

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 2 May 1984

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 11.45 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: NOISE PROBLEMS

A petition signed by 74 residents living on or near Calton Road, Gawler, praying that the House urge the Government to police noise control problems associated with quarries east of Gawler, and particularly along Calton Road, was presented by the Hon. B.C. Eastick.

Petition received.

PAPER TABLED

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.C. Bannon)—

Pursuant to Statute—

1. South Australian Government Financing Authority—
Report, 13 January—30 June 1983.

NO-CONFIDENCE MOTION: PREMIER

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That so much of Standing Orders be suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Opposition members: Yes, Sir.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the time allowed for this debate be 60 minutes.

Motion carried.

Mr OLSEN: I move:

That this House has no confidence in the Premier, and calls on him to resign immediately because of the Premier's failure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to resume his seat. I want to make one thing very clear: I have repeated over and over again that I regard urgency motions and, above all things, no-confidence motions, as very serious matters, indeed. Any member who trespasses against the strict Standing Orders will be dealt with, and I can assure all honourable members that my policy will be carried out.

Mr OLSEN: The motion continues:

to take any action against the Minister of Health, who has deliberately lied to Parliament about the use of taxpayers' funds, and because of the Premier's complete disregard for the conventions and precedents which require any Minister who has deliberately lied to the Parliament to resign or be sacked.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable gentleman to resume his seat. I rule that the word 'lied' in two places is unparliamentary. I will accept an amendment of 'misled' as a matter of procedure.

Mr OLSEN: In the interests of getting this debate over in the time frame of 60 minutes, I accept your ruling rather than attempt to take issue with it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will resume his seat. I hope that he is not reflecting on the Speaker's ruling. I have ruled that the word 'lied' used twice is unparliamentary, and I have made a suggestion as to what might replace it. It is up to the Leader to decide what to do. Otherwise, I will rule it out of order.

Mr OLSEN: With respect, I said that I had accepted your ruling and substitution. They were the words that I used in responding to you: that I had accepted the ruling, and in that respect substituted 'misled the Parliament by telling an untruth'.

The SPEAKER: Very well. The honourable Leader.

Mr OLSEN: This Premier is now ignoring the most fundamental and important Parliamentary responsibility of all: that Ministers must tell the truth and nothing but the truth to the Parliament. This Parliament yesterday was given further proof—further firm, clear, indisputable evidence—of the lies and the deceptions of this six month cover—up by the Minister of Health. But still the Premier refuses to take any action and refuses to utter even one word of direct criticism of the Minister of Health, let alone censure.

The Premier's inaction—his deliberate flouting of the principle of Ministerial accountability to the people through this Parliament—gives the Opposition no option but to move this motion at the earliest opportunity. The rights of this Parliament and the responsibilities of its elected members must be upheld. The Premier wants to ignore these rights and responsibilities; that is hardly surprising. It was this Premier who made lying statements before the last election—

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Deputy Premier): A point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood that your ruling was to prevent the words 'lie', 'lied', or 'lying', being used in this debate as well as in the motion.

The SPEAKER: Indeed.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There have been two occasions where the Leader used the word 'lie' and 'lying'.

The SPEAKER: I now give the ruling. What was happening was purely procedural. I was arranging with the attendants that the motion be retyped so that it would be in the proper Parliamentary form. I did not hear, because I was engaged in that task, the use of the word 'lie' or 'lying', but if those words are used again the appropriate action will be taken.

Mr OLSEN: This Government is there because it deceived the people of South Australia. It is now attempting to cling to office by condoning and compounding more untruths and more deceptions. Not only is this Premier defending the right of the Hon. Dr Cornwall to make untruthful, misleading statements in this Parliament about the use of taxpayers' funds, but also he is defending the right of Mr Rod Cameron to make the same sort of statement outside Parliament.

The evidence produced to the House yesterday shows that, when the Premier asked the media to get comment from Mr Cameron about this matter, he was sending the media down a trail of more deception, more untruth, more misleading statement and more cover/up. Yesterday, I gave a detailed account to the House on the 15 instances in which Parliament was clearly misled—blatantly deceived—about this ANOP market research poll. Those untruths were proved by my exposure of the questionnaire used. The revelation of the letter from Mr Rod Cameron to the Minister dated 11 August last year reveals further untruths to this Parliament.

I ask the House to consider first what the Minister has said in this Parliament about the political questions asked in this survey. He admitted to only one—that about his personal approval rating. And he tried to maintain that this single question was not asked at taxpayers' expense, that it was not included in the survey until the drug-related questions had been developed and agreed to.

I remind the House of the words of the Minister of Health in another place. On 11 April he gave what purported to be a full explanation of how the personal approval rating question had been included. He said:

The quote was \$32 000, which was accepted, and there was a clear understanding of the range of questions.

Then, according to the Minister:

Towards the end of our discussion—

remembering that this is after the \$32 000 and the range of the poll had been well and truly agreed—

at that point, Mr Cameron said, 'What about a personal approval rating? Would you like us to add on one more question concerning a personal approval rating?'

The Minister, later in his explanation, also said:

The original quote was \$32 000 and was accepted before the personal approval rating was raised.

The Premier also swallowed that story. He told this House on 12 April:

The Government did not pay for the question that was asked about him, so it was irrelevant.

The letter from Mr Cameron to the Minister, tabled in this House yesterday, completely and utterly demolishes that story. It proves that questions about the profile of the Minister, the profile of the Premier, performance appraisal of the Government and other blatant political questions were included in the costing of the survey and were paid for out of the \$32 000 of taxpayers' funds. The Minister's explanation simply does not stand up at all. Throughout his answers in another place we find protestations from the Minister in relation to the political questions that they were not funded by the taxpayer, such as:

It was not taxpayer-funded.

Nobody paid.

I was asked whether I would like, at no extra charge, a question tacked on to the end about approval rating.

Specific statements have been made to this Parliament—by the Minister and the Premier—suggesting that taxpayers' funds were not used to pay for political questions. All those statements were demonstrably false. I also invite the attention of the House to the preface to Mr Cameron's letter in which he told the Minister:

At our recent meeting in which you outlined the Government's wishes in respect of a community attitude study regarding drugs and related matters, you requested ANOP to prepare an outline of our submission. This letter will formalise the envisaged approach, method and broad content of the survey.

In other words, this letter shows that Mr Cameron and the Minister had discussions before Mr Cameron prepared this letter, and that it was Mr Cameron's understanding of the Minister's wish that all the questions he was outlining—including those of a political nature—should be included in the survey. So much for the Minister's contention that only one political question was agreed, and that as a result of some sort of cosy chat after the rest of the survey it had been agreed to. And so much for Mr Cameron's public statements, on the day I revealed the full questionnaire, that the Minister did not know about the political questions.

The Minister and Mr Cameron have been involved in a conspiracy to keep the truth from this Parliament, and the Premier became a party to that conspiracy when he invited the media on 19 April to talk to Mr Cameron. Before dealing with the principles of Parliamentary accountability and responsibility now at issue, I refer to the Premier's statement yesterday that he had drawn up guidelines to be followed by his Ministers in the conduct of any further market research. Those guidelines amount to a tame rebuke of the actions of the Minister of Health when the political penalty he should be paying is his resignation or dismissal.

They say more about the Premier's reluctance to make his Ministers accountable than they do about his determination to ensure that taxpayers' funds are not misused and abused. They give me some satisfaction in that on 18 April the Premier told this House that 'this whole issue has been quite ridiculously beaten up by the Opposition in a most extraordinary way', that 'this business has gone on in the

most ridiculous way for far too long' and that it was a 'somewhat tedious issue'. The Premier is now living to regret those words.

But the Premier's discomfort and obvious embarrassment with the continuation of this issue is not enough to satisfy the people of South Australia. He should be made to pay a higher penalty—the ultimate penalty—because he has supported a Minister who has told untruths and given misleading statements, deliberately misleading statements, to this Parliament. Australian Parliamentary history is littered with cases of Ministers who have resigned or been sacked for telling untruths to Parliament. No strict guidelines have been laid down in this Parliament for action which should be taken against Ministers censured by Parliament for telling untruths.

However, the 1976 report of the Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration (commissioned by the Whitlam Government) clearly states that there are circumstances in which a Minister is expected to accept personal responsibility and to resign or be dismissed:

In cases where the Minister has misled Parliament, condoned or authorised a blatantly unreasonable use of executive power, or where the Minister's behaviour contravenes established standards of morality, resignation or dismissal should be the appropriate action.

In J.A. Pettifor's volume *House of Representatives Practice* it states:

... If a motion of want of confidence in, or censure of, a Minister were successful and its grounds were directly related to Government policy, the question of the Minister or the Government continuing to hold office would be one for the Prime Minister to decide.

... If the grounds related to the Minister's administration of his department or his fitness otherwise to hold Ministerial office, the Government would not necessarily accept full responsibility for the matter, leaving the question of resignation to the particular Minister or to the Prime Minister to appease the House and satisfy its sense of justice.

In yesterday's debate nobody was able to appease the majority of members of the Legislative Council—the Chamber occupied by the discredited Minister—or satisfy its sense of justice.

The Minister was found guilty of a most serious breach of Parliamentary procedure by the most competent authority in the State—the Parliament itself. Senior Ministers in the Council failed to appease that House, yet the Premier claims that the Minister is innocent. In his public defence of the Minister, the Premier has said the Minister has done an outstanding job, that he has been an excellent Minister and that he has further work to carry out. The Minister's past record, or the job that he still has to carry out, are of no consequence in this case. They are irrelevant.

I now refer to debate in this House in February 1978 concerning the dismissal of the former Police Commissioner, Mr Salisbury. The then Premier, Mr Dunstan, said:

The principles are as simple as they are great. The Executive Government of this State is responsible to Parliament and to the people.

It must account for its actions and account for them fully and effectively.

Should any member of a government of this State deny this accountability, mislead this House, the penalty is clear: resignation or dismissal from office.

There is no other choice.

They were the words of former Labor Premier Dunstan some six years ago in this House. The words are as relevant today as they were then. Yet six years later another Labor Premier chooses to ignore them for his own political survival.

In that same debate the current Premier argued vigorously against the principles that he is applying in this case of the Minister of Health. He says that in all other respects the Minister has performed well and does not deserve to lose his job.

When it was put to this Parliament that Mr Salisbury had been an outstanding Police Commissioner, the Premier, the then member for Ross Smith, agreed when he said:

I am sure members from both sides and the public at large will agree [he] is a man of integrity, with a fine record of achievement, who has been a good Commissioner of Police . . .

But on the question of whether Mr Salisbury deserved the sack, the current Premier also said:

The responsibility clearly lies with the Commissioner of Police. That responsibility was conferred on him by the Police Regulation Act appointing him Commissioner. The responsibility was conferred on him by the fact of his holding that office. His responsibility in this respect was betrayed: it was not lived up to fully and, in the circumstances surrounding it, the Government had no alternative but to dismiss him.

Those are the words of the Premier to this House in 1978. The principles are as true today as they were then. Yet, the principles so virtuously espoused by the Premier six years ago have been abandoned to ensure his own political survival. Principles then so important to the Premier have been trampled underfoot in his desperate attempt to run away from this issue.

Let me turn to another example. On 14 October 1975, the then Prime Minister, Mr Whitlam, after asking for the resignation of his Minister for Minerals and Energy, Mr Connor, said:

My own painful duty in this matter has been twice to defend and preserve a great and fundamental Parliamentary convention. It is because of my insistence on preserving such standards and conventions that a great Minister and a close friend and colleague has fallen.

In that case the Prime Minister defended Mr Connor in the House of Representatives until it was shown, beyond doubt, that Mr Connor had told the Parliament an untruth. Mr Whitlam told Parliament:

I regret to say I, myself, was misled.

It was because he had been misled, that Mr Whitlam accepted Mr Connor's resignation. Yet, in the case presently before this House, almost identical circumstances exist. The Minister clearly misled the Parliament, not once but on numerous occasions. Apparently the Premier made no efforts to check the Minister's initial version of the events surrounding the Health Commission's survey. But, once the facts were revealed, as they were in this place yesterday, and it was obvious that the Premier had been misled by his Minister, the Minister should have stood down and, failing that, he should have been sacked.

Yet the Premier, who so often in the past has trumpeted the virtues of Parliamentary procedure, is now ignoring those great and fundamental conventions to avoid making the correct decision and standing down his Minister. The Premier is not demonstrating loyalty or political courage in his present shallow defence of the Minister. He is demonstrating weakness and lack of courage, he is defying great and fundamental conventions, because his own position within the Labor Party would be under threat if he took action against the Minister. This desperate defence of the Minister is a last-ditch stand to hold together a teetering administration. There are many examples in the pages of Australian political history of decisive action being taken by firm leaders over issues less important, less obvious, less fundamental than the one now under debate. Yet, the Premier refuses to act. He falls back on weak and unconvincing excuses to cover his own lack of control within his Party.

In doing so, he is establishing dangerous new rules for the conduct of Ministers in this Parliament. The precedent set in this case will be quoted in this Parliament, and used in defence of wayward Ministers, beyond the turn of the century. The Opposition has been unable to find any precedent for a Minister remaining in office having been found

guilty of misleading the Parliament. In closing, let me summarise the situation this House is now faced with:

A Minister in another place has clearly and deliberately misled the Parliament about the use of taxpayers' funds.

The House in which the Minister sits has passed a vote of no confidence in him.

But the Premier in this place refuses to ask the Minister for his resignation, refuses to sack him, refuses to utter even one word of criticism of the Minister's actions and behaviour throughout this scandal.

This is now a main street scandal, not a backwater barney, as the Premier has attempted to portray it. The great and fundamental principle of Ministerial accountability to the people through this Parliament is at issue—at risk.

The Premier argues that a no-confidence motion in a Minister in the Legislative Council is not relevant. How else can Ministers in the Council be censured by this Parliament? The Premier's logic assumes that any Minister in the Legislative Council stands above the standards and conventions of the Parliament. Using those criteria, Ministers in that Chamber are no longer accountable to the Parliament and to the people of this State. The Premier, by his inaction, has condoned and compounded the untruths told to this Parliament. The Premier, by his inaction, is rewriting the Parliamentary rule book so that there are now no rules, no standards of accountability to the people and no responsibility to tell the truth.

If the Premier persists with his attitude of complete contempt for this Parliament and the people of South Australia, the Opposition will have to consider seriously how the Government can be forced to pay some political penalty for this scandal in circumstances where it is prepared to accept none. We will have to examine all other conventions which all members are expected to observe, such as pairing arrangements and our continuing co-operation with them, if this Government and this Premier are not prepared to abide by the most important convention of them all: to tell the truth. I ask all members of the House to support this censure of the Premier for his failure to uphold that convention.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): This motion ought to be disposed of in just a very few words indeed by looking at the text which has been put before us, a text which had to be amended because, as part of this porno-political exercise by the Opposition, we see that words were used that the Opposition knew were deliberately unparliamentary. What is the motive behind that? We have just had to listen quietly in our seats to a lecture about Parliamentary propriety and the forms and conventions of this House. We have had to listen to that from a man who quite deliberately flouted the forms and conventions of this House in the very motion that he moved.

He was required by the Speaker to adjust the wording of the motion. Right from the very first words he uttered in this debate, the hypocrisy of this exercise has been exposed. I said that this motion ought to be disposed of in just a few words. We are told in it that I have failed to take action against the Minister of Health, who has deliberately misled this Parliament by telling untruths (in the amended form). The Minister did not mislead the Parliament. The Leader goes on to say, 'We have a letter to prove it.' That letter does not prove it. Indeed those documents—documents I might remind the House that were tabled by the Government at the first available opportunity following those documents having been asked for—proved nothing of the sort. The Leader of the Opposition goes on to say, 'The Minister has not satisfied the Legislative Council.' That is as ludicrous as saying that if, for instance, today I turn this motion around and move a censure on the Leader of the Opposition

and much to everyone's surprise it is carried the Leader of the Opposition will be instantly required to resign. Is that what he is saying? Of course the politics of this are what the Leader is emphasising.

The fact that a House is comprised of a majority of members who do not in fact support the Government (although on occasions some of them do) means of course that any vote that is taken in the case of a particular Minister has no constitutional support or support in any way in the forms and practices of the Westminster tradition to require that Minister to resign. But that is put forward as yet another reason why we should take action in this matter. The point is that the Opposition will not be satisfied in this place. Opposition members have said that. They want blood; they want a head on the plate. They will say anything, produce anything, and talk about anything to try to do it.

I think that, if ever we needed proof that the Opposition's real motive in this whole affair was pure politicking, we have it in the form of this motion. I would have thought that every single point that has been raised in the course of the somewhat turgid address of the Leader of the Opposition has been covered in a full debate that was provided for earlier. The matters that the Leader raised have been explored in question and answer in both Chambers over a considerable period of time.

I would have thought that we had reached the stage where the extent to which this matter could be hacked over again and again had finished. I guess, though, in the Leader of the Opposition's defence, one must see a sort of tactic or strategy emerging as far as the Opposition is concerned. Today is probably the third stage in this rather tedious but expensive campaign to promote a more vigorous image of the Leader of the Opposition. On Sunday night we had stage 1 in which we saw the new economic policy laid out—an extraordinary proposal to finance the State Budget by selling off profitable State enterprises—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Getting right down to the nitty gritty of selling off the cake stall at the Adelaide Railway station, I think the Leader has, with this rather extraordinary rehash of Tonkinesque economics, shown himself to be a cake stall politician with a pancake makeup. It demonstrates a cosmetic approach to the State's economic problems. However, this matter is serious. It is serious in relation to the stage to which the Leader has then gone on to take it. Yesterday there was the attack on the Minister of Health, mounted in both Houses—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr ASHENDEN: On a point of order, I was responding to an interjection of most personal comment made by the member for Unley who is not even in his seat. I was not responding to the Premier in any way. I have not been previously cautioned. I believe that I have been dealt with extremely roughly.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are always out of order. I did not hear what was said by a person on my right. If I had, I would have warned that person as well. Everybody might as well know what the consequences of interjections are going to be in the next half hour or so. I cannot help the honourable member because he may have been inflamed in some way. The honourable member stands warned.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was referring to a motion passed in another place, to which we are meant to have regard. Grave Westminster principles are being invoked to suggest that, because that motion was passed in the circumstances of the numbers in that Chamber, the Minister should

therefore resign. That is not a tenable proposition and it is one that I will not accept.

Let us look at what the Leader is saying in terms of arguments that he adduces to support action which should be taken by me as Premier. Incidentally, I am to be censured too and asked to resign because of an alleged complete disregard for the conventions and precedents of Parliament. I am well aware of the conventions and precedents of Parliament. I certainly have not been a member for as long as some colleagues on both sides of the House, but I have been here long enough, and I have studied and observed the Parliamentary process for long enough to know what they are about. Those conventions are evolved over time, and they have many nuances and applications. There is academic debate about how they should apply. There are numerous instances that can support any particular action in any case. What it comes down to ultimately is that a case must be established beyond doubt if the most severe penalty of all—the resignation of a Minister—can be, in fact, regarded seriously.

I would have no hesitation in taking action if I believed the circumstances so warrant it. I have been called on by this Opposition on a number of occasions to in fact sack various Ministers in my Government. None of those calls, I suggest, have had any great substance. They have all been couched in these lofty principles of Parliamentary procedure and convention. But, look at each of them. In fact, it is hard to remember some of the matters that have been drawn up, such was their triviality. They may have loomed large at the time; it may have been exciting and challenging to debate them at the time but, in retrospect, those Ministers have got on and gone about their job. If we ask anybody whether they should have resigned or been called to order on the sort of things put up against them, the effect on people is one of mystification—hardly recalling the incident.

In fact, there was one such incident quite recently. The Opposition's paucity of questions or of ability to question the Government on areas of what I would consider major substance in our economic and social climate today has been shown up by its using most of this Parliamentary sitting time since we resumed, first, on a spurious pursuit of the Minister of Recreation and Sport. There was question after question—high scandal!

All of it has been systematically rebutted by statement, evidence and letter over time, and eventually it was dropped. After all the huffing and puffing and carrying on about it, the Opposition subsided and we heard no more about it—with good cause. What if I had acted on the first day or two, listened to the member for Torrens' strictures on this, and demanded the resignation of my Minister? I would have stood condemned because I would have been hanging an innocent man. I would have been jeopardising the administration of his portfolios and the programmes he was implementing—for nothing. I am not prepared to do that, and it is valid to talk about the record of the Minister and the job he is doing in these instances—quite valid and appropriate. Therefore, talking about the Minister of Health and detailing his achievements, the job he is doing and the job he has to do is totally relevant to this particular debate and cannot be dismissed in the way that the Opposition requires.

Today it has hinged around, in particular, the proposal presented by Mr Cameron, which was one of the documents tabled by my colleague the Minister of Tourism on behalf of the Minister of Health yesterday, and indeed it was tabled in another place. I would say that it does not establish what the Opposition claims it establishes. By its interpretation, just as by its twisting of words, answers and questions throughout this whole sorry business, it may indeed cast doubt and innuendo on the area. However, I suggest that

that can be done only if one works from the presumption of total guilt of conspiracy.

I expect an Opposition to get a bit paranoid occasionally and to believe in terms of conspiracy and guilt. However, I would ask the Opposition, as I would any member of our community, to have some regard to that first precept of British justice of which I think we are all rightly proud: that someone is innocent until proven guilty. The onus in fact is quite the opposite to the direction from which the Opposition comes, which is the worst interpretation and the most malevolent way of assessing questions, answers and documents. The Opposition should at least concede some validity and truth in what is being said. If that is done and if that interpretation is made, it is very easy to reverse the case completely. I am not expecting the Opposition to do that.

The Opposition has demonstrated today, as it has before, that its interest is in the politics of this and nothing more. It wants to get every last shred of flesh torn off and blood on this issue and as many inches of print and media time as it can get—that is all that concerns it. I suggest that that goes completely (if we are to talk of principles of justice, conventions and lofty sentiments) against the way in which a debate of this nature should be tackled. Let me remind the House again that these documents on which the whole case is meant to hang and from which selective quotes are being made were in fact produced by the Government. There has been a full disclosure and the member for Torrens asked me on the last day of sitting before yesterday whether I would table certain documents. I said to him, 'I will discuss it with the Minister of Health and see whether there were problems of confidentiality or whatever involved.' If there were no problems there, I said that they would be tabled, because that is the way my Government operates. Unknown to me, but at the same time in another place, the Minister of Health was saying exactly the same thing—that he was prepared to table certain documents.

At the first available opportunity to do so, those documents were tabled yesterday and they do not prove or establish the case that has been represented on them. All the questions cited by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and today refer to the whole body of that document, a survey and questionnaire relating to drugs. That is what it is all about and the word is used again and again throughout that. There is within that document, I suggest, no substance in saying that, therefore, if the Minister had read that document carefully he would have understood that there were political questions of the sort that appeared in the questionnaire that was subsequently produced—absolutely none. It refers to drugs and makes it very clear, and that was the report that the Government got. Let me come back to that: whatever questions were asked, the Government commissioned a particular report and it got that report. It tabled that report and made it public.

Mr Lewis: Not so.

The SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the honourable member, for Mallee took account of the warning which I gave. I call him to order and that is the last chance he will get. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I also suggest that, as well as taking in total context the ANOP proposal, the Opposition might also look at the accompanying documents. However, the Opposition has chosen not to do that. The Opposition chooses not to refer to the accompanying documents, because they show that quite proper procedures were followed. The documents do not pertain to things that the Minister did or was involved in; in fact, they quite properly occurred in a sequence of events. The proposal reached the Minister's desk and he sent it straight across to the Health Commission, which analysed the proposal, said that it was adequate and that the survey was needed. The Commission did not have

the resources to conduct the survey itself, so it decided that it could go out without tender, as had been the Commission's past practice (and I will come to that point in a moment). The Commission decided that the price for the survey was reasonable and, therefore, should be accepted. That advice went to the Chairman of the Health Commission.

The Chairman of the Health Commission, in turn, noted his approval for the survey—and that is in the documents—and subsequently sent a telex to the survey organisation saying that the Commission accepted the proposal—'Get on with the job', which it did. The Minister was not involved in that process. The Minister of Health did not see the questionnaire that actually went into the field. The Minister saw, as he has said constantly, correctly and truthfully, the report presented by the market survey organisation, which met his and the Health Commission's requirements and which was subsequently published to the community at large. That is the truth of the matter and that, surely, is where the argument rests.

At no point in what I have recounted to the House can anyone say that the Minister of Health must resign because he has been dishonest to Parliament or because he has done something phoney or crooked in the way that he has handled this matter. I think that is really where this debate hangs. I am not only rejecting the call of the Opposition; I am also rejecting out of hand this tedious motion. It does not have the basis or substance of the facts that have been fully put before this place by the Government—and I refer to the documents produced and tabled by the Government, not to those that the Opposition scurried around and tried to elicit or misinterpret, doing whatever it could for its own purposes.

My Government, my Minister of Health, and his representative in this Chamber have put all the facts before this House and, therefore, before the people of South Australia. Those facts do not establish in any way a case for the Minister's dismissal. I thought that the Leader of the Opposition made a very revealing statement early in his speech. He said that part of the motivation for the motion was aimed at the Government itself generally. He said that my Party is in office because we misled the public.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My Party was elected to Government because the Tonkin Government failed the people of South Australia and because its policies, which the Leader and many of his colleagues had a hand in implementing, completely failed. It is a terrible thing, but apparently the lessons of history have not been learnt: we see the Opposition rehashing them again, dusting them off, polishing them, and pushing them out as its policies for an economic future in South Australia. The fact of life is that my Party was elected not only on the policies that we put forward (which we are implementing systematically and thoroughly) but also because of the failure of the policies of members opposite.

I repeat what I said yesterday: it seems to be a symptom of the conservative vein of thinking in politics that somehow if their opponents occupy the Treasury benches they are usurpers, that the proper persons to occupy the Treasury benches are those who are presently sitting on the Opposition benches, that in some way an aberration has occurred, that people do not fully understand that their natural leaders are not occupying the position of leadership. I would have thought that that argument had been fought and lost by conservative forces in the last century. I am not suggesting that they have not tried again and again by disruption by various sorts of methods, by twisting and turning the forms of the House to try to recapture their rightful role as they see it.

I assure members of the House that that is not the way that people in this country in a democratic society view the matter. We can have all the 1975 Federal-type situations, all those emotions and appeals to lofty sentiments, but underneath it all runs this vein of the Opposition, which will do anything, flout any convention or twist or turn in any circumstance to get back to what it believes to be its rightful place in Government. I would hope that that kind of arrogance had burnt out of our body politic over the past few years, that democracy has been with us long enough to get rid of those attitudes, but I regret to say, as has been evidenced over the past few days, that that is not the case in this State.

I assure members opposite that my Party will occupy the Treasury benches in this State for as long as the people desire us to do so, and while we are here we will do a job for the people of South Australia. Let us come right down to the basics of the matter, the reasons for these sorts of motions and this ignoring of the basic and fundamental issues of the day. The thing that hurts most in regard to all this talking about our having misled the public, or having broken promises, etc., is that the Labor Party was elected with some sort of mandate for economic recovery in South Australia; that recovery is occurring, and our policies are working. That hurts: it hurts the Opposition every time a business man (which it, the business Party, claims to represent) is heard to say that he believes that the Labor Government is doing a good job, that it is instituting reforms and that business is progressing under this Government.

