public servants to Government boards and committees to only those persons who, from the whole community, are the best available for the task involved.

Eliminating the practice of paying fees to public servants who are members of Government boards and committees which meet during normal working hours.

By letter dated 29 October 1981 the P.A.C. asked the Chairman, Public Service Board, to supply the following information:

(1) A listing of public servants who are no longer receiving fees, as a result of the implementation of the above policy, identifying the fees saved.

(2) Reasons why public servants are still receiving fees and how long payment will continue in each case.

The reply, dated 16 November 1981, from the Chairman, Public Service Board, stated:

Since my last letter the Government has further defined its policy concerning fees for public servants and it is understood that the policy is to be communicated soon by means of Department of the Premier and Cabinet circular. The policy provides that payment of fees to employees of the Government and officers of the Crown under existing appointments will continue until the expiration of their present term of office, or until 31 December 1981, whichever is the earlier. Furthermore, public servants are not to be paid for meetings attended outside normal office hours unless Cabinet approval is obtained.

When the Department of the Premier and Cabinet memorandum has been issued this board intends writing to each Minister seeking relevant information on all boards and committees. The data received will then enable us to fully answer your request for a consolidated listing of all Government appointed boards and committees. This task is not expected to be completed for some months but I will see that you receive the information as soon as it is available . . .

By letter dated 27 August 1982, the Chairman, Public Service Board, supplied a listing of boards and committees and current membership as at 30 June 1981. The annual saving in fees resulting from the Government's decision not to remunerate *public servant* members of boards/committees after 1 January 1982 is \$210 000. So, the Public Accounts Committee, following inquiry into this situation and following the Government's policy, was responsible for a saving of some \$210 000 per annum. The Public Service Board did supply to the Public Accounts Committee a list of the various statutory authorities.

My Question on Notice No. 177 in the last session of Parliament sought a considerable amount of information in relation to statutory authorities and committees that have been established in this State. On 29 July this year, in answer to that question, I received from the Premier a written reply, with which I am very disappointed. The Premier stated:

A detailed update of this information is currently being conducted. However, because the total information would run to over 200 pages, and because it would be out of date within a week of its publication, the Government does not propose to publish it. If you are seeking the information about a particular statutory authority I would be pleased to furnish you with relevant details.

There was considerable speculation amongst public servants, and certainly within the various authorities, about the purpose of my asking such a detailed question when there were some 240 to 260 statutory authorities, why I wanted to know who was on the boards, how much they were being paid, how frequently they met, what expenses and allowances

they were paid, when members of those authorities had been overseas, what was the cost of the overseas travel, and, of course, the assets and liabilities of those various authorities.

I asked for that information because many of the annual reports of those authorities had taken a considerable time to come to Parliament. Surely, somewhere within the Government there must be a central authority that monitors the role of the statutory authorities (or QANGOS, as they are known in other States). We have a tremendous amount of difficulty in endeavouring to establish the exact number of statutory authorities in South Australia because the Treasury Department, the Public Service Board, the Auditor-General, and the Ombudsman each has a list; then, of course, the Premier's Department was trying to compile a list. But to admit that the information would run to 200 pages reveals that there are considerably more statutory authorities than we expected.

But, I am absolutely amazed to think that the Government is not prepared to make that information available, whether to me or to the Parliamentary Library, because I know that various people and Government departments, including the State Library and this library, and members of Parliament are often asked information about various authorities. So, it is most important that we have that information. Denying me that information really means, in one respect, that I am being censored, but in the other respect the Premier refers to my seeking 'information about a particular authority'.

That makes it very difficult if there are investigations or inquiries regarding an authority by some other body. If I suddenly write a letter, it is easy for the Government to say that authority is subject to investigation by some other organisation and, therefore, I cannot have that information. I believe that all members of Parliament should have access to that list. I doubt very much whether the information would be out of date within a week, because most appointments to those boards are for a three or five-year term. Surely the financial details relate to the financial year in most cases, but that is accepted. What we really want to know and what we have been denied, of course, is who has been on the 'lurks and perks' gravy train. That is what it is all about; that is the crux of this statutory authority situation. It is very difficult to find out the criteria of those who are appointed on these authorities.

One of the questions I asked the Premier related to information regarding criteria of appointments. The Premier replied by saying that appointments are made after taking into account a variety of criteria, including the person's expertise, experience and other personal qualities which would enhance the committee. No-one would argue that there is plenty of expertise in the community which would be available to assist the Government and which would be of benefit to the various authorities.

We have come to accept in the past that retired members of Parliament have been appointed to some Government authorities. I accept that in years gone by Parliamentary superannuation in this State could not have been called a generous scheme; therefore, it was felt that some senior public servants and members of Parliament could be useful on some statutory authorities.

Let us look at what I have been able to obtain. Regrettably, some of this information is two or three years old. That is the tragedy of the whole system, because the best known secret in town is that nobody really knows who is getting what and who has some of the cream jobs on these statutory authorities. Taking a few examples at random, and without reflecting on any one of them (because I hold these individuals in high regard), the first is the State Bank of South Australia, which comes under the Treasury. Its Chairman is Mr G.F. Seaman whose appointment expires on 8 February

1986. He receives \$5 500 a year. That is the latest information that I have; I do not know whether that amount has been increased.

The Deputy Chairman, whose term expired on 8 June 1983, was J. R. Dunsford, a former public servant, and a very able and competent person. He received \$4 600 as Deputy Chairman. The members of the board were Messrs Hancock, Nankivell and O'Loughlin, who were paid about \$3 800 per annum. Mr Nankivell is a former member for Mallee and Mr Hancock is employed by the university.

The Electricity Trust of South Australia is under control of the Minister of Mines and Energy. The members of the board of the Electricity Trust have to do a considerable amount of homework, reading and study. The Chairman is Bill Hayes, a former Lord Mayor, who receives \$7 400 per annum. The Deputy Chairman is Mr Gilbert Seaman, who gets \$6 400 per annum. We note that Mr Seaman is Chairman of the State Bank and Deputy Chairman of the Electricity Trust; therefore, he receives \$11 900 per annum from those two statutory authorities. Members of the Electricity Trust board include the Hon. Glen Broomhill, who receives \$5 500; the Hon. John Carnie (who was elected to replace the late John Coumbe), who also receives \$5 500; Mr Bernie Leverington also receives \$5 500; Mr K. W. Lewis, who is the Director of the E. & W.S. Department, does not get paid, of course, because he is a public servant. Also on the Electricity Trust board is L. W. Parkin, who also receives \$5 500.

In regard to the Pipelines Authority of South Australia, latest figures that I have here indicate that the Chairman receives \$5 500. I understand that the Hon. Hugh Hudson is now the Chairman of that authority. The latest figures that I have are three years old, but I understand that the authority held about ten meetings a year, which amounts to \$550 per meeting; that is not bad.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: With Mr Hudson as Chairman they will probably be longer meetings.

Mr BECKER: I totally agree with that. I am wondering whether the figure of \$5 500 is correct. The Deputy Chairman is a Government employee. That position was occupied by Mr Bruce Webb, now retired. Mr Barnes, from Treasury, was also a member of the authority. Mr L.W. Parkin as a member of the authority, receives \$2 800. Judge Taylor is also a member, but he would not be paid because he would be classed as a Government employee. The Chairman receives \$5 500 and other members get \$2 800.

I refer next to the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, an authority which comes under the Minister for the Arts. As at March 1980, the Chairman was S.J. Mann, who was paid \$750 a quarter (\$3 000 a year), and the members received \$500 a quarter (or \$2 000 per annum). The members as at March 1980 were P.C. Bourke, L. Hammond, J.B. Jarvis, Dame Ruby Litchfield, and J. Noble. I am not sure whether Mr Jarvis was reappointed.

The South Australian Film Corporation, one of my favourite statutory authorities, also comes under the Minister for the Arts. As at March 1980, the Chairman, J. Lee, received a remuneration of \$4 900 per annum plus a \$2 000 expense allowance, making \$6 900. Therefore, the Chairman of the Film Corporation in relation to the other authorities that I have mentioned is very well paid indeed. The members of the South Australian Film Corporation are Irving Cook, Anne Deveson, and Sir James Hardy, each receiving \$1 200 per annum. I am not sure how that works out. Then, of course, there is Mr Morris, the General Manager, and Mr Moir is also a member. There is probably a reason why Mr Lee receives more remuneration as Chairman. That is why it is handy to have the information that I have sought. Once again one comes to the question of the criteria used in regard to persons nominated and elected to these authorities.

Another favourite statutory authority of mine is the Citrus Organisation Committee of South Australia. As long as I live, no-one will convince me that I should pay 22 cents for an orange when the poor grower gets only 3 cents or 4 cents. I know that the Minister of Agriculture and other people are not very happy about that position. This is one committee which does not measure up as far as I, as a consumer, am concerned. The Chairman is Perce Sanders, who receives \$2 750 per annum plus a \$500 expense account. The members of that committee received \$1 400 per annum. As at March 1980, the members on that committee were C. Binks, W. Davis, G. Fulwood, G. Harrington, G. Higginson and D.R. Ingerson. I believe that all those positions expire on 14 February 1985.

The Citrus Organisation Committee is a committee that I would like to further look at at some time in the future, because I do not think that growers are getting a fair go in regard to the price of their produce, having regard to what consumers are required to pay for fresh oranges at the markets in the metropolitan area. I do not mind paying 20 cents or 22 cents if I know that the grower is going to get at least 10 cents or 15 cents, because at least he would be making a reasonable living, but apparently that is not the case. Therefore, one wishes to know what happens to the levies that are paid by growers and the details of promotions done by the committee to promote the produce. I become very concerned that people buying supposedly fresh orange juice are buying, according to the fine print on the packet, a product using dehydrated orange concentrate which is imported into this country and mixed in with the orange juice. Therefore, the Citrus Organisation Committee has some explaining and some public relations work to do to assist the people it represents.

I thought it would be interesting to ascertain the details of the members on the board of the State Transport Authority. The Chairman in 1980 was Mr J.D. Rump. I believe that his salary was \$12 222: that may apply to a full-time Chairman. The members were R.H. Fiddock (\$4 600 per annum) and a Treasury representative (\$3 600), the present member for Florey, then trades union representative, R.J. Gregory—

Mr Mathwin: Is he still a member?

Mr BECKER: No, these figures are as at March 1980. One cannot get up-to-date information, and that is why I asked the Question on Notice. At the time, the member for Florey was receiving \$4 600, as were C. Hawkins and J. Matysek; D. Scrafton was receiving \$3 750 and H.B. Young, \$4 600. So there was a variation on that authority. It would be interesting to know what expertise each member of those various authorities had. No doubt in many cases they are well qualified and their appointments well justified, especially in the case of Mr Hayes, Mr Seaman and Mr Leverington (Electricity Trust).

I doubt the wisdom of putting one person on more than one such authority. There ought to be a change. The time has come when members of Parliament should not expect (after having served a reasonable term in Parliament), when they retire, to go on to one of these authorities and to be paid the salaries that I have mentioned (no doubt they would now be much more). Parliamentary superannuation is sufficient and would enable a member of Parliament to serve on one of those authorities because, after all, it is the continuation of community service. I do not see why one should be out of pocket through serving in any of these organisations, but it should not be seen as a means of obtaining additional income for one's own selfish reasons.

I tend to believe, not only from the evidence in this State but from reports I have seen dealing with other statutory authorities, that there is quite a business in getting oneself nominated or appointed and in receiving the large rates of

remuneration that go with those authorities. I do not want that situation to occur in South Australia. I do not want it to even get off the ground, but I am suspicious and I do suspect that if the operations of the management of statutory authorities are not closely monitored, people will use their influence, whether it be within the Public Service or within the Parliamentary system, to be elected to those authorities for one reason only, and that is to obtain additional income, whether retired or not.

I thoroughly object to that, and I am opposed to that type of patronism to Party hacks and to persons not prepared to give of themselves to their own State. Everyone should be prepared to make a contribution to his or her State and, if they are not prepared to do that, they are not worthy citizens. This country cannot always afford to be as generous as it has been in the past in seeking the services of these people. Many of these people do not serve on these boards for nothing: they have their hand out for the perks and perquisites. Some people want to be recognised in some way.

I am not saying that it all happens in this State, because it happens around Australia, and this is what has been coming out of the investigations and inquiries into QAN-GOS. In Canberra, it may be difficult for people to be appointed to Government authorities, but they seek higher rewards than the average citizen would ever be given or ever have any chance of getting. As people who represent the working class in this country, I cannot see how members opposite could support that type of patronism. I want to make sure that that sort of scheme does not get off the ground in this State.

There are from time to time issues within one's electorate where those who know what is happening become very annoyed at the misleading information that can be transmitted either by the media or by word of mouth. I am very annoyed about two major issues in my electorate at present. One such issue involves the international airport. I never supported that venture, I never will, and I will be glad of the day when it is put somewhere else. I cannot help cynically smiling when I read the criticism of the chaos at the international airport at present. I believe that on Thursdays there are four international flights. The airport is empty for most of the week, and then suddenly you get a Qantas and a British Airways jet in and out. The jumbo jet is not all that much quieter. It is an absolute nuisance and a pest, as far as the people living near the Adelaide Airport are concerned.

In the last few months there have been quite a few close shaves and I, as are the rest of my constituents, am a little tired of having to put up with the inconvenience of the international airport and all the hoo-hah telling us that Adelaide needs these international flights. As the Minister of Tourism admitted in reply to my question, about 50 tourists have been arriving, on average, on these jumbos.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: It was your Government that organised it.

Mr BECKER: I said to the Minister at the bench that I opposed it. I opposed it all the way. The Minister was the one who wanted international flights, and the Minister on the front bench and his Party wanted direct flights from Japan. Do what you like, but do not have them land at West Beach! Land them at Edinburgh or elsewhere, although I would not wish that on the people of Edinburgh. Let us get on with selecting the land at Two Wells and building the airport. However, the whole problem is that it takes many years to select the right site and then once the site has been selected, unfortunately years have to be spent on wind studies to ascertain the right angles at which to construct the runways.

Everyone has a fair idea of where the land will be within the Two Wells area. We still do not know, and there is still insufficient study over a period as to the prevailing direction

of the wind and the velocity, which is a very important consideration. The big danger at West Beach is that, once wind velocity gets over 14 knots, the 727s have trouble in taking off. Probably two or three times a year the jets have to take off on the east-west runway, a very short runway, and fly out over Henley Beach South. If members have ever landed on that runway they will know all about it. It can be done within reasonable safety limits but certainly the pilot needs to have everything going for him.

It was only at 10.15 a.m. last Sunday that a 727 aborted a landing at Adelaide Airport. It was some 12 months ago that a 727 coming into Adelaide Airport with its wheels almost on the runway had to go into full thrust and take off again because some twit stalled a little Cessna in the middle of the main runway.