I suggest that consultation around the place with anyone working in the community of South Australia, whether with the traditional cloth-capped working man (whom members opposite would suggest we represent, although I suggest that our Party represents the broad base of wage and salary earners in this State) or with the cigar-smoking capitalist, personified as being a supporter of the Liberal Opposition in this State, would indicate that they are all saying that the economy is turning around and that things are improving. That is fundamentally what hurts those members sitting opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: That is why, instead of hearing questions about housing, employment and State finances, we heard the bitter outburst of the Leader of the Opposition last night. Because the Government's Budget is on course, he cannot stand it; the thought appals him; he wants to know why everything is not going wrong and why we seem to be working to Budget adequately. Instead of questions being asked about the matters to which I refer, questions are asked about personalities, in a constant attempt to try to draw blood from the Government and not to expose the Government on its record, because members opposite know that that is impossible. Instead they attempt to pick out personal foibles and weaknesses as they see them. The Opposition will not succeed. I reject this motion totally and utterly.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Premier has sought to drag a series of red herrings across this trail in the bluster to which we have just been subjected. I am sorely tempted to respond to them, but I shall not do so, except to say that the Premier's much vaunted recovery has led to more than an additional 9 000 people being unemployed in this State since the day the present Government took office. The CPI figures for South Australia reflect the record increases in taxation and new taxes that have been imposed on South Australia as a result of the Premier's breach of faith with the public—

The SPEAKER: Order! Those remarks are highly irrelevant to the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When members have regained their calm and their stability I will give the call to the Deputy Leader. It is quite clear that the remarks that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is now making have nothing to do with the motion before the House.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: You have confirmed the point I was making, Mr Speaker, that the material that the Premier largely dealt out to the House today is irrelevant to the motion, because my comments were in response to what—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Deputy Leader. I ask the Deputy Leader to resume his seat. That is a sheer and defiant objection to the Speaker, and I will not tolerate that. I have warned the honourable member and I will not do so again. The honourable Deputy Leader.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I am precluded from replying to some of the material that the Premier has put before the House. I intended to do so in only a fleeting fashion, anyway. I do not intend to have my opportunity to make a speech in this important debate denied to me. As I said earlier, the Premier indulged in a series of red herrings that were totally irrelevant to the motion.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

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

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I made a fleeting reference to these matters, but I will now get back to the nub of what this is all about. The Premier is dealing in bluster, but the Opposition is dealing in plain facts that everyone in this House can understand. Is the Premier now saying in defence of his Minister that the letter tabled in the House yesterday is somehow or other qualified by the supporting documents to which he referred? Is he saying that the Minister did not read the letter that the Health Commission dealt with? That proposition is a new twist. The Premier has left the Chamber, but it is interesting to note what he said yesterday in relation to how he is going to control his Ministry and administer the affairs of this State. I know that we are not allowed to use the word 'lie' in the sense that we call somebody a liar, but one is able to quote newspaper reports and the like where that word is used. This is what the Premier said yesterday:

We could all put all the worst possible complexions and interpretations on those answers, and some flimsy case could be erected. But it is not on that basis that Governments should be judged, it is not on this basis that the performance of Ministers should be analysed, and it is certainly not on that basis that I, as Leader of this Government, will ask any of my Ministers to step down or resign, nor will I sack them in the event that they do not do so.

Therefore, the defence of Minister Cornwall in this place has really resided in the proposition that, if the Minister is perceived to be doing a good job in some areas (and this Minister is certainly not so perceived by people in the public arena who he has maligned scurrilously on numerous occasions), he can get away with telling complete untruths to Parliament—that is the proposition to which the Premier is now giving his assent. The Minister can come into this place, say what he likes and do what he likes but, if he is perceived to be doing a good job, he is safe. Where do we finish up with that proposition? This whole affair, from start to finish, has been a cover-up.

The problem for the Premier is that this much vaunted credibility he is on about all the time is in shreds, because he is in it up to his eyes as the Premier of the State. Is he

trying to get us to accept the proposition that even though this questioning has been going on for about six months, including repeated demands being made for this survey, that they have not bothered to find out what was in the survey? Is that what he is asking us to believe? One of the reasons the Premier is loath to sack the Minister, when it is quite clear that he should do so, is that he (and I believe the Government's Leader in the other place) are up to their eyes in it. What sort of traditions are we to follow in this place? We are dealing in facts: what have been the standards that the Labor Party, in its righteous indignation, has sought to apply in the past? What were the standards it applied when Commissioner Salisbury was sacked peremptorily and the media was manipulated to make matters look right?

What were the criteria used? His dismissal notice was delivered to him at midnight. What were the standards used by the Labor Party then? He had misled by withholding information, not by telling lies. His crime was not as serious as the crime that has been exposed here. He was sacked peremptorily for withholding information from the Premier. There was a Royal Commission, and what did the Royal Commissioner say about it? This bears on the point that the Premier made: he thinks that, if this Minister is doing a good job, he can come in here and deliver the biggest canards, whatever he likes, complete untruths, or whatever word equates to 'lies'. He can come in here and use them if he is perceived by the Premier as doing a good job—and I dispute that. This Minister has done an appalling job. A standard was applied to Commissioner Salisbury, and this is what the judge said in support of the Government's case then:

Mr Salisbury was highly respected and well thought of by the South Australian community during his term of office as Commissioner of Police.

I reckon that he did a damned sight better job for this State than Cornwall will do in a million years.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to refer to 'the member in another place'.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable Minister: it is hard to use the words, but the honourable Minister, 'honourable' in quotes.

The SPEAKER: Order! I trust that that is not a reflection on the Speaker.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: I do not wish to reflect on the Speaker. I certainly do not want to reflect on you, because I want to get this off my chest. This is the conclusion of the Royal Commissioner:

I think that it is always justifiable for a Government which has been misled by the head of a Government department on a matter of substance to dismiss that officer, particularly when the Government has, in consequence of the receipt of the misleading information, itself misled others. I believe that dismissal is justified in those circumstances even where the officer dismissed has been, in all other respects, satisfactory in his service.

Salisbury had been outstanding in his service, but he was sacked peremptorily with no questions asked, in the middle of the night, because they were the standards that the Labor Party believed should apply in this State. They also applied in relation to the sacking of Cairns, a senior Minister and one of the leaders of the Whitlam Administration.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Deputy Leader has the floor.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Cairns was one of the shining lights and one of the leaders in the Labor Party. He did not go around in a public forum behaving like the Minister from the other place does. I used to respect his intelligence and public utterances. Why did he go? Because he misled the Parliament, because he gave it misleading information.

Minister Rex Connor I remember well as one of the outstanding members of that Federal Administration. I did not agree with his politics for a minute, but he was an outstanding Minister. What happened to him? With great regret, Prime Minister Whitlam sacked him for misleading Parliament. These are the standards that have applied until recent times with the Australian Labor Party in South Australia. We have Ministerial responsibility *a la* Bannon here now, not *a la* Westminster system. The Leader gave some very telling quotes from authorities as to what is the proper and right thing to do in this system to which we are supposed to subscribe.

An honourable member: Devastating!

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: They were devastating quotes, and again the honourable back-bencher seeks to trivialise the situation. The Premier at least did not do that. He sought to drag red herrings across the trail.

An honourable member: He did not have any answers.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: He did not have any answers—that is quite true—but at least he did not try this buffoonery that comes from the back bench of the Labor Party when it knows that it has no defence. If ever it has been in the situation where it has no defence—not one skerrick of a defence—it is in this motion today. I speak with some feeling, because we have thrown all standards out of the window according to the behaviour of this Government. Nothing like it has occurred before in our ken in the Westminster system.

Let me quote another authority that is cited in this place from time to time in relation to the traditions of the Westminster system, under which the freedom and the rights of the citizens are upheld in this the highest court of the land, where the rules are made. Some years ago in the House of Commons, in fact a couple of centuries ago, there was a mechanism for impeachment, whereby people who were guilty of high crime or even misdemeanours were impeached. A similar system exists in America. In fact, a President of that country lost his job. He was to be impeached: he was on the verge of an impeachment procedure because he told a lie publicly. If he had burnt the tapes, it would have been different. Nixon says that his mistake was that he did not burn the tapes. The crime is not what one does, but it is being found out, especially in this day and age. That is the morality. But if someone is found out, he pays the price.

The Premier can get up here and hoo-hah about British justice, but what further evidence do we need than what has been placed before us in this place? If a person is found guilty, he pays the price—that is the fundamental principle of British justice. He is not let out of prison because he is a nice fellow, a mate, or because he is a Cameron, who will go into print and tell untruths because he has done a lot of work for the Labor Party. Mr Cameron will verify it. He is condemned by his own letter: he is up to his eyes in this, just as the Hon. Mr Sumner and the Premier are involved. That is what British justice and the system are all about. If one is guilty, one pays the price. One is not let off. But that is what the Premier is saying.

British justice provides that it does not matter whether a person is the best or the highest citizen in the land: the concept is that it does not matter what a person's track record has been. Why are lawyers locked up? Why are judges impeached? If people are found out, they pay the price. Why has a Minister left his job? Why did Wran get rid of his Minister in New South Wales, Mr Jackson? Mr Jackson had a good record, for all we knew. However, if a person is found out, he pays the price. That is what British justice is all about. Regarding impeachment, which has now been superseded, Erskine May states:

Impeachments were directed in particular at Ministers of the Crown, but the growth of the doctrine of collective Cabinet

responsibility, and of resignation of the Cabinet following a successful vote of censure against a Minister, resulted in the disuse of impeachments in modern times.

Thus, we do not work under the American system where a President is impeached, where they get rid of him for telling a lie. In our case, the Minister resigns. That doctrine has superseded impeachment in the Westminster system. Erskine May further states:

The House may treat the making of a deliberately misleading statement as a contempt.

And contempt of Parliament means that a member is out of Parliament. He does not just lose his job as a Minister. Further, it is stated:

In 1963 the House resolved that in making a personal statement which contained words which he had later admitted to be untrue a former Minister had been guilty of a grave contempt.

That was a reference to the Profumo case. Members may recall the gory circumstances surrounding that matter. It is fairly fresh, I guess, in people's memory, even though it was a long time ago. Profumo's crime was not what he did outside Parliament (although a lot of people would not have approved of that) but that he went into Parliament and lied about it. That was his crime. So much for the Premier's spirited defence and bluster in relation to his Minister. He has been found out.

Let me conclude by referring to what the editorialists have been prepared to acknowledge in this State in recent times, and I refer to the unfortunate experience of the Deputy Premier. I believe that the facts were quite clear, but they took a bit of sorting out. We had to read the *Hansard* references. This case is crystal clear. The facts are quite plain, and quickly and readily grasped. At least the editorialists have been prepared to put the facts. It was stated in the *News*:

The price of being found out. At the end of another amazing week in Australian politics, a vital principle has been diluted to the point of being meaningless.

This is here in South Australia: we are leading the world. We have thrown out the rule book and this is the man who has done it! The man who talks about his credibility.

Mr Lewis: Orange flower water.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: No, it is worse than that. The article continues:

This is the principle that Ministers who mislead Parliament must resign . . . It was because Parliament had been misled that Mr Whitlam sacked Dr Cairns and Mr Connor . . . At all times those who hold high public office must bear in mind that they are . . .

The SPEAKER: Order! The time for the debate has expired.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes—(23)—Mrs. Appleby, Messrs L.M.F. Arnold, Bannon (teller), M.J. Brown, Crafter, Duncan, Ferguson, Gregory, Groom, Hamilton, Hemmings, Hopgood, Keneally, and Klunder, Ms Lenehan, Messrs Mayes, Payne, Peterson, Plunkett, Slater, Trainer, Whitten, and Wright.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA JUBILEE 150 BOARD ACT AMENDMENT BILL 1984

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the South Australia Jubilee 150 Board Act, 1982. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

Members will be aware of the great importance to South Australia of the jubilee celebrations in 1986. Soon after coming to office, my Government introduced legislation which had been prepared by the previous Administration to incorporate the South Australian Jubilee 150 Board which is charged with the responsibility of organising and promoting programmes, functions and celebrations for the 1986 anniversary. That legislation established the Board of 14 persons, which was an appropriate size for the work of planning and organising which the Board then had before it. The Board also has the responsibility of involving as many people as possible in the jubilee celebrations. For this reason the Government now believes that it is appropriate to expand the size of the Board from 14 to 19 to allow for a wider representation from all sections of the community.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 6 of the principal Act which provides for the membership of the South Australia Jubilee 150 Board. The clause amends the section so that the membership of the Board will be a maximum of 19 persons appointed by the Governor rather than as is presently provided a maximum of 14. Clause 3 amends section 9 of the principal Act which provides for the procedure at meetings of the Board. The clause increases the quorum for meetings of the Board from seven to 10 members.

Mr OLSEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMMISSIONER FOR THE AGEING BILL

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER (Minister of Community Welfare) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the appointment of a Commissioner for the Ageing; to prescribe his objectives and functions; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. In so doing, I propose that this Bill should lie on the table until the Budget session of Parliament. I hope that during that period members in this place and another place will acquaint themselves with its provisions. I also hope that individuals, organisations, and other bodies concerned with the ageing will take the opportunity to make comments to me on the Bill.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

The purpose of this Bill is to establish the position of Commissioner for the Ageing and to define the objectives and functions of that office. In short, it is the Government's intention to create a focal point for information and advice about the ageing in South Australia, and for the co-ordination and support of services for this important section of our community.

Over recent years, South Australia has seen a marked increase in both the numbers and the proportion of the older members in its population. The number of people of 65 years of age is increasing by more than 4 000 every year.

In 1983 there were more than 147 000 people over 65 years in this State, or about 11 per cent of the population. By the turn of the century it is likely that there will be nearly 200 000 people over 65 years, comprising 13 per cent of the State's population. It is predicted that this trend will continue beyond that time producing even more significant changes to this State's population structure.

Within the older population, there are many other important social and demographic characteristics which warrant the interest of governments and the wider community. For example, it is estimated that between 1981 and 1986, the number of Italian-born aged people will increase by one-third, and those from Greece and Germany by one half. Women comprise 65 per cent of people over 65 years of age and 72 per cent of people over 80 years. Seventy per cent of women over 65 years do not have the support of a husband, and many lack other family ties.

For many people there are good things to be enjoyed in their older years—independence from family and employment responsibilities; increased time in which to expand one's knowledge, skills and experience; new opportunities for community service; more time to spend with one's friends or to relax after a busy period of life. For many it is also a time of loneliness, boredom, impaired physical and mental health, increased dependency, fears, anxiety and poverty.

It is this Government's strongly held commitment that neither the numbers of older people in this State nor the difficulties which they may experience will be viewed as a burden upon the State, but rather as a responsibility to be addressed by the Government and the community as a whole. Furthermore, we will seek to foster those attitudes, structures and practices in our society which enhance the role and status of the ageing and not merely sustain them in their latter years. To help fulfil this commitment the Labor Party, in its election platform, stated its intention to appoint a Commissioner for Aged Care and Services. It was envisaged that the Commissioner would provide a prime contact point for issues concerning the ageing and co-ordinate services and assistance available to them.

Following the Premier's announcement in October 1983 that the Government would proceed with this intention, widespread public consultation was undertaken to define the objectives and functions of the proposed Commissioner. A support group of prominent people from services and organisations for the ageing was appointed to guide the consultation and comment on a final report. There were 1 250 copies of an ideas paper distributed to departments, organisations and individuals with an interest in the ageing. Discussion groups were held with aged people and leaders of organisations in city and country areas. Interviews were conducted with key people involved with policy making and administration of services. Reports and other literature were analysed and information and comments were sought from social science research bodies and the State Office on Ageing, Wisconsin, United States of America. One hundred and thirty-five submissions have been received from diverse organisations and individuals throughout the State. There was widespread support for both the proposal and the consultative process. The information, comments and recommendations received have strongly influenced the legislation which is presented to the Parliament now.

In addition, as a part of the process of developing the proposal that there be a Commissioner, the Government was confronted with the question of whether to establish the office of the Commissioner by the enactment of special legislation, whether to provide for a statutory office by amendment to the Community Welfare Act, or whether to establish an office by administrative act. Obviously, it would have been possible simply to appoint a person within the

Public Service to perform the functions that are to be prescribed by legislation. However, the Government has perceived that many people in the community think that it would be appropriate that the functions of a Commissioner be contained in legislation, and it is certainly the case that an office prescribed by Statute will acquire a status that is, in the opinion of Government, desirable because of the special needs and position of the ageing within our community. Accordingly, the decision has been made to provide for the office by legislation, and that decision will culminate in the passage of this Bill.

It will be immediately apparent that the Commissioner's title has been changed from 'Commissioner for Aged Care and Services', as originally proposed, to 'Commissioner for the Ageing'. The new title more clearly represents the Government's intention that the Commissioner will have responsibilities to all the ageing with their skills, experience, enterprise and resourcefulness, whilst giving special attention to their need for care and services when required. The objectives for the Commissioner also reflect this broader mandate. They have a three-fold focus—the ageing themselves; the programmes and services for the ageing; and the community of which the ageing are a part.

The term 'the ageing' has been given lengthy consideration and whilst it will not appeal to all, seems more acceptable than other terms including 'the aged' and 'the elderly'. It is also receiving more widespread usage (viz. Councils on the Ageing; studies on 'The Family and the Ageing', etc.) and is in common use in the United States. It has been decided not to limit the term to a particular age group but to follow customary usage as referring to the older members of the population.

The primary responsibility of the Commissioner will be to provide informed advice and commentary to State Government Ministers, departments, instrumentalities, programmes and services affecting the ageing. Such advice will also be available to other levels of government, service agencies, non-government organisations and the general public.

Many policies and services separate old people from others in our society. This is not the philosophy of this Government, nor the intention of this legislation—nobody should be subject to society's intended or unintended rejection. The Commissioner will try to identify and promulgate inclusionist rather than exclusionist practices at all times. The Commissioner will have access to all Government Ministers and heads of departments and instrumentalities on matters concerning the ageing.

For the Commissioner's advice to be fully informed, it will be necessary for the Commissioner to study and consult widely. Information about the ageing needs to be brought together, analysed and applied to the South Australian situation. Local research on the ageing and the services provided for them needs to be encouraged. The Commissioner will promote such research, compile data and ensure its dissemination throughout the community.

The Commissioner will consult widely with individuals and organisations about issues and needs of the ageing. These will include policy makers, service administrators, professional workers, academics, and organisations for the ageing. In particular, the Commissioner will consult with the ageing themselves and will seek to ensure that society adjusts to the needs and aspirations of older people. Obviously, the process cannot be all one way, and one of the tasks of the Commissioner will be to pursue that balance, taking into account other considerations and expectations.

Conceptions abound about older people being unproductive and dependent. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Commissioner will seek to ensure that the skills and experience of elderly people are recognised and used

for the benefit of both the community and individual elderly people. Wherever possible, the Commissioner will seek their wider participation on Government committees, boards of management and in other community structures—particularly where decisions and actions are being taken which affect them.

There is a highly complex array of Government authorities, non-government organisations, private practitioners, local communities and other bodies involved with the ageing. The Commissioner will liaise with such bodies and support the co-ordination of their endeavours. Some attempts at co-ordination are already occurring at local and regional levels in the State. This has led to a sharing of information and ideas, greater support and co-operation between agencies, more awareness of the needs of the ageing, and an identification of gaps in services.

The Commissioner will work closely with such organisations and support their development in other areas. At the State level, the Commissioner will facilitate the greater co-ordination of Government policies and services for the ageing. In relations between the State and Commonwealth Governments the Commissioner will provide an important channel of communication and represent the State on influential advisory and co-ordinating committees.

Whilst there is a considerable amount of information for and about the ageing, it is not always in a form accessible to the elderly. The Commissioner will seek to ensure that information for the elderly is comprehensive and well-presented and available through those channels with which they have regular contact. In time it is expected that the Commissioner will provide a clearing house of information for service providers and policy makers so that they have the latest research data as well as information on such matters as funding sources and priorities, departmental responsibilities and procedures, programme ideas and practices.

It is not the Government's intention that the Commissioner should be responsible for the administration of services for the ageing. As far as possible, this Government will provide policies and services which are inclusive—for all the people—and it will be the task of the Commissioner to seek to ensure that they are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of older people. Whilst inclusive policies and services run the risk of fragmentation, the Government will look to the Commissioner to identify gaps and assist with co-ordination on behalf of the ageing.

Finally, it is not intended that the Commissioner should have a regulatory function. Almost certainly the Commissioner will receive personal complaints about treatment received or not received from service givers. Such complaints will provide important information to the Commissioner for advising about services. However, if the Commissioner becomes an investigatory and enforcement agency for personal complaints, there are dangers of duplicating the existing avenues of investigation as well as providing a conflict of roles *vis-a-vis* those of advising, liaising, supporting and co-ordinating. Where existing standards of care and enforcement mechanisms are found to be ineffective or insufficient, the Commissioner may be asked to advise the Government on more adequate measures.

I propose this Bill to lie on the table until the Budget session of Parliament. I hope that during that period honourable members in this place and in the other place will acquaint themselves with the Bill. I also hope that individuals, organisations, and other bodies concerned with the ageing will take the opportunity to make comments to me on the Bill.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 contains the definition of the Commissioner for the purposes of the proposed new

Act. Clause 4 provides for the office of Commissioner for the Ageing. It is proposed that the Commissioner be appointed for a term not exceeding five years. He is not to be appointed under the Public Service Act, but the conditions of his appointment will be determined on the recommendation of the Public Service Board in order to ensure some consistency with comparable appointments in other areas of Government. In the event that a Commissioner is appointed from the Public Service, his existing and accruing rights to leave are to be preserved.

Clause 5 provides for immunity from liability for the Commissioner in the performance of his functions under the Act. Any liability shall attach instead to the Crown. Clause 6 sets out the objectives of the Commissioner. It is proposed that the Commissioner should work to achieve a proper integration of the ageing within the community, to create social structures within which the ageing may realise their full potential, to advance a desirable social ethos in relation to the ageing, and to achieve a proper understanding of the problems of the ageing within the community.

Clause 7 relates to the functions of the ageing. The Commissioner is to advise on programmes and services designed to assist the ageing. It is intended that he monitor all aspects of the effect of Government action upon the ageing. He will be able to initiate appropriate research, collect data and provide information to the ageing. He should assist in the co-ordination of services for the ageing. He will be required to keep under review the special needs of various groups of people who comprise the ageing in our community. Associated with the performance of his functions, the Commissioner will be expected to consult with the ageing and represent their views to the Minister. He will be specifically empowered to establish committees to assist him in any aspect of his work.

Clause 8 provides that the Commissioner shall, in the performance of his functions, be subject to the general control and direction of the Minister. Clause 9 allows for the appointment of staff to assist the Commissioner. The Commissioner will be able to arrange to use facilities of the State Government. Clause 10 provides a delegation power. However, delegations will be subject to Ministerial approval and will not derogate from the powers of the Commissioner to act in any matter himself. Clause 11 provides for the presentation of an annual report by the Commissioner by the end of September in each year.

The Hon. H. ALLISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 1 to 2 p.m.]

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1984

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 1 May. Page 3859.)

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I wish to take the time available to me to express my concern and the concern of my electorate about the announcement made yesterday by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Frank Blevins) about the closure of SAMCOR at Port Lincoln. I do so with some disappointment that we do not have members of the Government in the Chamber who at least understand and appreciate the ramifications of the action they have taken. In axing the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln they have totally ignored the social and political ramifications of their actions. They do not understand, they have no idea, and, what is more important, they do not want to understand. I have expressed my concern in many ways. On 5 April this year in answer

to a question from the member for Alexandra the Premier stood up in this place and said that we cannot subsidise a facility to the extent of about \$1 million a year on the base employment at the moment of 15 employees. That was a gross distortion of the facts and it has blatantly misled Parliament, there can be no doubt about that.

Yesterday, the day on which the announcement was made, there were 115 employees at the works and that is the case for most of the year. Government members do not understand, nor do they appreciate, that they have taken the bottom line of someone else's facts and figures and have said, 'That's it; sorry, fellows; no more.' That point needs to be made, because I understand that in the other place yesterday the Minister of Agriculture made an offhand remark that there were 40 employees. Good grief, when we have an institution or a business as large as the SAMCOR works, we have a Premier who has miscalculated by 100 employees, and a Minister who has miscalculated to the extent of about 30 per cent, where do we stand? The Premier does not understand what it is all about, nor does the Minister.

I ask what we, as individual members representing areas like Eyre Peninsula, can do when negotiating with the leaders of our State when they refuse to accept the number of employees presently at the works. They do not seem to be aware of the social, political and regional ramifications that are created by that works. I have spoken many times about this project and I have expressed my concern because from time to time the possible closure of the works has been mentioned. Each report that has been tabled has said that the works cannot pay its way and therefore it must be looked into. I think we can all appreciate that but I think we should also appreciate that the works was built in Port Lincoln 55 years ago as a service works. It was designed with an over capacity to enable it to cater for slaughter and process fire or drought affected stock. In other words, it was designed with the capacity to enable it to accommodate all stock in extreme circumstances.

There is no way in which that facility could ever operate with a 100 per cent capacity for a full 12 months of the year. That would be a human impossibility, but the Government does not understand that and it cannot appreciate that; it is not prepared to look beyond its blinkered alleged Budget sheet. The Premier and the Minister stood in this Parliament and said that last year the works lost \$500 000. I correct that statement, because the statement put out by SAMCOR, signed by the Chairman, states that the actual operating deficit was \$341 000. Another gross distortion of facts! On top of that, they have added the money that was actually spent on capital improvements for the USDA licence. Instead of, as business people would do, depreciating it over a period of five or 10 years, they have allowed the total 100 per cent depreciation to go off in one year. They then ran to the people and said that the works is making a phenomenal loss. That is playing with figures and that is what the Premier and the Minister have been doing.

Elsewhere we find in the report that, in order to bring up their losses, they have allowed for depreciation. They have also allowed for wage increases for the next financial year. I find that incredible—whether it is normal business practice, I do not know, but it seems incredible that the Premier and the Minister have gone to the public and said, 'Look at the losses that this business has incurred', even though they have allowed and budgeted for proposed or anticipated increases in salaries for the next financial year; in other words, they have not even kept their books within the same 12-month period. This problem is more far reaching than they can possibly imagine. Do the Minister and the Government realise that the employees at that works have

reached an agreement with management under which they have been working at the award rate plus 10 per cent? They have also been working on the overs and that means that if a line of sheep or cattle comes in excess to their normal day's requirement they are prepared to work to kill that line. That is what they have been doing in the best possible tradition. They have skill and expertise that I believe has attracted favourable comments from markets in Sydney. Yet the Government is turning a blind eye to it.

Look at the Government benches now: not one member with the slightest bit of interest in this works is in the Chamber and yet the Government is prepared to see the jobs of 115 people employed as at yesterday go down the drain. I refer to that figure because we are talking about 115 employees during the slack period of the year. When the lamb season comes in that figure will build up considerably. Once the higher capacity is reached and there is a situation of fire or drought affected stock, the employment could be nearer 300. In the middle of the previous year, 1982-83, employment reached 230 at the Port Lincoln works and there were also the employees of the two boning operators who process for export and sell boneless mutton. With those operators in the boning rooms as well as the 28 or so involved in the Lincoln bacon factory there is a potential of 300 jobs kicked out the window because the Government has been led to believe that it looks as though it will make a \$1 million loss.

I challenge those figures, because no one else has been able to come up with them and the Government is working on an assumption in a report made nearly 12 months ago in which it was assumed that because we had a drought in one year and a good year in the following year there would be a reduction in stock; there will be less stock available because farmers are increasing the productive capacity of their farms, building up their stock numbers.

I put it to the House that, if we have another month of dry weather, that abattoir will not be able to keep up with the demand made on it and yet the Government has indicated that it will kick it out the door. What is more important: where will the stock being processed by that works go? At the moment the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln is processing 2 500 sheep a week, 80 head of beef a week and 400 head of pigs a week. Where will that go? It is no good taking it to SAMCOR at Gepps Cross, because I understand the clients of SAMCOR have been told today that they have to reduce their allocations by 50 per cent. What sort of management is there at the top?

There is no doubt about it: the employees, the processors, the exporters, the producers and the people on Eyre Peninsula all know where the problem is. It is right at the top management level. When and if we see the 1983-84 report of SAMCOR operations we will see some stark figures. I think the Government will have to look seriously at the operation of the Gepps Cross abattoirs because, if it applies the principle that it is applying to the Port Lincoln works, the Gepps Cross abattoirs will have to be closed. If it applied the same principle to the State Transport Authority, that would have gone out the window years ago.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That is politically important.

Mr BLACKER: Yes, that is politically important, as the member for Alexandra says, and that is the difference. In his report the Minister makes some sweeping statements but he does not quote facts. He indicates that the number of award employees is currently relatively low.

He also indicates that the retrenchment provisions for award employees will be determined according to the length and continuity of the service of the individuals concerned, and there are 89 there today. That is the problem the Government has. Another problem is that many of those people hold a letter dated 1977, on the transfer from the

Government Produce Department to SAMCOR, indicating that they would not suffer as a result of the transfer. The implication of that is that they are Government employees.

How can the Government accommodate 100 employees at normal Government employees' rates? What about the 31 Government employees there now? They talk about job transfer schemes, but that is laughable. These people are virtually being asked to sell their homes and leave. There is no way that Government departments in that area can accommodate an additional 31 employees. I asked the Minister of Labour this morning to contact the people involved immediately. A meeting of employees was held yesterday, another is occurring today, and more meetings will be held. These employees have been pushed by the Government and they have responded by working remarkably well. They have responded to a 10 per cent increase in production, and maybe that has embarrassed SAMCOR because production at Port Lincoln has been so much better than it has been at Gepps Cross. The employees at Port Lincoln have also responded to the overkill which can be up to 30 per cent a day on production. Those employees have honoured this commitment, but the Government now thumbs its nose at them because it is not prepared to take the matter any further.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Perhaps you should explain what is meant by 'overkill'.

Mr BLACKER: A run of stock comprises the stock that is brought into the abattoirs for killing on the day. If a client buys, say, 300 sheep and the normal run is 250, there is an overkill of 50, and the Port Lincoln workers have agreed to kill that excess and complete the run. That commitment has been honoured and we should applaud that fact. It is an admirable commitment made by the employees in this situation. So, both employees and management have done their bit, and the Port Lincoln works have operated more effectively than ever before.

What this Government is doing to the present manager is nothing short of scurrilous. He has met every demand made on him, but it would not matter how good he was: this Government is hell bent on closing down the works. The implications are far wider than I have already indicated. However, I do not believe that the Government has the slightest clue of the implications of its proposed action: it does not know what it will do to the fat lamb industry. It will totally annihilate the fat lamb industry on Lower Eyre Peninsula. If there is no local abattoir at which lambs can be killed, they must be road freighted to Adelaide for the auction market. One can imagine the disadvantage to producers who must send stock to Adelaide by road, a distance of 600 km. It is the same as Adelaide producers being asked to send their lambs to Melbourne for sale, and that is a direct parallel. It is a ridiculous situation, but that is what the Government is asking fat lamb producers on Eyre Peninsula to do.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: It's like taking the baby away from the breast and putting it on Adelaide tap water for 24 hours.

Mr BLACKER: That is correct. Lambs will be taken from their mothers, loaded into a truck in which they will spend 16 hours on the road, and unloaded in a damp and dirty condition. Not only must road freight amounting at present to \$3.50 a head be paid (without an abattoir the rates will skyrocket): there will be a loss of two to three kilograms of body weight, as well as a lack of bloom, the animal not having had a drink from its mother for at least 16 hours; there will be a downgrading in the rate, and the price will drop by up to \$10 compared to the price paid to a competitor in the Adelaide Hills area. Obviously, producers on Eyre Peninsula will go out of fat lamb production. As they will not be able to produce for the fat lamb market, they must

go for the wool market, and there will be an involvement in the live sheep trade.

There will thus be a total restructuring of farming practice in the area, and meat for consumption in Port Lincoln will have to come from the nearest abattoirs at Port Augusta. That is how ludicrous the situation is. If stock is bought locally by local butchers, it must be loaded on to a truck, road freighted to Port Augusta, killed there, loaded into a chiller van, and sent back to Port Lincoln. That is the result of the ludicrous action that this Government seems hell bent on taking.

The implications of the Government's proposal are far reaching. I do not know how I can get it through the minds of the Government as to the effects on Port Lincoln. At least when we had Des Corcoran as a Minister of the Crown he realised the implications that such an action would have for the town, especially in the context of the consumer market. Without the local buyers being able to compete on the local market there will be a depressed market for the primary producer and an increased cost of meat to the consumer, because stock cannot be killed locally and must be brought in from other areas.

Over the recent Christmas break, the Port Lincoln works closed temporarily for seven weeks. The very day on which the SAMCOR works closed, the prices of some specialty cuts rose by as much as \$1 a kilogram. That indicates a pressure that will be placed on the local community as a result of the Government's proposal, yet the Government seems to ignore that fact. Unless price control is to be introduced in respect of red meat (and I do not know whether that is the Government's intention), I do not know what will happen. I appeal to the Government for someone to sit down and think about the overall operation at Port Lincoln. Such a meat works must run at a loss because of the very nature of the service work carried out. There is no alternative to that. It is a matter of how much credence this Government puts on the total stock population of Eyre Peninsula and whether the Government intends to wipe its hands of such production and turn it to the wall, along with all those employees who have been so loyal to the local abattoir for so long. It would seem from the reaction up to now that that will be the case.

The Minister says that only 50 per cent of the cattle and pigs produced locally goes through the Port Lincoln works. True, there are competing abattoirs at Port Augusta, Peterborough, Gepps Cross, Noarlunga and Murray Bridge, and much of the stock from Northern Eyre Peninsula is killed at an abattoir in another area that may be closer than Port Lincoln is to the local producer's property. The Government has made unfair and inaccurate allegations. There has been a reduction in stock numbers. This may be attributed to many reasons, including seasonal conditions and the high price of grain. There is a depressed condition in the grain market commencing today, so there will be an increase in the quantity of stock coming forward and a balancing effect will result. However, we will not have the facilities to handle the quantity coming forward.

Government members might point to other facilities, but they are flat out now. When we have that at the very beginning of the season (the fat lamb flush has not yet started) and the SAMCOR works at Gepps Cross cannot handle its present commitments, having told its clients to reduce their quotas by 50 per cent, the situation is frightening.

SAMCOR at Gepps Cross, should be able to handle everything that people can bring to it at this time of the year, but it cannot. It all comes back to management that is sadly lacking. One of my major concerns is the manner in which the manager at Port Lincoln and the employees were told about this closure. I was talking to the manager by telephone at 7 a.m. yesterday. He had heard a whisper, third-hand,

through a processor that an announcement would be made about SAMCOR. He did not know whether it was Port Lincoln, Gepps Cross or where it was, but he was concerned enough to ring me at 7 a.m. yesterday.

I said that I was unaware of any impending announcement but that as soon as I heard I would let him know. At 2 p.m. I was advised by the Minister that an announcement was to be made. I said, 'Can I ring the local SAMCOR manager?' He said, 'No, don't do that.' I said, 'Why? Hasn't he heard about it yet?' He said 'No'. He did not know about it at 2 p.m. yesterday. I had employees telephoning me last night. The only way they had found out about it was through the media. That is a disgraceful way to treat employees. The manager was utterly concerned at 7 a.m. yesterday that if an announcement of a closure, which had been talked about for years, were to be made he should at least have been given the courtesy of being told about it (which I would ask the Minister to do), so that he could himself inform the employees, but such is not the practice of this Government.

This worries me, on a purely human relations basis. Common decency and courtesy should ensure that such a situation does not arise. But the Government seems to treat things in that way. The Minister's statement mentions something about redeployment of Government salaried personnel to other areas. I ask how and where this will occur and what they will be offered. Will they go to some place in Port Augusta, or Adelaide? Is the Government to buy their houses back? What are they going to do? There is no way that the Government can absorb even a fraction of the persons who are in that position. It is unbelievable that a Minister could make such a statement when he knows there is no way in which he could honour that commitment.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Does he have the support of Cabinet?

Mr BLACKER: I do not know whether he has the support of his Cabinet at all. If he does, his Cabinet colleagues have not considered the implications, because they would never have allowed him to do this if they had. When the Hon. Des Corcoran was a Minister he made sure that the matter was followed through properly. The losses then were far greater, not only in actual dollars but also on a relativity basis, than they are today. The loss last year was \$341 000, which was a tremendous improvement when one considers throughput of stock in that year which amounted to 313 573 head of sheep and lambs, 6 397 bodies of beef and 13 121 carcasses of pigs. With a throughput like that to have run at such a loss at a works that is 54 or 55 years old was a tremendous improvement. Another factor is the flow-on effect. What will happen to stock producers with food requirements such as meat, fish and blood meal, which runs into about 600 or 700 tonnes a year, all of which will add costs to those producers in the area?

We know now that all those commodities will go up overnight by \$25 to \$30 a tonne on freight alone, let alone the lack of bargaining power between various producers. What about exporters who have been encouraged to come to SAMCOR? We have an exporter from Melbourne operating out of Port Lincoln who does not operate anywhere else in Australia. That organisation has developed a Western Australian lamb trade and sent 46 000 lambs to Western Australia last year. These contracts or agreements were lined up to commence in four or six weeks time so that carcass lambs would leave South Australia from the Port Lincoln works in refrigerated containers on road train configuration trucks, shipped from Port Lincoln to Perth. The Government has an interstate competitor being kicked out the door just like that. The company has operated here for some 18 months or so. What happens to it? I do not know. It goes on and on.

What happens to the 15 000 lambs which that small operator sends to the Middle East? That is another market down the drain. No-one else can pick that up because there are no killing facilities, and they are incapable of carrying that out. I would like to ask another question about the management programme. When did the State Government take over the operation of the Port Lincoln works? I do not know, and I doubt very much whether the Government knows. Whenever it was, the Government has it now, and all it wants to do is close it down with all possible haste.

Again, seeing that the Minister is in the House I impress upon him the position of the employees at that works. Yesterday at the works there were 81 award personnel—10 in the engine room, two or three in the skin section, and the union secretary to whom I spoke did not know whether there were two or three in the sheds that day, but there were 10 storemen engineers, including office staff (engineers, management, and so forth), and 11 DPI inspectors making a total of 114 or 115 (if there were three in the skin shed), as well as 28 Lincoln Bacon specialists. I presume a similar situation applies today. That gives a total of 142 employees who were advised by the press yesterday that their jobs were on the line. That does not take into account any export operator who potentially would like to be there.

This raises another question. As members know, this could go on and on, because there were two export operators who wanted to get into the boning rooms soon after recommencement of operations after the Christmas break. SAMCOR dillied and dallied around and still the operators do not have an answer. We have lost buyers from the area. Peter Kruper, who used to be a buyer for Freezepacks, has gone to Geraldton in Western Australia. He was one of the best competitive buyers in the area. He has gone because of the dilly-dallying of the Minister and the Government and the SAMCOR Board. They should take the blame for that.

The numbers that will be shown at 30 June for production capacity must be affected because some top level official in Adelaide has said, 'You cannot take on export operators. You cannot open those boning rooms and allow them in.' That has been a problem. We have a Government that is prepared to rig figures to be able to deprive operators of the ability to operate from those works. The Government can get the figures down and increase losses and reduce throughput. That is what the Government has been doing: there is no doubt about it. It cost Peter Kruper his job at Port Lincoln. He was unable to talk to me. He was offered a job by one of the companies that wanted to get into SAMCOR at Port Lincoln. The operator that wanted to get in was another Melbourne based company—another interstate company that had the potential to come in. It wanted to come in and was persistent about it, yet SAMCOR management in Adelaide closed the door on it.

The member for Alexandra is obviously very concerned about this because many of the competitive prices for his fat lamb industry were built up by the *Troubridge* operating to Port Lincoln. That means less trade for the *Troubridge*. We have a Government instrumentality acting in complete defiance of the economic viability of one of its other instrumentalities. So it goes on. I want the Government, the Minister, the Cabinet subcommittee, or whatever may be the responsible party, to sit down and study the overall implications of this problem. It is not just a matter of looking at the bottom line of someone's fictitious figure. That is not the case at all, because the figure has been rigged by denying throughput to increase expenses. That has been done. There is no question about it. It is a proven fact.

The local manager has been denied the opportunity to use his entrepreneurial expertise to attract business. What about all the contracts presently pending from Western

Australia to the Middle East? They have denied those. That will have the effect of a loss to South Australia of exporting companies. Not only are the companies lost, but the interstate trade that goes with them is lost. That Cabinet subcommittee must sit down, discuss the matter and take into account the overall implication of the closure of that works on the entire community from the point of view of the consumers, the producers, exporters, employees and the fish factory. That factory processes about 350 tonne of fish offal. What will happen there? What will happen to that? Will someone go out with a pick and shovel and bury it? That is the dilemma: one cannot take 1 000 tonnes or more of fish offal by road to Adelaide: that is just not on.

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

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): The Ministerial statement to which the member for Flinders has been addressing his remarks is a statement that the Minister delivered to Parliament yesterday surrounding the proposed closure of Port Lincoln works. It is a statement that I believe was prepared in haste and was not in ordinary circumstances intended to be delivered to the House either this week or next week. In fact, it was a statement that was still in its preparatory stages prior to the Cornwall affair bursting in this Parliament in recent days, and the announcement yesterday was only a strategic effort by the Government to head off the flak that was attracted by that other situation. I believe that as a result of the statement being prepared in haste indeed the implications about which the member for Flinders has spoken were not carefully thought through by the Government.

They certainly were not considered to the point the subject deserves before such an announcement is made. I suppose that it could be said, as spokesman for agriculture on behalf of the Opposition, that we are blessed today with a tremendous opportunity to kick the Minister of Agriculture in the head, to take political advantage of the situation and indeed attack him viciously which, in a number of respects, he deserves. However, the situation on the ground is, as we are informed, that the Government has made up its mind to close the abattoir at Port Lincoln on 30 June this year and as correctly referred to by the member for Flinders the implications are wide and extensive. The primary producers of Eyre Peninsula cannot continue in their range of farming pursuits without access to a locally sited abattoir.

Indeed, their pursuits and the range of practices that have been going on in and about that peninsula community for many years would need to be quite dramatically changed, particularly in the lower Eyre Peninsula region. It is true that the lamb producing industry in that area (the industry that depends for its income on breeding sucker lambs and delivering those lambs in the main to the Port Lincoln works at certain periods during the year) will now collapse as a result of the local works not being available, and that particular aspect has been canvassed already quite appropriately by the local member at some length. So, too, will the situation need to change in relation to preparing for the next and subsequent droughts that occur on that peninsula.

An odd drought year or odd dry year on Eyre Peninsula can be suffered by the community, and indeed they have shown over the generations that they can bounce back from it. So, too, have they been able to bounce back and gradually reorganise and restock their properties after an extended drought. However, the real problem occurs in a community like that when, after several good seasons (that is, several good years), a drought year or years follow, because over the several good years there is a tendency to stock to the maximum those properties that are suitable for carrying livestock as part of the overall farming practice. As a result

of stocking to the maximum in those good years in the event of a bad year there needs to be an opportunity to unload. Of course, the fat stock that are unloaded prior to the real impact of the drought year are able to be placed virtually anywhere in the State because they are in high demand.

However, the stock that remain on the properties during the drought year, and especially when it goes into a second drought year, obviously deteriorate in condition and are held on the basis of trying to retain the breeding element of the flock and so on until the last minute and then unloaded by the primary producers, and the only outlet for that type of drought stock is via a local facility. Without that local facility there are two options: one is to transport those drought affected stock a long distance to the nearest effective abattoir, that is, an abattoir that can handle them, like Gepps Cross or even south of metropolitan Adelaide, at greater expense than the income that is derived from the sale of those stock. The second option is to dig a pit and bury them.

We are not talking about a few sheep or cattle here or there. Let us go back to 1982, particularly the period between August and December, which was in the closing months of a prolonged drought after a few good years in that region. During August, September, October, November and December 1982 the Port Lincoln works processed between 10 000 and 17 000 head of sheep a week. I can just imagine the industrial, political, social, and indeed local impact that would occur and the hullabaloo that would be raised if the Eyre Peninsula region without such a facility had to dispose of numbers of that kind by simply digging a pit, shooting them, burying them or whatever. I do not believe as a total society that we can afford to leave the Eyre Peninsula region without access to an abattoir.

The Government having withdrawn, albeit without having regard to the surrounding implications, does not mean that that is the end of the road. I think that on the positive side we need now to explore the Minister's veiled offer in his statement yesterday and seek to ascertain precisely what assistance may be available to a private operator to at least in the first instance install a facility on the existing SAMCOR site at Port Lincoln in order to cover the needs of the local community, bearing in mind, of course, that the local community is subject to a considerable population growth. If figures emerging from the area can be relied on, then indeed the Port Lincoln population will grow by between 7 000 and 10 000 over the foreseeable few years. That, added to the current population and consumer needs of the Port Lincoln community, I believe suggests that there is a very lucrative opportunity for a private operator to install and operate a local facility for the local needs.

It would at least overcome the immediate situation and the needs of those people for supplies of sheep and pigs, if not beef, and would overcome the situation for at least some of the employees who look down the barrel at the moment of being out of a job. It does not have regard at all for a service facility to cope with the needs of that rural community in the event of drought. At this stage, as already warned by the local member, in the Rudall region of Eyre Peninsula they are very concerned about the situation at present, having had a false start in that region this year.

Their feed has gone off again. The likelihood of their facing a lean period in this season is very real. I do not know and neither does anyone else at this stage how extensive that situation will be across the rest of Eyre Peninsula. However, it is a vulnerable area of the State, even though we have realised that it is a very valuable producing area. It grows an enormous amount of the grain produced in South Australia.

It has a high primary producing rating on the production scale generally, but it is vulnerable, particularly in the mid and upper regions of the Peninsula, and in that respect it deserves an outlet for its stock within its economic, transportable, and practical reach. The closure of the Port Lincoln works will take that away in one fell swoop. I, too, was somewhat concerned after reading the Minister's statement that he should stoop to the situation of incorporating misleading material. It was misleading to the extent that, by implication, the losses sustained at the Port Lincoln works have deteriorated over the past 10 years. The member for Flinders has indicated that the net loss for 1982-83 was \$341 000, and I have been supplied with figures that are similar.

I accept that losses during 1983-84 will be considerably more than that, and that they may well escalate to the tune of \$1 million. However, in a situation pertaining to the Eyre Peninsula farming region, that is not unexpected. Whether or not those figures are rigged, the thing is that the sheep numbers on Eyre Peninsula are still down as a result of the 1981-82 and early 1983 drought situation, and it will take several years for sheep numbers to be increased. In the meantime, the need of the community in the area to have access to a facility is not lessened.

I can understand the reluctance over the past few years of meat industry groups to go into that SAMCOR operation as partners or as operators of part of the premises, because the sort of stigma that has been hanging around the place has done little to attract an investor or a meat abattoir operator. However, having regard to the situation that was outlined by the Minister, we must seek to restore at least some of the land on which a private operator may be encouraged to install new, modern, but small, premises sufficient in the first instance to at least maintain sufficient local manpower and expertise in order to supply the local needs, and beyond that, modular additions, which are quite feasible these days, could be added to the premises as demand increases.

For the period during which a private organisation can sufficiently equip itself to cater for the overall needs of Eyre Peninsula, an appropriate part of the present premises should be maintained by the Government for the purposes of using it in the event of drought disaster. I think that side of the subject has been well canvassed. It is a fact of life that droughts occur in Australia and that they will continue to occur. One of the regions where they will occur perpetually is the Eyre Peninsula region of South Australia.

The member who spoke before I commenced my remarks indicated that the *Troubridge* operation, a Government instrumentality, was dependent in part for its business on the transport of livestock from Kangaroo Island to Port Lincoln. It is true that some livestock has been shipped to Port Lincoln in recent times, and it has been good business for us as islanders, the Government, and private enterprise at Port Lincoln. Together particularly with lambs from the lower Eyre Peninsula region our stock has gone towards putting together orders to service Western Australian outlets, and geographically the whole exercise has made good sense. The closure of the abattoir will close off that outlet for Kangaroo Island lambs. Accordingly, the viability of the ship and its continued operation between Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln will be further eroded.

When the service ceases, which I believe ultimately must happen having regard to the way the Government is going, we will lose access to the delivery of superphosphate from Port Lincoln as well. So, the Port Lincoln industrial community is indeed in the barrel. In this regard the Government has shown its colours and demonstrated its lack of concern for an area of South Australia which is of no political value to the Labor Party in this State. The spending of half a

million dollars in districts where it suits it is peanuts to the present Government. However, in regard to a valuable primary producing area to the State which has and will continue to depend on the transport facility referred to, the Government has shown no regard whatsoever.

I agree with the Minister and the Government in saying that it is difficult to argue a case on sheer economics for such a facility to be maintained at Port Lincoln. I believe that there is a need to restructure the existing service premises to provide for that community. But to close it up in the way that has occurred, to do so without appropriate and sensitive consultation with the people directly involved, to cut across the bows and the course of action that the local people in Port Lincoln have taken in this instance, to ignore Government employees at the works, and to treat the management in the way that has been described by the local member today I think is quite inexcusable. I believe that the Minister of Agriculture has become a victim of SAMCOR rather than the master of it. He has lost touch (if he ever was in touch) with the real needs of the meat industry generally, and I am referring to the process from paddock to plate involved with supply of meat to consumers.

SAMCOR's principal works at Gepps Cross, referred to earlier today, has been subject to disrepute, not due to the efforts of people on site but due to the floundering of the Minister in his handling of the operation. SAMCOR was restructured in 1980. In 1981 its finances were healthy; indeed, the Gepps Cross operation made a profit. In 1982 a further and even larger profit was enjoyed. In 1983 the operation was going very well, but due to the impact of the drought the 1983-84 balance sheets show that it will sustain a loss. I do not blame the Government or the Minister altogether for that loss. It has been the victim of field and seasonal circumstances, the same as has occurred in regard to the operation at Port Lincoln.

The actual management and operation of the abattoir at Gepps Cross seems to be somewhat awry at the moment. I am told that seven or eight principal operators at Gepps Cross, that is, recipients of processed products from the works, were advised yesterday that orders would be down to 50 per cent. I do not know whether the blame rests with the union movement, the management, or the Government for not having its finger on the pulse (or whether collectively the blame should be shared), but the thing is that that operation is already off the rails, following a tremendous amount of effort and an enormous amount of restructuring of finances, and an enormous amount of research and direction as to how the Gepps Cross operation was to work.

It is on the skids, and it is very disappointing to this side of the House, and very disappointing to me, because over that period that I mentioned I happened to be directly involved in trying to get back some sort of management direction and some sort of businesslike approach to the function of SAMCOR at Gepps Cross. Never at any stage was it expected that the management at Port Lincoln was to run the same sort of commercial operation and compete with the private sector as was clearly the case for the Gepps Cross operation.

It has always been recognised by successive Governments since the Government first became involved in the Port Lincoln works that it was a service facility installed and maintained in that community because it was an essential ingredient of management function and social life of Eyre Peninsula. Its location at Port Lincoln was the obvious and appropriate place for such a facility. The fact that the Government has now bowed out, gone rubbery at the knees and, indeed, unloaded the situation, does not mean that a facility is not needed.

I hope that the Minister, over the next few days and as quickly as possible, will identify that land is available at

Port Lincoln for any private operator who is prepared to come up with a reasonable proposition, that the Minister will honour his undertaking in the statement to the extent that he offers some underwriting of debt, some low interest loan funds and any grant moneys that are available in order to establish a new and appropriately constructed premise to cope with the ongoing needs of that community, and with the scope to expand and cope with the other situations as and when they occur in the future.

It concerns me that a Government can fiddle around with a situation, as it has in this instance since coming into office, and I accept that the present Minister has inherited some of the problems of his Government from his immediate predecessor under the same Government, but that is no excuse. There is no excuse for any Minister, let alone the Minister of Agriculture, to treat a community like Port Lincoln with the sort of contempt with which he has treated them in the announcement of the closure in the way that he did it, particularly, as cited by the member for Flinders, without consultation with the local community and the local council, which have been desperately concerned about this matter for some time, and in particular to do so without any formal consultation with the management, let alone the employees who are on the skids as a result of the decision.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I wish to discuss two matters fairly briefly this afternoon concerning education. In doing so I am glad to see that the Minister is in the House at least for the beginning of my dissertation, and no doubt he will catch up with the rest of it if he has to leave. The first matter concerns the situation applying to school assistants. The Minister on coming to government carried out his election promise and reinstated the original formula for school assistants, but a problem has arisen in that many schools have become over entitlement and many have become under entitlement. For those members of the House who do not realise it, there is a 5 per cent corridor that applies, which means that as long as the movement is within the 5 per cent corridor, then a school need not necessarily lose school assistant hours nor necessarily gain school assistant hours. The Minister gave an undertaking before the election in line with his policy for the removal of clause 13 (3) of the School Assistants Award—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: There has to be an application by the relevant union.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I understand that, but there has been no application, as I understand it, although perhaps the union has made an application, but the effect is the same in that the Minister is not applying his powers under clause 13 (3), which gives him the power to move school assistants from one area to another. There is no doubt that the threat to use clause 13 (3) caused a lot of alarm and despondency within the education community, particularly within the school assistants community. The Minister's undertaking not to use his powers under clause 13 (3) in the early stages reassured those schools and school communities where a particular school was over entitlement that it was not going to have the school assistants compulsorily removed, even assuming that they were over the 5 per cent corridor.

However, what has occurred, because of inability and lack of mobility, is that many schools that are now under entitlement for school assistant hours are not able to have those entitlements fulfilled. This is a very serious matter, and I am well aware of some of the problems. I am well aware that there are many schools that are over entitlement by only a few hours, and that one would have to add the entitlement of many schools together to make up the full-

time hours of one school assistant that could then be allocated to another school that was under entitlement.

I know that is a real problem, but there are many schools now that are severely disadvantaged because they are very much under entitlement for their school assistant hours. I know that they have put this to the Minister because I have seen copies of their communications to him, but they are putting to me that the school community and in particular the students are being seriously disadvantaged because of this situation. I am not pretending that the Minister is ignoring this problem. He has an inquiry which is looking into the role of school assistants and into a new school assistants formula. However, I would suggest that, if that committee is not to report soon, the Minister should instruct it to report as soon as possible, because the situation is getting quite serious.