The Adelaide Airport was originally built for interstate aircraft: it was not built for the people who want to have pleasure and fly their own little twin-engined and single-engined aircraft around the place. We do not want them: they are not wanted. We do not want the small business jets or the toy and hobby aircraft people there at all, because they are the ones who have the worst aviation record in Australia: that is the first point. They are the ones who land in people's backyards and run off the runways and do all sorts of things. What annoys me is when a single-engined or twin-engined Cessna stalls in the middle of the runway when a 727 comes in, forcing it to go into full thrust and blast off again with between 150 and 170 passengers on board.

The Hon. J.W. Slater: You can't blame them: it's the communication.

Mr BECKER: It is not the communication. What can one do when some little private operator stalls his plane? The piloting of the whole aircraft on and off the runways is under the control of the control tower. However, once a 727 is on its flight path and is on its final approach, there is little that a pilot can do. Of course, he could run straight over a Cessna, but the pilot will not risk his life or that of the crew and passengers. We have seen abortive approaches and landings at Adelaide Airport on more than one occasion. That is considered an emergency situation under any air safety regulations. We would not want it to happen. We do not want an aircraft to crash down our way because we know the absolute chaos and shambles that has occurred when there have been practice crashes.

There is no way that one would ever safely be able to get everyone to the hospital within two or three hours or protect people with properties if there was ever an accident at the Adelaide Airport. Therefore, I do not support the proposal in the *Advertiser* on 27 April that a third airport runway is desirable. I can assure the air transport authorities that it is not on: we do not want it. We certainly do not want a third runway to accommodate people in light aircraft. Of course, the proposed location of the third runway is extremely dangerous. If a light aircraft comes in from the north, it will have to fly over the Kooyonga golf course, and the wind draught caused by the trees will not be conducive to good flying conditions. Certainly, the noise pollution suffered in other suburbs will be more than that in the suburbs experiencing the problem at present. So, here we have a stupid bureaucracy going wild once again, wasting taxpayers' money and coming up with ideas that have caused a tremendous amount of anguish amongst the residents in the area. All that they have done is move and now incorporate more noise pollution and worry for more people than have had to put up with it in the past.

I can only urge the State Government and the Minister (and I hope that I get his support in Cabinet) to encourage his Federal colleagues to reserve the land and, if they have not already started, to start taking wind tests in the Two

Wells area so that we can get on with planning and establishing the correct location for international runways. It will take 15 years as from yesterday to build a new airport. It will probably cost about \$500 000 000. However, hundreds of jobs would be created in the construction stage and the construction of the facilities, and at least we can build a decent airport and accommodation for those who have to work in the airport. We can incorporate a decent international airport and we can certainly build something which could operate 24 hours a day and which will make a worthwhile contribution to the tourist industry. One would create more jobs and, whilst the capital cost is high, at least in the long term we would create permanent jobs because we would have an expanded facility at the airport and the opportunity to bring what are supposed to be lucrative markets closer to Asia, especially the tourist market.

Mr Ashenden: But would you get—

Mr BECKER: The member for Todd is concerned about the time it takes to get to the airport. I think that if he has been around the world (I think that he has on one or two occasions privately in previous employment) he would know that nowhere in the world can one get to an airport as quickly as we can get to Adelaide Airport. We are thoroughly spoilt and, because that situation exists in Adelaide, it does not mean that it will continue. It will not continue because the residents in the south-western suburbs will not allow it to continue. If it is good enough for the Germans to spend 30 minutes travelling to airports, for Americans to spend 1½ hours travelling to the airport in New York and spend up to two hours in queues to be dealt with at their international airport, it is good enough for Adelaide. One will not even have to do that because we will put in a modern transport and commuter system at Two Wells. One would probably do it within half an hour and still be better off.

The people in the south-western suburbs are sick and tired of being told by those who live in the eastern suburbs that we have to put up with all the noise and rubbish. It is bad enough that we get all their rubbish at the Patawalonga and Sturt Creek. I certainly want that airport moved and it is high time that the Government honoured the commitment of previous State Governments to ensure that it will be done.

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

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I follow the formality of the Address in Reply debate and support the motion before the House. However, there is certainly no way in the world that I can support all of the comments in the Governor's Speech which, of course, is the Speech prepared for him by the Government of the day. I would like to address myself to some specific points contained in the Governor's Speech and look at some of the points that should be considered in those areas. Later in my speech I will consider a number of matters of specific importance to the electors of Todd. The first point I make is that in his Speech the Governor stated:

During the coming session a number of measures will be placed before you aimed at raising the revenue required to meet the State's liabilities in the most equitable way.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: I agree with the Minister that the statement is perfectly correct because never before in the history of South Australia has there been a Government that has introduced so many taxes and increased them in such a short time as has the present Government in South Australia.

However, I do not think that the Minister, even in his wildest dreams, would agree that the taxes have been imposed in the most equitable way. As I have said in a previous speech in this House, the taxes that have been introduced

have been designed with one purpose in mind: to hit hardest the person least able to afford them. I will shortly go through the sad list of tax increases that have occurred since this Government came to office. I am certain that members of this House will then agree with my statements. The Governor, in his address, also said:

While the economy shows some signs of improved growth . . . The person from the Premier's Department who wrote the Governor's Speech is completely out of touch as far as the South Australian economy is concerned.

Not only has the Government raised taxes, it has also taken more steps to destroy the South Australian economy than even the Dunstan Government did. I did not think that we would ever have a Government that would do more to destroy the South Australian economy than did the Dunstan Government. I will go into considerable detail to show the effects of the Government's actions in relation to economic growth. The Governor was correct when he said:

. . . the immediate situation remains bleak.

That is certainly totally true. Until there is a change of Government that situation will remain true. Until we have returned to the Treasury benches a Government which believes in encouraging private enterprise in South Australia, encouraging the mining industry, and encouraging the manufacturing industry, the South Australian economy and its outlook must be bleak indeed. The Governor's Speech continues:

. . . however, there is no early prospect of substantial reductions in unemployment.

The gall of the Premier to allow that statement to be included in His Excellency's Speech is beyond comprehension. That is the Premier who, only eight months ago, promised increased job opportunities for South Australia, who said that there would be no increases in taxation, and that there would be no new taxation measures. What have we found? Immediately that Premier was elected, one of the first things he said was, 'Of course, now that I am elected things are a little difficult and you must be patient, you must wait for any of our promises to be met'. The Premier did not have the honesty to say that before the election. He did not have the honesty to get up and say that conditions in South Australia were such that unemployment prospects were difficult. I recall that for three years, while my Party was in Government, the Premier stood up virtually every Question Time and attacked the then Government on unemployment and unemployment levels in South Australia.

The Premier now says that unemployment is outside of his control, and that there is very little that the South Australian Government can do. When things are different, they are not quite the same! I assure honourable members opposite that, if the constituents in their districts are like the constituents in my district, they are well aware of the way in which they have been totally misled by the Premier and this Government. We also have a Federal Government which stated that it would find 500 000 new jobs. After the disaster that it brought down tonight I certainly do not see that coming true.

We have certainly seen a growth in unemployment figures since the State and Federal Labor Governments came to power. Let us not forget that since the State Labor Government came to power it has scrapped two very important mining complexes which could have taken place in South Australia and which would have brought in between 2 000 and 3 000 jobs for this State—they have been dismissed out of hand. The State Government seems to be saying, 'Forget the 2 000 or 3 000 jobs, forget the promises we made that we would create employment in South Australia. We will do our best to destroy any commercial confidence in this State. We will do our best to put people out of jobs in

South Australia.' That is the policy of the present Government. His Excellency's Speech continues:

Positive factors over the next 12 months will be a rural uplift . . . I suppose the Premier will claim all the credit for that. All that has happened is that we have had rain, desperately needed rain, for the rural community, a community that this Government does its best to absolutely and utterly destroy. Yet the Government is pinning its hopes on growth in the rural sector. The taxes that this Government has brought in will have a disastrous effect on the rural community: 1c a litre on petrol might not sound much to the Premier, but he should talk to the people who live in the rural communities and who have to travel miles and miles to a town. The Premier should talk to the farmers who have to transport their produce for sale, and everything that farmers buy has to be transported to them. We will see just how much help this Government gives the rural community.

The Governor stated in his Speech that there will be a marked growth in the Federal Government's expenditure with specific stimulation in the new dwelling sector and the building industry. Therefore, the advance that will occur in this State (and as I continue I will show that this will not occur) is pinned on two areas — the rural sector (which, as I said, has nothing to do with this Government because this Government does nothing to help it), and the Federal Government. What an admission in the Governor's Speech that this State Government is absolutely bereft of ideas to enable South Australia to get back on its feet.

Let us consider some of the other credits that have been claimed by this Government. His Excellency the Governor stated that the Savings Bank of South Australia and the State Bank will merge. Of course, that was a policy of the previous Government, so we find that this Government has merely put into effect the plans of the previous Government. The Speech refers to the development of Technology Park. Once again, this was the complete and utter brain child of the previous Government, and it was established by the previous Government. Yet, we find that the present Government is trying to take the credit for the development of Technology Park. The Speech then refers to small business, and the Government would have us believe that it will do something for small business. So far, all that this Government has done for small business is to increase the taxes that hit the small business men hardest, and I have on file a number of letters from small business men who express their utter dismay at what this Government has done since being elected to office. I will refer to that matter later.

The Governor's Speech then refers to the Housing Trust and how the Government will encourage the trust to provide housing for those in need. What was one of the first actions that this Government took when it came to office? It increased the rent of South Australian Housing Trust accommodation at a rate greater than has previously occurred. This is the Government that is supposed to help the little people: the people who will be hit hardest are those who cannot afford the increase in rent. I can remember that, when the previous Government introduced a small increase in Housing Trust rentals, the uproar from this side had to be believed, but we do not hear a whimper now that the Government has increased rentals at a greater rate.

Reference was made to the north-south transportation corridor. The Government seems proud of the fact that it will destroy and remove completely a feature that could be used in future years. I note that neither the member for Mawson nor the member for Brighton is in the House at present, but I wonder how they feel about the fact that a corridor that could have been used to transport their constituents to the city or to the northern suburban areas will be removed completely by their Government.

I do not use South Road very often, but I had occasion to use it a few days ago. I thought that there were problems in the north-eastern suburbs, especially on the North East Road and the Lower North East Road. However, despite the fact that South Road beyond Tapleys Hill Road is a far wider road than any in my district, the traffic chaos and the conditions were far worse than anything we have to put up with. The traffic moves at a snail's pace, yet this Government is going to remove a transport corridor that could have moved people rapidly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

Mr ASHENDEN: We find that this Government will remove a transport corridor that people to the south could use to get from their homes to the city much more quickly. This is the Government that is also doing its best to destroy rapid transport for my constituents to get from their homes in the north-eastern suburbs to the city. Of course, I refer to the Government's inaction in relation to the north-east busway. I will refer to that matter both in relation to the Governor's Speech and in more detail later in the Address in Reply debate.

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

Mr ASHENDEN: As I said earlier, the Governor's Speech puts forward the Government's intentions in regard to the coming session of Parliament, and I now refer to another of the Government's claims placed before the Parliament during His Excellency's Speech, that is, the ratification of the River Murray Waters Agreement. Once again we find that the Government has taken an initiative of the previous Government and claimed it as its own, when in fact the excellent work undertaken by the previous Minister of Water Resources (the member for Chaffey) was the main reason behind the agreement being reached and the success of that agreement achieved.

I would have thought that the Government would prefer to omit the reference to expenditure on mineral exploration. I will be addressing that matter in considerably more detail later in my speech. The Government has taken unprecedented steps in its attempts to scare away any possible expenditure on mineral exploration in South Australia. We have only to see what the Government has done in relation to Honeymoon and Beverley to realise exactly the effect that the action of the Government is having in this area. Also, I have further information to relate to the House that shows clearly that, despite the Government's promises, contained in His Excellency's Speech, in fact we will see a serious decline in the amount of money that will be spent in South Australia on mineral exploration. I think probably the most telling point of all in regard to mineral exploration is the fact that B.H.P. had actually budgeted \$30 000 000 for exploration development in South Australia. Because of the Government's inaction, that amount of \$30 000 000 has been taken from South Australia and has been spent in offshore drilling off the coast of China.

The Governor's Speech also made reference to the amount of money that was spent in South Australia during the past financial year. But, of course, in preparing the Speech the Government made absolutely no comment about the fact that all of that money was spent because of the initiatives of the previous Government. Reference to electricity generation was made as follows:

Detailed studies are being made of the various options for future generation of electricity in this State.

I am glad to see that at long last a Labor Government is addressing itself to the matter of the production of electricity in South Australia. It was the Dunstan Government that placed South Australia in a most invidious position in

relation to power supplies. It protected the supply to New South Wales into the twenty-first century and sold South Australia's gas to that State at a dirt-cheap rate while at the same time allowing for a gas supply for South Australia to produce electricity for only a few years with no protection in relation to price. Of course, that is why we are now paying so much for our electricity and why the Electricity Trust is being forced to search for alternative sources of supply from which to generate electricity. It could well be that in the 1990s we will find that South Australian gas is being exported to New South Wales for generation of electricity in that State while here in South Australia the Electricity Trust is importing some form of fuel from elsewhere because we cannot use our own gas supplies.

Mr Whitten: That is rubbish.

Mr ASHENDEN: So much for the Dunstan Government: that is an absolute statement of fact and members opposite know that only too well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Todd must be heard in silence.

Mr ASHENDEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Another point in the Governor's Speech refers to Olympic Dam. All I can say to members opposite is that I hope this Government will become a little more active in protecting the rights of the mining companies in relation to Olympic Dam than it has been so far. It has been deathly silent in what it is going to do to ensure that the joint venturers are able to proceed with their operations at Roxby Downs. Yesterday I was fortunate enough to spend the day at Roxby Downs and I would suggest that, if members opposite really want to find out what life is all about, they also would go there to look at the development which is being carried out.

Members interjecting:

Mr ASHENDEN: They say that ignorance is bliss so they probably would not want to go there. I have been to Roxby Downs on three separate occasions; once when exploratory drilling was under way; then when the main shaft had been commenced; and yesterday, when I saw that the main shaft had not only been completed but there is a tremendous amount of underground tunnelling. To bring it home to the members opposite, I point out that the size of this development already has to be seen to be believed. For example, in the underground works at the moment, there are trucks capable of carrying 50 tons of ore. There are graders and bulldozers capable of lifting 10 tons at a time into those 50 ton trucks. About 500 metres underground there is a workshop, canteen and kilometres of tunnels which have already been developed. I will later place on record the size of the development, but the point made yesterday was that it has already been determined that there is enough ore and mineral reserve in that development to enable production to continue at foreseeable rates for the next 300 years.

The Hon. D. C. Wotton: There are those who support the present Government who want to close all that down.

Mr ASHENDEN: Exactly; there are a number of groups trying to close that mine down. This Government is doing absolutely nothing to assist the joint venturers in ensuring that Roxby Downs will be able to proceed. I cannot understand how a Government in charge of this State and its welfare can be so unconcerned about actions which could lead to a serious slowdown, if not cessation, in the work at Roxby Downs. Having already closed down Honeymoon and Beverley, how can the Government imagine in its wildest dreams that any mining company will ever again want to invest money in South Australia? I will go into that in greater detail later.