There may be a need for a new school assistant formula: that may be the only way out of the dilemma although, if there is a new school assistant formula, it could well mean additional school assistant hours are allocated to various schools, and that would mean an increase in funding.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: How many hours are over and under?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I do not have the exact figures, although I have seen them somewhere, but it is about 700 hours. In any case, if there is a new formula, it is quite likely that additional expenditure will be required by the Government, and that has to be looked at in comparison with other priorities. The Minister is in the middle of Budget decisions now. I hope he has received enough information from his inquiry to start making some decisions on this matter. I am pleased to see that the Minister is investigating these matters thoroughly, but I do have one criticism. I am certainly not a person who is used to carping, but I have one criticism that some of these inquiries are taking a long time to report. I am not trying to argue against the consultation process. I had a reputation I think as a Minister of consulting, and I would hate to think that the present Minister did not adhere to that, as well.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: The School Assistants Review asked if it could have the opportunity to survey school assistants in schools, and it is proposed that that take place in term 2.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I appreciate receiving that information from the Minister. However, what worries me is that the Minister will not receive the required information he needs for his pre-Budget planning.

This is a vital area for pre-Budget planning. I repeat that I know from the correspondence and representations I have received as shadow Minister that some schools, in my opinion, are being severely disadvantaged. There are other areas of education where students are also being disadvantaged, but that is a subject for another day. I repeat to the Minister that I hope he can get sufficient information from his inquiry. I suspect that there will have to be a new formula. If there is, let us get on with it and look at the new formula. If the Minister is prepared to release the details I will be happy to debate them. It is an important issue and I wanted to canvass it at the beginning.

The second issue I want to address is the question of the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch. The Minister will not be surprised that I am bringing this to the attention of the House. He mentioned in a passing manner in answer to a question the other week a press release of mine which appeared in the *News*, although he did not actually say that I made the press statement (I suspect that that was because it was in answer to a question from his own side). I understand why the Minister did not do that, but nevertheless the question of the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch is important. I am not saying that

the Minister treated it as anything but an important matter. What the Minister did in the first half of his reply to the question was to repeat the contents of a circular which the Assistant Director-General of Education (Mr Giles) sent to all school principals which set down, if I can put it this way, the approach to the task by the senior executive group that in fact recommended the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch, and that was factual and informative information to the House.

The Minister also went on to try to allay fears which exist at the moment amongst school librarians, parents and professional librarians about the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch. I have to say that rarely since I have been the shadow Minister have I received so much correspondence and so many representations as I have about this vexed question of the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch. Even when I was Minister and when I did handle the odd controversial matter I doubt that many of those matters brought about as much correspondence or as many representations as I have had over this matter, as shadow Minister. It obviously is extremely serious. Of course, it all follows from the present reorganisation of the Education Department. A groundswell of opinion is starting about the plans that are in hand for the Curriculum Branch. I am the first to agree that any major reorganisation of a massive bureaucracy such as the Education Department is bound to bring with it many many problems.

It seems to me from what I have been told by people connected with the School Libraries Branch that inadequate consultation was gone into by the senior executive team that made these recommendations. I have here correspondence from a school community which typifies most of the letters I have received on this matter. I was not going to mention it but I see the Minister smiling. He may have thought I was going to mention correspondence I have had from the Primary Principals Association, but I am not. I am selecting a letter which typifies the correspondence I have had from school communities rather than—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that smiling is within Standing Orders.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I hesitate to say what I was going to say after this morning, so I will not. There were not many smiling members this morning, Mr Speaker. This typifies the correspondence I have received on this issue. One of the points it makes is that teacher librarians are in a unique position in that they are isolated from other professionals with the same role and concerns as themselves and this applies particularly in the country areas.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: A similar thing applies to school councils, of course.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, and that is just one point, but the school resource centre, as it should be more correctly termed nowadays, should be the hub of any school. It is the resource centre of the school, the centre around which the education of the students is carried out and, in fact, it represents the centre of the education environment.

Apart from the issue of the disestablishment, the Minister knows that there are problems, particularly in primary schools, with numbers of teacher librarians because it is also a very vexed question. It is very important for any school that its librarian establishment should be up to the correct formula and that the school resource centre should work as it was originally intended to work. Part of the disestablishment process was also the removal of the magazine *Review*, which has a two-fold purpose. *Review* is used by teacher librarians as a selection tool and it also acts as a professional journal for teacher librarians. It is my understanding that the executive review team took the view that its use as a selection tool was really not justified but that

its use as a professional journal was in fact justified. I submit that, in the Minister's recent answer to the question, when he was saying that there would be a continuing issuing of publications to teacher librarians and other staff, he was probably referring to publications which would handle the professional side—

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I was trying to indicate that the actual *Review* service would have to continue. It does not mean in fact that we are disadvantaging school librarians.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In that case, as I understand it, the Minister is going against the recommendations of his executive team. He may well want to take that up with his executive team and I suggest he does that, because it is very important. I make the point to the Minister that not only is the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch causing problems but so is the removal of the magazine *Review*.

I have a document before me which is an internal Education Department document. Before the Minister leaves the Chamber I want to add that I have had no contact whatsoever with the signatory to the document although he will no doubt recognise it when he sees it. The document claims that the decisions of the senior executive on this matter were based on a four-page discussion paper prepared for the occasion, one page of limited background and discussion (referring mainly to departmental reorganisation) and three pages of recommendations and their explanation. The document states:

The senior executive also had access to the report of the review team which looked into the branch operations in 1983.

I repeat that this is an internal Education Department document, which goes on to state:

The discussion paper contained a number of errors of fact and some inconsistencies. For example, it claimed that the increase in the number of library advisers in 1984 'is an indication of a response to a felt need'. In truth, the number of library advisers has decreased (22 in 1978, 5.8 in 1983, 4.5 in 1984). The discussion paper also gave the impression that there was an overwhelming argument and support for those recommendations of the review team which the paper promulgated for implementation. No alternative arguments or views were put.

That is very surprising. The document continues:

Nor did the paper pose for action those recommendations of the review team which highlighted the need for continued central professional support for school libraries.

If that paper highlighted the need for continued central professional support for school libraries, why is the present Minister disestablishing the School Libraries Branch? That is an important question. The document continues:

It must be emphasised that the review team based its findings on discussions 'with 110 teachers and librarians'. Because of such poor sampling, the branch surveyed every school, through their principals, early in 1984, concerning the use of *Review* as a selection tool. Of the 566 who have so far responded, only 104 claim not to use *Review* for that purpose. Of the 462 who do, 313 do so regularly and 149 occasionally.

Therefore, we have an internal document from the Education Department criticising the Minister's action. I was glad to hear the Minister, by interjection, say that, in a reply to a recent question, he was concerned about the cessation of the publication of *Review*. We shall see what action he takes to ensure that that publication or something like it is continued and used not only for professional support but also as a selection tool for teacher librarians and their colleagues.

No doubt, the School Libraries Branch offers to schools a service that must be retained as a central responsibility, but the paper to which I have referred also mentions that the South Australian Institute of Teachers supported the disestablishment of the Branch. It is interesting to note, however, that the Institute has denied that statement and, in the latest edition of its journal, has taken the Education

Department to task for insinuating that it supported the disestablishment.

I do not believe that the Institute supports the disestablishment of the Branch. Indeed, I understand that it believes that the Branch should be retained as a central responsibility. The internal paper to which I have referred also makes the point that the decision to withdraw central professional support for school libraries was made on incomplete and inaccurate information and without the opportunity for proper consultation. That is a serious allegation and I put it seriously to the Minister that, if the decisions of the senior executive team as to the disestablishment of the School Libraries Branch were made without proper consultation, as is alleged in this document, the Minister should ensure that such consultations take place, that he review the decision of his senior executives to disestablish the Branch, that he review it soon because of the despondency and lowering of morale that is occurring in the education community because of this initiative, and that he announce soon that the Branch is not to be disestablished and that the magazine *Review* will not cease publication.

The SPEAKER: Without wishing to restrict debate, I commend the honourable member for Torrens for addressing himself to a line. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I, too, intend to address myself to a line in the Appropriation Bill: the line that says that there has been a fortuitous increase in the revenue collected by way of stamp duties. Some time ago I placed on notice a question asking, as a result of the increased housing activity, what increased revenue had accrued to the Government. I received a reply that, because stamp duty was collected from a number of forms of transaction, it was impossible to say how much stamp duty was contributing to State revenue. What has happened to computerisation? It should be a simple task to find out how much stamp duty revenue is being received from the different forms of transaction. I believe that a serious difficulty arises regarding State charges in this area, and I want to satisfy myself as regards the impost on the owners of new homes in this State that arises as a result of our taxation system.

The housing industry is going through a period of uplift. I could not get the information I required, but the Treasurer has since confirmed that there has been a substantial increase in revenue from stamp duty. The housing industry is one of the most important for South Australians, indeed for all Australians. In this State it has gone through a depressed period since 1977. Over those six or seven years the building industry has suffered because of a low output. This has now caused the demand for housing to increase, as is shown in the current building figures. During this period there has been enormous pressure on the existing home market, and later this year we may see from statistics that the average price of a house has risen by as much as 25 per cent. This is an extraordinary rise in price, coupled with a large Housing Trust building programme and a large private sector building programme. Therefore, on all fronts the housing industry has received a significant boost, as has Government revenue, and it is the latter that concerns me.

Many of my colleagues on the other side of the House know, as I do, that the price of housing has risen significantly. Modest houses which a year ago sold for \$40 000 are today bringing prices of about \$60 000. That is the nature of the market, but it is unfortunate because in the process more and more people will go to the Housing Trust for housing, as the lift in prices in the existing market has made it impossible for them to get to the stage where they can afford to buy a house. The Minister of Community Welfare, who is in the House at present, will understand that problem.

I point out to the House the impact that this has had on Government revenue. I take the case of a person who bought a house for \$40 000 one year ago. The rates of stamp duty on land conveyancing were as follows: \$1 per thousand for the first \$12 000, \$2 per thousand from \$12 000 to \$20 000, \$3 per thousand from \$20 000 to \$50 000, \$3.50 from \$50 000 to \$100 000, and \$4 over \$100 000. For a house that cost \$40 000 the stamp duty was \$880.00. I can point to a number of dwellings that have sold for more than that figure, but I am using \$40 000 as indicative. Such a house now costs \$60 000 and Government revenue is \$1 530.

Not only must young people find an extra \$20 000 by way of a mortgage, but they also must pay an extra \$650 for the right to own their own home. It is the same home that they could have bought a year ago for \$40 000. That is \$650 extra which has to be paid because of the increase in price. Of course, anyone who knows anything about finance will understand that stamp duties will go on to the cost of housing, increasing the cost of the mortgage. I am greatly concerned about people who are not necessarily in good financial circumstances and who have now found a little bit of space: they have had increased grants from the Federal Government and have now been able to look at the possibility of owning their own home, yet the Government takes \$650 off them for what I call a very modest home. I have just gone through the process of selling my house in Bellevue Heights so as to move into my electorate. The total cost of transfer fees and other costs associated with the move is in the order of \$8 000, which is an enormous impost for any change in housing. It concerns me that the Government continues to set fees which increase the burden on young home buyers.

On that note, I would like to mention the housing industry and its fragile nature. Recently, there have been a number of updated estimates as to how many houses will be commenced in South Australia in the forthcoming year. We are now talking in the same way as we were in the 1975-77 boom period. We will go through a very dangerous period because not only has the existing market exceeded itself but also we have a number of people who are borrowing very large amounts of finance to build their first homes. Everyone knows what happened following the 1975-77 boom. There was a crash. I know that when I was writing papers for the building industry I tried to suggest a means by which we could smooth out the peaks and troughs.

Of course, because of all these factors coming together we are now having a strong boom period. Unfortunately, within two years we will be back in the position that we were in following the 1975-77 period, because that is the nature of the animal. It is unfortunate because again we will have demands placed on welfare organisations, the Housing Trust and the Department for Community Welfare. I do not believe that I have a solution to the problem, but sometimes I ask that Governments think about the way in which they offer incentives for housing. Certainly, the offer of increased moneys towards deposits has come at a time when the economy is going through an uplift due to circumstances beyond the control of Federal or State Governments. These factors have come together and produced the unusual situation with which we are faced today.

That situation will change because of the economics involved. In South Australia, for example, there has been a deferred demand for housing for some four or five years: people have taken rental accommodation or have lived with parents. Suddenly, they have all taken advantage of a Federal Government subsidy, and, we have seen an uplift right throughout the market. I would have preferred that the Government had really thought through what was happening. This might sound cruel, but if that rate of subsidy had been

decreased for at least another year then we could start to pick up the needy in the following year so that we did not place pressure on prices when all the other demand factors are coming on the market.

We never say that the Government is very sensible, and I suppose it is good to be wise in hindsight, but in simple terms, if the Government now draws back slightly on its grants to new home buyers for some 12 months, I believe that it will be healthier for the housing industry and for the people concerned. With all the demand in the market which is fuelled from the bottom (and everyone knows the cyclical nature of housing), people are upwardly mobile. They start with a modest house, and then buy a more expensive house if they are fortunate enough to be employed. If they are not fortunate enough to be employed they stay in the same modest house.

With their upward mobility and the increase in bank money available, because businesses are not investing and because more money is coming into the economy as a result of the rural boom, all these factors are affecting the economy at once. Whilst we might smile, and the Minister of Housing and Construction in South Australia might congratulate himself on the level of housing, I wonder what he will say in 18 months time. It is not the voice of doom; it is a fact, and the cyclical nature of housing is well documented. Added to that is the natural demand and the additional assistance from the Federal Government which is fuelling the situation.

I pointed out earlier that the average price of housing in the last year would have risen by about 25 per cent in the existing market. I mentioned the lower end of the market where price rises have risen most noticeably from \$40 000 to \$60 000. I would like people to reflect on what that means in terms of the young home buyer. If he has very little money available he has been able to take advantage of the \$7 000 grant from the Federal Government, but he is facing a market in which the house he was going to buy has risen by \$20 000. Admittedly, he is probably in a slightly better position to afford a higher mortgage because of the economic improvement, which will be sustained for at least another 18 months. But he has to take out a much larger mortgage than he can afford. I use the term 'he', but it could be a woman. He does this in the belief that, first, he will continue to be employed and that his spouse will continue in employment.

In the 1975-77 boom there were similar preconditions. The economic situation deteriorated and caused many people to be unemployed. Interest rates changed and extra money available to the system started to dry up. I do not want to predict that that will happen again, but a real increase in the economy of some 5 per cent or 6 per cent, as the Treasurer is estimating, will cause a real improvement in the gross domestic product this financial year. That is not sustainable in any developed country. We are seeing extraordinary circumstances impacting on the housing market.

My fear is that the downturn which must come ultimately for a variety of reasons will put the housing industry back in a very poor situation. Also, because of increased house prices more and more people will be asking for assistance from the Government. What little the State Government can do is review its stamp duty charges. As I have pointed out, \$650 extra revenue on a very modest house is an extraordinary sum.

I now wish to address myself specifically to the Appropriation Bill. Again, I have asked Questions on Notice of the Premier concerning lines of Budget overrun. I received a reply that we do not have six-monthly estimates available on what revenue has been allocated because the funding is on a yearly basis and it is up to each department to balance its books at the end of the year. I do not believe that that

is satisfactory. I believe that all good budgeting procedures should entail, at three-monthly or at least six-monthly intervals, a review of the department's position and an assessment whether some stringent initiatives have to be taken to restrain expenditure, consolidate the position and make some real savings in those areas where expenditure is running behind the allocated budget. We all know that there is a tendency in Government if there is a little money left at the end of the year to spend it, and that is a very poor budgetary practice. I have mentioned it a number of times in this House.

In his explanation of the Appropriation Bill, the Premier said that providing Supplementary Estimates on the Appropriation Bill at this time of the year is no longer as appropriate as it used to be. Of course, he was talking about the situation this year, with the Budget being more closely met than in previous years. The interesting point is that, when he gives examples of the areas at which the Appropriation Bill is aimed particularly (and remembering that the appropriation covers only those areas of shortfall), he mentions the Minister of Health. The South Australian Health Commission needs an extra \$7.5 million. He selected three areas for inclusion in the Appropriation Bill just to make it look as though the exercise is being done quite fairly. He is able to say that at this stage he will need \$3.6 million for increases in the prices of various supplies and services beyond what was allowed for in the Commission's allocation.

We know that in the last Budget the Health Commission was the worst performer of all Government departments, and again this year the same situation arises. Out of a total of \$14 million, which the Premier says is an example rather than specific targeting (but he is obviously being quite specific when he names the charges that need to be met), he refers to various items for the Health Commission. It continues to amaze me that the Minister of Health, whose reputation has been somewhat tarnished in the last few weeks, and who says above all that he is a good and competent Minister, continues to be the Minister who has least control over his budget. The Premier stated that for the Health Commission the proposed appropriation of \$7.5 million is made up of the following: \$3.6 million for increases in the prices of various supplies, \$1.7 million for the State's share of a possible shortfall in fees to be collected in 1983-84, and \$2.2 million being the State's share of additional expenditure in a number of areas.

I would like to know whether there are any areas of expenditure in the Health Commission which have had extraordinary increases, because these are the only areas that have been mentioned. The Education Department will obviously run over budget and we all know the reasons for that. However, the Health Commission suddenly has some extraneous costs that no-one else has borne. Everyone else seems to have stayed fairly well within budget, and the only ones that have not lived within their budgets have had some fairly good reasons—not that we would have sustained that argument if we were in Government, but I am saying that the targets have been reasonably met. The first item of \$3.6 million is obviously another area where the Minister has failed to keep control of his budget. Again, I remind the House that I have asked Questions on Notice about the accountability of the Health Commission and got unsatisfactory answers. It seems that it is a very large and cumbersome organisation and the Minister still has not come to grips with the problems of how to manage funds in that area.

The next item (and this is also an interesting item) involves \$1.7 million for the State's share of a possible shortfall in the amount of fees to be collected in 1983-84. I have raised this matter also on previous occasions—bad debts, areas where the moneys are not collected in the way they should

be—and the Health Commission continues to do the same thing. I wonder when there will be some accountability in that place and when the Minister will actually get that ship floating. A number of other areas have been included in the \$14 million provided in the Appropriation Bill. However, certainly during Committee I will be asking some questions not only on the Supplementary Estimates themselves but also on some of the total budgeting items as they relate to the previous estimates provided to us last year. I am not sure whether he was smiling when he said this, but the Premier stated:

Looking ahead to 1984-85, the Government believes that a continuation of budgetary stringency will be necessary.

I am not sure whether the Premier is joking, but if stringency is the keynote of the 1983-84 performance, then we have some grave difficulties on our hands. Everyone understands that, in the number of charges that have increased (and I believe that it is over 100 now) during the last year or so, there have been some massive increases in Government revenue, amounting to about 14 per cent. If this is budgetary stringency, we would hate to see largesse. If the Premier believes that the Budget will have to be sustained on the same strategy as he used during 1983-84, then we will indeed have a year of substantial taxation increases.

I think that the Premier must have been having a bad dream when he wrote about the stringency of Government, because certainly this Government has not been stringent in anything it has done. There are a number of items which I believe need to be canvassed in Committee in order to understand just how well the Government is performing. I have asked a number of Questions on Notice to which I have received either no reply or unsatisfactory replies, and it seems that this is indeed the only avenue I have available to elicit some response from the Premier.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this debate. Certainly, there will be no indication from me that the Government should not have access to this money. I understand that the Government has to continue with its basic administration, and so I take no point of issue in that respect. However, it seems to me that the Government could consider spending a lot less money in certain areas and could be more efficient in the way that it spends the money available. I want to highlight some of the areas where I believe the Government is going astray. On this very day, and over the past few Parliamentary sitting days, a classic case of over-spending has been the subject of debate, and I refer to the ANOP survey which was used to test the community's attitude to drug use and which cost \$32 000. It was most interesting to hear the Leader of the Opposition indicate that another organisation could have conducted the same survey for either \$22 000 or \$18 000. That represents a possible saving of \$10 000 or \$14 000. I will not further canvass arguments that were advanced in the no-confidence motion moved in the other place.

However, I refer to a matter that I have raised in this House by way of a question to the Premier concerning aspects of State pride and how the Government can perhaps reflect its interest in this pride. The issue to which I refer specifically concerns free flags for certain organisations, particularly schools. It was pointed out that the cost of free flags for schools which do not have a State flag would be in the order of \$16 000. The Premier indicated that although it was a relatively small amount, nevertheless the Government has to be very careful about every area in which it spends money. He indicated that the Government could not afford to allocate that amount of \$16 000 at that time. Yet we find that the Premier and the Minister of Health were not prepared to shop around for an alternative organ-

isation to conduct the survey, where a possible saving of \$14 000 could have been made, according to information given to this House yesterday. The Government must become accountable for that sort of reckless spending.

It was all very well for the Premier to suggest that members pay for flags out of their allowances. I do not know how many schools the Premier has in his electorate, but there are 37 schools in mine. The Premier may think that members of Parliament are well paid, and he is entitled to that opinion, but a flag costs \$50, and if 37 schools approached me concerning the supply of flags, bearing in mind that one cannot give an undertaking in one area and renege in another, I feel that the cost of flags to schools in the electorate of Goyder would be prohibitive. So much for the Premier's saying that we must watch small amounts. If one analysed other areas of expenditure, I am sure that it would become evident that hundreds of thousands and possibly millions of dollars could be saved. Of course, the previous Liberal Government was able to show that very clearly when money was saved in many areas.

As a second example, I refer to legislation passed in this place some days ago in regard to controlled substances. One aspect of that Bill concerned a lowering of penalties for the use and possession of marihuana from \$2 000 or two years imprisonment to a maximum fine of \$500. Yet one finds that the Government is at present spending \$400 000 on a 'Quit. For Life' campaign, being a campaign that of course I would endorse. Why is the Government spending that money? It is because it sees the negative effects that smoking has on the community, particularly as they relate to the costs incurred by the community. It was noted in some of the earlier publicity on the 'Quit. For Life' campaign that smoking was costing the community \$25 million a year in medical and related charges. So, the Government is going out of its way to try to promote a campaign that will help people's health and save the Government money in the long term. Yet at the same time a Bill has been passed which to all intents and purposes endeavoured to decriminalise—not quite, but almost—the use of marihuana, a drug that has severe effects on the reproductive system of people, on their memory and capabilities in other areas.

Tragically only last week one of the Kennedys passed away apparently through drug abuse. An article in the *Sunday Mail* on 29 April indicated that in an earlier report David Kennedy had stated that he wished he had never started taking drugs. He said:

Drugs—oh man, the drugs. They always catch up to you—

and he made many other statements. The Government could save a lot of money if it went out of its way to endeavour to stop people using marihuana in the first instance, to cut off the bud before it has had a chance to shoot any further. I think our society will suffer not only from the adverse medical effects but from the greater costs in treating drug addicts in the long term. This is another area where the Government should have looked at things more closely in the first place and where it could have spent money more wisely had penalties been increased, rather than providing for a decrease in penalties applicable.

Another area of apparent contradiction in the Government's use of money relates to the management and control of national parks. Last year I wrote to the Minister for Environment and Planning pointing out to him that national parks on Yorke Peninsula had not received any money for the control of both flora and fauna pests in those parks. The sum involved amounted to \$3 000 or \$4 000 for a full year.

That is not a large sum but I do not know the total amount for the State. The farmers adjoining national parks were and are still upset because they are subject to stringent

controls in connection with any noxious weeds, and the local council authorities ensure that the farmers carry out protective measures. Yet, these farmers who carry out the measures can see on the adjoining property, the national park, that nothing has been done, and when they approach the appropriate authority they are told that no money has been made available. I wonder how the farmer would get on if he told an apprehending authority that his budget is a bit tight this year and he could not afford to eradicate noxious weeds. That would be intolerable, and I can imagine other farmers getting very upset over this situation, yet that is how the Government is acting.

I am pleased that in his reply to me the Minister indicated that money will be available in the coming financial year for this work to be carried out, but the amount of growth by then could be considerable particularly as we have had a fairly good season, and if it is followed by another good season it will be hard to bring the weeds under control.

I suppose members will ask how I advocate that money can be saved. I believe that we will save money if we can nip it in the bud. The ironical thing is that during the last two years and particularly the last year there has been a push for more land to be acquired from the adjoining farms and to be added to a national park. The sum being mentioned to these farmers varies, and it has slowly gone up from an insignificant figure to a considerable one. One farmer has been offered \$16 000 and another farmer \$23 000 for the purchase of land adjoining a national park.

I could say that other figures have been bandied about as to the true value of the land, but nevertheless a total of \$39 000 has been mentioned. The farmers concerned have been virtually told to sign on the dotted line, and between them they will get \$39 000. That will give the national parks more land which it would appear they are not able to look after properly as it is, because of lack of money. The Minister has said that he could not make \$3 000 or \$4 000 available this year for pest plant control and yet the Government (admittedly another department) is saying that \$39 000 will be made available to buy land to add to the same national park. Something is wrong in the affairs of this Government.

I would also like to refer to some of the implications of the Clean Air Bill which was passed earlier. At the outset this Bill seemed to be welcomed by people in South Australia, and yet unfortunately so many aspects of it will be determined by regulation and not by this House. The Bill provides for licences to be issued to certain industries which would come under the Clean Air Bill. During the passage of the Bill, I suggested that the licences should be renewable every three years rather than every year. That seemed logical enough because, after all, driving licences are renewed every three years and not every year. In answer to a question about it, the Minister said that this matter had been considered and the licences will be renewable every year. He was asked how much the licence fees for each industry would be, and it was then revealed that the licence fees would vary from \$30 for an industry up to \$2 500 for an industry per year. No wonder the Minister did not want to see it on a triennial basis because that would have meant a payment of up to \$7 500 in one hit for a licence for an industry. I can understand the Minister's concern but the unfortunate thing is that I can also understand an industry looking at South Australia and asking why it should locate here when we have such high licence fees in this area.

I think it is a retrograde step at a time when this Government is trying to encourage industry and we are trying to get South Australia back on to a footing that was well under way under the previous Government. That does not seem to be advancing the cause. I believe that at such a time the imposition of up to \$2 500 for a licence fee for an industry is unwarranted and completely unnecessary. I sup-

pose the only positive thing is that the rest of Australia will be rubbing its hands in glee because it will be easier to attract certain industries to the other States.

The area of workers compensation has come to my attention perhaps more than any other matter has in the electorate of Goyder. Small businesses in particular, as well as the larger ones, have told me that it is the one factor that makes it difficult for them to put on more workers. Only a week or two ago I was telephoned by the proprietor of a business that started less than a year ago. As well as himself, he employs two persons full time and one other person part time; in other words, four people are getting employment from his business. He told me that his workers compensation insurance premiums were to be ridiculously high for the coming year because he had been reclassified under a different section, and as a result he did not know if he could expand any more or whether he would have to put someone off.

Thankfully, I was able to refer him to some people for advice, and I believe he did get a cheaper rate. I remember last year the proprietor of a motor garage in one of the towns told me that the workers compensation insurance premiums for his business varied from \$7 000 up to \$16 000 for exactly the same cover. The Minister of Labour has apparently helped organise a conference on workers compensation to be held in Adelaide on 31 May and 1 June this year. The conference is called 'New directions' and the speakers (the list is impressive) are coming from New Zealand, Canada, Queensland and other places. I believe that this is a step in the right direction.

Unfortunately, it will cost participants \$150 for registration and enrolment. If that was all that was involved, perhaps one could find an excuse, but I believe that small businesses should be encouraged to attend the conference because we will not get anywhere if only a select group of big business men determine our workers compensation policy and dictate it to others. The small business person, who is being hit the hardest, should be present at the conference but he will pay \$150 to attend, as well as the cost of travel from a country district and the cost of accommodation in Adelaide. Further, the small businessman in the country must engage another person or even other persons to act in his absence for those two days. So, we are talking about hundreds of dollars that it will cost the small businessman in the country to attend the workers compensation conference. With this in mind, I ask whether it will reach the people it needs to reach, and I hope that the Deputy Premier will consider spending a little more in this area so that the whole of South Australia may benefit by coming to grips with the present workers compensation fiasco.

The Liberal Party recently released its workers compensation policy, and we hope to reduce the premium rates by 20 per cent when we are back in power after the next election. For the many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of small business proprietors throughout the State it would be advisable to video tape the proceedings of the conference, to edit those video tapes so as to produce a compact programme of 30 minutes or an hour in length, and to make those tapes available to people throughout rural areas. Many organisations throughout the country could handle the tapes. The local Chamber of Commerce would be the obvious one, but other service clubs with small business members would be pleased to show the tapes so that local businessmen could see what happened at the conference.

The Department of Labour, correctly in my view, sends inspectors to inspect business premises from time to time. Although I acknowledge that safety regulations must be enforced, I believe that, if enforcement is taken too far, a person can be forced out of business. Cognisance must be

had of the economic situation in this State, and restraint must be exercised where it is necessary. I shall not detail specific incidents because, having received letters from me containing the relevant information, the Minister of Labour knows of certain instances in the Goyder District where I believe people have been the victims of inspectors from his Department. These people seem to have been singled out for no real reason, and the Minister has done his best to help in this area. A change in overall Government policy might not go astray so that persons would be encouraged, rather than discouraged by disincentives in the form of harsh inspectors, to comply with the requests of departmental inspectors. If industry is encouraged, the economy of the State will improve, and we will not need to approve as much expenditure as we are asked to approve in Bills such as that before us.

A sum has been set aside for health care and the running of hospitals. We have heard many hours of debate concerning the Minister of Health in another place. I do not know whether or not he is still in office because I have not had a chance to catch up with the latest news, but I dare say that his time in office is limited. Be that as it may, it seems obvious that some country hospitals are coming under the hammer of possible extinction. In the old and new Goyder Districts, five out of six private hospitals exist and they are worried and concerned about the future. Indeed, people living in the area are concerned. They are worried because the Government does not seem interested in negotiating with them on various aspects such as the provision of community beds in the hospitals. I refer to beds that could be set aside for patients who have no private health insurance and who in the case of accident must receive treatment urgently. For instance, at Ardrossan an accident victim who is uninsured and is unable to pay cannot receive treatment at the hospital, and representations have been made on behalf of that hospital, the Mallala hospital, and other hospitals in the district.

Two or three community beds are required for emergency cases so that people who cannot afford private health insurance or who for some other reason are not insured may receive treatment. With the increase in tourism these hospitals are receiving patients who have no private health insurance and these cases must be turned away at the door because they cannot pay. They must then find another hospital, and in the meantime disaster may result. I must say that in no circumstance does any of these hospitals turn away people needing urgent attention, but such a patient must be transferred to another hospital as soon as possible.

Further, city dwellers are fortunate because in an emergency they can reach a hospital quickly, whereas, if some country hospitals close, country residents must travel for up to an hour before reaching the nearest hospital. In this regard one must remember that the person who is seriously injured must be taken to hospital quickly, otherwise disaster will result. We see examples of hospitals being virtually shown the writing on the wall. Indeed, in the Murray Mallee I understand that four hospitals have been told that they may be closed soon. Country people must fight for their hospitals and the Government must reassess its priorities in this connection. It must realise that country hospitals are cost efficient, operating on a unit cost of between \$85 and \$95 per patient per day, compared to the unit cost in city hospitals of between \$165 and \$300 per patient per day. The Sax Committee's report suggests that 72 years of age should signal the end for anyone wishing to serve on a hospital board. However, under this rule Russian President Konstantin Chernenko and United States President Ronald Reagan would be out of a job in South Australia.

Mr Whitten: Will they be any good?

Mr MEIER: They would do a better job than the person now running the Government in this State. Another area causing concern and alarm is the lack of a suitable water supply in many country areas. Indeed, this is causing the rural economy to deteriorate. Possibly the best spokesman on this subject in this House is the member for Eyre. In the Goyder area there are three places that desperately need water. I believe that rural production would increase significantly if Morowie, Balgowan on Yorke Peninsula, and the Watervale area in the Clare Valley had water. It would be better if this Government could spend several million dollars, a not insignificant amount, to upgrade the State there, rather than in other areas.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 1), 1984

Second reading debate resumed.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): The first point I wish to make in this debate relates to the Bill before us today. An article appears at page 2 of today's *News*, headed 'Medi Row Flares as Doctors Revolt' by Craig Bildstien, who addressed the problem which now confronts all of us who live in country communities and who do not have access to the public hospitals which, here in the metropolitan area, have been established at taxpayers' expense. I do not question the wisdom of that prior decision having been made at any point in history during the development of our society in South Australia in which those hospitals in the urban areas of this State have been developed for public purposes. However, I now question tactics used by the Labor Party federally and in this State to remove adequate health care services from people living in rural areas. Quite clearly it is a strategy with a long-term impact that will leave country people disfranchised, unserved, and very poor cousins to their city counterparts. I will read parts of the article, which refers to problems arising as a consequence of the impact of Medicare:

South Australia's Medicare row has flared again—with country doctors refusing to treat public patients.

That famous (or infamous) Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, has threatened to use Government doctors to break the dispute. This brilliant man of integrity, about whom we heard the Premier speaking so eloquently yesterday and today, is threatening to use Government doctors to break what would be seen in other industrial circumstances to be a strike.

Mr Meier: Hasn't he resigned yet?

Mr LEWIS: I had not heard that he was resigning. I wonder though. It strikes me that one of the best things the Government could do to assist its prospects of re-election at the coming election in 15 to 18 months is to dismiss him if he will not go. The article continues:

He will set up temporary community health centres to treat patients unless doctors abandon their anti-Medicare campaign.

That is the way the Government sees it. I do not see it as anti-Medicare at all. I just see it as looking after their investment and their own livelihoods. They are not wealthy people, I might point out to the House, by comparison with others of equal professional standing. By 'standing' I should say, in terms of the professional qualifications they have had to obtain. By the time they service their indebtedness

in capital terms to their practice and the facilities upon which it relies outside what they use in the hospitals, they are not left with incomes in any way exorbitant. They are more poorly paid, in fact, than a number of blue collar workers in this country at present. The article continues:

Country doctors are refusing to treat patients in public hospitals unless they are privately insured.

That is as may be, for the following reasons:

Public patients who do not have health care or pensioner health benefit cards are getting emergency treatment only. Upper Murray Australian Medical Association president, Dr. J. Emery said today the arrangements discouraged private health insurance.

Indeed they do, because one pays up to 1 per cent of one's income as an additional tax. That is supposed to be a substitute for what was previously one's choice to insure oneself or not to insure oneself and take what was available in outpatient departments or public ward accommodation. The article continues:

The dispute has been brewing for a long time, but it's finally come to a head, he (Dr Emery) said.

The Federal Government is trying to encourage people to enter hospital as public patients.

It is quite a blatant attack on the medical profession through the purse strings of patients.

Dr Emery, of Loxton, said people could enter a country hospital as a public patient without cost—other than their 1 per cent Medicare levy.

But if people took out private cover to enable them to choose their doctor, they would be charged \$80 a day for their hospital bed.

That is penalising private patients, and as far as we are concerned, that's not on, Dr Emery said.

We have tried to talk to the Health Commission, but they don't want to know about this.

We have been left with no alternative but to take this action.

Dr Cornwall has appealed to the doctors not to disadvantage any patients.

The action was 'regrettable' in the light of the South Australian Government's decision to review private medical practice in public hospitals.

For doctors to take direct action before the inquiries and negotiations are completed is irresponsible, Dr Cornwall said.

I wonder whether he would say the same thing about the builders labourers at present who are simply telling the Arbitration Commission, 'If you do not give us what we want we will bring the industry to the ground.' They do not mind. The employers, of course, will be picked off one by one. They will cave in as the costs of sustaining a stand-off in the industrial relations arena on their respective building sites becomes far greater than meeting the demands that the labourers union has made.

They will go outside the Commission and simply pay those demands and it will become *de facto, ipso facto*. In due course it will flow on to the rest of the community. It will be called a so-called benefit. However, Dr Cornwall is not saying anything about that. I doubt that he ever would or ever has or is ever likely to, yet the circumstances it would appear are identical in every other respect except that in this case the builders labourers have already made an agreement which they are breaking. The doctors have made no such agreement., They have been lumbered with a package in which they have not had any say or about which there have not been any negotiations whatever. That is hardly an industrial relations exercise in the model that the Labor Party says it believes in. The article continues:

Doctors had a duty to ensure patients were not disadvantaged. If the dispute was not settled, he would see the Federal Health Minister, Dr Blewett, about using Government doctors.

Sure, they acknowledge that. I have not spoken to one who does not. If that is the way the man wants to operate, it only seeks and serves to underline what has been said about him by my more senior colleagues in recent days and by the press.

I guess that in addition to that point made by the doctors, and commented on by the Minister, there is another point I need to make about public hospitals which are community

built and which are presently operated by community elected boards: they are under threat in exactly the same fashion as described by the member for Goyder recently. There is no question about it: it is the intention of the Labor Party to nationalise health. Doctors will be paid salaries, and whether or not people can get into hospital will depend on their position in the queue or whether they are literally dying. The capacity to have elective surgery, which will avert major trauma of a chronic or acute nature will completely disappear as it did in England during the last couple of decades as the nationalised public health scheme there has bitten hard, not only by eroding of availability of health care facilities and services to country people, but also on the incomes and incentives to the people who provide that essential public service, who are our doctors.

I am distressed by that prospect on behalf of the people whom I represent, because they rely on those hospitals for the delivery of their health care services in their respective isolated and remote communities, and it is not good enough for the Government to simply ignore them and say, 'We will build regional centres to which you will be able to go to get the same kind of treatment.' That is foolish. To get to and from that hospital it will cost them, as citizens, a great deal more than would be the case in the metropolitan area of Adelaide or any other urban centre in which there are Government built and managed hospital. What is worse is that once they arrive at these centralised regional hospitals they will be so isolated from their friends, relatives, immediate family and their loved ones that they will invariably fret as human beings do when they are put into situations in which they do not know anyone else, even though they may be situations in which they are treated with sympathy and concern. The same thing applies to animals placed in strange environments, and the rate at which one can expect them to recover from their trauma will be reduced by some measure according to the effect of that distress as a result of their isolation in social terms from those supportive friends, relatives and immediate family to whom I have referred.

Another matter of concern to me that is philosophical in substance, but real in its impact is the question of the closure of the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln, and I want to address that now and leave the public health arena to the kind of furore which I can see developing for so long as the incumbent Minister remains there. It has been stated recently that the SAMCOR works at Port Lincoln must close.

I agree with that general principle, but I am concerned about the necessity to ensure that there are abattoir facilities available in that place to provide the service necessary to the livestock producers not only on Eyre Peninsula which is isolated from the abattoirs at Adelaide or any other place in South Australia by the two gulfs but also the community of rural producers on Kangaroo Island, who have been able to send their livestock for slaughter to Port Lincoln as an additional increment to the throughput of those works in a very sensible cost effective fashion. It increases the freight on that leg of the *Troubridge* ferry run as it has developed from Kingscote to Port Lincoln, and it is a sensible way of utilising that total resource.

If the closure of the Port Lincoln SAMCOR works means that there will be no other abattoir there, South Australia will be the poorer. Quite clearly, however, it is impossible for the existing SAMCOR works in Port Lincoln, managed and operated as they are, to be allowed to continue to operate in that fashion, costing the State Government something over \$1 million a year. That is a hell of a lot of money that I would like to see spent on the roads in rural South Australia, not propping up pretend jobs, and that is the nub of the problem. The pretend jobs are the unrealistic demands made in the first instance by the stevedoring labour in the

ports. The amount of work they do in return for the wages they are paid is grossly inadequate.

They have always used the fact that they occupy a position geographically and economically right at the jugular of our society. It is at the economic and sociological stability jugular. They only have to put a clamp on that and they literally freeze the capacity of this country which depends on trade to continue trading. They have done it effectively and successfully over the years. They may have, indeed I believe did have, a just cause several decades ago, but they certainly have never had a just cause since the mid 1950s. They have demanded and obtained disproportionately higher wages than the effort and contribution they have made to the common welfare and prosperity of this nation. The second group of people who have been irresponsible in the way they have treated their own jobs and the common welfare of their fellow Australians are the meat workers. SAMCOR in Port Lincoln has up to now operated under a State award which has a much less efficient throughput requirement per dollar earned than has the Federal award, and God knows that is bad enough.

The State award productivity is even worse and the demand and reliance (in industrial relations terms) on tally systems for determining income and work to rule on time—throughput for each unit—is quite unreasonable. It detracts from the capacity of the economy to take up the slack in the market place when it is available. It detracts from the capacity of the abattoirs to cope with the high levels of throughput with which it could otherwise cope, during times when rapid destocking of our rural rain-fed grazing lands are suffering from drought and it militates against the capacity of the rural sector to be more self-sufficient and self-reliant without the need for Government to step in and subsidise it at such times of drought.

It is because of the collective greed of the people in that industry that I have no sympathy for them whatever. They have shown no compassion, insight, sympathy or concern for their fellow Australians (be they in the context of their fellow Australian farmers or the general context of their fellow Australian citizens anywhere), who have suffered a loss of overall prosperity because of the selfishness and greed of that union making those unreasonable demands of higher and higher wages per unit output. It will never work for an employee or a group of employees to imagine that they can create more jobs by doing less for each dollar they are paid and for each week they work.

Indeed, the converse is true. The more each of us as Australians produces each week for the money we earn, the cheaper will be the goods which we produce for our fellow Australians and the cheaper will be the goods that we produce in excess of our fellows' needs, which we can then export. If those goods are cheaper, they will be able to compete more effectively on world markets. If we ignore that lesson and continue on in this stupid belief that we can shorten the working week, reduce the amount of work each man does each week for the same or more money, then we will reduce our competitive position and we will reduce the number of real jobs in this country, and by that means the total prosperity of the nation will be reduced.

That brings me to the next topic that I want to raise. I do not have sufficient time to canvass this matter as well as I might otherwise have done. However, I refer to the report that we received in this Parliament during the middle of last month called 'Technology strategy for South Australia' and the implications of that in regard to change in an industrial society. Honourable members may recall that, during the course of the debate in which I was given the honour and opportunity to participate, I concluded my remarks by saying that we have had a fortunate past but

that we could well ruin our future if we ignore the lessons of history and our responsibilities of the present, in which case we will lose what we could otherwise have had, namely, an equally prosperous, if not more prosperous, future.

The inevitable consequence of technology being applied in any society of man is change and, accordingly, change needs to be assessed to determine the human consequences of it. It is not good enough for us simply to say that change for its own sake is desirable. I have never been a slave of fashion, and the maxim I have just stated, namely, change for its own sake, is nothing more than a statement of the basis for those people who hold views that fashion is desirable. It may be entertaining, it may be titivating, but certainly it is not essential. We need to be aware that, for reasons other than for personal expression (the establishment of the individual's identity in the mind of the individual, and so on), to adopt 'a fashionable approach' across the board as the maxim by which to determine how much we will change and what change, if any, there will be, is grossly stupid.

So, the human consequences of rapid technological change in industrialised societies need to be understood. In addition to the remarks that were made during the course of the previous debate by myself and my colleagues and the Minister, I would like to place on record some other remarks. I shall begin by quoting from the Californian *Management Review* an article by Mr Keith Davis entitled 'Social responsibility is inevitable'. This might interest members opposite, particularly the members for Florey and Albert Park. The paper states:

Social responsibility refers to the need for business to be concerned about the social effects of its actions. Substantial social responsibility is inevitable because of a multitude of changes in the business environment. These changes are so significant that they have created (and will continue to create) a major incongruence between the traditional economic lifestyle of business and society's desired lifestyle. Social responsibility of business is a functional necessity in the modern business world. Business's only option is whether to move forthrightly into the social arena or to be forced into it fighting and kicking all the way. Obviously the former option presents a more viable social role for business in the future.

Finally, the social responsibility model is not a new business mission. All societies need a business function to provide economic outputs. The social responsibility model merely provides an overlay on the traditional economic mission of business. The traditional role of economic entrepreneurship is amended to include that of social trusteeship. What is needed is economic outputs and social outputs, not one instead of the other. If business effectively integrates these outputs, its future should be more promising than its past.

By quoting that article I am referring (as was Mr Davis who wrote it) to the necessity for business to recognise that it is not adequate for it to pursue to the exclusion of all other things the motive of profit and profit alone. Equally, it is not adequate, moral or just for a trade union movement to see its role in business as being nothing more or less than extracting the maximum possible income for its members from those entrepreneurs who provide the employment opportunities for the trade union members. That would be equally immoral. The responsibility of management and labour advocates is to examine quite properly the impact of what a business does to the society in which it exists. In the past that has never happened. By saying that, I mean that it certainly has not been the model of the past. There have been fewer occasions on which that has happened in the instance of the trade union movement than in the instance of business management.

If we look closely at what I have chosen to talk about we can see that the human consequences of technological change, whether it is rapid or otherwise, have in the main been good and beneficial in the opinion of the majority of human beings, day by day through history to this point in the development of our history. At least that is so in the Western democracies. Otherwise, some of those modern industrialised

countries, which are democracies, would have opted for no such change, nor could it have been a sustained change. Alternatively, there may have been slow change only through political mechanisms.

If we see the adverse consequences of such change as mistakes and to examine ways of identifying and avoiding those mistakes in future, it will be more constructive and useful for us than if we simply set about knocking change where it can and should be taking place. These days, it is known that the rate of change is increasing exponentially; that is, it is going up faster and faster each day. In using a term such as 'rapid', it is always important for us to remember that its meaning changes from week to week and year to year. The definition of that word is always relative to the norm at any given instance in time. I suppose 'faster than average' is the best way to define it.

However, we need to examine rapid technological changes in modern industrialised countries and the human consequences which result from them, knowing that they are not restricted to within the borders of those countries but that they extend to other countries which do not resemble the countries in which the changes are taking place. A classic example of that, of course, is the way in which rapid technological change in our own society has increased our dependence on liquid fossil fuels, with the resulting effect of the increasing affluence of the Arab populations of the Middle Eastern countries, a consequence of which is that the lifestyle in those countries has now become virtually unrecognisable in less than the lifetime of a generation, comparing it as it was when someone who is now 25 years old was born, that is, in the mid 1950s, to what it is now.

I guess it would be fair if we were to categorise the fashion in which we should look at those changes as being changes and consequences, and their impact on the individual, on the physiological functions of specific endocrine systems within the individual's metabolism, seeing it internally and how it affects the individual. As an example, I refer to the kinds of things which constant typing on a word processor keyboard does to the muscles and tendons in the arms of the typists who have to use them exclusively throughout their working day. It is not a question of them now adding the paper to the reel of the typewriter and getting a break from the monotony of that constant exercise. The paper sheet feed is now automatic. They simply sit there, listen to the information they are typing from the dictaphone, and type it. Consequently, there is considerable increase in the amount of injury from which they suffer in their forearm and wrist tendons. I guess the staff in *Hansard* will know all about that.

The third group of consequences is that on small groups in society (such as the implications for the family). The fourth group is subcultures within a society, whilst the fifth group would be whole cultures. Unless we are prepared systematically to analyse the adverse effects of technological change in this way, to do that, we will indeed be less than adequate in our understanding of how to avoid them.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Lenehan): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I wish to take this opportunity to refer to a number of issues relating to the financial responsibilities of the present Government, as they pertain to my own shadow portfolio responsibilities of environment and planning and Chief Secretary. First, however, I will refer to a couple of matters generally in regard to financial aspects that have been brought to the notice of this House of late. In a youth paper not very long ago, I saw a comment which was written by a young person and which spells out fairly clearly what we are facing in this State. It is headed 'The State Budget (or State spending spree)', and states:

Unlike some of us who budget to cater for our incomes and some potential income, the Bannon Government is going on a spending spree and then creating income by forcing up costs. If the State Government were a business, we (the consumers) would be reducing our spending on their goods as the prices rise at ridiculous rates. But, we are a captive market, forced to bear the burden. Unlike other States, our State Government's income is more reliant on what they can dig out of our pockets and the business community. We have not got the bountiful in-ground reserves that are returning us an income. What we have got is staying in the ground with little apparent assistance from the State Government to get it out.

I am sure that that is the attitude of many people in this State. It is spelt out simply by a young member of the community, and that is how the current financial situation is seen by that person.

Despite the way the Premier has been carrying on in this place and outside in recent times, the financial state of South Australia is nowhere near as rosy as he would have us believe. Early this year my Leader bought before this House an alternate Budget strategy in which he called on the Government to change the direction of its financial policies to avoid massive and unprecedented tax increases. The basis of that strategy was the immediate appointment of a Budget Review Committee to keep firm control on all Government spending, reducing the size of the public sector, scrapping other Government promises that will significantly increase spending, no help to capital works programmes already approved, and any revenue that the Government decides to raise to be on a one-off basis to recover the costs incurred with the drought, bushfires, floods, and so on, which we recognised caused so much havoc to the State last year. My Leader went on to say:

The Premier's options to avoid such a huge deficit are clear. He must reduce the size of the public sector, not increase it. The former Government had budgeted to reduce the size of the public sector this financial year by about 740 positions.

Last weekend our Leader went before the people of South Australia, indicating in very clear terms what a reduction in the size of the Government sector would mean to South Australia in regard to cost benefit.

He went on to say in his statement that it was important that the Government did not rob communities of important and already promised projects, in particular, the completion of O-Bahn, the Finger Point Sewage Treatment Plant, and the Cobdogla Irrigation Scheme. We recognise already the impact of the Government's refusal to go ahead with those schemes not only on the local communities but also in the wider community of this State. It is putting more people on the Government pay-roll, and that is not helping the overall situation the Leader went on to say:

We now have revealed the most important difference between Liberal and Labor policies—our commitment to financial and economic responsibility as opposed to Labor's plan for bigger, high spending and interfering Government.

Again, that has been referred to very successfully in the commercial that went before the South Australian public last weekend. That approach is responsible, manageable, and is consistent with the policies which the Liberal Party put to the people at the last election and which it will continue to put before the people of South Australia.

The Government, on the other hand, has continued with a programme of broken promises and has come up with only increased taxes and a breakdown in promises in relation to capital works. The Premier has taken very little heed of what the Leader had to say at that time. The Government has gone on its own merry way and we recognise the problems being caused, particularly in the business sector, as a result of its action.

I was interested to read the Chairman's address to the fifty-fifth annual meeting of ICI, presented by Mr Bridgland, in which he said:

We need also to be aware that, despite the wages freeze throughout much of 1983, our costs continue to rise strongly. The costs of State Government services and taxes and of workers compensation insurance are increasing at an alarming rate, and there seems, as yet, to be little recognition by State Governments that their mounting cost structures are progressively reducing the capacity of industry to maintain, let alone expand, employment prospects.

That situation is held by many people in this State. Referring to new projects, Mr Bridgland said:

Inevitably, during a period of severe economic and financial strain, there are fewer resources available for new developments.

We recognise that that is an overall problem, in this State particularly. Unless the Bannon Government puts the brakes on higher taxes and charges, we will not see what is being described by some people as the current economic upturn being translated into sustained growth and long-term jobs in this State.

Putting Party politics aside, I know that is what this House would wish to see come out of any Government that has the responsibility of maintaining government in this State. Unfortunately, the South Australian Government has already increased more than 80 separate State charges and we have continued to see examples of promise after promise being broken. We had much to say in this place some months ago about the introduction of the financial institutions duty, the first new tax introduced in this State for many years. We recognise its effect on the community, particularly the business community, in this State.

A survey carried out by the Opposition earlier this year showed that a significant number of companies were transferring their banking business out of South Australia following the introduction of the Bannon Government's new financial institutions duty from 1 January. Based on the findings of that survey the Leader of the Opposition called on the Premier for an assurance that there will be no increase in the rate of that duty in the next State Budget (and we sincerely hope that that will be the case) and to review the provisions of the legislation which allowed double-dipping or the multiple taxing of funds lodged with banks, building societies, credit unions and other financial institutions. The survey showed that banking business is being transferred from South Australia to Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory, and the Northern Territory, which are the States and Territory that have not introduced this new tax.

In a press release the Leader made at the end of February he was able to indicate that in some cases the amount of business going out of this State is significant, running into millions of dollars. We recognise that at the end of the last financial year South Australia held only 5.5 per cent of the total trading bank deposits in Australia. We have also been looking at Government spending and imposts and their effect on industry in this State. We have carried out detailed studies into ways of reducing public spending and imposts on industry. The aim is to reduce the State Budget deficit and ultimately to level off and possibly reduce taxes, charges and other imposts which are a disincentive to job creation.

The policies that we would be bringing to this State will give the people of South Australia some important choices: the choice between big government and small government; the choice between higher taxes or reduced taxes; the choice between freedom and Government regulation; and one of the key elements in these policies is the identification and eradication of waste in the public sector. We will continue to promote that policy as was the case in the commercial that the Leader presented last weekend.

We have made perfectly clear where we are going as a Party, as an alternative Government, and the direction that we will be taking when the Liberal Party is returned to Government at the next State election, because it is important

that the people recognise the alternatives that they have and the major differences between the Liberal Party and the Labor Party in South Australia. We have had little assistance, if any, from Canberra since the change in Government and the coming to power of the Hawke Government. In fact, on many occasions the Federal Government, under Hawke, has turned its back on South Australia. Of course, the outcome of the Alice Springs to Darwin railway project is a perfect example of just how much support Hawke and the Federal Government are prepared to give their South Australian colleagues and their counterparts in this State.

We recognised, and we indicated in this House, the vital importance of that railway to help open up South Australia's northern areas for development and to put South Australian companies in touch with market opportunities in Asia, through the port of Darwin. It was vitally important that that should happen and it is vitally important that the line be built, but it is quite obvious that while we have the present Federal and State Governments we will not see much action in that regard.

We have also seen the wrangling over Medicare and what it means to not only the people in this State but to the people in Australia generally. I think that only now are people starting to recognise just what Medicare will mean to them and the disadvantages that they will see as the result of its introduction. People have come into my electorate office concerned about the gap that they can now not cover through any form of insurance. Younger people with large families are facing problems as a result of this, and people generally are starting to recognise the problems associated with the introduction of Medicare in this State. Of course, we had the wrangling associated with the Minister who has received so much attention in this place for the mishandling of his own portfolio. The Minister of Health, in another place, made himself even more unpopular during that confrontation when he became involved with the medical profession in this State.

For example, of course, we recognise that during debate in the Legislative Council Dr Cornwall referred to the State Branch of the Australian Medical Association President (Dr Richard Southwood) as being 'a part-time smiling actor'. He described doctors who took part in a peaceful demonstration on the steps of Parliament House as being 'right-wing rednecks'. This type of personal abuse is completely unnecessary, as has been pointed out by various speakers in this House in the last few days, and has only created anger and distrust, particularly when conciliation and consensus were required during the debate on the introduction of Medicare.