I think the most classic statement of all refers to my own electorate and the residents in the north-east suburbs. I must place this on record, as this would have to be the most cynical statement that I have ever read: 'Construction of

the north-east busway is proceeding rapidly'. They are the words used by the Government, which also said, 'And commencement of operation of the system is expected by 1986'. Let us get some facts on the record. Before this government gained office, along with the assurances it gave that it would not raise taxation or introduce new taxation, it also promised the residents of the north-east suburbs that the north-east busway would be proceeded with at exactly the same rate as promised by the previous Government, and that it would be completed by 1986. The member for Brighton is looking at me as if I am not telling the truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: It was the Government members who told the untruths in this place, and I would be happy to forward to her some pamphlets handed out by my opponent, prior to the election, in which it was stated that Mr Bannon, if elected to Government, would ensure that a rapid public transport system would be completed to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986. What is the truth of the situation? This Government has stated that by 1986 the busway will only be completed to Darley Road, approximately one half of its length, and the Government has the gall to state in this address to the Parliament that the north-east busway is proceeding rapidly. It is months and months behind the schedule planned by the previous Government and when this Government came to office the north-east busway was ahead of time and programme in relation to its construction.

I can assure members, particularly the member for Newland (I am sure he is receiving exactly the same comments as I am), that this will be one of the most telling points at the next election as far as the north-east suburbs are concerned. Residents there are extremely upset that a Government is in power which will not ensure that their public transport system, promised by both the previous Government and the present Government, will proceed as it had been planned. Yet another of the multitude of broken promises of Premier Bannon and his Government.

The Governor's Speech also refers to shipping services and the way in which this Government is attracting shipping services to South Australia. Once again, that is an initiative of the previous Government.

Mr Whitten: That is rubbish: Des Corcoran started that.

Mr ASHENDEN: The honourable member might like to hear what the Federal Government is doing to the country at present, because that is an utter disgrace, too. We find that the Federal Government (just like the State Government) has made all sorts of promises which, of course, have not been kept and I have no doubt that tomorrow morning the population of Australia will come to realise what South Australians have already realised: Labor Party members of Parliament cannot be trusted.

Let us come to another point in relation to the Governor's Speech. We can always tell on this side of the House when we really get to something about which the Labor Party feels quite deeply: that is when they interject. One does not hear from them unless one is really getting to them. I thank members opposite for proving once again that their Government has embarrassed them severely. I refer to another statement from the Governor's Speech:

My Government came to office eight months ago determined to give a new direction to South Australia's economic and social development.

I can sum that up in two words: it has. The only direction in which this State is now heading is one which even in our worst moments we would not have dreamed of eight months ago. I think that I have already gone through many of the points of dishonesty and, for members opposite, perhaps we should go over some statements which their Leader made when he was Leader of the Opposition. He is

now Premier and, of course, he does not feel that that fact has anything to do with it. After all, he can make a promise and, as far as he is concerned, forget all about it. However, in his A.L.P. policy speech the Premier stated:

Unlike the Liberals we will not allow State charges—like transport fares—

they have gone up 48 per cent—
electricity—

which has gone up by 12 per cent and another 6 per cent rise is to come shortly—

hospital charges—

they have gone up 20 per cent since this Government came to power—

to be used as a form of back door taxation.

Well, that is not a bad effort, is it? In his A.L.P. policy speech Mr Bannon also stated:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties—

it has not done that yet but I should say that it is not too far away.

Mr Whitten: They should.

Mr ASHENDEN: I hope that that is recorded so that members of the public realise that the Labor Caucus is in favour of the reintroduction of succession duties. The interjection from the member for Price was that succession duties should be introduced.

Mr Whitten: I still stand by it.

Mr ASHENDEN: The statement from the Premier continues:

The A.L.P. will not reintroduce succession duties and will not introduce new taxes . . .

I do not know what they call the financial institutions duty. However, to me that is a completely new tax.

Ms Lenehan: How would you raise the finance?

Mr ASHENDEN: That is easy to answer.

Mr Whitten: Sack 2 000 people!

Mr ASHENDEN: When the Liberal Party was running for power it did not make the promises that the Labor Party made. The Labor Party knew when it made those promises that it could not keep them. On the night that the Premier won the election he gave the first indication that he had no intention of honouring his promises. When we were running for power we were honest with the public of South Australia. We did not make statements we could not keep. Let us get on to the Premier's statement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: This Government has stated that it will not introduce new taxes, yet it brings in an f.i.d. That is the most iniquitous tax that one could imagine. The Premier's statement continues:

—nor increase existing levels of tax during our term of office.

I would like to reassure the member for Bragg that (as I have said before) one knows when one is getting to Government members because they really bite; the people in their electorates would be telling them that this is exactly what the people of South Australia cannot stomach at present. What else did Mr Bannon say? He stated:

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

That referred to the previous Government. I will give one thing to Mr Bannon: he certainly is not drip feeding; he is taking the money of South Australians at a tremendous volume. He said that he would not introduce higher electricity or water charges; and so it goes on.

For the record, and because members opposite obviously must have this pointed out to them again, let us look at what this Government has done since it came to power: it has increased gas charges by 13.9 per cent; electricity charges

have gone up already by 12 per cent and shortly will go up by another 6 per cent; E. & W.S. Department water rates are up by 26 per cent. We find that this Government also, of course, increased the rates for irrigation along the Murray. It has increased hospital fees by 20 per cent; veterinary surgeons registration fees are up by 25 per cent; hairdressers registration fees are up; waste management fees are up; architects fees are up; Hairdressers Registration Board fees are up; pastoral leases are up—only by 50 per cent! Metropolitan Taxi Cab Act fees are up; the Racing Act and Trotting Control Board fees are up; number plate fees are up; Government supervisors at race meetings are charging more; trotting stewards fees are higher; nurses registration fees are higher; chiropodists annual licence and subscription fees have been increased; fishing licences are being increased; post-mortem fees have been increased—this Government even gets one when one dies! Physiotherapists licence fees have been increased. I refer also to bus fares, and I want it recorded in *Hansard* that the Government members are laughing at the fact that bus fares have been substantially increased—in fact, by far more than they were under the full three years of the previous Government. Water rates are up; Housing Trust rents are up—I spoke of that prior to the dinner adjournment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ASHENDEN: I am absolutely staggered that members opposite find that amusing because the residents of Todd certainly do not find it amusing, and I am quite certain that very few members of the public find those increased taxes and charges amusing. As I said, virtually every member sitting on the Government benches laughed when I spoke of those taxes. That, of course, shows the absolute contempt in which members of this Government Party hold the members of the public of South Australia. Perhaps they may like to laugh at this letter from a small business man, who is in considerable trouble. This is a letter which has been forwarded from a manager of a small business in the north-eastern suburbs. It reads:

As the manager of a small business, I am becoming terrified to open business mail assuming there will be a further cost increase by one authority or another. Electricity and water rates have increased. Postage and phone charge increases are coming

What further tax increases are coming up in the State and Federal Budgets relevant to small businesses, I dare not contemplate. Our staff has had no wage increases this year, we have had to lower our product prices to remain competitive; we are finding it harder to collect finance from our debtors and our suppliers (who are going through the same scenario) are pressing us for payments.

We, and all other small businesses we associate with, are continually walking a tightrope with the abyss below getting deeper and deeper. If the Governments keep loading more charges on small businesses I warn them they will face one hell of a strong lobby group.

Members opposite perhaps will take a little heed there, because the point is that taxes and charges which their Government has increased not only relate to the fact that the average family in South Australia is now up for \$12.50 out of their household pocket, but businesses will suffer because they will not be as competitive as their interstate counterparts. South Australia has long prided itself on the fact that its costs of production were lower than they were in other States. I can assure members opposite that because of the tax increases which their Government has brought about this is no longer the case.

Members opposite again might poo hoo this, but they should be extremely careful, because I have been given information about at least one major employer. Let me stress here on the record that, although I am a member of the Industries Development Committee, the company to

which I am about to refer is not a company that has made any approach to that committee.

I have been given confidential information that a major employer in this State is seriously considering relocating in another State or possibly overseas. The reason is purely and simply that most of the company's products are sold interstate. It used to be able to produce those goods more cheaply than their interstate competitors and could still bear the cost of transportation and sell those goods competitively. I have been told that that situation has disappeared in South Australia. Therefore, if the company stays in South Australia and produces here, the cost of production is about the same as it is in the Eastern States. By the time the cost of transport is added on, the goods must cost more than if the firm was established in either Sydney or Melbourne: it is that serious.

South Australian industry is in a very difficult position. Unlike the Government, it cannot just walk out and say that it will increase prices. This Government says that it needs more money and therefore it will raise taxes. It is easy to do when you are the Government, but you cannot do that in private enterprise because, as soon as you raise your prices, you are no longer competitive, people will not buy your goods and you are out of business.

The sooner members opposite realise how the world of private enterprise works, the better it will be for this State. Every dollar earned by someone in private enterprise is money not coming out of the State coffers. In fact, it is contributing to the State coffers. Every dollar paid in wages in the Public Service is a dollar that comes out of the public pocket. It is as simple as that. Surely it is better to encourage private enterprise to get the creative dollar into South Australia rather than the dollar that is just drawn out of the long-suffering taxpayer's pocket.

Before moving on from the matter of State taxation, I will refer to some of the typical misleading information put out by the Labor Party prior to the last election. We have seen already that this Government does not give two hoots about the truth. It wanted to gain power at all costs. In order to gain office, it made promises that it knew it could not keep. Having gained office, it did not even blanch when its Deputy Leader misled this House on at least three occasions.

Mr Trainer: That is an untruth.

Mr ASHENDEN: It is completely true, and later I will read evidence which shows quite clearly that it is absolutely true. I have a pamphlet put out by my opponent at the last State election. It is very interesting to run down the list of items for which he criticised the previous Tonkin Government during the three years from 1979 to 1982. He refers to certain price rises. I will go through the items for which the Tonkin Government was criticised. At the top we find interest rates. They are something about which the present Governments, both State and Federal, made all sorts of guarantees and gave assurances. They stated that if they were re-elected they would lower interest rates. In fact, when we were in Government and the present Government was in Opposition, it continually attacked the Tonkin Government for not taking action to lower interest rates. In eight months this Government has done absolutely nothing to lower interest rates. In fact, because of the pressure of inflation, it is putting even greater pressure on interest rates, and I have no doubt that those rates will rise even further.

Beer is also mentioned on the list. A few weeks ago we remember that the Premier announced a steep increase in the cost of beer. Hospital beds have gone up 20 per cent since the present Government came to power, but the previous Government was criticised because the prices went up slightly. The list refers also to electricity, water rates and bus fares. It states that bus fares went up by 10 cents one year when this Government has increased bus fares by

almost 50 per cent. Again, it has hit the members of the public who can least afford it.

I think that my remarks have shown quite clearly that the Premier has been totally dishonest with the public of South Australia. I also mention a matter that I will not go into in great detail, because it has been canvassed in this House many times. We have seen the complete dishonesty of the Deputy Premier in misleading the House. We have seen the Minister for Environment and Planning misleading the public completely in relation to actions taken by the previous Government regarding mining development in this State. Prior to the election, the Minister of Transport promised residents of the north-eastern suburbs that the O-Bahn bus system would proceed, as it would have proceeded under the Tonkin Government. We know now what that promise was worth.

The present Chief Secretary was critical of the member for Victoria, when he was Chief Secretary. It is my intention during a future grievance debate to read to the House statements made by the present Chief Secretary in relation to occurrences under previous Chief Secretaries and what he said that the Chief Secretary in the Tonkin Government should do—that is, resign. However, we now have a situation at Yatala in which identical occurrences have become well known. But has this Chief Secretary taken his own advice and resigned? Oh, no! We now find him defending the action he has taken, we find that it is everybody else's fault but his own. In other words, when he was in Opposition he condemned the Chief Secretary and demanded his resignation because of certain situations; now that he is Chief Secretary the truism comes out that when things are different they are not the same.

I turn now to the Minister of Mines and Energy. How on earth he can allow that to remain as the title of his portfolio I do not know. I will refer shortly to a Ministerial statement that he made to this House which shows clearly that his last interest is that of the mining companies. The Minister of Water Resources has taken what I believe is an unprecedented step. I have raised this matter in the House before, and I do not intend to dwell on it tonight. The former Minister of Water Resources promised a constituent of mine at Houghton a reticulated water supply. He did this in writing. One of the first actions of the present Minister on coming to office was to withdraw the promise to that family, a family that had been fighting for years to have a reticulated water supply connected to its home. It was promised under the previous Government and taken away by the present Government. I ask members opposite how they would feel if, with young families, they were promised a water supply by one Government and then, when another Government was elected, as one of its first actions it withdrew that promise. If members address themselves to speeches made in this House about this matter they will note that the persons concerned were prepared to pay the cost of installation and the cost for the main to be laid, so connection of this water supply would not have cost the Government anything.

Let us look now at some more of this Government's dishonesty in relation to the Surrey Downs development. The Government owned land at Surrey Downs on which a school was to be built. The Government determined that a school was no longer required and that land has now been sold to the South Australian Housing Trust. Against the wishes of local residents, a development is to occur although local residents believe it should not proceed. This development is in the electorate of Newland, whose local member, instead of placing the blame where it lies, is attempting to blame the South Australian Housing Trust, when members in this place know full well that the Government is in a position to implement controls over such developments.

Also, if the Government had not sold this land to the South Australian Housing Trust many of the problems in this area would not have occurred. I raise this point because it once again shows that dishonesty is not confined to the Premier and his Ministers but applies also to members on the Government back benches. We have heard the member for Hartley, supported tonight by other members opposite, in relation to the alleged statement that I am supposed to have made advocating the axing of 2 000 public servants.

My statement is on the record. Members of the public and members of this House can refer to the *Hansard* in question, where they will note that all I said was that the employment of those 2 000 public servants should not have proceeded if the Government could not afford it. It is as simple as that. Now that they are employed, let us get it on the record that there is no way that I or any member on this side of the House would advocate that those public servants should be sacked. I hope that that matter has now been laid to rest.

I now turn to other matters of economic importance in South Australia. The first area that I wish to deal with in relation to State development is an area where South Australia could, if led by a reasonable Government, develop most rapidly. I refer to the area of mineral development. Because of its geographical location, South Australia is at a serious disadvantage in relation to its manufacturing processes. As I pointed out earlier, that disadvantage has seriously increased because of the activities of the Government in increasing taxation. Even without that, other major problems face manufacturing development in South Australia.