I refer now to a few matters in the environment and planning responsibilities of that portfolio for which I am responsible on this side of the House. First, I refer to the problem being encountered by the National Parks and Wildlife Service as a result of a reduction in financial assistance on the part of this Government and the results that that is having on the management of our parks and reserves. I have said many times that the State's potential in regard to tourism, let alone the purposes for the retention of those parks and reserves, is incredible. One has only to look at the number of people who are visiting our parks and reserves from this State and other States as well as other countries to see how popular these parks and reserves are becoming.

However, we are continually being told that the parks are being allowed to run down and the management of certain areas is becoming an extreme problem because of the lack of finance. I could not count the number of times that, in this House while I was Minister, the Opposition referred to the failure of the then Government and in particular of me, as Minister, in not adequately financing the management of national parks. Now, of course, they are a damn sight

worse off than they have ever been. It is a matter that the present Minister should consider very carefully, because there is much comment in the community from those who visit the parks and those who have properties adjacent to the parks. The Government and the Minister have a responsibility to upgrade management in those areas and to provide sufficient finance to ensure that that happens.

Recently, we have seen wrangling on the part of officers in the National Parks Division that almost meant the closure of some outer metropolitan parks over the Easter break. The Minister for Environment and Planning was aware that this trouble had been brewing for some time, yet he did very little to try to solve the problem, and at that stage it seemed that many people, including families who had booked ahead for activities within the parks over the Easter holidays, would be disadvantaged. Then the Minister apparently decided that something should be done, and he acted as the holiday drew closer.

The Government has been responsible for the inaction that has resulted in increased land prices, including those for building blocks, in this State. Every time I have spoken in a debate such as this I have referred to the problems that arise because of the Hon. Mr Hopgood's lack of commitment and his failure to do something about the problem of land prices. The prices of building blocks in metropolitan Adelaide are soaring as a result of the inaction of the State Government. Recently, I have referred to the situation where the President of the Real Estate Institute and the President of the Urban Development Institute have written to the Premier expressing their concern that the Government should appreciate the critical shortage of zoned broadacres and development allotments being made available for housing development. They went to the Premier because they were getting no satisfaction from the Minister for Environment and Planning. They had repeatedly complained to the Minister but he remained inactive. Then there was a recent meeting attended by the Premier and members of the development industry and other interested groups. However, I understand that very little has resulted from that meeting, and we are still facing these problems while the Minister ignores the need for Government action to make available more land for development.

I now turn to the subject of police responsibilities, which are a part of the correctional services portfolio. I was very much concerned to read in the *Police Journal* a letter written by the widow of Inspector Geoff Whitford. I knew Geoff well as a constituent and as a resident of the town in which I live. I had the greatest respect for him as a person and as a police officer. I can only say that I recognise the problems that have been experienced by Geoff's widow since the death of her husband. She has been a courageous and brave person in bringing up her family in these circumstances, but the concern to which she refers in the April edition of the *Police Journal* relates to the stress under which members of the Police Force operate. Mrs Whitford states:

What the higher echelon of the Department doesn't realise is that, if an officer feels he can't cope with the job situation, (he) certainly won't express this feeling. The common belief of most police I have discussed this with is that if you say anything your career is virtually over as far as promotion or job responsibility is concerned.

It has come to my attention that there are several senior officers in an extreme state of stress. Some have taken long service leave or early annual leave only to be recalled to work on odd days or constantly telephoned at home about work.

I am aware that a study into stress is to be conducted. I understand that more than 300 questionnaires have been distributed to a random selection of officers to comment on work related stress. I appreciate it when the Acting Police Commissioner indicates that this is not something new. It is not something that we are talking about as having just

started to happen recently. But, I believe it is essential that this survey be carried out. In fact, in March or April the President of the Police Association called on the Government to undertake a major study on stress affecting South Australia's police. As a result of that and other requests made that major study is to be carried out. Whether or not it is as a result of lack of resources is something that can only come out of such a study.

But, certainly in the short time that I have had the opportunity to be responsible for this portfolio, I have recognised the enormous amount of pressure and the work load at present affecting the majority of police, particularly in certain areas of the Force. I am pleased that some action is being taken to carry out a study into that important area.

I could talk for the rest of the afternoon on problems still being experienced relating to correctional services. However, I have only five minutes remaining, and I want to refer to other things as well. I will have to speak about those other matters later. But I remind the House that legislation that was introduced by the previous Government has still not been proclaimed. Regulations that were ready to be brought down while we were still in office have not come before the Parliament. We have seen the results of the massive bungling that has taken place following the introduction and pushing through this House of new parole legislation.

We have seen prisoners being released accidentally; we have seen massive problems in that area. We forecast that this would happen at the time the legislation was being debated. Many of those predictions have been fulfilled recently. I learnt only today that the industrial complex that was built by the previous Government at a cost of nearly \$7 million is still not being used. Apparently it was being used to some extent and some prisoners were working in that facility, but I understand that it is not being used at all now. I will certainly take that matter up with the Minister on a separate occasion.

There are numerous areas to which I want to refer, but they will have to be dealt with at another time. They relate to the Department of Environment and Planning. One could talk about the heritage situation and the present Government's attitude. One only has to look at the demolition of A division and the double standards of this Government. It hypocritically stood up and stated what its members believed with regard to heritage preservation in this State. Yet, through double standards it facilitated the demolition of A division. We have seen the destruction of the Grange vineyard when this Government and the Minister for Environment and Planning (Dr Hopgood) based the whole of the Labor Party's environment policy on preservation of that area as open space.

At least when we were in Government we explained to the public what we would do and what we were able to do, but the Labor Party made a magnificent promise at that stage which quite obviously won it votes. Of course, now we have seen what has come out of that—yet another broken promise; the vines have been removed, and it is to become a development area. The last matter, with only a minute to go, relates to the very real need for more financial and general assistance to be given to the State Emergency Services in South Australia. Recently I had the opportunity to attend a couple of SES functions, and it has been made very clear to me that there is an obvious need for the Government to make a much greater commitment to that service in this State than it has been prepared to make in the past.

I look forward to the Government's bringing down the Budget, when I will be able to check further on the matters that I have raised today, and I hope that the Government will adequately recognise its responsibility.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I wish to use this opportunity available to me to voice my concern about the possible expenditure of \$1 million of State money for the 12-metre yacht challenge. This proposal has been under way now for a few weeks and no real information has come out about it. However, I would like to refer to what has been said, consider the proposal and comment on the expenditure involved, as well as mentioning the slight which I think has been occasioned to our State industry and the danger of \$1 million being spent on building a boat for Bond. It started with an article in the *Sunday Mail* on 4 March, under the heading 'Cabinet to meet on South Australia America's Cup II', which states:

State Cabinet tomorrow will discuss backing a South Australian challenge for the next America's Cup with a new Ben Lexcen super yacht.

It also states that the America's Cup challenge could be staged in Adelaide in 1986, which is a lot of rubbish. The article continues:

If the Government agrees to provide the loan it is understood it would retain a mortgage on the Ben Lexcen designed yacht, recoverable when it is sold after the challenge.

I think that that is really airy-fairy stuff, because I do not think that there has been any investigation at all into what a yacht like that is worth after a challenge. The successful one might be worth a reasonable amount, but a loser is worth nothing. It comes down to tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars instead of the millions which it costs to make these boats.

The next article appeared in the *Advertiser* on Friday 16 March, when *Australia II* was here. An announcement was made then that money would be provided to assist funding the construction of the yacht and supporting the challenge. That article did not mention how it would be done properly, but referred to a syndicate raising \$2 million or \$3 million (possibly \$4 million) and \$1 million of State money. It is interesting to see the following comment in the editorial in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 20 March:

... even when the *Australia II* parade has passed, it is possible that in *South Australia I*—

that was the craft that was supposed to be built—

this State can find a beautiful symbol that we have the vision, the will, the expertise and the money to do grand things.

Again, it has stated all the wrong things. We have the vision—terrific! But we are taking someone else's design and having it built somewhere else, so the expertise is not here or they are not using the expertise available in this State. We are not using anything at all in this State. We are having the vision built, which is what? We are using someone else's concept to represent our State and sending \$1 million of State money and at least \$3 million of public funded money out of this State to finance a boat as a test vessel in conjunction with Bond's design ostensibly. I do not think that that editorial had any substance in it at all. Another article appeared in the *Advertiser* on 19 March referring to other boats being built here, and in connection with the America's Cup it stated:

The *One and All*, a 30-metre topsail schooner, is being built at North Haven for South Australia's 150th anniversary ...

The article continues:

When South Australia's contender for the 1987 America's Cup starts to race, the *One and All*, a South Australian Jubilee 150 boat, will be at the front of the spectator fleet.

It will not be: it cannot be while the money that is being sent out of the State does not support local projects. The local boat building industry responded in the *Advertiser* on

Saturday 24 March in an article, headed 'Boat builders want South Australian challenger built here', as follows:

South Australian boat builders are angry that the State's America's Cup yacht will be built in Western Australia. At a meeting of the South Australian Marine Contractors Association executive on Thursday night, it was decided to ask the State Government to intervene in the decision by a South Australian consortium to build the yacht in Cottesloe, Western Australia. The association President, Mr P. W. Hebdon, said he was disappointed the Government had passed over South Australian builders without consulting them.

That is absolutely true. I have fairly good contact with the boat building industry in this State and not one member of it was ever consulted on whether it was possible, but I will refer to that later. The article continues:

One of South Australia's most experienced boat builders with 33 years in the industry, Mr W. R. Porter, said yesterday at least three South Australian boat builders were capable of constructing a 12-metre racing yacht required for an America's Cup challenge. 'It's South Australia's money so why the hell is the boat being built in Western Australia? It should be built here', Mr Porter said. ... 'Western Australian boat builders don't know any more than we do—the guy who built *Australia II* had never built a 12-metre in his life before.'

I will refer to that later. Mr Porter at that stage was working on the *One and All*, which is the boat being built for South Australia's 150th anniversary, to be State owned afterwards and used for the State over a long period. I also received a letter from the Marine Contractors Association of South Australia, and I would like to read it because it is from a man who has been deeply involved in the marine industry.

An honourable member: That can be incorporated.

Mr PETERSON: I want to read it because I think it is important, and it really encapsulates the feeling of the people in the industry. This man has worked all his life boat building at Port Adelaide.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: You take your time and you read it.

Mr PETERSON: I will do that, thank you. The gentleman concerned understands the industry as well as any man, and as a matter of fact is involved in the training of apprentices, so he knows what he is talking about. He heads the letter 'Dear Norm', because I do know the lad, and states:

It has come to the attention of our association that a South Australian based syndicate may approach our Government for funds to mount a campaign to provide a 12-metre yacht to compete for the honour of defending the America's Cup. This event will be held in Western Australia in 1987-88. At a meeting of the marine contractors it was agreed that a project of this calibre would provide a much needed boost to our local boat building industry. We wish to advise that we have within our industry all necessary construction capabilities and expertise (including the 'Krafft farmer' plate development technique)—

that is another thing to which I will refer a little later—

This technique was used for the plating of *Australia II*. At this stage I would like to nominate a number of noteworthy points related to our local industry over the last 25 years or so. 1959 Adelaide Ship Construction commenced production and over the next 12 years completed over 70 world class ships of all shapes and sizes. 1964 South Australian boat builders pioneered Australia's first all welded aluminium ocean racer using marine grade aluminium imported from the United States. Australia at that time did not have plate manufacturing facilities.

That is another point to which I will refer later. The letter continues:

It was on this vessel that the 'Krafft farmer' technique was first used (an Australian first).

That is in 1964, not 1984—the same technique as used on *Australia II*, which I will prove later. The letter continues:

Craftsmen involved on the above project are still actively engaged in our industry at this time. Between 1964 and 1970 many fine metal yachts were constructed from aluminium and steel for local and interstate markets. The early 1970s saw a change of direction for our industry with the development of tuna and prawn fisheries; consequently, our boat builders followed this trend, developing construction methods that enabled them to produce many fine metal and timber tuna and prawn boats. The mid-1970s saw the

construction of the world's biggest fibreglass foam core ocean racer, *Anaconda II*, in this State with an overall length of over 80 feet. Thanks to our shipyards we have within our ranks many fine craftsmen skilled in the state of the art techniques of one-tenth scale lofting.

That is a technique used in drawing up a ship and developing it. The letter continues:

We are masters of line-heating techniques.

That is a method of compound bending of the metal, getting the round shape using only heat, a fairly delicate technique which has been used here many times. The letter continues:

As a result of the booming early '70s we have a number of modern facilities ready for almost instant use.

That is true. We have major shipyards here, such as Adelaide Ship Construction and Colan Engineers, which are lying idle. There are also minor shipyards, which build vessels which are not quite as big as those built in the major shipyards, but which have been building boats for over 100 years. The letter continues:

We have many highly skilled tradespeople looking for a chance to return to their chosen careers. The Marine Contractors Association was formed in 1983 to bring together employers, tradespeople, apprentices, etc. in an effort to strengthen our chances of remaining cost effective through a uniting of forces and the sharing of skills via frequent communication. On this basis we are ready willing and able to compete for the opportunity to tender for any vessel whose construction may be made possible by means of public money, including a 12-metre yacht.

In the hope that we may be heard and considered,

Yours faithfully

. . . Shipwright.

At this stage I will not mention his name. He added a footnote to his letter as follows:

To build a 12 metre in South Australia by South Australians will do for South Australia what *Australia II* did for the nation.

I think he is right in that regard: if it is to be our yacht and we are going to spend the money on it, why not let it be ours all the way? There would not be the same sort of support for a vessel built elsewhere. To emphasise the fact that the techniques required are available in this State, I refer to an article from a 1964 Comalco publication, referring to the first yacht in Australia made by the Kraftformer technique. The yacht was built in this State in 1964, was named *Yample*, and was sailed in the 1964-65 Sydney to Hobart yacht race. The article states:

Here is one of the most interesting recent designs from the board of a local naval architect. It features a 34ft 6in ocean-racer which breaks new ground in a number of ways. Firstly, it was designed by Sydney's Warwick Hood (former assistant to *Gretel* designer Alan Payne).

So, there is a connection there with the America's Cup. It continues:

Secondly, the yacht is Australia's first attempt to produce a round bilged all-welded aluminium yacht of sizeable proportions. And it was designed to the order of an all new company—Australian Manufacturing Proprietary Limited of Adelaide. The yacht will act as an experiment in alloy fabrication which, it is hoped, will lead to large scale production of aluminium craft. Jim Polson, one of the heads of the company, commissioned Hood to design the craft.

Honourable members may recall Polson Refrigeration in this State. The article continues:

The hull will be robustly constructed of aluminium alloy number 5086 (4 per cent magnesium content). This is easy to weld and form and offers good resistance to corrosion. The shell plating is 3/16ths inch thick and the deck 1/8th inch.

That was in 1964. Recently an article appeared in *Modern Boating* of January 1984—20 years later—referring to the fellow who built the 12 metre. Under the heading 'Crayfish boats get 12-metre treatment', an article states, in part:

Perth boat builder, Steve Ward—

who is the builder for Bond—

has adopted a building technique first developed in the construction of *Australia I*, to flare the bows on crayfish boats and give them more 'slice'.

What a lot of garbage! That was done 20 years ago in this State when the same technique was used with a Kraftformer machine. The article continues:

Exploring a number of building options prior to the construction of *Australia I*, the Cottesloe boat builder discovered a West German machine used for sheet metal bending within the aircraft industry. Ward paid more than \$60 000 for the Eckold Kraftformer machine—

which is exactly the same machine that was used here 20 years ago to build a similiar yacht—

and gave the Bond Syndicate its first building breakthrough by being able to bend and form the frame and plates of *Australia I*.

So, that technique was in existence 20 years ago, and yet we talk about bringing technology into the State and doing these things. Regrettably, that technology was let go because we did not support it and did not make it work, as happens.

My concern about this work going out of the State is shared by the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. I have a letter written to me and signed by Mr Arnold Schrape, who is aware of my involvement with the Marine Contractors Association. I want to read this letter into the record, because the Marine Contractors Association is now a member of the Chamber of Commerce and is recognised by Government departments such as the Department of Marine and Harbours and the Department of Fisheries, as it is by the Chamber of Commerce. The letter, dated 13 March, states:

On the 4th of this month, an article entitled 'Cabinet to meet on S.A. America's Cup bid' was published on page 3 of the *Sunday Mail*. It was reported that a syndicate of South Australian business men had sought finance from the South Australian State Government to promote a challenge to Mr Alan Bond's America's Cup syndicate.

The Marine Contractors Association of S.A., a section of this Chamber representing the boat builders in South Australia, is concerned that consideration may be given by our State Government to supporting a venture whereby the construction of a South Australian challenger may be carried out in another State.

That has now been confirmed. If the yacht is built at all it will be built elsewhere. The letter continues:

This Chamber would be appalled at such a prospect. South Australia has a long history of successful boat building—

and I have supported that with some of the evidence I have put forward—

At this time the industry is facing strong interstate competition. What better vehicle could there be to promote our industry at this time than by a South Australian America's Cup challenger constructed in South Australia by South Australians?

I could not agree more. It continues:

Industry in this State has produced some of the finest tugs and tuna boats in the world. Our achievements range from the smallest boats to massive off-shore oil rigs.

We are all aware that Eglo has built off-shore oil rigs, and since the announcement by the Minister of Transport we are now all aware that that company is going to build the *Philanderer*, and hopefully the replacement vessel for the *Troubridge*, in this State. We have the technology to build whatever we need to build.

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I will come to submarines in a moment—I have 13 minutes left. The letter continues:

One has only to reflect on such names as Eglo Engineering Pty Ltd, Colan Engineers Pty Ltd, the Adelaide Steamship Co. Limited, and the Broken Hill Proprietary Co. Limited, Whyalla, to appreciate the wealth of ship building expertise which was developed and still exists in our workforce. South Australian industry is capable of building a challenger, competitively, irrespective of the nature of its design or construction.

These statements indicate that we have experience in all forms of boat construction. Of course, there is no guarantee that all America's Cup challengers will be built of aluminium. That will depend on the waters and the vessels that are acquired. I think something like 23 official challengers will be accepted, and I do not think that they will all be made

of aluminium. The letter from the Chamber of Commerce continues:

The industry would take pride in pulling together on such a project for the prestige of South Australia and the industry. It would be inconceivable that a South Australian challenger for the America's Cup should be constructed interstate, and particularly if it is being financed by South Australian taxpayers' money.

That is my point exactly. The letter further states:

This Chamber seeks your stronger support for this South Australian industry.

I will always do my best for South Australian industry, as I have always said that we should support local industry and that South Australian made products should be supported by the South Australian Government.

Mr Ferguson: We should print the telephone book here.

Mr PETERSON: Where is it printed?

Mr Ferguson: Melbourne.

Mr PETERSON: It should be printed here.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: What if it's a winner?

Mr PETERSON: Somebody asked, 'What if it's a winner?'

If the yacht is successful in the trials, on my understanding of the situation Bond has the right to take over the vessel. This scheme comes down to building a boat for Bond. It is not as though Bond has not made a quid out of the State; he will make more than \$5 million. If it is no good (and only one boat will end up being there), there is no way that we will get back our \$1 million. For instance, who will take the liability of this consortium? When will they stand up and say who they are? Are they going to take the responsibility for the \$1 million individually and say that they will stand for that much? Is it going to be a limited liability company that stands up and forms itself and takes the \$1 million? I want to know. To get back to the answer to the question—

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: I do not think the honourable member needs any help with his speech.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you for your protection—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: What has this got to do with the State's finances?

Mr PETERSON: From where is the \$1 million coming?

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! I have said that I do not think the honourable member needs any help with his speech.

Mr PETERSON: In case anybody asks what it has to do with the State's finances, \$1 million of State money is likely to be spent. Surely that is clear even to the honourable member.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Who are you talking to?

Mr PETERSON: Anybody. In answer to my question about the 12-metre yacht, he said:

... the Government is doing it on the basis that it believes that the money so spent in assisting the project in this way will yield far more dividends in terms of promotion of the State than it would if it were spent in a whole lot of other ways. Indeed, South Australia has already received publicity just talking about mounting a challenge. That sort of publicity cannot be bought with a million dollars worth of advertisements placed nationally and overseas, promoting South Australia. As a promotion of South Australia, as a symbol of this State, the venture will yield some very direct and tangible results both in terms of jobs—

and I cannot see where the jobs will be if it is to be built elsewhere—

and activity in South Australia.

I suppose the activity refers to the undertaking that there will be trials run in South Australia. Anyone with any concept of ocean racing or this type of racing will know that the waters in this State have absolutely no relation to the seas off Western Australia. To sail a challenge in the gulf would have no relevance to race conditions. If they sail in the gulf, the yachts would have to be so far offshore that we will not see them. What happens to the million people

each with a dollar invested? Will they stand on the beach? If so, they will see nothing, and there will be no point at all. In terms of jobs, the boat builders will get nothing out of it. We will get some people here for a challenge, but it will not be a real challenge anyhow.

The reply also referred to repayable loan conditions on the syndicate and activity being generated in South Australia, which I believe is related to the race here. In regard to promotional value, there was recently a yachting event held that was of great significance to this State. In February and March of this year the Australian championships and the Olympic trials were held for seven classes of international yachts. That event will never again happen in this State. We will never again, in my opinion or in the opinion of anyone I have asked, get an occasion when we will have Australian championships and Olympic trials in this State. In February and March the biggest sailing regatta ever held in Australia was held in the waters of this gulf. In the seven Olympic classes there was a total of 210 boats and 380 crew members from all over the nation. They came to South Australia to sail. There were star class boats or tornadoes, solings, windgliders, Finn, Flying Dutchmen and 470s. They arrived and started registering on Saturday 18 February and sailed right through to about 10 March.

We talk about promoting the State. This was a world class competition and what promotion did it get? Not one iota! Not one thing! There was nothing in the newspapers. The tourism people did nothing about it, yet there were 380 people from around Australia, and undoubtedly others with them. There was a lot of interest in an event like that, but the local media did nothing about it. It gave it about 2 inches of column space each day. The television did nothing except show a few snippets. Yet, members tell me that, because we are going to build a yacht here, sail one race and then go to Western Australia, people will flock over the border. Who is going to promote and put the time and effort into it? That was not done for an Olympic event. Is the glamour of a 12-metre yacht that great? It has to win before it is any good at all. Will it drag millions of people here? I believe the whole scheme is wrong, and I will be very surprised if we get anything substantial out of it. I hope the \$1 million does not go into it, because, if not, we may then get investment in and support of boating schemes in this State.

We should not have spent \$10 on the *Falgie*; it was not a South Australian ship. Why that money was spent on it I do not know. At least it is providing work for unemployed apprentices, and to that end I will support it, but not for any other reason. We have problems in other areas of the State. We have a Fisheries Department which would like to buy South Australian boats but, because we cannot develop a decent design here that it would like to use, it does not do so. We have two marine architects in this State and one is being blackballed because the *Joseph Verco* tipped over in the river after the modifications were checked by the Department of Marine and Harbours. The architect is now being blackballed, the matter is with the High Court, and he may never again work for the Government. How can we get development and technology—

Mr Ferguson interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I will get to the submarines. Let us not kid ourselves that technology comes only in micro-chips, computers or robots— it does not. It comes in the form of change in anything we are doing, whether it be building submarines or aircraft. The change is the technology and we must support that change. Once we have got something acceptable and saleable, we will create jobs because we will have a market for a product. Until we do that, all the talk of changes and Technology Park and what the future will bring does not matter. We must support every aspect.

I refer now to submarines, as this is an important project that must go ahead. In the last few months we have said to the world that we would love to challenge the 12-metre yacht, but we cannot build it. We have to get it built in Western Australia, but we can build the most complicated piece of machinery in the world today, namely, a submarine. I would like to be on the board of a submarine firm in Europe looking at this and saying they cannot build a 70 ft yacht, but they are going to build submarines!

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Look at the jobs that it would create. Why not show some initiative and show these people? We should support industry in this State. People must support their State. If they do not support these industries they will go down the tube and in a few years we will wonder what happened to them. What we have said to the world in the past few months is that we cannot build this yacht because we have not got the technique, even though we pioneered it and did so 20 years ago in this State, but we can build supersonic submarines.

Mr Ferguson: We can.

Mr PETERSON: I know. I know we can build these yachts, too. Let us not build a boat for Bond. If we are to spend money let us build the yacht here and get the technology and skill back here. The domino effect of that will expand into all other aspects of boatbuilding and that industry. If we can get one industry going here then we will be better off than we are at present.

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

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I would like to use the time allocated to me to address my remarks to economic growth in the western, south-western and southern suburbs of Adelaide. The southern region already has an extremely high population and a potential for further expansion. It is a rapidly growing area, as honourable members would be aware. However, it has a very narrow industrial base, and is severely limited in job opportunities, particularly within its regions. Within the region unemployment levels are already a matter of concern. They are higher than the metropolitan average and are a cause of great concern, not only to local members in the area, my colleagues in this House, but also to the councils in the district which are addressing themselves to this problem at the moment.

There is also concern about the large number of people in high age groups who fall into the unemployment area. The principal challenge of economic development in the southern region is to increase the number of new jobs and the job potential, thereby increasing local access to employment for those who live in the area. It is no good having a population that has to leave the area for employment. We must aim to bring employment back into the region. The gain to the region, therefore, will be to reduce the number of residents who need to commute to metropolitan Adelaide to work. There are many areas in which the Government can assist small businesses to expand within the regions of this State. Unfortunately, the present Government does not seem to understand what we on this side of the House mean when we say that the Government should step out of the way of small business and allow it to get on with its work.

The Government cannot understand that by returning South Australia to a State of high taxation and large government, which it has done in competition with the private sector, it has in fact taken a move that is stifling this State's potential to produce jobs. That is a historical fact. We saw the changes of attitude that occurred during the Tonkin Administration from attitudes prior to 1969, but now we are seeing a return to the large government, large taxation

policies being espoused and put in train by the Bannon Government. Until the Government can produce a strategy to reduce the size and cost of government in South Australia, which in the long term will reduce State taxes and charges, we will not see a move to increase the availability of job opportunities in regions. This is, once again, a fact.

When I say that we are looking to increase job opportunities in the region I am talking about long-term permanent jobs—not short-term jobs brought about by short-term employment programmes, but long-term jobs brought about when private enterprise is given a free rein to operate and all of the incentives of Government to get on with the job. If this State is to go ahead we must get rid of waste and duplication within the public work force and allow more competition within the private sector. The private sector is the way that South Australia is going to recover. I know that honourable members opposite are not of my philosophy and perhaps do not agree with me on this matter, but it is a known fact that, with the mixed economy we have in this State, our hope lies with the private sector.

I will use the southern region as an example to explain lack of employment opportunities in the south. The region has the capacity to employ only 42 per cent of employable residents in the southern region. I think that is an interesting figure: only 42 per cent of those people in the southern region who are employable work in that region. Perhaps we should compare that figure with the northern region of Enfield, Salisbury, Elizabeth, and Munno Para, where 56 per cent of working residents are employed in the area. In the western area, 91 per cent of such people are employed in the area. According to the 1981 census, 68 per cent of working residents in Noarlunga, Happy Valley and Willunga council area commuted out of the area for employment. To maintain the current ratio of jobs to working residents there need to be about 7 400 jobs created in the southern region alone over the next 10 years. That figure assumes we do not have any influx of population to that area. However, as honourable members are aware, the Government is planning to inject into the area over the next 10 years tens of thousands of residents into new housing developments that are on the drawing board. Therefore, that figure of 7 400 potential new jobs will need to be increased many fold.