In South Australia we have an abundance of natural resources, particularly minerals. The former Tonkin Liberal Government made tremendous strides to have mineral exploration increased in South Australia and to have those resources developed. That development would have brought tens of millions of dollars, developing into hundreds of millions of dollars, in royalties to the State coffers; money that would not have had to be raised through taxation. That mineral development would have brought tens of thousands of jobs to South Australia. Despite that, the present Labor Government has done everything it can to discourage mining and mining exploration in South Australia. It has grudgingly allowed Roxby Downs to proceed; at the same time, it is doing absolutely nothing to assist Roxby Downs to proceed. The Government has been absolutely silent about the planned blockade that is to occur at Roxby Downs later this week. The blockade is being set up by professional demonstrators who have taken themselves away, army style, to a training camp to learn the techniques of how best to stop the development at Roxby Downs. Has the Government given any words of encouragement or any words that could encourage the Roxby Downs developing companies? No.

It will be extremely interesting to see what occurs at Roxby Downs. I hope for South Australia's sake that common sense prevails and that Government protection will be provided. After all, it should be on the record that, if Roxby Downs proceeds, it will be the biggest mine in the world. The Roxby Downs development is a copper, uranium, gold, silver, and rare earth mine, and it contains over 2 000 000 000 tonnes of mineralisation. It was pointed out yesterday that that figure is not the limit. The developers however found so much ore that they are no longer exploring; they have enough to develop for the next 300 years, and the Government is doing nothing to assist this development. The reserves already found at Roxby Downs contain more than 30 000 000 tonnes of copper, more than 1 000 000 tonnes of uranium, and more than 1 000 tonnes of gold and silver. This material could be developed at a rate of about 150 000 tonnes of copper per year, along with the associated minerals of uranium, gold and silver. The anticipated investment is \$1 400 000 000 in 1982 terms

At present, more than 300 people are currently employed, and during construction there will be a further 8 000 man years, or an additional 3 300 people. At the production phase, 2 400 people will be directly employed, but about another 18 000 jobs will be created indirectly, arising from the mining development at Roxby Downs. Obviously, members opposite do not think that that development is worthy of their interest. The economic effects of that development are tremendous. If 20 000 new jobs are created, that will mean 20 000 fewer people on the unemployment benefit list—a huge saving in taxation. At the same time, these people will be constructively employed and they will create wealth for SA. There will be 20 000 people with jobs that they did not have previously—people who can obtain goods and services that they could not obtain before. Yet this Government is doing virtually nothing to assist that.

We find that some members opposite (I am certain that this view is not unanimous, although evidently the majority of Caucus members hold this view) will not support the Roxby Downs development, Honeymoon, or Beverley, because of their hangups about uranium. I suggest that those people get their blinkers off and have a look at overseas figures which show the number of countries that already have nuclear power plants to generate electricity. More than double that number of countries have nuclear power plants on the boards. The number of nuclear power plants will more than double in the next few years. Japan, for example, will shortly generate 25 per cent of its electricity by nuclear power, and yet we have a Government which says that, despite the demands and needs of overseas countries for Australian uranium, we will leave it in the ground. We will let South Africa, Canada or other countries make the profits and we will let people from those countries get the jobs that could be made available to South Australians. I believe that the *News* editorial on 18 August summed up very well indeed the importance of Roxby Downs and the threat that the planned blockade represents not just to Roxby Downs but also to South Australia. It stated:

It is plain that a deliberate attempt is to be made to thwart the Roxby Downs joint ventures—and the workers already on the site sharing in the early benefits.

It was pointed out, as I have already stated, that the protesters are professionals: they have been trained in the art. It is also interesting to note that at least one other member on this side has been provided with information, which was given to me late this afternoon, that members of this protest group are going to the colleges of advanced education and offering the students free transport to Roxby Downs, free food while there, and free accommodation—come and enjoy the sun! In other words, they are deliberately offering incentives to students to join them in their efforts to bring to a halt one of the major developments in the world and certainly the most important potential development in South Australia.

I now refer to education. I have kept very close contact with the schools in my district, the parents, the school councils and the teachers, since my election in 1979. I know that people have been extremely concerned at the direction which the South Australian Institute of Teachers has been taking over the past two years. There is no doubt at all that the South Australian Institute of Teachers played a major political activist role in the 1982 election. There is no doubt at all that Ms Leonie Ebert alienated not only a large proportion of the public but also a large proportion of the teaching profession.

Mr Mayes: She got the highest primary vote, though, didn't she?

Mr ASHENDEN: The point is that parents were extremely concerned about the high profile taken by the South Australian Institute of Teachers, and that was reflected by the

teachers themselves. Over the past couple of years while I have been visiting schools, parents and teachers alike have spoken to me on many occasions about the role played by the South Australian Institute of Teachers. I know from my discussions that parents in South Australia, and rightly so, regard the teaching profession in this State very highly indeed. I have been fortunate enough to work in other States, and I can say categorically that the standard of professionalism in the teaching profession in South Australia is second to none. This State can be immensely proud of that profession and its teachers. Parents of children going to South Australian schools are immensely proud of the teachers and are extremely protective and defensive of them, which is good to see. However, the South Australian Institute of Teachers, in two short years, attempted to take steps—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: You mean the executive.

Mr ASHENDEN: Yes. Certainly, the President and the executive took steps that could end in only one result, and that was to alienate the parents of children being taught by the teachers in South Australian schools.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: What about what they did in 1979?

Mr ASHENDEN: The profile taken by the institute in 1979 was nothing like that taken by Ms Ebert over the past couple of years. People have been more upset during that time and this has been evidenced by the comments made to me. Over the past few days, following the announcement of the result of the election of a new President of the South Australian Institute of Teachers, I have been staggered by the number of parents, school councillors and teachers who have said that that was one of the best things that could have occurred as far as the teaching profession is concerned.

Members opposite should not be too upset about the appointment because, after all, as was stated in the *Advertiser*, the appointee was previously a member of the A.L.P. However, he has stated that he will take a much lower profile and that he will try to heal the wounds and repair the rifts that were brought about by the previous executive. I certainly hope that that will be the case, because education is far too important an issue to be torn apart by political activists such as the outgoing President of SAIT. I refer to some of the actions that occurred while Ms Ebert was President. First, I refer to a letter written to the *South Australian Teachers Journal*. Under the present President that journal has had a dictate placed upon it that it can only publish letters of its members: I suppose some people might call that free speech. In fact, that is the heading of the letter to the Editor in the *South Australian Institute of Teachers Journal*, which reads as follows:

In light of recent SAIT advice for teachers to be informed and involved in current issues, I would ask Leonie Ebert and her team what part they have played in some of the more restrictive and divisive changes we have had to live with.

For example:

the banning of advertisements by mining companies in the SAIT Journal (like it or not, mining is necessary: and surely such industries have the right to at least pay to defend themselves);

the resignation of the previous SAIT Journal editor. A lot of uniformed gossip is around schools—what is the story?;

the loss of Chalkie's column. I find column 59 blatantly sexist, and at times absurd, but I wouldn't ban it;

These are not my words but those of the person writing the letter to the Editor. The letter continues:

the loss of SAIT members. Even though membership is very close to being compulsory for registration . . .

That very same edition of the *South Australian Teachers Journal* contains an advertisement headed 'The Nuclear Environment' which explains to teachers a book that is available to them that should be placed before the children. It is a book that is available from Friends of the Earth and the Movement Against Uranium Mining. Therefore, I can

imagine that that certainly would be a most biased piece of literature, and yet here the institute, which prohibits mining companies from advertising, is accepting for publication an advertisement from a group which obviously is pushing an anti-mining and anti-uranium point of view.

Is that what Ms Ebert calls democracy? She will allow the journal that represents her and her institute to publish advertisements putting one point of view but not allow advertisements putting another point of view. Is it therefore a logical extension that she would be espousing to teachers that it is all right for them to put anti-mining lessons before the children but, whatever they do, they should not put before them anything that has to do with pro-mining.

I notice that some members opposite think that this is amusing. Almost certainly they live in brick homes and, for members opposite, I point out that clay comes from mining. They would have either cement or clay tiles or galvanised iron roofs, all of which are products of mining. When they go home they probably switch on the gas or the electricity, both energy sources being products of mining. The utensils they use to eat with are all products of mining. Why is it that an industry that can bring so much wealth to a State, that it can bring so many jobs to a State, and why is it that this Government has done its best to try and bring such developments to a halt?

Recently the Minister of Mines and Energy made a statement to this House in which he defended his Government's actions in relation to the fact that his Government would be making no financial reimbursement to the joint developers of the Honeymoon mine. The fact that it cost that company \$10 000 000 does not concern this Government two hoots. The Minister stated quite blithely that legally the Government is not required to make any reimbursement. The Minister did not talk about the morals of the issue. Whether the present Minister likes it or not, a previous Government gave those mining companies approval to proceed with that development.

Now, purely and simply because of the quirk of an election, the company that invested \$10 000 000 is to lose all of that money and the Minister of Mines and Energy says that that does not worry him one iota. He says; 'Why should the Government make any reimbursement? It is not legally bound to do so.' I think that that statement begs two questions. Surely to goodness, if industry is going to come to South Australia or was going to come to South Australia, it will think twice. It realises that here is a Government that very likely will take away any development on which it spends money. Would you, Mr Speaker, if you were a representative of a mining company, spend money investing in South Australia knowing that, if you found uranium, you would not be able to develop it? Yet opposite is a Government that says it is trying to develop South Australia. That brings home how cynical and with what total and utter disregard this Government regards the truth. It is a disaster for South Australia and I only hope that by the time we return to the Treasury benches this State will not be so far down the drain that it cannot be brought back to the level it would have continued to develop towards had a Liberal Government been returned to office.

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

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): Unfortunately, for one hour Government members have had to put up with the greatest tirade of absolute abuse with no basis whatsoever from the member for Todd. I have come to the conclusion that in five months this Government has caused the recession in the car industry, the recession in the white goods industry, has completely closed down the ship building industry, and has closed down Roxby Downs. What a good job we have

done in five months according to the member for Todd! What an absolute barrage of stupidity to say the least. What the member for Todd is really telling the Government is that his answer to the present recession, which unfortunately we are in, is to sack everyone.

Mr Ashenden: You're not original.

Mr MAX BROWN: The member for Todd can say what he likes but he has gone on record as saying that that would be his answer as far as he is concerned: we would not employ anyone.

The **Hon. Lynn Arnold**: He has had an hour to refute it and he has not.

Mr MAX BROWN: As the Minister of Education has said, he has had an hour to say that he would not do that, and he has not done it. The whole problem that we face in this country today is the fact that there are more and more people being unemployed, causing great troubles to any political Party—and the member for Todd's Party ought to know that because it has been Federally involved for over 10 years in causing the problem, and yet apparently it still does not know it. It is time that people like the member for Todd started to address the real problems that the political Parties of this country, including his own, have to face.

I would suggest that the member for Todd should address himself first to the real problem in this State, that is, the \$60 000 000 deficiency in the State's finances. I can only assume that, if the member for Todd's Party was still in power, it would pluck money from the money tree, dig it up from where it has hidden it over three years or continue its bankruptcy.

Let us be real about it: does the member for Todd in his wildest dreams suggest that I, as a representative of the working class people, like to see the proverbial drink of beer which the old worker always has after work (if any of them are working) cost more? Of course, I do not like it at all. Nevertheless, being responsible, something has to be done about the situation.

Mr Mayes: You could sack 2 000 workers!

Mr MAX BROWN: I have been through that. However, we have to be real about it. I think that the continuing barrage to which Government members have been subjected tonight by the member for Todd is the greatest amount of bunkum that I have ever had the misfortune of hearing. I turn now to more important things than the member for Todd and his barrage of stupidity. First, I refer again to the loss of Mr John Coumbe. Of course, I think that he was mentioned by all speakers in this debate. I certainly mentioned him in this Government's first debate on a previous occasion. At that time I said (and I will repeat it tonight) that I found Mr John Coumbe to be one of two members opposite who were very appreciative and approachable. I believe that he did a marvellous job on behalf of his constituency. I do not say that lightly. I am not trying to be a hypocrite: I am saying it quite seriously and sincerely, and I again pay my respect to the previous member for Torrens (Hon. John Coumbe). As an industrialist and a person on the opposite side of the industrial field, I found him a very, very fine gentleman in all respects.

I now turn to the very great calamity experienced recently in respect to the bush fires. Some people might say, 'Why is the member for Whyalla worrying about the bush fires, because he was not involved?' However, at this time I want sincerely to congratulate the many people who voluntarily assisted to overcome this particularly great tragedy and pass on my hopes that those people who lost their homes and suffered greatly in other ways will quickly overcome their losses and get back to the normal life they lived before the calamity occurred.

Perhaps I should not say too much about the bush fires because I had a personal involvement to some degree. My wife's brother lost his wife in that tragedy, besides losing personal effects. Lives were lost and great financial hardship is being experienced in this State because it appears that a person, who has been arrested and charged for the offence, deliberately lit the fire.

I say that I should not speak about this matter because some people might think that I raised the question at this time only because of personalities and the fact that I was not close to the woman in question, even though she was my sister-in-law. Some people would say that that would be paying lip service to her sad loss and that perhaps it was being hypocritical. However, I raise it at this time not on that basis, but on the basis that our society as a whole is paying a tremendous cost in respect of this type of act; that is, the deliberate lighting of fires. In our society there is a growing cancer, as it were, by which too many people, for reasons that I confess I just do not understand, appear to get some sort of enjoyment or satisfaction in the acts of destruction or vandalism that they perform.

In this case, a man has been apprehended and charged. If he is found guilty, I ask what sort of penalty this gentleman (if that is what we can call him) might receive. What penalty would bring back a life, undo the tremendous cost factor and heal the emotional aspects of the tragedy? I have not known the penalty for some years that would do this. It has come home to me in this case, because, as I have said, of my personal involvement. The people who perform this type of criminal act—and that is what it is—should have a penalty, perhaps in some cases for the rest of their lives, working under supervision, just performing tasks of rehabilitation of property, human life and society as a whole. Even this penalty would not undo the tragic circumstances of the disasters which these types of people cause. However, it might force them ultimately to take their proper place in our society and act as responsible people instead of the nuisances that they now are. I say that with some sincerity because, as I have said before and I repeat tonight, the tragedies that the common people of our society are enduring in this modern age just cannot go on unanswered and without some real penalty occurring.

I will turn to a matter of some importance, which has a very long history unfortunately and which would play a very important part in the rehabilitation of the steel industry, particularly in Whyalla. I want to speak at some length of the possible building of the Alice Springs-Darwin rail link. Let me pause because I was rather angry, to be truthful, with Opposition members over a letter to the Editor in tonight's *Adelaide News*, written by Senator Don Jessop and headed 'Rail link "vital" for South Australia'. The Senator writes of what Queensland Premier Bjelke Petersen suggested about constructing a railway that everybody in Australia knows was never a possibility. He also goes on and attacks the Hawke Government. The letter says, in conclusion:

During the fight to have the Stuart Highway sealed some years ago, it was pointed out that South Australia was losing \$80 million per year due to the fact that Queensland had a sealed road linking it with the Northern Territory. I would suggest that failure to construct the railway could cost this State a similar amount. Therefore the South Australian Government must take an aggressive stance to force the Federal Labor Government to proceed urgently with the north-south railway. When this is completed South Australia will become the national transport centre, creating an incentive for other industries to become established in this State.