To reduce the jobs to working residents ratio to proportions equivalent to those in the Marion and Brighton area will require the creation of 14 800 jobs or four times the level achieved in recent periods. We are looking at the need to create jobs in the region so that residents can live and work in that vicinity and not have to commute out of the area. I will describe to the House some of the specific economic disadvantages being experienced in the south-western and southern suburbs. The Southern Region of Councils, which I will use as an example because it has done quite a bit of work on this subject, identified four key areas of disadvantage in that region. The first is the high cost of industrial land. I will come back to that matter shortly, but it is a terribly important consideration for any firm intending to set up business in that area. The second area is the distance from the Adelaide market centre and the severe transport problems in reaching local and interstate markets from the southern region. Thirdly, there is an unspecific State development policy on regional economic problems. These are things that the Government must address urgently; it cannot be put off. Finally, there is a narrow based industrial network that is isolated from suppliers and markets and lacks strong reserves of executive talent.

This is another reason against industrial development in the southern sector. Six strategy areas must be addressed by this Government if we are to see a growth in job potential in the southern suburbs. The first is land cost equalisation with other areas of Adelaide. The cost of industrial land in

that area must be brought into line with the cost of industrial land elsewhere. Secondly, there must be a reduction in State taxes and charges imposed on employers of labour. That is essential. Without that we will be in big trouble setting up business enterprises, anyway. Thirdly, some type of local small business development oriented towards the region must be developed.

I know that the Government is developing its Small Business Corporation, but it must produce a capital source to help businessmen setting up in that region. Fourthly, there must be a mitigation of pay-roll tax to give incentives to people setting up in that area. Finally, there must be a review of existing incentives to assess their regional impact. I visualise a review of the incentives that apply in, say, the northern and western suburbs and then applying them to the southern suburbs. I will refer to State taxation shortly, but in the meantime I will draw to the Government's attention a few more of the problems or disadvantages for businesses establishing or expanding in the south. The Government can exercise control over those problems by changing its policy.

First, I will address the question of the use and cost of industrial land. I refer to the cost of Housing Trust estates. Fully serviced industrial land is offered for sale by the South Australian Housing Trust in three zones in the northern region and in one zone in the south. The value of land in each estate is revised annually by the Valuer-General. Criteria determining revaluation are based principally on demand and on prices realised in sales of adjacent private land. There are also weightings reflecting the utility and desirability of neighbouring infrastructure and the size of individual allotments.

If one compares the cost of the land available in the three northern zones with that in the southern zone, at Smithfield it is \$42 000 per hectare, and some six hectares remain; but in Lonsdale land is \$70 000 per hectare, and 60 hectares are left. One wonders why 60 hectares of land is still available at Lonsdale. Of course, not only is that land 70 per cent more expensive but, as will emerge shortly, if one considers transportation problems and other logistic problems in setting up, it appears that the place to go, unless the Government changes its policy, is Elizabeth West, Salisbury South or the Smithfield area, if one wants to set up a business.

Mr Mathwin: And there is heavy traffic on Brighton Road.

Mr OSWALD: That is a matter for serious consideration by everyone in the western suburbs. A similar degree of encumbrance on land applies to each location. A purchaser is required to complete improvements within six months. These extra imposts or a purchaser include compliance with set-back and site clearance requirements, completion of landscaping, the provision of off-street parking, and an obligation to use building materials and finishing acceptable to the developer. They are all expenses additional to the land cost which, I repeat, in the southern region is 70 per cent higher than elsewhere. People wonder why we have difficulty in attracting decentralisation to the southern area!

Although the Housing Trust appears generally satisfied with the valuation system used by the Lands Department, the formula which produces the variation I just mentioned is based on parameters unrelated to factors which bear on the viability of prospective commercial purchasers. This is particularly true if one compares land values at Elizabeth West with those at Lonsdale. There is a variation of 70 per cent which, in the view of those who represent the southern districts, is quite intolerable. Clearly, Elizabeth is at a commercial advantage because of its proximity to transport and markets in the north, north-east and western areas of the city. It also has advantages stemming from a long-standing industrial estate in the Elizabeth region.

If this Government is to be fair dinkum in its approach to job creation in the southern suburbs it must, as a matter of policy, ensure that land cost as the first charge on economic development is the first element in any policy that addresses equality of opportunity across all regions of outer metropolitan Adelaide. In other words, one must equalise the cost of industrial land and bring it into line so that developers know that land in the south costs the same as land in the north. The Government must urgently address this question if comparable land costs for industrial estates are not going to be levied at the Government and become an Achilles heel in its policy for diversification of industry in the south.

I now turn to the Labor Government's abysmal record in relation to its failure to recognise regional needs in transport planning. At the time of the 1982 election we all received the now infamous pamphlet entitled 'Elect a Bannon Government: we want South Australia to win'. It is a litany of untruths, broken promises or promises which have no show in the world of being honoured, nor do I believe the Government has any intention of honouring them. It is a pamphlet of utter deceit. I have referred to many paragraphs of the pamphlet in past speeches, but on this occasion I refer to the paragraph on transport, as follows:

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

Mr Mathwin: That's a laugh!

Mr OSWALD: As the member for Glenelg says, that is a laugh. The Government has downgraded priorities for transport corridors in the south, and has axed the north-south freeway. At the same time the Government is planning on putting tens of thousands of people into the Aberfoyle Park area and near suburbs in the next 10 years. Transport will be utterly chaotic, but all we hear about is some vague plan to upgrade the top end of South Road around Darlington. What is the Government doing about that? It is putting more people down there and in no way considering internal transport requirements—just more people, and no planning.

It is well recognised by the operators of small businesses that the southern region is isolated from the mainstream of trade in Adelaide. An operator in the southern area who relies on the supply and delivery of heavy materials is confronted with obvious transport problems. How does he get his raw materials in and out? Not only does he have a road problem, he also has a rail problem and he does not have the advantage of sea transport. Therefore, his daily operation is at a disadvantage even before he lays the foundations. I will quote now from a recent draft supplementary development plan prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning.

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

Mr OSWALD: I have referred to the failure of transport planning to recognise regional needs in the western, south-western and southern suburbs, and I emphasised particularly the economic isolation in those areas. Small business operators identify isolation from the main stream of trade in Adelaide as a major detraction from commercial viability in the south. This is of great concern to potential businessmen setting up in these areas and to local government. I refer to a recent draft supplementary development plan prepared by the Department of Environment and Planning. I believe that it highlights the difficulties associated with transport planning as perceived by potential developers and regional councils. I think that the supplementary development plan puts in perspective the problems associated with transport development, as follows:

... although (planned) transport improvements will improve the accessibility of the region, they will not solve many of the issues in the region. Indeed, further transport improvements alone

could be undesirable if they attracted further residential growth without any accompanying industrial development.

Positive incentives to attract employment, other than service employment, would be of benefit to complement proposed transport improvements and the expected new housing in the region during the next decade.

In practical terms this means that the draft supplementary development plan envisages continued unpreparedness for inevitable significant increases in traffic pressure and a continued failure of planning to address adequately the necessary relationship between transport planning on one hand and regional economic development on the other.

It is patently clear that no government can set in train the development of an area of the size and vastness of the southern region, talk in terms of putting tens of thousands of people down there and then have no overall transport strategy for the next 10 years. Earlier, I mentioned new roadways at the Darlington interchange to handle traffic in that area. There will be an enormous problem in years to come when people living in the southern suburbs attempt to travel to their workplace, if we cannot through correct policies develop industries within that area.

I conclude by raising the question of the mitigation of pay-roll tax as an incentive to decentralisation, which is a very important subject. It is an initiative that was introduced by the Tonkin Government in late 1979, following the election. Honourable members will recall that in November 1979 when the Hon. Dean Brown became Minister of Industrial Affairs he announced that pay-roll and land tax would be rebated as an incentive and that it would apply to semi-rural manufacturing and processing industries from 1 January.

In other words, it was designed to be an incentive to redeploy industry in semi-rural and rural areas. Under the scheme, industries in outer Adelaide areas would have 50 per cent of their pay-roll and land tax rebated, while industries in rural areas received a 100 per cent rebate. The Hon. Dean Brown said at that time that about 60 per cent of eligible companies applied for the rebate, so clearly it was a very popular move. In the rural zone 120 firms with an annual pay roll of nearly \$70 million applied for the rebate. The annual pay-roll tax rebate for these firms totalled more than \$3 million, and the land tax rebate was nearly \$40 000. In the 50 per cent rebate zone, 30 companies with a total annual pay-roll of more than \$10 million applied. They would get back nearly \$250 000 in pay-roll tax and \$2 000 in land tax. That is a considerable amount and quite an inducement to a company to move to that area.

I place on record the collective views of the Southern Region of Councils in this regard. I think it is very important that I place on public record the views of the councils as regards the mitigation of pay-roll tax, because we see it as an incentive. I point out that the zones to which the 50 per cent rebate applies are further south than Lonsdale. Some honourable members were not in the House prior to dinner when I compared cost of equivalent industrial land at Lonsdale and at Smithfield, and I noted that Smithfield land is 70 per cent cheaper than Lonsdale land.

It is the view of the councils in the southern area that we could use pay-roll tax as a method of equalisation. On the subject of mitigation of pay-roll tax, and bearing in mind that Lonsdale is not in the 50 per cent zone, the region is aware of the importance of pay-roll tax revenue to State fund raising and the circumstances surrounding the handing over of that tax for collection by the State. They are responsible councils, and they do acknowledge this. However, in the 12 years since the tax became a State issue, its potential as an instrument of economic intervention has only been explored with respect to decentralisation. That is different from what the southern councils refer to. In the short to mid-term, the region believes that tax relief measures could

be applied more selectively to stimulate regional economic growth and employment. For preference, relief measures should be offered as part of a kind of regional package of incentives similar to those that I have already mentioned.

Two strategic options are apparent to the region. The first option is to advance the 50 per cent discount threshold north to include Lonsdale. I believe the Government should seriously consider that aspect. The second option is to offer discounts to firms relocating in designated areas at rates which reflect the degree of disadvantage of that area, the stage of development of the company, and the capacity of an operation to pay. A realistic approach to this option might set limits on the remission of tax via a honeymoon period at the end of which the full tax could be reimposed, subject to a means test based on the taxation return. In this way losses of revenue could be limited to a period and staggered in order to reduce the overall effect of tax collections. The southern councils favour the second option as a suitable strategy for future investigation. I urge the Government to consider their views in the current inquiry.

The Government is certainly not on the right track in its incentives to industry to decentralise in the south. As I have pointed out on a number of occasions, the Government talks about tens of thousands of new residents about to be injected into this area in the next 10 years, but it is not providing for the future transport system in the area, let alone making any provision for local jobs for new residents. It is critical that the Government changes that course of action for the benefit of those residents who live in the area and for the more than 60 per cent of residents who will have to move out of the area to find employment.

If the Government wants to do something about its credibility in the eyes of residents in the west and in the south, it will review its policies on existing incentives to industry to relocate in those areas, and it will do something about the cost of industrial land in those areas, equalising it with the areas to the north and do something about the imposition of State taxes and charges that companies have to bear. Further, the Government will do something about the 50 per cent zone in regard to the rebate of pay-roll tax. It is essential that the zone be extended so that the Lonsdale area and the area right through to the cliff face is included in that 50 per cent zone.

The Government came to office on a package of promises to develop the south. It has fallen down on the promises that were made. In fact, it is devoid of any imagination at all. We have yet to see anything done in the southern region, and very few things have been done in the western regions. It is a Government of inaction, and members on both sides of the House representing the areas to which I referred are embarrassed by the Government's performance. It is not doing anything in those areas, and its long-term plans seem to have stagnated. We are honestly appalled by the performance of the Government in those areas.

The long-term transport plan is a disaster. I do not know that the Minister has come to grips with the matters involved or whether he even understands the problems in the south. It is hardly competent planning to expect tens of thousands of people to move into the southern region, as is expected by the Department of Environment and Planning, while the Minister of Transport has not even addressed the impact of those residents moving in. It is an appalling situation for local government to have to contend with. The local councils are worried sick about the matter and they are asking the Government to address the problems concerning the southern region. Some five or six councils are involved, and they expect the Government to do something constructive in the long-term interest of future residents of the area.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): We are constantly informed by the Federal Labor Government, through the Prime Minister and through the South Australian Premier, that things in the economics sphere are improving very rapidly. I find it very hard to equate claims such as that with what is actually happening in electorate offices, particularly an office such as mine. Since 1975 we have never had to resolve more unemployment and welfare problems than we are doing at present. During the past five or six months the situation has deteriorated very rapidly. Grown men and women have come into the office in tears over their personal plights and their inability to manage. Not all of these people are pensioners, although there is no doubt that Australia is rapidly becoming a divided society. People who are affluent, those who are working in reasonably well paid jobs, with escalating salaries, are reasonably well off; they are well and truly able to cope. In fact, that group of Australian society is among the most affluent that can be found anywhere in the world.

On the other side, however, are those people who are on pensions of various kinds, and those who are on the basic wage or a little above the basic wage, and they are really struggling to make their way. A quite alarming situation has come to my attention concerning a number of men and women on the basic wage who are maintaining that it might be better for families to split up and for each to take an equal number of the children, to seek welfare housing and to obtain a pension with all the associated benefits, such as not having to pay any health benefit fees, reduced electricity rates, and other assistance offered by the Government. Of course, that literally means that Government policies are designed to break up rather than to strengthen families. I find it most alarming that things like that are happening with increasing regularity in what I had always considered to be one of the more affluent electorates in South Australia. However, that is occurring in the South-East, and I am extremely worried for the less-well-off people in my electorate. I have to thank the Minister of Community Welfare (and this bears directly on the problem) for the very prompt action that he took today.

One lady, a widow with a family of six, came into my electorate and was asked to provide \$360 bond money and \$160 for two weeks rent for a rather old house but one which admirably suited their needs. They were, of course, totally unable to obtain that amount of money (over \$500), and they sought aid from a variety of volunteer service organisations, in addition to the Community Welfare Department, which advised the family that there was literally no bond money available for people in the country and that the only bond money was in Adelaide, where it obviously seemed to be fairly readily available.

I asked the Minister for immediate assistance, and he acted within a matter of two or three hours to assure funds for that family. I understand that by 7 o'clock this evening they would have been able to pay that deposit and be satisfactorily housed. If funds were available through the Department of Community Welfare in country regions, as they obviously are in Adelaide, that problem would not have arisen.

Even more importantly, I believe one of the best sources of help available to people in South Australia is not through Government agencies but through those partly Government funded voluntary agencies, the 4 000 voluntary social service organisations working in South Australia today to whom the South Australian Council of Social Services referred in a report which I received early in February of this year. The Council of Social Services made the obvious comment that by tapping that enormous reserve of caring and goodwill in our community the Government of South Australia is able to provide high quality welfare services to tens of

thousands of individuals and families at a relatively low cost. You are not having to pay large numbers of departmental staff: you are tapping on the tens of thousands of people who willingly, day by day, week by week, throughout the year give of their services with very few people required to sit in paid administrative positions to organise the various working units.

As SACOSS comments, low cost does not mean no cost, and many organisations do rely heavily on funding from the State or Commonwealth Government. An alarming number are finding that their funds are simply not sufficient. They cannot cover the cost of maintaining existing services, let alone expand services to meet an increasing public demand. That increasing public demand takes me back to my initial comment. If our society is doing so well, why is it that the number of applications for assistance to the Department of Community Welfare doubled under the \$1 million welfare funding programme, which was announced on 18 December 1983, when the amount of funding increased by only a relatively small percentage?

The sum of \$1.3 million in grants was provided, but in one of two surveys undertaken by SACOSS it was discovered that, of some 90-odd social service voluntary groups surveyed, a little over 40 had an increase in funds and more than 40 had a decrease in funds. So while money is being taken from one and given to the other, it leaves a great imbalance of service provision in this area which is increasingly demanding of Government and private funds.

It is a very sad situation that in this very affluent society—one of the world's most affluent societies—we are finding it increasingly hard to provide services through these Government and voluntary agencies. So, why do I refer to this matter in the present Supply and Appropriation Bills debate? I do so without any qualms because the Premier only today, in commenting that the economy was recovering, also said that the Opposition was a little annoyed that the Budget was on course. Obviously, we are not annoyed that the Budget is on course because, if the Budget is on course and we look like finishing up in a reasonable position at the end of the financial year, we will also be in a position to ask the Government to make sure that this area of desperate need in the community is one of the first to receive financial lubrication—not later, but now.

I ask the Minister of Community Welfare and the Treasurer to address themselves immediately to this problem—a problem to which their attention was drawn some two or three months ago at a meeting of SACOSS, and which has not really been attended to any more in the past three months than it was then. This matter is not political: it involves a humanitarian approach to the great problems of society. I hope that a good proportion of the money that is being provided in the two Bills before us will be spent in alleviating the distress of people, such as the person to whom I referred earlier and the other many people who call into my office on almost a daily basis.

I thank the people in my electorate who are doing such wonderful voluntary work. For example, Mr Shea of St Vincent de Paul, who rang me today, is one very dedicated person. Mrs Hennessy, who spent almost three decades in the service of St Vincent de Paul and who retired only a few months ago, is another person who deserves mention. I believe that she was also President of that women's group. The Salvation Army, district aid, the various church organisations and Meals on Wheels all provide services to our poor and needy and are deserving of comment. But, there is no way in which I can go through the massive list of 4 000 voluntary organisations referred to in the SACOSS report. It really represents a marvellous contribution on the part of volunteers in South Australia—a contribution that

saves the Government vast sums of money while helping to provide for the poor and needy within our community.

Another issue that I will take up is the report on shacks in South Australia, which was released in March last year by the Minister for Environment and Planning. I find that report surprising on several accounts. The South-East appears to have been treated differently from shack areas in the rest of the State. I believe that there are some 80-odd different regions listed in the report and that the Lower South-East seems to have suffered compared to what has happened to most of the areas that have shacks. The Minister made a rather strange statement when he said that the submissions made by South-East shackowner associations—Carpenter Rocks and Donovan's Landing—had been ignored when he made his final recommendation.

It seems amazing that a Minister can call for submissions and then publicly state that those submissions for my district were ignored. Not only did he ignore the submissions but also he appears to have ignored, in part, the recommendations of that Shack Site Classification and Review Committee, because none of the shack sites in the Lower South-East were recommended for freeholding and all in all there is a great deal of discontent. There was a meeting at Port MacDonnell a few weeks ago, when over 500 shack owners attended on the Sunday morning. That was the largest meeting of shackowners I have ever attended.

It was very orderly, polite and well conducted. It certainly had far more people in attendance than did the South Australian Shackowners Association meeting that I attended the week before in Adelaide. The meeting was chaired by Mr Allan Scott, a South-East businessman, and from that meeting emerged a committee which includes Colin Johnson and Mr Hannegan (one of the Carpenters Rocks Shackowners Association and one of the Donovan's Shackowners Association) and several others who formed a steering committee to solicit the Minister's further review and reconsideration of his decision. I believe that the local people are certainly worthy of such a review in view of the fact that the Minister, first, ignored their submissions and, secondly, did not carry out the recommendations of his committee.

Strong evidence exists that the committee of review spent very little time in the South-East. It did not visit the shack areas with any of the people who made the submissions, but simply called on representatives of the local district councils and, as a result, I believe it visited the South-East and left with very scant knowledge of the merits of freeholding or extending the leases of quite a large number of shacks in that area. Donovan's itself, which has shacks abutting the Glenelg River, was completely missed. The terms of reference did not permit the committee to review that delightful section of the river which is unique in South Australia.

I also draw members' attention to not only the discourtesy of the Minister in ignoring the report and the South East Shackowners' submission but also in not having acknowledged a single letter from my electorate office during the preceding 12 months. I did not obtain one letter of response from the Minister's office or from his staff. The only intimation I had that a decision had been made on the classification committee's report was when I received a final recommendation from the Minister with no covering letter referring to my own representations. Instead, he sent an ALP candidate to the Port MacDonnell shackowners meeting as an errand boy—a candidate with no knowledge of or previous experience in South-East shackowners' problems.

That was part of the pattern which gradually emerged when the previous Labor Government was in power. It chose, time and again, to ignore local Liberal members and to pass messages through its own candidates. That, again, is an insult to the South-East electorate. It elects a person

to represent it and it is a discourtesy on the part of the Government to ignore that representation. Either that, or one has to assume that there is gross inefficiency and misplacement of important information fed through to the Minister. Certainly, the Minister has not heard the last of the extreme Lower South-East shackowners' problems. I hope that the Minister will visit the area, and will show me the courtesy of allowing me to accompany him so that I can point out the difficulties in the company of people who have already made submissions to him. If he does not do that, I shall simply be at great pains to point out the continuing discourtesies of this Government.

Another problem, which is probably rife throughout Australia and is certainly a difficult problem in my own region, is that involving our young people. They seem to have problems in finding suitable recreation, particularly in country areas. They are at the worst end of the unemployment problem in that they form, by far, the highest proportion of unemployed in Australia. In Mount Gambier, as in many other country regions and perhaps in one or two metropolitan regions, we find that the impact that video is having on our lives has also impinged further on the problems of teenagers and those in their early 20s.

Recently a number of drive-ins and theatres have been closed. Youngsters, instead of sitting around on the streets, have attended drive-ins and been entertained or gone to the local cinema. Now they do not have that opportunity. I had discussions with young people who were sitting around on the main street in Mount Gambier during the Easter break. On talking to those young people and other young people attending hockey, BMX bike riding, and equestrian events, and even Anzac celebrations (in which they showed considerable interest), and on asking them how they were getting on, I found that one of the points made was that they are now thrown even more on to their own ends and that they sit around in the main streets in their cars engaged in idle chatter or in prematurely learning how to imbibe alcohol. They are not very happy about that.

One of the matters which Mount Gambier local government referred to a former Liberal Government just before it lost office and which it now has referred to the present Government relates to an aquatic centre for Mount Gambier. I was fortunate to attend a Parliamentary conference in Kenya and to visit London briefly last year with the permission of this House. I appreciated being able to visit a number of satellite cities in and around London. It was notable that those satellite cities frequently (I think almost invariably) had included a large aquatic and recreation centre as the nucleus of entertainment in the area for both young and old and that this was done from the date of construction.

Mount Gambier, with a population of 25 000, has a small heated pool in the YMCA and diminishing recreational facilities following the closure of the drive-in. It is crying out for not only Federal but also State assistance for such a centre to be built. I would like to see the present Government pay attention to this matter and accede to the request made by the Mount Gambier City Council by making available substantial funds for the commencement of the building of such an aquatic centre. For example, it could be a South Australian Jubilee project and, as such, it would be an excellent way of solving a number of youth problems in the area and of providing some fine additional recreational facilities that would take children and adults off the streets. I believe, from experience in the United Kingdom, that lovely centres such as these help people to enjoy recreation as a family because families certainly go along to them. I urge the Government to give immediate consideration to this matter.

I turn once again to the matter of Jubilee projects currently before the State and Federal Governments. I remind South

Australian Cabinet members that one of our assessed Jubilee projects is the Captain Cook Park which is to have a replica of Captain Cook's vessel in it and which is to be a major tourist attraction and centre for tourists visiting the South-East. This project has been allocated Federal funding, but the Captain Cook project could be in the doldrums if it does not receive further assistance from the State Government and the local community. If that project is to carry on and be completed in time for the 1986 sesquicentenary, I urge the Government to look at the project and to decide whether or not it can support it with further funds. If something does not happen in the near future, I believe that that project is in danger of failure because it is estimated that a considerable amount of money is needed to complete the project. Certainly it cannot be completed with local funding.

In case members think that this is a sort of begging letter, I remind them that Mount Gambier and district has a very high reputation for funding a great number of projects of its own accord. It has raised millions of dollars to provide the YMCA, to provide substantial extensions to an aged and caring centre (the Boandik Lodge), and to support appeals for overseas. For the Italian Earthquake Appeal a few years ago, our small community raised over \$20 000, which is very good by comparison with any other centre in Australia, and we are certainly not simply a hand-out community.

There are projects which are urgently in need of funding while we are draining ourselves of resources for other projects that we are supporting of our own accord. If the Government wishes the South-East to have some important Jubilee projects completed by 1986, I urge it to consider the aquatic centre and the Jubilee Highway Captain Cook memorial.

Another matter that has been causing me concern since I landed in Australia has been the South-East water supplies, having learned that those apparently large lakes well to the north of Adelaide—Lakes Eyre, Frome, Torrens, and Gairdner—were not lakes at all, but huge salt pans. When I arrived in the South-East and was asked whether I would like to teach elsewhere in this State, my first question was, 'What is the rainfall?' When I was told that Booleroo Centre had about nine or 10 inches, I said that I would prefer to stay in Mount Gambier, where I took up teaching some years after I arrived.

The South-East water supply is extremely important. It was estimated some 10 or 11 years ago that we had sufficient underground water reserves to support a population of about 250 000. I have been the Secretary of the South-East Water Protection League since 1969, when suggestions were made that there would be sufficient water to supply the Adelaide area with underground water piped here. At that time the current estimates were grossly exaggerated, and research conducted by Steele Hall and the subsequent Dunstan Government at Des Corcoran's insistence proved that there was just sufficient water to keep the South-East's needs on an even keel, but certainly not enough to pipe to Adelaide.

I asked some 20 Questions on Notice and received responses to those only yesterday. I am extremely disappointed that many of those responses simply said, 'This information is available from the Engineering and Water Supply Department,' and that other responses contained less information than I already had in my rather substantial file, which has been building up since 1959, when I started teaching and had local students researching those South-East hydrological problems. However, I will request the Engineering and Water Supply Department to supply me with the relevant information following the Minister's advice to me that that information is readily available. Once I have received everything that I solicited from the Minister, I will be in a better position to assess whether those reports are

adequately researched, because the essence of the questions that I asked the Minister and which he in no case referred to, was, 'Do we have adequate researched information to say precisely how safe the South-East water supplies are?'

I do not believe that the Ministerial or departmental answers were adequate. I do not know whether they have been pruned in any way simply to make them easier to print in *Hansard*. If so, it would be deplorable; the public of South Australia, and certainly the people of the South-East, are entitled to all the information that the Minister says is available. It certainly has not been publicly advertised, even though the South-East has been vitally interested in problems of water supply for many decades.

Another point I would like to make is that there are environmental policies and reports that are diametrically opposed to one another currently in circulation in South Australia. For example, the pine industry in the South-East needs to grow far more pines following the burning in the bush fires of some 22 000 to 23 000 hectares, or about 50 000 acres. The Woods and Forests Department has a reforestation programme, but we certainly will not be able to reforest all that area in less than several years. An environmental report prevents anyone from clearing any more land or planting improved pastures, pines, or anything else.

If the South-East is to survive in the face of keen competition from afforestation programmes in Queensland and New South Wales, something must be done. In Queensland a \$300 million pulp mill was recently announced in the Maryborough/Gympie area. If we are to survive in the face of such competition, obviously we must encourage State and private plantings as a matter of extreme urgency. I know that some applications to the Minister for private plantings to go ahead where there are only a few scattered trees over the larger proportion of the land in question have been turned down and are currently on appeal. The Minister has simply said that those trees cannot be cleared and the land cannot be planted with pines. It is silly when a major industry has its progress retarded through lack of encouragement. There are other matters to which I will refer in the grievance debate.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to have the opportunity to bring to the attention of the House a number of matters of concern to me. In particular I refer to issues that were brought to my attention during the past week when I carried out an extensive trip around the northern parts of my district. For the benefit of the member for Mount Gambier, who mentioned that, when he first came to this country, he had looked at the map and seen large areas that he later found were salt pans, I point out that one of the salt pans contains a considerable amount of water and I suggest that, if the honourable member has ever considered visiting those areas, this would be an opportune time for him to do so, because it is something to see.