The thing about this letter that I find intriguing, to say the least, is that it is written by a Senator who was in power for well over 10 years and who announced and re-announced the situation of the railway line and yet did not achieve anything. However, he comes out in condemnation and expects, with the wave of a magic wand, the Hawke Gov-

ernment, which inherited the problem, to immediately achieve the desired result. I will be more constructive about the situation. I have always believed that the project should go ahead. I join with the new Federal member for Grey, Mr Lloyd O'Neil, the Whyalla city council, the Northern Territory Chief Minister (Mr Everingham), the Premier and even the Leader of the Opposition in voicing my concern about the Federal Government's decision to not proceed with the venture. I also welcome the constructive approach, unlike the approach of Senator Jessop, being made to the Federal Government by Mr Everingham and the Premier. In my opinion, this is the correct way to deal with the problem. I only hope that something positive will come out of the submissions being made by those two leaders.

I will deal with some of the remarks made prior to the decision to put to the Federal Government a joint submission in an endeavour to persuade the Federal Government to change its current stance on the project. I am aware that, although the submission was made to the Federal Government, no positive signs have been shown so far that the Federal Government will take up the case. However, I point out to the House that a distinct possibility exists that another railway line (I understand, between Adelaide and Melbourne) could be a feasible proposition. Hopefully, if we are not successful in obtaining the proposition that has been spelt out (that is, the Alice Springs-Darwin railway line), at least we might get the alternative. In that way, hopefully, it could at least to a lesser degree assist the steel industry as far as Whyalla is concerned.

Some of the statements made prior to the lead-up to the decision and the submission being made to the Federal Government last Friday unfortunately were along the lines of Senator Jessop's comments, until some reasonable attitude was adopted by the leaders and a little more togetherness came into the proposition. I believe that that is to their credit and should have been something at which they ought to have been looking right from the word 'go'. I am not happy about some of the statements. The first one appeared in the *Adelaide News* on 1 June this year. The article was headed 'Bannon blasted on rail link' and stated:

The Premier, Mr Bannon, today was accused of lack of aggression in the fight to have the Federal Government reverse its decision to cut funds for the Alice Springs-to-Darwin rail link. The Northern Territory Chief Minister, Mr Everingham, said: 'There is at least as much, if not more, in it for you as there is for us.' When told Mr Bannon had teleaxed the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, last night asking him to restore funds for the rail link, Mr Everingham retorted: 'That's aggression?' 'When David Tonkin was your Premier, he backed us to the hilt in fighting Malcolm Fraser for this project. 'There has been a marked coolness since Mr Bannon took over. 'I wonder if he has done a deal not to rock the boat.'

History proves again that that press statement, attributed to Mr Everingham, was quite wrong. That statement achieved nothing in its attempt to have the Alice Springs to Darwin link become a reality. The play on words continued when the Premier, Mr Bannon, in an article of 1 June 1983, urged the Prime Minister to reconsider cutting funds to the Northern Territory. The article was most interesting, as follows:

In his telex, Mr Bannon says his Government supports the earliest possible construction of the rail link.

Mr Bannon said that before he supported any enquiry all parties would need to be satisfied it would be a true examination of the merits of the two alternative transport systems.

It was vital the agreements on the funding arrangements for the rail link were reached before setting up the enquiry.

'Otherwise, should the study outcome endorse the rail rather than the road, link, we will be back to square one. Your Government would be open to allegations of pre-empting the outcome of the inquiry if there is an agreed funding arrangement for only one of the two alternatives,' the telex says.

That was at least giving some sort of explanation of what he believed the Federal Government ought to do. I will take this matter a little further, because I think it is important that we consider it. A newspaper article of 4 June under

the heading 'Foreign cash may fund Northern Territory link: Bannon', contained a rather interesting suggestion from the Premier. He is reported as saying that it may be possible for the Government to look for foreign investment to build the proposed railway line. The article states:

'For South Australia's part, we are very keen to assist both the Territory and the Commonwealth in any negotiations that are necessary,' he said. Asked whether the railway was completely lost, Mr Bannon replied, 'I would hope not. I really think that the Commonwealth decision was made without looking too closely at all the implications of stopping this project.'

On 13 June I was interested to read an article stating that the trade union movement had also got involved with this project. The article, under the heading, 'Deficit funding for Darwin rail urged', states:

The Federal Government should build the \$560 m. Alice Springs to Darwin railway by deficit funding, the State ALP Convention resolved yesterday.

Then, later it states:

Australian Workers' Union Vice-President Mr J. Doyle said the Port Augusta to Kalgoorlie line had been built by deficit funding.

'There's nothing wrong with deficit funding—it's how you spend the money that counts,' he said.

I am saying that the sort of attitude adopted by the trade union movement and the State convention of the Labor Party was, in fact, a positive and real attempt to address this problem. I believe that the statements and attitudes reported in those articles did nothing in anyway to solve the problem that we are facing with this issue. I believe that a report of 23 June attributed to the South Australian Chamber of Commerce and to South Australian industry generally, was much more positive and showed what co-operation is all about. I will refer to that press statement, because I believe it was the first real effort made to achieve a feasible answer to this proposition. Under the heading, 'Rescue bid on rail link', the article states:

Industry throughout South Australia will join the Chamber of Commerce in a big campaign to save the Alice Springs to Darwin rail project

The South Australian Chamber of Commerce today announced a major study into the benefits to local industry if the threatened railway link goes ahead.

In my opinion, the chamber's economist, Mr R.A. Nettle, had something important to say, as follows:

... the study would look at immediate and future employment benefits from the building of the line.

It also would cover potential increases in over-seas trade through Darwin, the likely useage of the line, development of the Northern Territory and its effects on Australia and the value of increased tourist trade.

I am sure that the Chief Secretary, who is also Minister of Tourism, would be interested in that. The article continues:

This rail link has been promised for more than 80 years and is widely believed by commercial interests throughout Australia to be a project of major national significance and long term benefit, Mr Nettle said.

The railway has become Australia's national political football. It has been promised and denied longer than any other major Australian project and the private sector has become thoroughly tired of this indecision. The chamber wants member organisations and the public to assist either financially or with evidence on benefits of the rail link.

That article completely and utterly destroys the recent barrage in this House by the member for Todd. In fact, if Mr Nettle is correct (and I have every reason to believe that he is correct), the issue is 80 years old. Of course, the Australian Labor Party has not been on the Treasury benches for 80 years and, therefore, cannot be accused of doing nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I invite the member for Bragg to take the Chair.

Mr MAX BROWN: Mr Acting Speaker, I will not be too unkind to you. I assure you, Sir, that I will not do anything unkind in the House while you are in the Chair. Mr Nettle's submission on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce was

quite valid. The point he was making was brought home to me quite recently. I am not denying that there is an economic problem in relation to the building of the rail link. There is no question about that, and I am sure that both Parties would agree. One of the points that Mr Nettle pursued I believe should be given a valuable response. I refer to the fact that the project would create employment. I support Mr Nettle's approach.

I said a moment ago that Mr Nettle's point was brought home to me personally. Recently, my eldest son obtained a job, after being unemployed for quite some time, under one of the job creation schemes that are operating in Whyalla. I found, following discussions with my son, that in real money terms he was receiving some \$50 per week more than he was receiving in unemployment benefits. Although the Federal Government is required to pay my son \$50 more under that scheme, at least he was producing something: he was working and, if he continues to work, he will pay taxes which, unfortunately, is the very problem that faces this country at this time.

I will pursue that point a little further. For some years I have believed that Governments, in dealing with unemployment, would be wise to examine the cost in terms of cash, the cost savings in regard to non-production, the benefits that could be achieved in having people meaningfully employed instead of doing nothing, and finally the cost to a community in welfare payments, and so on. Sometimes I wonder whether an unemployment scheme would be more beneficial to everyone if it was devised to require unemployed people to make themselves available to help communities in a practical way by doing odd jobs or working on projects of a beneficial nature to the country generally.

I believe that my son's case is a good example: for an extra \$50 a week, he is working, some dignity has been restored to his life, and he is doing a job that will benefit the community of Whyalla. That is a very good example of the point made by the Chamber of Commerce economist, Mr Nettle, in a submission to the Federal Government in regard to the railway line. In broad terms, I do not believe that the Federal Government has looked closely enough at the employment prospects that this line would bring. At least something would be built for the nation, even though people would be paid a few dollars a week more than they would be paid by way of unemployment benefits. No political Party has so far considered this matter in depth.

Unemployment in any community, and certainly in Whyalla, takes away a person's dignity (because he cannot work, through no fault of his own), and other problems are created. The B.H.P. early retirement programme did not solve the problem: the people who retired at, say, 55 years of age will never work again. It is an absolute calamity to the social structure of this country that that happens in our midst. On top of all that, we find that early retirement schemes, by which people obtain a fairly substantial settlement in some cases, do not help the problem, because people do not invest that money to gain interest in real terms because they want the pension. The Government of the day, of whatever political persuasion, has found that pensions, unemployment payments, and so on total a third of the Federal Budget. That is the sort of problem to which we should be addressing ourselves, and we should not resort to a tirade of abuse (and I refer again to the member for Todd). That will not solve the problem. We have to face up to the matter, whether we like it or not. To be candid, I do not like it.

On top of all the things I have mentioned, we now find that, because of the unemployment situation (and this occurs in Whyalla), broken marriages occur, causing many problems. There are children to worry about, and a wife or husband who has been left in very dire circumstances must receive

welfare payments. It is costing the taxpayer more and more. We should be realistic: we should face the problem and come up with an attempt to solve the recession that we are facing. The Alice Springs to Darwin rail link would, first, employ a number of people who are now unemployed; and, secondly, it would assist the steel industry, particularly the Whyalla steelworks, more than would a \$350 000 000 package deal.

It would override that completely, because it would be a practical solution to the problems we are facing. Although I could go on speaking about the problems of the unemployed people I will not take up too much of the time of the House. However, if ever a community in this country has experienced the problems of unemployment, certainly it is the city of Whyalla. Currently about 1 200 people are unemployed and they are all in receipt of unemployment benefits. On many occasions I have questioned, and (perhaps tonight I should question this matter even further) the amount of money that the Federal Government, whatever its political persuasion, pays to that sort of community in dole cheques alone, without anything else. Again, I stress the point that I have made before: those dole cheques do absolutely nothing for the society in which we live, for the community with which we are involved, or for the people who are in receipt of that benefit. It is a terrible calamity; unfortunately, it is probably the greatest calamity that we face.

I do not want to say any more about the unemployment situation. It is a depressing situation to say the least. On many occasions I have been accused of being disinterested in unemployment or criticised for not doing enough about the unemployment problem. I wonder how much one can do. All one can do in real terms is to struggle and endeavour to get the Governments of the day to make decisions that ultimately will bring us out of this terrible recession. I know of no magic wand that someone can wave to produce jobs.

Currently, together with many good people in Whyalla, I am involved with a proposition which could help the employment situation in Whyalla. There is a possibility of discussing this proposition with Senator Button on Friday week, when he will be in Whyalla. I understand that money is to be made available from the Federal Government to assist the three steel cities of Australia, that is, Newcastle, Wollongong and Whyalla. This money is separate from \$350 000 000 to which I referred earlier. I believe that the amount involved is a few million dollars. I am firmly of the opinion that it should be used for a feasibility study to investigate the possibilities of creating other industries within the community of Whyalla.

There are distinct possibilities for other industries. The first that comes to my mind is the possibility of a submarine building operation. I think we ought to be looking at what would be required to upgrade the Whyalla shipyard to facilitate such an operation. That could cost a considerable amount of money, but such an operation would be labour intensive: labour would be used in a meaningful way to do something worth while for the community.

Another proposition is that, if Roxby Downs does proceed, what happens, say, to the possible refining of copper? We ought to be looking at that situation and what it involves. I do not want to go any further than that, as anything I mention would be purely supposition, and a lot of homework would be required. Nevertheless, if some millions of dollars are made available to Whyalla by the Federal Government, this matter ought to be looked at in a constructive way and the possibilities explored of creating permanent employment and a permanent new industry as far as the city is concerned, rather than use the money generally on digging up roads, planting trees, or things of this nature. We have to go deeper than that concept of getting people back to work.

The problems that face us are not easy to solve and anybody in this House with any other ideas about solving the problem of unemployment is certainly having hallucinations; there is no doubt about that. Given proper leadership, a proper attempt to overcome our problems and a little more togetherness in these issues then, who knows, Australia may eventually come out of the deep and unhappy unemployment situation and recession it now faces.

I believe that in this debate, finally, both members of the Government and members of the Opposition are getting around to not merely filibustering for a complete hour. At last some sanity has been introduced in this debate, and many members on both sides have spoken on the issues they know about and have left it at that. I support the motion.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I begin, Mr Acting Speaker, by welcoming you (as the member for Bragg) to the Chair, and I hope that it will be the forerunner of many more times that we will see you in that position. I support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply, and at the outset I wish to mention my predecessor in this place, the Hon. John Coumbe, who unfortunately died a few months ago. At that time I joined with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Light in paying tribute to his memory and to the service he gave to this House, the public of South Australia and the electorate of Torrens. Having paid that tribute, I now want to convey my thanks on behalf of my constituents (who were, of course, his constituents) for the kind thoughts that have been expressed by members in this place in this debate upon his memory, because he really was a great South Australian.

I wish to discuss the State aid debate and in particular the effects on that debate occasioned by the decisions of the Federal Government and its Minister, Senator Ryan, especially concerning the allocation of funding to non-government schools. In a few weeks, or perhaps sooner, I wish also to deal with the effects of Senator Ryan's announcement on the Government sector. There are some serious effects flowing from her decisions and the Federal Government's decisions on the Government school sector, not only in South Australia but throughout the whole of Australia. I will deal with that as a separate subject, because it is extremely important.

However, I now wish to deal with the effects of her decisions and the Government's decisions on non-government schools. At the outset, I mentioned in this House a few months ago that the State aid debate in Australia had been, until the last couple of years, relatively quiet. It is a debate that has gone on in Australia since well before Federation, and it is one of those greatly divisive debates which naturally split the Australian community.

Generally, over the past 10, or perhaps 15, years the State aid debate has quietened down, and the two systems of schooling have co-existed with mutual co-operation for the benefit of all students. However, because of the activities of the Australian Teachers Federation and the promises made to that federation by the Labor Party over the last couple of years, that State aid debate is now raging, especially in the Eastern States. I believe that it is a great pity that, once again, we will see divisions within this community occasioned by decisions of the Federal Government really paying back the Australian Teachers Federation for the \$750 000 which it contributed to advertising in favour of the A.L.P. before the last Federal election.

If one wonders what evidence can be introduced to prove that the State aid debate is now raging again within South Australia (where traditionally the two systems of schooling have co-existed rather well), I remind members that on Wednesday (that is, tomorrow) a display will appear in the

Speakers' corner in the Constitutional Museum, entitled 'St Dominic's Priory: the struggle for State aid in education'. This display has been mounted and organised by the staff of St Dominic's Priory of North Adelaide. I might say that 1983 is the centenary year of Dominican education in South Australia. One of the organisers of the display (Sister Shirley Macklin) has stated in a pamphlet (which I think most members will receive) the following:

State aid to private schools, especially Catholic schools, was a controversial issue in the 1880s, and it is still an issue today. Non-government schools have become the scapegoats in the current educational debate.

I point out that that is as soon as tomorrow. I would suggest that members in this House who are interested in this matter may wish to attend the official opening of that display on Friday at 11 a.m. It is to be opened by Mr John McDonald, the Director of Catholic Education in South Australia.

In particular, I have referred to the decisions of the Federal Minister of Education (Senator Ryan) concerning the Commonwealth Schools Commission guidelines, which were issued to that commission by the A.L.P. Federal Government. These guidelines and decisions have very serious implications indeed for the non-government school system throughout Australia. I wish to deal with four of those guidelines. First, despite promises to the contrary, the Federal Government has failed to deliver \$16 000 000 specifically promised for needy non-government schools. Members will be able to check that in tonight's Federal Budget. It has failed to deliver an election promise and, of course, we have said and heard much in this House over recent weeks about how the State Government has failed to deliver its election promises. Here we have a Federal Government doing the very same thing. Before the last Federal election, it made a promise which people would have taken into account before they cast their vote, namely, that \$16 000 000 extra would be made available for needy non-government schools.

That has not eventuated. The second thing that has happened is that new guidelines have been issued, making it more difficult to establish and fund new non-government schools. Because of the guidelines it will be extremely difficult for churches and community groups to establish new non-government schools. They will have to meet very strict criteria, indeed, to be able to first establish a school and then qualify for Federal funding. That is very important.

The next thing that we have, which has had much publicity, is that there has been a 25 per cent reduction in funding or grants to 40 non-government schools throughout Australia. Of course, members opposite will say, 'Those 40 schools are rich resource schools; they have high resources compared with other non-government schools in the community.' The two South Australian schools singled out for this attention were St Peters Collegiate Boys School and Seymour College. It is all very well for members to say that those schools are rich resource schools, but 25 per cent is a very savage cut in funding. It is the parents of the children at those two schools who will bear the brunt of this cut in funding. It could cost those parents, if those schools cannot absorb that extra amount of money out of their own present resources, up to an additional \$300 per year in fees — just for that 25 per cent reduction. But, it is not that point which is the ominous point in this whole debate.

What is ominous is the fact that there is no doubt that in 1985 there will be a further reduction in grants, not only to those 40 schools throughout Australia that I have mentioned but to many other non-government schools as well because that is the A.L.P. policy. It is very important that all parents of children at non-government schools realise what lies ahead for them under the A.L.P. Federal Government and, indeed, the State Governments in Victoria and

Western Australia. We are not too sure about the attitude of the State A.L.P. Government in South Australia because there is a small difference of opinion between the present Minister of Education in South Australia and his Federal colleagues. But, I am extremely worried as to what will occur as far as State funding is concerned for non-government schools in the future.

We have to reserve judgment at this stage on the State Government, but there is no doubt that as far as the Federal A.L.P. Government is concerned there will be significant reductions of per capita grants to students at non-government schools in the future; 1985 will show us the way that the trend will continue to reduce over the ensuing years.

However, the most important portent for the future as far as the Schools Commission guidelines issued by the Federal Government are concerned is the breaking of the nexus for per capita funding as a ratio of the cost of educating a child or student at a Government school. I want to develop this a little.

The policy of the Liberal Party, as far as State aid to non-government schools is concerned, is quite clear. The Liberal Party believes that every student at a non-government school is entitled to a basic per capita grant. That per capita grant is set in line with prevailing economic conditions. It is set in line with the amount of money available for education but it is a basic principle that every child or student at a non-government school is entitled, by right, to a per capita grant. On top of that, various schools are entitled to varying amounts of money on the basis of their needs. My Party believes that there should be needs-based funding as far as that goes. No doubt exists that some schools have more resources than others and that schools with lower resources deserve more on a needs basis than do wealthier schools. Underlying all of that is the basic principle or right of a child at a non-Government school to receive a basic per capita grant as a contribution to his or her education by the State.

However, in Canberra, per capita grants have been related in the past to the cost of educating students at Government schools. With one stroke of the pen Senator Ryan has broken that nexus. Grants to non-government schools will no longer be attached or set as a ratio to the cost of educating a child at a Government school. If ever parents at non-government schools wanted proof of the Federal Government's attitude to the funding of non-government schools, they have it with that very point that I have mentioned. I hope that parents will realise the importance of the decision taken by Senator Ryan a little over a month ago in regard to funding of non-government schools.

However, the matter does not simply rest with the Commonwealth Government. I mentioned the Victorian Government. We have had the Cain Government in office in Victoria for more than 12 months. What has it done with grants to non-government schools in that State? The Cain Government is very shrewd and the Federal Government has copied the Cain Government. With the State Board of Education, which recommends grants to non-government schools, the Cain Government changed its membership before the grants were recommended so that the grants came forward to the Cain Government in accordance with A.L.P. philosophy. What has happened in Victoria? In talking about the money granted by the Victorian Government to Victorian non-government schools, I am accurately informed that non-government schools attended by 33 per cent of the students will face funding cuts of up to 57 per cent next year and up to 80 per cent in 1985. They are enormous cuts. I understand that one non-government school in Melbourne, if we take into consideration the combined cuts from the Federal and State Governments, is going to be short by some \$800 000 in one year. How can a school,

however rich or extensive its resources, absorb a funding cut of \$800 000 in one year without passing on an imposition to parents?

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: How could they possibly pay it?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, how can parents pay? In fact, children will have to be taken away from non-government education when that is the choice of the parents. I have mentioned previously that the personnel of the State Education Board were changed by the Cain Government before they made these recommendations. I will quote my Victorian colleague, the Hon. Walter Jonah, shadow Minister of Education, who stated on 24 July:

'The board—

that is, the State Education Board—

is hampered in reaching an objective view by the inflexibility of most of its members, including the Deputy Chairman, Mr Gerry Tickell, the immediate past president of the Australian Teachers Federation. With the representation on the Board of the teacher unions, he has publicly pledged the abolition of State aid for private school.

I emphasise 'has publicly pledged the abolition of State aid'. I assume that that is not only the abolition of per capita funding but the abolition of capital funding as well. I bring this to the attention of parents of children attending non-government schools in South Australia because that was the action of the Victorian A.L.P. Government. I hope that the South Australian A.L.P. Government does not follow that ideology, and it is ideology (it is plain socialist dogma). I hope that the South Australian A.L.P. Government does not follow that lead. As I have said before, we will have to reserve judgment on this matter. I mentioned previously the changing of personnel on the Education Board in Victoria. The Commonwealth Schools Commission was changed in the same way by Senator Ryan. The first thing Senator Ryan did on achieving office was to remove the representative of the Australian Parents Federation on the Commonwealth Schools Commission.

Mr Jennifer Adamson: Another piece of dogma.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Of course it is a piece of dogma. The Australian Parents Federation, along with the Catholic Education System, represents 25 per cent of all students educated in this country. Their representation combined is now 13 per cent of the Schools Commission. I will read to the House a letter written on 31 May by the Vice-President of the Australian Parents Council, Mrs Judith Roberts, who is also President of the Federation of Parents and Friends Association of Independent Schools of South Australia. The letter states:

My Dear Prime Minister,

I wish to express my concern to you, and that of our federation, at the recent appointments made to the Schools Commission by your Minister for Education Senator Susan Ryan.

The Australian Parents Council, which has always been represented on the commission, has been overlooked in these appointments, and I protest most strongly to you on this omission.

During the Federal election campaign, in your stated Australian Labor Party policies, and by personal comments, you promised—and I underline the words 'you promised'—

that your Party would work to provide unity in the field of education, and seek to lessen the divisiveness and bitterness of the 'anti-State-aid debate'.

These appointments to the commission, by ignoring the voice of parents of nearly one quarter of the total student population, in the non-government sector, do not demonstrate sincerity in this matter.

The re-appointment of Mrs Joan Brown, and the appointment of Mr Van Davy, together with the recent appointment of Ms Lyndsay Connors as a full-time commissioner, all of whom have been particularly active in the anti-State-aid debate, are of great concern to us.

The appointment of Mr Paul Hughes to give an Aboriginal voice is of significance, but the inclusion of a commissioner with an emphasis on migrant education would have been similarly of importance.

I agree with that, and applaud that appointment. The letter continues:

My federation and the Australian Parents Council, with whom we are affiliated, must protest to you most actively at our exclusion from the Schools Commission. Senator Ryan did write to the Australian Parents Council and seek a panel of names for nomination, and we would certainly like to know why this advice was ignored.

That letter sets out the views of parents associated with non-government schools in South Australia in the non-Catholic sector. I now refer to the Director of Catholic Education, Mr John McDonald, and his comments about this matter.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That's in South Australia.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, in South Australia. I refer to a circular entitled 'Whatever happened to consensus?', as follows:

The new Minister of Education, Senator Susan Ryan, recently announced membership of the re-constituted Commonwealth Schools Commission. Previously the specific interests of the Catholic sector have been represented on the twelve-person commission by Fr John Williams (Director of the Catholic Education Office, Tasmania) and Mr Greg Dunne (nominated by the Australian Parents Council). Mr Dunne was the foundation Chairman of the South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools.

Director's comment:

In the reshuffle, Mr Vin Faulkner (Catholic Education Office, Victoria) as the only nominee of the Catholic sector to be appointed to the commission—and then only as a part-time member.

However, the interests of the Government sector have been strengthened by appointments of both full-time and part-time commissioners.

(It is also disturbing to note there is no commission member resident in South or Western Australia—full or part-time, Government or non-government. Our State will have no direct voice in the commission.)

These moves have been made in spite of the following facts:

- Nearly 20 per cent of all children attending Australian schools attend Catholic schools.
- The main portion of Government grants to Catholic schools for recurrent and capital funding comes from the Commonwealth, via the Schools Commission.
- The Schools Commission is responsible for all of the special programmes, including the Special Education, Migrant Education and Disadvantaged Schools Programmes operated in Catholic schools.
- The major portion of Government school funding—for example, 96 per cent in South Australia—is provided through State Government sources, not the Schools Commission.

That is a very important point. The circular continues:

It is patently provocative for the Minister to vary the membership of the Schools Commission in this manner, given the commission's responsibilities to Catholic and other non-government schools. This is especially the case when one considers the relationship between State and Commonwealth Governments in education funding.

But, even aside from funding responsibilities, there is another major problem with the re-constituted commission.

Previous commissions, particularly those constituted in the early and mid 1970s, derived their strength from the interchange between representatives from the various sectors. Because of better balance in membership, points of view were put and there was usually consensus on major issues. This was a real benefit to Australian education.

I believe that the current membership does not allow for such an interchange. I also believe that the bias towards the Government sector will inhibit the development of proposals aimed at a fair deal for all.

The circular includes a letter to the Editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 10 June 1983, as follows:

Sir, as a parent of four children at non-government schools, I was appalled to read that Senator Susan Ryan, Minister for Education and Youth Affairs, has failed to give representation to non-government school parents on the Commonwealth Schools Commission ('Government snub for private schools', *Herald*-28 May). The non-government school sector is disadvantaged enough as it is—the 23.9 per cent of children in non-government schools in 1982 received only 13.2 per cent of public expenditure on schooling.

Of course, that comes from the Commonwealth Schools Commission recommendations for 1984, which was published in January 1983. It was further stated:

It is hardly fair to deny parents of almost a quarter of the nation's schoolchildren representation on this commission, which is the main adviser to the Federal Government on school funding and curricula.

Mr John McDonald, the Director of Catholic Education, in a letter to me of 14 July, stated:

My main concern about the lowering of the proportion of non-government representatives on the commission is that it will be difficult for the commission to come to consensus on important issues because the points of view will simply not be put with the same force as they have been in previous years.

You rightly point out that at least two of the new appointees have been extremely active in the anti State aid debate. This does not augur well for future discussions on the funding of non-government schools by the Commonwealth through its Schools Commission.

As Mr McDonald might well say, what has happened to consensus? Finally, I wish to deal with another very ominous portent that has flowed from Canberra—the report of the committee of inquiry into the establishment of the new Radford College in the Australian Capital Territory. The committee of inquiry, which was known as the Anderson Inquiry and chaired by Dr Don Anderson from the Research School of Social Sciences, A.N.U., has brought down a report that certainly applies in the main to the setting up of this new non-government college in the A.C.T. However, some of its recommendations, if accepted by the Commonwealth, could go far beyond announced Labor Party policies and could limit severely the capacity of the community to, first, establish new non-government schools; secondly, to determine curriculum for non-government schools; and, thirdly, to control totally the selection and dismissal of staff.

That means that churches or community groups that wish to establish new non-government schools would have a great deal of difficulty in, first, establishing the school because of the various criteria laid down; secondly, in determining the curriculum, even under what would have been the A.C.T. education authority guidelines; and, thirdly, great difficulty in controlling totally the selection and dismissal of staff. That is very serious. I agree with some of the recommendations of the Anderson Report, including a recommendation that Christian schools should be set up within the State system, in consultation with the churches. That is an extremely good idea. It gives variety and freedom of choice, which is something in which we on this side believe. However, I will not deal with that recommendation: I refer to the recommendations which, if the Labor Party accepts them and promulgates them on an ideological basis throughout Australia, will be at issue. Those recommendations are as follows:

1. Impact studies should be prepared in respect of all proposed private schools in established areas based on an assessment of enrolments, educational, social and financial effects, and a clear assessment of the educational need for the school.
2. The preparation of impact studies in respect of proposed schools should be regarded as an essential part of the planning for new schools and should be complemented by an ongoing monitoring of the effects of new schools on existing schools.
3. The proposed Interim A.C.T. Education Planning Board should review arrangements for the approval and certification of education programmes in consultation with the A.C.T. Schools Authority and other education authorities and schools.

They are the very things to which I referred. It continues:

4. A clear distinction should be made between the registration of private schools and their funding; schools which obtain registration should not automatically receive public funding unless they also meet additional conditions prescribed in respect of funding.

Big brother is watching over the private schools in Australia! Recommendation 8 is very important and is as follows:

The proposed Interim A.C.T. Education Planning board should initiate early consultations on the feasibility of establishing an integrated public education system in the A.C.T. and should convene a working party, broadly representative of interested parties, to examine the issues involved and report to the Interim A.C.T. Education Planning Board.

Those recommendations are contained within chapter 9 of the report. I shall read only two or three other brief extracts. A further chapter, entitled 'Public and private schooling: the need for a new approach', refers to schools in the A.C.T. In part, that chapter states:

The policies followed have led to the establishment of a dual system of publicly funded schools. Our assessment of the situation in which capital funds were provided for Radford College has led us to the view that rational planning for the provision of new schools is impeded by the existence of this dual system in its present form.

It further states:

While we value the right of parental choice, we do not regard this as an unqualified right in all circumstances.

I do not wish to quote further extracts, as I have already quoted at great length tonight. If ever there were ominous signs for the non-government school sector in South Australia this Radford College Report is one of them. I forwarded to John McDonald, of the Catholic Education Office, a copy of the Radford Report, and I want to refer to his response. I am pleased that the Minister is in the House; I hope that he has had an opportunity to obtain a copy of that very interesting report. In a letter headed 'Committee of Enquiry—Radford College', Mr McDonald states:

Thank you for your letter of 12 August, regarding the recommendations of the Committee of Inquiry into the proposed Radford College in the Australian Capital Territory.

The South Australian Commission for Catholic Schools has considered these recommendations and shares your concern about the situation that might develop if the Government acts upon the recommendations of the committee of enquiry.

The Catholic system has serious reservations about the integration of non-government schools into the Government system in New Zealand.

The Radford College Report mentions the New Zealand system at some length. The letter continues:

In practice the arrangements have not turned out to be as advantageous as originally anticipated. Many of the recommendations of the committee, either directly or indirectly, infer that non-government schools should be integrated into the Government system in the Australian Capital Territory. Catholic authorities are opposed to such a move.

The National Catholic Education Commission and the Catholic school authorities in Canberra will closely monitor the situation because of the potential problems posed for our schools.

Once again, I think that shows how the Catholic system feels it is threatened. Of course, the Catholic system, the great systemic system in Australia, is the one that will gain more from the present Federal Government's policies, because it is totally needs based, and in general the Catholic schools are the least resource rich schools. They will receive more money under the present Federal Government's system than will the other non-government schools. Yet it is the Catholic schools and the Catholic Education Office that oppose the Federal Government's policies so much, because they can see the writing on the wall.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: They know that their independence is threatened.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, and they can see what will happen in the future. Father Williams, the Director of Catholic Education in Australia, formerly a member of the Commonwealth Schools Commission and a strong critic of Federal Labor Party (which was then in Opposition) policies for non-government schools, has been removed from the Schools Commission. Obviously the Minister has a right to do that. The Minister receives three nominations from the Catholic Education Commission. However, it seems

strange that Father Williams, who was a very highly respected member of the Schools Commission and a critic—

An honourable member: Other duties, perhaps?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I do not think so—he was a critic of the former Opposition (now the Government), and he has been removed from the Schools Commission. I mention that because I think it is very pertinent. I think I have shown that the non-government school system in Australia is under threat. The Minister has not realised it, but I did say earlier that we reserve judgment on the South Australian State A.L.P. Government. The signs are there. Finally, I want to quote from an editorial in the *Canberra Times* which deals with the Radford Report from which I have just quoted.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Ferguson): Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: There are two excerpts from this editorial, as follows:

The Anderson Report will be the subject of further editorials but two final points might be made here—

I will quote only one—

The first is that to suggest as the committee does the Government/non-government categories have become obsolete on the basis of the two criteria it chooses—funding and autonomy—is absurd both in terms of the choice of the criteria, and even by the criteria themselves should they be agreed as the only relevant ones.

Finally, the editorial states:

The Anderson Committee's amalgamation proposals would turn the educationalists' crises in the Government school sector into a disaster across the entire system.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I support the motion and congratulate my colleague, the member for Torrens, on a very decisive speech on a subject which is very important to us, and that is the education area, particularly the role of private schools. I wish to address two items in my Address in Reply speech, and they relate, first, to reforms in this House of Assembly and, secondly, to the economic realities we face today. First, the Address in Reply debate itself is part and parcel of our history. I believe that it is too long and too drawn out, and that it could in fact do with some considerable revision. We should seriously look at the proposition of how much time is allocated to Address in Reply debate. I have had it suggested that we should follow the Congressional system in America, where it is possible for members to record a speech which they believe is of great import but they do not have to actually address the House; they can have it included in the *Hansard* or the record of the day as part and parcel of their thoughts and views. I feel that we spend an enormous amount of time talking to empty Houses in this debate and, in many cases, for very little result.

The second reform that I believe should be implemented is in terms of Question Time. Since I have been in this House we have had the spectacle of the Government wasting time whenever the opportunity arises, and we find ourselves with very few questions able to be asked within the allotted hour. I feel, as a new member in this House, that we have either to extend the time for questions or, alternatively, reduce the time provided for explanations. Perhaps some general rules should be laid down about conduct and the answering of questions because, as it stands today, there is insufficient questioning of the Government at a time when surely the Government must be questioned.

My third point relates to Questions on Notice. When I was a Parliamentary clerk to Sir Thomas Playford some 20 years ago there was a requirement that Questions on Notice should be answered within the week and it was one of my duties—

The Hon. G.F. Keneally: Was that before Hindley Street or after?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAKER: I had to ensure that those questions were available to members the following week. Of course, now we are rather fortunate if we see them by the end of the session.

Mr Ashenden: How many answers came in today?

Mr BAKER: I do not think that any answers came in today, which clearly indicates that the Government is not doing its job. It is clearly not living up to the rules that have been laid down. In fact, it makes new rules every day and one of them is, 'We will not answer Questions on Notice.' I think that it is high time that this practice of delaying the answers for as long as possible should cease forthwith and if we have to lay down rules by which Ministers have to live, then we should do it, because the position is quite unsatisfactory.

The next item I wish to address is the organisation of the House. We had the spectacle last session of the House sitting every Tuesday, and one hour before it was due to sit we knew what we were to consider. This is not how the Parliament should operate. We should have at least 24 hours notice of all business that is available.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Why didn't you come in earlier, to find out?

Mr BAKER: In fact, I did come in earlier on a number of occasions and I was told, 'We have not got the paper'. The Minister concerned—

Mr Ashenden: The Minister for closing mines.

Mr BAKER: The Minister for closing mines and the Minister of Labour should consider the fact that we, in the Parliament, are supposed to be working to the common good. However, how can members on this side of the House consider legislation or anything else if they are given very little notice of what is coming up? I certainly would appreciate the time to be able to look at the Bills concerned before the event, so that I can be properly prepared. It seems that this is another area at which the Government should look seriously.

I refer also to the introduction of Bills without sufficient notice. Again, on a number of occasions Bills have been brought into this House and have had to be passed immediately, either because the Government made a mistake with the original legislation or because some immediate problem has had to be fixed up. Unfortunately, it has happened on too many occasions, and it does not allow members to look through a piece of legislation and formulate considered views on the matters therein. Therefore, I would like to see reform in this area.

So, there are a number of items that need reform and I place them on record: Question Time and the way it is used must be looked at seriously; answers to Questions on Notice must be speeded up; the Address in Reply debate must be looked at in terms of its relevance in today's world; the organisation of the House and the way in which the business operates is in dire need of reform; and the way in which Bills are introduced needs to be looked at. That is a fairly low key approach to what I believe would assist this House in conducting its business. I believe that such consideration is overdue. I have been in this House but a little time and I think that we can all be better served; if we cannot live by a code of ethics, then a set of rules must be drawn up which allows this House to function more effectively than it does now.

The second item I wish to address tonight is in relation to the economic realities of the world. I think that, if members want to understand what is happening in the rest of the world, they should obtain a copy of the O.E.C.D. reports which have comments of particular relevance to

Australia and a vast amount of statistics which people can pore through to gain an understanding of what is happening overseas and not rely on papers to provide that information.

I have selected a few statistics from these reports and I think that they are fairly revealing in terms of where Australia is headed, where the solutions lie and particularly in South Australia their relevance at the micro-level (as I call it) because, until this Government understands a few basic points, South Australia and in fact Australia will not lead in the right direction.

I believe that the Labor Governments, both Federal and State, have an inadequate knowledge of what is happening in the rest of the world and that until such time as they grasp a few of the fundamental facts they will continue to lead us in the wrong direction. I will quote to the House a few of the statistics because they are relevant to the proposition that we should consider. As we are all aware, Australia is currently experiencing a rate of unemployment in excess of 10 per cent.

I was looking at the O.E.C.D. statistics from 1979 to 1982, which show that over that period, when things did not go as strongly as we had all hoped, Australia's unemployment increased from 6.2 per cent to 7.1 per cent. During the same time we saw the United States increasing from 5.3 per cent to 9.7 per cent. It is worth remembering now that the United States has shown a turn-around in its situation and is not heading in the same direction as Australia. It has been recognised—and the statement has been made in the past two days—that Australia will continue to experience higher levels of unemployment.

The Japanese, of course are suffering under 'heavy' bouts of unemployment, having increased from 2.1 per cent to 2.4 per cent. People on the opposite benches have alluded to the marvellous job which the Japanese are doing. If we learnt a little from what the Japanese are doing we would all be doing a little better. The German situation, which increased from 3.3 per cent to 7.5 per cent between 1979 and 1982, has now stabilised; so, they also have hit a bottom mark.

The United Kingdom, which experienced horrific rates of unemployment—from 5.1 per cent to 11.7 per cent, and now topping at 15 per cent—is also seeing the fruits of some endeavour by its Prime Minister because it is understood that the United Kingdom's economy has bottomed out (unlike Australia's) and will start to improve. Consequent upon these statistics is the performance of those countries in a number of areas.

It is interesting to look at the industrial production indices on a 1975 base for the period in question (1979-1982). Australia's industrial production indices decreased over the period from 114 to 111, which was a decrease of only some 3 per cent in real terms. The United States decreased some 9 per cent from 129.5 to 117.7. The Japanese actually increased their industrial production index from 131.4 to 139.3. The Germans decreased from 117.4 to 113, and the United Kingdom from 115.7 to 104.6.

An interesting part of those statistics is that, of course, Australia never reached the production that any of those countries achieved up to 1979. The only reason why our industrial production index was as high and had a loss of only some 3 per cent was the contribution of mining, associated construction and processing of materials. If that was measured in real terms, the decrease in the industrial index would be over 10 per cent, showing that we have done far worse than any other country. Today, I am talking of long-term propositions.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr BAKER: I hope that the Minister of Mines and Energy can understand that proposition. In the employment field we see similar down-turns and effects; I will not read

out the statistics associated with the employment base associated with manufacturing. Needless to say, all countries except Japan suffered a decrease in employment, particularly the United Kingdom.

One of the reasons why the Japanese economy has done so well and why some of our major trading partners are turning around is quite simple. If any historian wishes to use the figures over that period of time he will find a correlation between the performance of the country in terms of real wage increases, inflation and interest rates and, relating them back to production indices, he will find a strong correlation between those indices. I will quote for the period of 1979-82 on a 1975 base. The Australian wage indices, which happened to be one of the highest, increased from 147.1 to 209.6—an increase of 42 per cent. In the United States the figure was 31 per cent; in Japan 13 per cent (again the lowest increase of real wages of any country); in Germany 23 per cent. We start to see a picture emerging of why we have done so badly over that period.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: The whole world's recession is Australia's fault—is that what you are saying?

Mr BAKER: The Minister is not listening. I am trying to say that most countries in the world have experienced a recession. The countries that will come out of it are those that take the right measures, and Australia is not taking the right measures under this Government.

The United Kingdom had an increase in real wages of 41 per cent for that period. That is important, because the United Kingdom and Australia have done poorly. If we look at price increases over the same period we find that Australia was at 34 per cent; the United States at 33 per cent; Japan at 16 per cent; Germany at 18 per cent; and the United Kingdom at 44 per cent. The inflation rate in the United Kingdom is now down below 6 per cent. If we look at Government bond rates we see the same picture emerging. It is important to note what is happening with interest rates in the rest of the world compared with Australia. For the 1979-82 period, Australia increased from 10.1 per cent to 14 per cent and is now stable at around 15 per cent. In the United States the figure dropped from 12.1 per cent to 8 per cent and is now lower. In Japan the figure went from 8.6 per cent down to 7.5 per cent. That country is stable at that level. Germany was stable over the period at 7.9 per cent for its long-term Government bond rates. The United Kingdom has been decreasing and is now under 10 per cent, from a higher base level of 11.7 per cent. The upper figure for the United Kingdom for 1979 was 11.7 per cent and it is now coming down considerably.

If we draw some conclusions from those figures, in almost all sectors Australia is heading in the wrong direction or is not heading in the right direction fast enough. I wish to address that question because the international statistics should reveal to Australians and South Australians where their future lies and how Australia is going to improve the situation. We have an internationally caused recession, but the micro base—as distinct from the macro base of the national sphere—is obviously in South Australia—the South Australia that we purport to represent. If we follow the old premise that, if we look after the pennies the pounds will take care of themselves, we will find that that is appropriate to the argument I am expressing tonight. The simple proposition is that we must at all micro levels in each State of Australia take the necessary action to ensure that we meet international objectives. It is totally inconsistent for this House and this Government to do otherwise. There are some very important components which I will address and develop when I next have the opportunity to speak. I will make those comments tomorrow when I continue my remarks. I believe that they are matters pertinent to where

South Australia is heading and to where we should be heading. I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr KLUNDER (Newland): I wish to deal tonight with the subject of petitions. This particular subject matter came to mind when some people in my electorate whose acumen I would normally respect and who are, in fact, very sensible and capable people, indicated to me that they had refused to sign a petition not because they happened to disagree with the subject matter but because they felt that the format of the petition put them in a demeaning position with respect to this Parliament.

They felt, for that reason, that they were unable to put their signatures to such a petition. That brought me up short and I decided that I needed to look again at the format of petitions. I took a petition form into the library thinking that it would also be sensible to take with me some old dictionaries because, while I am not ordinarily a dictionary diver or word walloper, I thought it necessary to take with me some old dictionaries so that they would be contemporaneous with the material in petitions. For those who like to know such details, I use the *Shorter Oxford Dictionary* of 1933 and Sir James Murray's *New English Dictionary* of 1914. The word 'petition' has a number of meanings. The definitions of 'petition' are: 'That of formally asking', 'of begging', 'supplicating,' or 'humbly requesting'.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr KLUNDER: I defer to the superior knowledge of the Minister in this matter. It is fairly obvious that three of those four meanings are relatively class based. It is also fairly obvious, of course, that we took the format of petitions, as I understand, from the British form of the last century, where the British Parliament ruled over a country badly divided into separate classes. In fact, the petition may well have been the only way in which the working class could communicate with those bastions of the upper and middle classes, the House of Lords and the Commons, respectively.

The petition format is bad not only in the definition of the word 'petition'. The first sentence in any petition starts, 'The humble petition of the undersigned'. Of course, one needs to look at the meaning of the word 'humble', which means 'having a low estimate of oneself'. One wonders how the Parliament of Britain in the last century knew that all those who were going to sign a petition would have a low estimate of themselves. The second possibility is that they 'should not be self assertive'. That, of course, is a total contradiction in terms because people who write and sign petitions are, by that very act, asserting that will.

A third definition is 'that of lowly condition', which fits in perfectly with the class concept of last century Britain but which would hardly rate in today's Australia. It can also mean 'modest and unpretentious', which makes one wonder how the Parliament of those days knew that. The word 'humble' does not really have any place in a petition. The next word in the petition is 'sheweth', which I do not know how to pronounce, because I could not find it in any dictionary. Consequently, there was no guide to my pronunciation.

Mr Trainer: It was even too archaic for the 1914 dictionary.

Mr KLUNDER: Yes, it was even too archaic for the 1914 dictionary, as my colleague points out. One assumes from

the context that it means 'shows' or 'states'. At this point the petitioners are supposed to fill in what they believe is their complaint or comment and they then run into the following words:

... your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will...

Therefore, we need to look at the definition of the word 'pray'. It means to ask either 'earnestly, humbly or supplicatingly'. Obviously, they are terms that the British Parliament was fond of. Alternatively, it can mean, 'to make devout and humble supplication to an object of worship'. I can hardly believe that even members of the British Parliament of last century, and I certainly hope that no members of this Parliament, could think of themselves in terms of being God like or objects worthy of devout supplication. However, one wonders.

There are a number of objectionable alternatives in the dictionary definition. In any case, even if we take the definition of 'pray' to mean 'ask earnestly', one wonders to some extent about the insistent suspicion that the petition will be frivolous. The petition then continues to refer to the phrase 'honourable House', which is a marvellous phrase. It is probably the closest example of double speak or 1984 new speak. As we know, 'House' is defined as a dwelling place for human habitation. However, we do not actually mean 'House' in this context; we mean this Chamber. Of course, we do not actually mean this Chamber; we mean the people seated inside the Chamber who represent people out in the electorate. The word 'honourable' has a multiplicity of meanings. The first of these (and I was surprised to find it in the dictionary) was 'worthy of being honoured'. That sounds somewhat circular. The second meaning is 'entitled to respect and esteem'. It might be my upbringing, but I always thought that one had to earn respect and was not entitled to it by virtue of being elected.

Another definition of 'honourable' is 'respectable in quality or amount'. I do not have the foggiest idea what that means. 'Honourable' can also mean 'decent'. I am quite sure that many people in the electorate would have their suspicions about that, too. It can also mean 'of distinguished rank'. That might have applied in nineteenth century England, but hardly here today. Finally, I found a meaning that is probably the most reasonable definition, that is, the word 'honourable' as a courtesy title. Consequently, the phrase, 'Your petitioners therefore pray that your honourable House will', can be translated as follows:

Those who beg, supplicate or humbly request, therefore make devout and humble supplication to an object of worship, namely, a House worthy of being honoured.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Does that mean that your mortgage is paid up?

Mr KLUNDER: At least. It is only when one looks at that kind of double speak that one realises how horribly pretentious the phraseology of the petition really is. The petition then asks the honourable House to take certain action and concludes 'and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray'. One wonders who bound them, whose duty it was to bind them and whether the necessity to pray for ever is bound in duty upon those people who put their names on the piece of paper.

Mr Trainer: They are bound by the duty to be humble.

Mr KLUNDER: At least. I am aware that I may have been a little harsh in applying such a literal interpretation, especially when one regards the flowery and ornate style of people of the last century who wrote at the end of letters, 'I have the honour to be, sir, your most humble and obedient servant', without meaning a word of it. If we go back to the definition of 'petition' as meaning a formal request, then the 'humble petition of the undersigned' can simply become 'the petition of the undersigned'.

The word 'showeth' could become the word 'states', and instead of 'your petitioners praying that the honourable House will' we would merely write 'the petitioners therefore request that members of the House of Assembly will'. Finally, the last phrase 'your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray' could be tossed out altogether as being totally meaningless and not, I hope, supplanted by the modern meaningless phrase 'yours faithfully' or 'yours sincerely'. I understand that a committee will consider the Standing Orders of the House, and I can only express my humble and devout belief that in its erudite wisdom it will come to a perfect solution to what I see as a rather vexing problem for some of my constituents.

The SPEAKER: As in 'duty bound', as the Chairman of that committee I shall endeavour to do my best.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): In the *Advertiser* of 27 April, an article under the heading 'Third airport runway desirable: report' stated:

A third runway is 'desirable' at Adelaide Airport, according to a provisional master plan on the airport's future. The plan says a third runway would switch a significant amount of likely aircraft noise from houses in four suburbs to houses in three others.

The Hon. R.G. Payne interjecting:

Mr BECKER: Yes. It further stated:

The plan, issued by the Minister for Aviation, Mr Beazley, yesterday is based on an assumption that the existing airport will continue to be Adelaide's main regular public transport airport but the 210-page plan recognises this may not be so. The S.A. Airfields Committee established in 1981 is continuing to examine a proposed alternative airport in the Two Wells-Virginia area.

The article then tried to substantiate some of the reasons for this report, and further stated:

A draft environmental impact statement incorporated in the plan says the proposed new runway would result in a 'significant' drop in the number of houses likely to be affected by aircraft noise in Thebarton, Hindmarsh, North Adelaide and Glenelg. 'However, this option would result in dwellings being newly affected by aircraft noise in Fulham, Lockleys and Brooklyn Park, although the total residential area affected by noise could be reduced by direction of more noise over airport land and open space,' it says.

Provision for the possible extension of any of the two existing or proposed third runways over Tapleys Hill Road should be maintained the plan says, but it adds that the need for any extensions is 'uncertain'. The plan is based on 'potential traffic levels,' using a nominal year of 2010, of 160 000 annual aircraft movements. In a 'peak hour' in 2010, it envisages to 20 regular public transport aircraft movements, from 1 000 to 3 200 international and 3 400 to 5 000 domestic passengers, 200 commuter passengers and 2 200 vehicle movements into and out of the airport.

That is absolutely unbelievable. The article further stated:

It envisages need for a public car-park with 3 000 to 4 000 spaces, and retains the existing main airport access road... On curfews, the plan says that although they are an integral part of the Commonwealth's noise abatement policy, the Department of Aviation has no powers to prosecute an airline whose aircraft break curfew.

That is the first time it has been stated publicly and in a report that, under the Commonwealth's abatement policy, the Department of Aviation has no powers to prosecute an airline whose aircraft break the curfew. That is one of the main issues concerning and worrying my constituents. It is widely believed and strongly supported that at all costs the curfew at Adelaide Airport from 11 p.m. to 6 a.m. should be maintained. Certainly, it will be maintained in respect of commercial jet aircraft. Unfortunately, a few years ago under another Government there was a trial period for a light jet aircraft to operate from Adelaide Airport to the Moomba gasfield in an emergency. As there were no complaints, and because there was very little movement of that aircraft at that stage, the aircraft was allowed to continue its operations.

This amendment extended provisions to include aircraft such as those used by Ward Cargo and T.N.T. which fly

around Australia with computer packages in the early hours of the morning. That is not necessary and those aircraft could be rescheduled to arrive at the Adelaide Airport during normal operating hours; certainly they could get here at 6 a.m. Simply because they do not want to do that, there has been little effort to do anything about the matter.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: They have had trouble with aircraft warming up, too.

Mr BECKER: Aircraft warming up and tuning have always been a problem but, having made representations to the Federal Government over the years, I have been able to get greater control in regard to that problem. At quite an expense to aircraft companies noise buffers have been incorporated in the hangars. At least over the years, having made those pretty solid representations to Governments, we have been able to have the activities of the airport contained within reasonable limits, although I would not say that I am happy with all the activities.

The gradual increase of aircraft movements at the Adelaide Airport worries me. The Adelaide Airport is becoming as busy as was the old airport in Melbourne before the new Tullamarine International Airport was built there. Already we are putting up with quite a lot of problems at the Adelaide Airport. If in the year 2010 there will be 160 000 aircraft movements per year, that will mean that there will be 438 aircraft movements a day.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: Will you be around then?

Mr BECKER: Yes, I think that is the only way I will make a profit out of the Superannuation Fund. That will mean that by that time there will be about 25 or 26 aircraft movements per hour between the authorised hours of 6 a.m. and 11 p.m. (a 17-hour period). That means that there would be about 18 aircraft movements per hour for a 24-hour day. That represents about one every three minutes. For an airport the size of that which we have at Adelaide and having regard to its proximity to the city, that may not sound like very much, but an aircraft coming in or taking off every three minutes has a considerable environmental impact on the community. At present, problems in regard to excruciating noise are experienced by residents who live below the flight paths of Adelaide Airport. A considerable number of properties have changed ownership because of an increase in noise and traffic movement into and out of the Adelaide Airport. Living below the flight path at Glenelg North makes me realise that I would not wish on any other residents the problems that are experienced there. I am prepared to tolerate the noise, although my neighbours may not be. However, I would not wish to see other residents elsewhere having to tolerate that noise. Certainly, I would not want to see people's properties damaged through aircraft pollution and noise pollution.

The Department of Aviation has never accepted that properties suffer damage from vibration. I arranged to meet with one of my neighbours at 5 o'clock in the morning so that I could experience the problems that he encountered between 6.30 and 7 a.m. when four major jet aircraft took off from the airport. I was with him in his kitchen and listened to the windows rattle and saw the tiles around the kitchen sink move. It was quite unbelievable and quite eerie to realise that houses in the Glenelg North area experienced that problem.

The Hon. R.G. Payne: You mean the tiles on the roof?

Mr BECKER: No, these were tiles in the kitchen which have had to be reset several times.

Mr Trainer: How often do aircraft take off during that period?

Mr BECKER: This estimate refers to 160 000 aircraft movements. That does not refer to jet aircraft only, but there would certainly be one aircraft movement every three minutes. Certainly with the commercial jet aircraft there

are four take-offs between 6.30 and 7 a.m. It is constant, and in certain weather conditions such as those that we have experienced in the past two months there has been a considerable amount of damage to properties.

The Department of Aviation will not accept it. People from that department have been with me and inspected properties, and they are frightened to admit that it is the cause of the problem. The 747s, whilst they may be slightly quieter on take-off, under current weather conditions of heavy cloud are no quieter, and in fact are quite frightening because of the huge size of the aircraft. Because of the difficulty they have in taking-off fully laden from Adelaide airport (they have had to reduce their fuel load to take-off safely if they have considerable loads of cargo), they are causing property damage. But, of course, one must prove that claim in a court and have a court accept it. No-one has the money to fight the Federal Government and the Department of Aviation. I hope that my neighbours and the residents and my constituents—

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

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): In this grievance debate I wish to draw the attention of members to the problems of the retail section in my electorate. I fully supported the private members' Bill introduced into this House last session by the member for Hartley.

The Bill was to provide certain protection for small business people on the question of leasing and renting of their premises. The problem of leasing is not a new one, and complaints by small business people regarding oppressive clauses in commercial lease agreement commenced to surface in the late 1970's.

Small business people increasingly were and are being forced by large shopping chains to accept lease conditions which require them to pay, in addition to normal monthly rental charges, a percentage of gross annual turnover, a percentage of goodwill on the sale of the business, and a sum of money to assign the lease to other prospective lessees. Particular complaints that have surfaced in my electorate, relate to the following:

1. A chemist shop proprietor's lease expired and the landlord sought an increase in rent from \$105 per week to \$300 per week. The proposed new lease was to force the present owner of the shop to open seven days and seven nights per week. The chemist was unable to accept the terms of the new lease and was forced from the location into another location. This proprietor also complained about businesses in shopping centres being charged for repair work on leased properties. He referred to a particular instance where he was collectively involved in paying for repairs, which in his opinion would have cost him only \$120. The account from the landlord was for \$200.

2. A delicatessen owner had made arrangements to sell his business. The landlord took exception to the proposed new tenants and raised a series of objections to their taking the remainder of the lease. The objections were as follows:

(a) Parking was allowed for one car; the new owner had two cars.

(b) There were four people in the family and allegedly there was only accommodation for three.

When temporary arrangements had been made to overcome the landlord's objections to both of the above-mentioned problems, the landlord objected further by finding further fault with the proposed new tenants. Finally the sale was cancelled because of the delay and legal complications.

3. A fish shop proprietor had a lease for two years, plus the right to renewal for a further three years. At the end of the two-year period his present landlord demanded an increase of \$25 per week. The tenant referred this matter

to his landbroker, who stated that he had no need to comply with this demand. The lease required the tenant to pay an increase on an annual basis equal to the increase in the cost of living. His original rent was \$70 per week; it has now increased to \$110 per week. The landlord has threatened that he will not renew the contract at the end of the contract period unless the present tenant agrees to a weekly increase equivalent to \$25 per week, back-dated to the day of the demand. The landlord has further threatened that if the present tenant sells his business he would expect to receive from the goodwill of the business the equivalent amount of the increased demanded, or he would not allow his shop to be leased to the purchaser.

4. A gift shop proprietor has recently been asked to agree to a contract because of the change of ownership of the property. He was originally on a week-by-week contract with the previous owner. He entered the business by taking over an empty shop that the landlord had great difficulty in letting. Over a period of 12 months, no wages were drawn from the takings of the business and all profits were used to buy new stock to make the business more attractive. After 12 months the business was attracting new customers from the surrounding areas and about to provide a profit for the proprietor. The new lease may be described as a standard lease. It did contain provisions for insurance to be taken out by the present proprietor to protect the shop in every possible way, and it also provided that repairs to the shop would be undertaken by the present proprietor in the event of fire, etc. In addition there was a small increase in weekly rent. The unfairness of the new contract related to the fact that the shop was more than 50 years old, and under the terms of the contract the new owner could, by demanding necessary repairs to the shop, have taken all profits away from the business. The proprietor decided to close the business.

5. I have received complaints from a wholesaler about the amount of money charged for the renewal of lease documents. Accounts for amounts of up to \$250 are provided to tenants for the compilation of the new lease documents when they wish to renew their leases. This proprietor stated that the documents would cost not more than \$80 to prepare. He has also joined the list of people who have complained about charges being made for renewal and repairs to the premises.

In recent times opposition to the member for Hartley's Bill has arisen from the Building Owners and Managers Association and the Australian Council of Shopping Centres. Press releases from these people have stated that controls would: deter property investment and development; unfairly restrict flexible working agreements; discourage commercial awareness and self-education in the property industry, and fail to eliminate undesirable lease practices. I find myself in disagreement with that point of view and the supplementary argument that the introducing of legislation will increase the rent levels. I cannot agree with the arguments of this group of people.

I find that lease and rent arrangements of the majority of landlords are quite satisfactory. However, the 10 per cent of unscrupulous and unfair landlords has now brought us to a situation where we must introduce legislation for the protection of small business and small business people. I was recently involved in negotiations regarding increases to small business people at the bottom end of Grange Road. Surveys taken by the Highways Department have found that rents have risen in my electorate in the last 12 months by amounts of between 70 and 90 per cent, so that, without legislation, shopping lease rents have and will increase dramatically in any event. The increase of between 70 and 90 per cent, of course, is far and away above the cost of living increase.

I am supportive of the Attorney-General in his calling of an inquiry into the shopping lease question. However, the amount of exploitation that is being referred to me by small business people should be drawn to the attention of this Parliament, and presents this Parliament with the need to clearly find an answer to expedite the inquiry and the

introduction of legislation into this Parliament.
Motion carried.

At 10.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 24 August at 2 p.m.