During my visit a number of problems dealing with education and transport were brought to my attention, but I emphasise from the outset, having again visited the Roxby Downs mine, the great progress that has been made in that area and the great benefits that will flow to the people of this State in the future. I sincerely hope that everything possible is done to encourage the joint venturers to develop that enterprise into one of the largest uranium, copper, silver and gold mines in the world. No doubt that will occur in the relatively near future. I sincerely hope that the Education Department will soon make the appropriate announcement about its plans to educate the children who will be living in the new town when it is built in the relatively near future.

There are some problems at the Oodnadatta school. Urgent maintenance on the Samcon building is required: there are

cracks in the walls, the cladding is coming away, and one can see daylight when inside some of the rooms. It is quite unsatisfactory. There are a number of other matters that I sincerely hope are brought to the Minister's attention. I understand that a ban has been imposed by some unions or that there is a demarcation dispute resulting in problems in relation to obtaining maintenance personnel to carry out necessary repairs. From my limited knowledge of air-conditioning, I would say that the three airconditioners are quite unsatisfactory.

In my judgment, they should be replaced with adequate refrigerated air-conditioners. I do not think anyone would expect people to live in that community without adequate air-conditioning. I could refer to a number of matters such as drinking facilities for children in the main foyer, but I will follow those up by way of a letter to the Minister. At Ernabella the Pukatja Community adviser approached me last week concerning problems about payment of electricity by the Health Commission. This appropriation measure deals with funding of the South Australian Health Commission, the Education Department and the State Transport Authority and I want to refer to those three areas.

It was interesting to note that in the Premier's speech he referred to an increase in costs of electricity for pumping water. I remind the Premier that I have a number of communities in my area who pay excess rates for electricity. They are penalised. Because they live in areas supplied by local government authorities they have to pay 10 per cent above Adelaide prices. They receive their power from the same source as areas charged at the same rate as Adelaide. That is discrimination. I hope that the Premier will do something about it. He talks about pumping water. I also have a number of areas in my district where people would love to pay for water pumped past their homes. I hope that the Minister of Water Resources will take note of what I say. I now read from the letter received from the Pukatja Community:

Mr G. Gunn,
S.A. Member of Parliament,
Peterborough, S.A.

Dear Sir,

I am writing on behalf of the Pukatja Council in relation to a long-standing outstanding debt owed to the community—and I believe to many other communities in the North-West. This debt is the charge for electricity generated by the community and supplied to the hospital. This debt has been the subject of a long dispute with the Aboriginal Health Organisation and this community over many years. It seems that the problem exists because of the inability of different Governments, i.e. Federal and State, and departments, viz. Health Department and Department of Aboriginal Affairs, to agree to who should fund this item.

It seems that our community is the rope in this tug of war and that we are exposed to strain beyond our capacity to cope. While Governments and departments quibble over who is to pay, the development of the community is hampered by lack of funds. Funding for Aboriginal communities is very closely monitored by the relevant authorities, e.g., ADC, DAA, TAFE. Local enterprises which contain a heavy emphasis on self-reliance and training are not always profitable. Our community does not have the financial capacity to carry a large debt that is clearly the responsibility of the Government. Not only is the debt outstanding, but the new health services, Nganampa Health Inc., are also indicating that they will not pay for electricity supplied in this financial year.

This situation is one that disadvantages the Australian people most seriously disadvantaged already by the intrusion of white civilisation into their land. It only helps to reinforce Aboriginal feeling that white Governments don't really care about them and are prepared to put them last again. Enclosed in this letter is a copy of a letter sent by our Community Adviser to the Aboriginal Health Organisation where he outlines to them our concern. Their response is also enclosed which indicates the basis of the dispute. This letter indicates that Nganampa are in receipt of \$175 000 to pay for electricity charges, but as yet they refuse to do so. However, this does not solve the problem of the unpaid backlog of charges still outstanding to AHO. This debt is \$12 850.36. Enclosed is a copy of another letter he sent to DAA in Alice Springs dated 20 February 1984. To date this letter has not been acknowledged let

alone answered. We are hoping that you, sir, will intervene in this situation to help our community through this difficult financial mix-up.

Yours faithfully,
GARY LEWIS,
Chairman Pukatja Community Council

I hope the Minister of Health (Dr Cornwall) will take action to rectify this situation which has been brought to my attention. I will take up the matter but I believe it is my duty to bring it to the House's attention at this time. I also hope that the Minister in the House will make the necessary representations.

The District Council of Murat Bay has for some time been negotiating with the Minister of Transport and the Minister of Education about providing a sealed road to the new Miltaburra Area School. At this stage it has not received an adequate response. At the time of the completion of the Karcultaby Area School a sealed road was built from the Eyre Highway to that school, and I now request the Government to seal the roads from the Eyre Highway to the new Miltaburra Area School. I refer to a letter dated 26 April from the District Council of Murat Bay to the Minister of Transport (Hon. Mr Abbott), which states:

Dear Minister,

I write in reference to council's correspondence of 20 March 1984, to the Minister of Education, regarding the access road to the Miltaburra Area School, and your reply forwarded through Mr Graham Gunn, M.P., member for Eyre.

Council is extremely disappointed at the brief consideration given to a serious matter which is causing widespread concern. To strictly adhere to the definition of the subject road as a rural local road and therefore council's responsibility is an obvious case of the State Government attempting to avoid a responsibility which by any definition is morally theirs.

The road past the land whereon the school has been situated is a 'natural surface' roadway, i.e. the rural traffic that previously used the route was not of a sufficient number of nature to even justify a rubble surface road. Quite naturally, with the advent of the Miltaburra Area School, the tremendous increase in the number and nature of traffic using the route has emphasised not only its unsatisfactory nature, but also that it is unsafe.

The development of the education facility undoubtedly caused the problems being experienced, and as the development of the facility was the responsibility of the State Government, it is only proper that the road should have been developed by the State Government to a standard sufficient to cater for the traffic generated as a result of the school development. Freight companies have refused to deliver to the school, necessitating the collection of all school freight from Wirrulla.

Council does not share the opinion implied from correspondence received from Mr D.W. Ralph, Regional Director, Eyre, of the Education Department who implied that council should be so overwhelmed with the facility provided at Miltaburra, that it should willingly meet any subsequent costs.

Council has and will continue to maintain school bus routes in a manner befitting their importance; it does, however, seek the application of the same development criteria that resulted in the access road at the Karcultaby Area School being sealed as part of the initial development.

Council seeks an urgent meeting with you to further consider the matter and, to this end, has taken the liberty of asking Mr Graham Gunn, M.P., to contact you in an effort to arrange a suitable time and date.

The letter is signed by the District Clerk. I received a letter this week from the council asking me to make representations for a deputation to meet the appropriate Ministers. I received correspondence also from the council expressing its concern about the continual refusal of the Minister to cart water and supply adequate service west of Ceduna. The Government can find millions of dollars. We can put money into building yachts and participating in yacht races, but the Parties on both sides of the House in my judgment have failed miserably.

They will not take the course of action to provide what should be a necessity of life to people who have lived and worked hard and who have missed out on a lot of the basic necessities of life, such as providing them with an adequate supply of water, because of their isolation. I think that that

is a disgraceful set of circumstances and I make no apology for saying it. I intend to pursue that matter and the unfair charging of electricity tariffs on every occasion which presents itself to me in this House, and I intend to make life difficult for Ministers until those people receive justice. I have just spent seven days flying in the north of South Australia in a light aircraft, and I have a list of problems which would not be tolerated within 50 or 60 kilometres of Adelaide.

It perturbs me to see the amount of money which is spent in many areas, which may be very nice, but in my judgment there are far more deserving cases in other parts of the State. Therefore, I intend in the next few months to raise these matters and to be as difficult as is necessary and as I possibly can. I make no apology for saying that, because I believe that it is not only my responsibility but that I would be failing in my duty as a member of Parliament if I did not raise these matters in the House.

Whilst talking about education, I would like to mention briefly the decision to abolish the TAFE colleges at Peterborough and Clare and amalgamate them into one large monstrosity at Port Pirie. People a long way from the areas that are to be affected get these bright ideas and make these decisions. There is considerable opposition from the local community, and I believe that the Director-General of TAFE should reconsider the situation. I understand that he is now going to have a third inquiry in relation to what should be done. If one wants to waste money and delay making decisions, one refers these too-hard decisions to inquiries. If we really want to find a way to save taxpayers' money it is to cut out some of these unnecessary inquiries and listen to what the local people say.

I sincerely hope that the Minister will intervene and tell the Director-General of TAFE to get his act together, listen to the needs, and accede to the requests of those local communities and not amalgamate the colleges. The amalgamation would take away their management skills and have them swallowed up into a large organisation at Port Pirie. I have a number of documents at my disposal and, if I were to read them into *Hansard*, they would be quite embarrassing to the Director-General. I will do that on another occasion.

I now want to say a little in relation to roads in my electorate, because the reduced funding for rural arterial roads has concerned me for a considerable time. The statistics I have obtained from the Highways Department show a dramatic decline in real terms in funding for rural arterial roads in the northern region. In the year 1981-82 that region received \$483 500, in 1982-83 it received \$370 000, and in 1983-84 it received \$275 000—a considerable decline when costs have been increasing. The poor motorist is probably the most overtaxed person in this community. In an electorate like mine, where I have hundreds and hundreds of kilometres of unsealed rural arterial roads, this sort of cutback in funding is not only unfair but is also retarding the development of the State.

As long as we can afford to subsidise the metropolitan transport system, then I believe the Government should be able to find money to give people in country areas a fair go. The \$80 million-odd that it is going to take to fund the metropolitan transport system this year is found and there is no quibble; the money is paid. The buses must run. The trains must run. There have to be various other facilities provided.

Mr Evans: They only run sometimes.

Mr GUNN: That is another matter. The member for Fisher can deal with that matter later. My poor constituents have to wait years to get a few lousy kilometres of road sealed. They pay their taxes to the State and Federal Governments and it is a disgrace that there is even talk of undedicating the Highways Fund, because if that comes

into effect we will have other Government departments wanting to get their greasy hands on the money which is currently allocated to roads. Those departments will want to have some of it off. First, it will be just a few million dollars, but I guarantee it will not be long before it will be more and more. Who will miss out? It will not be the people within 50 or 60 km of the GPO in Adelaide, but rather my long-suffering constituents. If I am the only person, I will not be voting for a Bill to undedicate the Highways Fund. That does not mean that the Highways Department cannot be made to become more efficient and should not be the subject of a Public Accounts Committee inquiry.

I do not object to that, but I think that it would be unwise and very dangerous, particularly for country people, if the Treasurer and the public servants who advise him get their hands on the funds that are dedicated for road construction. I am not saying that the Highways Department should not be subject to examination in this place before the Budget committees: I agree with that, but I believe that to allow the Government to get its greedy hands on those funds would be of no advantage to the voting public. I predict that there would be less money for country roads, such as the Quorn-Wilmington road (work on which has been proceeding at a snail's pace), the Hawker-Orroroo road, the Elliston-Lock road, the Morgan-Burra road, and I could name dozens of other roads which would be put further behind the eight ball as a result of the proposal. I am most concerned about that.

I am only sorry that I do not have an hour to speak on this matter. I know that the Minister is saying, 'Save us from the agony of having to listen', but I was elected to this place to represent my constituents, and I will jolly well do my best to do that as long as I am here. I received a letter from the District Council of Hallett on 13 February, signed by the District Clerk, as follows:

Our council is greatly concerned with anomalies which have occurred during and following the recent harvest. The resurgence of the economies both federally and in the State of South Australia is coincidental with record grain harvests. While the benefits are plainly obvious and beneficial to all, it is paradoxical that the local government areas such as the District Council of Hallett suffer heavy financial burdens.

The area encompassed by this council has produced vast tonnages of grain in this 1983-84 season. Because of the district's geographical location in relation to the seaboard ports, the majority of this grain is carried in heavy trucks in an east-west direction on roads which are largely unsealed. The damage to these unsealed roads has been quite devastating.

This council wishes to make quite clear its unenviable position. In July 1983 road grant moneys were slashed from \$90 000 to \$50 000. The resultant effects were shattering to the small rural areas involved and one man of our outside staff of six has been laid off, machinery is lying idle, and consequently roads are unable to be maintained properly. We claim therefore that of the moneys generated in this area through grain and its transport, a large proportion should be returned to maintain the roads damaged by that transport. Anything less than a substantial increase in grants will result in local government areas such as the District Council of Hallett finding their responsibilities quite unbearable.

Can the State Government justify the fact that our community (and others similar) suffers from damaged, dangerous roads, unable to be repaired promptly due to the reduction of funds.

I contacted the Royal Automobile Association to obtain some information about the amount of money that is collected. In its response it states:

Stamp Duty: Stamp duty paid on new registrations and transfers for the year ended 30 June 1983, totalled \$25 455 000.

State Fuel Tax: During the year ended 30 June 1983, road users paid \$25 792 000 under the Business Franchise (Petroleum Products) legislation. The net proceeds of \$25 726 000, after allowing for collection costs, were credited to the Highways Fund for roads. At the time the tax amounted to 1.5 cents/litre for petrol and 2.53 cents/litre for diesel. However, in the latter part of 1983, the Government increased the tax levels to 2.51 cents/litre for petrol and 3.49 cents/litre for diesel, and amended the legislation to provide that the additional revenue was not required to be ear-

marked for roads. The increase is expected to raise an additional \$15 million in a full year. The legislation now simply provides that the Highways Fund shall be credited with an amount not less than that received in 1982-83.

The Government already has a boot in the door in regard to its obtaining road funds to spend in other areas. The letter from the RAA continues as follows:

Federal Fuel Excise: Excise on petrol and diesel is currently 9.397 cents/litre, which includes the surcharge applied to fund the Australian Bicentennial Road Development program. It is estimated that South Australian road users would contribute approximately \$140 million per annum in petrol and diesel excise.

Import Parity Levy: There are varying estimates of the amount per litre of fuel which comprises the import parity levy. We estimate, however, that South Australian road users contribute a total of \$210-\$225 million per annum through this tax source.

That gives us an indication of the amount of money that Governments, particularly the Federal Government, receive from the motoring public.

If all those funds were returned, there would be a considerable increase in the amount of construction work that could take place. I appeal to the Government to do something to rectify this situation. We can find \$100 million at the drop of a hat to build the O-Bahn—and I am not saying that it is not necessary—but if we could spend \$25 million of that money on the roads in the isolated communities a great deal of good would be done. Many of these communities lack adequate facilities, anyway. I could go on and quote chapter and verse from other correspondence that I have received from councils, but I will do that on another occasion.

At the end of last year I received a quite disturbing letter from the Iron Knob Progress Association. It states:

It has been brought to the attention of the Iron Knob Progress Association that tankers transporting hydrogenfluoride (hydrofluoric acid) regularly pass through Iron Knob en route for Western Australia. The local Country Fire Service has endeavoured to gain information about procedures in the event of an accident with this substance, as we understand it to be highly toxic, and one of the most dangerous substances on the road.

It seems that no-one wants to know about these shipments, or to disseminate any information concerning emergency procedures. Indeed, local constable and C.F.S. are not even alerted when a shipment is due to go through on Highway 1. The Progress Association is highly incensed, as, if an accident occurs to a seemingly innocuous tanker, local sister, ambulance men, police, C.F.S. crew, etc. are putting their lives in jeopardy in going to attend it.

We feel, therefore, that someone in authority should at least be alerted when the tanker leaves Port Augusta, so that in the event of its non-arrival at Kimba, appropriate emergency action can be taken—indeed steps may have to be taken to evacuate townspeople depending on direction and strength of the wind. We realise that such an emergency may never eventuate, but forewarned is fore-armed, and the Progress Association feel most strongly that the lack of information in all areas—transport, treatment, etc. is highly irresponsible and request that you follow up our request regarding this matter.

I did take up the matter with the Chief Secretary and a number of other people. Some years ago my attention was drawn to problems that occurred when highly dangerous material was dumped on the road south of Burra. Some of my constituents were called upon to carry out a great deal of work to render the area safe. A great deal of expense was incurred by them and they got not one cent in compensation from any Government department. They used their own equipment to make the area safe, and that is why I draw this matter to the attention of the House.

The final matter that I raise relates to a request from the Tarcoola Special Rural School Council that consideration be given to the erection of a new school at Tarcoola. I believe that the request, which the council forwarded to the Acting Regional Director of Education on 15 February, ought to be supported. I hope that the Minister is in a position to do something about that request. I also raise the commonsense request from the Coober Pedy School Council

to the Minister of Education for the purchase of the Croation Community Club building and the transfer of some of the educational facilities at the Coober Pedy Area School to that site. Concern has also been expressed to me about the Government's continuing opposition to requests from isolated communities for cheap power. There is particular concern at Marla Bore, where people will soon have to generate their own power. A similar situation is arising on the Nullarbor. Therefore, I call on the Government and the Outback Areas Trust to examine these matters so that those communities are not disadvantaged.

This measure has my support. I read the Premier's speech with some interest and wondered how he came to some of the conclusions contained in it. No doubt, in due course, when these matters are examined in more detail, the Premier will be somewhat more forthcoming than he has been in the past. I have received much correspondence in recent times from people involved in the tow truck industry. When I read the regulations that are currently in effect I thought that they were the most Draconian and the worst set of regulations I had come across since I have been a member of Parliament.

Mr Evans: You wouldn't like to be shackled by them?

Mr GUNN: I certainly would not like to be shackled by them. I believe that the regulations highlight the weakness in the current situation. I have received much correspondence, as I know other members and the Premier have. I hope that the regulations will be promptly withdrawn and that some action will be taken to review and amend the way in which they are dealt with. It is wrong that people should be forced to operate under such regulations and, when they come to the Subordinate Legislation Committee or other committees to give evidence, it is virtually a *fait accompli*. Then, the time factor runs out.

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

Mr EVANS (Fisher): This Bill will provide moneys enabling the State to continue to operate. In this debate members have an opportunity to talk about anything in the State that relates to expenditure by the Government or to areas where the Government should be spending money in the opinion of individuals or the communities those members represent. Indeed, it would be easy to talk for longer than the full half hour and raise matters relating to one's electorate. When the Premier and Prime Minister talk of a low inflation rate and say that it should be much better for the average person in the community trying to meet family food bills and such costs, I ask the Prime Minister and particularly the Premier of this State to ask some of their friends how much cheaper or dearer it is to live today than it was 12 months ago. There is no doubt that the average family is feeling the pinch when it comes to buying foodstuffs. I am talking not about those who are unemployed, but about those who are disadvantaged by a lack of income from a wage earner. Those people are in a worse financial situation in most cases, although not in all cases.

Quite often a young couple, where the only breadwinner works as a tradesperson with no overtime and a very moderate wage, trying to pay off a first and second mortgage and maybe other hire-purchase agreements, while the other partner is taking on the role of looking after the children, are often worse off than some of the people on social welfare benefits who have concessions for Housing Trust rent, telephone, motor vehicle registration, public transport, and so on. It is not easy for many families in the community today that are hoping to buy their own home. One of the greatest benefits, if there are any, they have at the moment is that interest rates on loans for housing have dropped. Regardless of who had been in power federally, that would have

occurred: we know that. It is brought about by the world scene more than by the local scene.

There must be a fear in the hearts of many of those people, more particularly those who are building a house at present, that if interest rates rise again many more families will be in a serious situation than there were in the critical period of 1980-81 and even earlier in 1977-78. As the cost of building a house today is escalating rapidly, the gap between what these people can contribute as an individual or as a couple and what they have to borrow from some financial institution is greater than it was previously. All is well while people are able to maintain the same income coming into the home. If there are two incomes and one partner loses a job or is sick, or if interest rates rise, a catastrophe strikes quite often.

I ask the Government not to say that everything is rosy and sweet and that we will have a long period of people being able to spend right up to the limit of their means without needing to be cautious and keeping some reserves for the future. If we spread that sort of philosophy we will have some golden days and months but we will have some sad years afterwards. I offer that word of warning because, as a result of Medicare and other such things, the inflation rate may not seem high. But, when we come to buy the goods to keep our families operating in the manner to which they are accustomed, the cost of living is rising rapidly.

We can take, for example, the cost of power. When working among the community it is inevitable that in a day one will run into 20 or 30 people who say that the cost of power and gas is becoming too expensive, and they ask how they can cut down on its use in the home. The Government has pushed up the cost of power to an extent where many people are concerned. Many aged people and others living on pensions worry about how they can foot the bill, even though they may be entitled to some minute concessions. It was the Labor Government that brought about the tax on Electricity Trust charges by stating that it wanted 6 per cent of ETSA takings. That was simply a tax on an essential commodity—nothing else. It was a tax on using power—the power that might warm an elderly person or keep a home in the condition where dampness is down, especially for young families during the winter months, or for cooling a warm house during the summer months. I am told that the biggest demand on electricity is during the hot days and months of the year. There is nothing for the Government to be proud of in that area.

When it comes to public transport, we all recall that, not less than 12 months ago, in July last year, an announcement was made to put up bus fares by some 40 per cent. That is a massive increase. If any section of private industry decided to increase its charges by 40 per cent next week the news media would run headlines, as it did against the Government on the issue of bus fares. The present Government would attack that private enterprise business day in and day out until something was done about it. It would threaten and would, in fact, probably bring about some form of price control. I am not saying that the STA should not try to recoup operating costs because it is becoming a burden upon the State, as the member for Eyre pointed out.

I appreciate that within my own area we are starting to get better public transport from the bus section of the State Transport Authority—something that I could not achieve in the past. I thank the present Minister, even though it was well on the way with the former Minister, the member for Torrens, to implement a better bus service into the Mitcham Hills, Coromandel Valley, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill areas. We are grateful for that, although it could still be improved a lot. One would not want to have a teenager going to university and wanting to get to and

from it at night on public transport as they would be waiting until the next morning.

I am appreciative of the fact that the State Transport Authority, with the Minister's blessing, has set out to find a solution to the problem of upgrading the public transport service to parts of the Stirling District Council area. I am conscious that there is a conflict existing where private operators travel to my colleague's area and to Lobethal and Mount Barker and other towns in that vicinity. Those operators return through Bridgewater and, while doing that, pick up passengers. Because they are not subsidised the private operators charge a fare that enables them to balance their books or show a slight profit. In some cases that fare is more than double the STA charge. Naturally, the people of Bridgewater are saying that they want the STA bus service to go to Bridgewater and I think that is justified. However, the private operators might then say that if they do not have the Bridgewater clientele they will not be able to run the bus to Lobethal and the other towns. If the STA has to go to those places its deficit will be greater.

I am reasonably sure, from what I have learned over the past few years, that when Mr Virgo was Minister he wanted to subsidise outlying private operators on a passenger trip basis because that would have been cheaper than using STA services. Perhaps the time is now ripe to do that with other services operating on the fringe of metropolitan Adelaide that cannot provide a service as cheap as the STA because they are not subsidised by the taxpayer. It may be that if some small subsidy is offered it will allow them to offer a comparable price to STA prices. Perhaps that would be cheaper for the Government and the community would accept that. Also, it would do nothing to upset employment of people in the private sector or to put a higher cost factor back on the STA.

I will now quote what the union said at the time bus fares increased. In so doing I emphasise that the Minister promised at that time to bring down a report within three months on the effect of that price rise. To my knowledge that report has never been presented to the Parliament and the Minister has never been taken to task by the press about not providing that report. In fact, everybody has forgotten about it.

Mr Lewis: When did he say that?

Mr EVANS: He said that way back in August 1983, or it may even have been in mid or late July. In July 1983 the unions complained about increased fares saying that the increases would cause a rise of \$6 a week to families and that the weekly outlay for fares for many families would be \$24. The unions also said that, based on those figures, the annual cost to families (taking into account getting to work and school) would increase from \$756 to more than \$1 000 a year. The article states:

Among the hefty increases announced by the Bannon Government, the two zone adult fares will rise from 70c to 90c and children's fares will rise from 20c to 30c.

The association's State secretary, Mr A. Boyle, said the union was working on an alternative fares structure.

He said the Transport Minister, Mr Abbott, and the Premier, Mr Bannon, would be invited to meet the union's executive to discuss using this system instead of the STA's.

The move had come when his office began receiving numerous calls of support from the public after Monday's story in the *News* stating the union was considering 'widespread industrial action' over the reason for the fare increases.

Mr Boyle said the union's suggested fare structure would eliminate the use of a ticket more than once. It would revert to the one-ticket, one-ride system.

He said the union had been telling the STA for more than two years that it was being defrauded of 'millions of dollars' under the system which enabled people to use a ticket for more than one trip.

It was 'mismanagement' that had caused the STA to announce the average of 40 per cent increase in fares.

I make the point that the people working the buses made the quite clear statement that it was mismanagement that was causing the problem and also people who were manipulating the ticket system. I ask the Government whether or not it will bring down the result of that report (it is many months later) and tell the Parliament what the result was.

I notice that even the unions have gone quiet on it now because they know that the public in general is conditioned to the extra costs. In talking about public transport, I wish to pick up the debate that I have entered into through the media and other areas in recent times regarding the railway line through the Hills. My photograph was in the *Advertiser* standing just outside the National Park tunnel alongside what in my view was a fault in the track. I ask the Minister or the Australian National engineers—it is outside the STA area by about a kilometre—to go and inspect it and see how much more it has deteriorated since I looked at it. With the winter months coming, if a drain is blocked on the top side of that track and nothing is done about it, there is no doubt that there would be a derailment. It is more likely to be a goods train than a passenger train, unless it is the Melbourne Express, which is a heavy one. Surely the crew of the train and everyone else should be taken into consideration. Their lives are at risk if something goes wrong.

I ask the STA to make representations to Australian National to look at that track. Only a few months ago, near the Pioneer Bridge, a passenger on the Melbourne Express, when the train hit a bad joint—which the crew call a 'square joint'—on the track, was thrown from his seat and had an injured arm as a result. That was on the STA part of the line; the very next day a rail gang was up there straightening the kink out of the track. So, it can be done if the pressure is put on when there has been an accident, but why wait for an accident to occur? I know that there was a possible move afoot to shift the railway line north of Adelaide and to do away with the Hills line altogether and for that reason there was some negligence in regard to keeping the track up to date, but we now know that the track will be kept going. It will be upgraded from Tailem Bend to Melbourne. We know that the standard gauge will become the gauge that will be used throughout the system, even if they have to use a third rail in parts of it through the Hills to achieve that to Tailem Bend.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: They will do that, will they?

Mr EVANS: Yes; they have made that statement.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr EVANS: Yes. So, now we know that they will achieve that, why do we not start upgrading the Hills line? Some things can be done, such as taking some of the curves out, because with the modern engines that we are using—the big Victorian engines and the two more recent ones that Australian National has bought—their weight and length are such that they tend to push the corners out, and perhaps they need to straighten the line a little in some parts. More particularly, I just want the track to be put into safe condition because many people who have some knowledge of the track believe that it is not safe.

The other thing is the train to Bridgewater, and I will not get into the debate about Victor Harbor, in which a lot of people support the concept of a tourist train; I believe that it would work. At least, the STA could take up the challenge of promoting the rail service to Bridgewater as a tourist attraction. Many people are already doing the trip. In saying that I come—and I am pleased to see that the Minister for Environment and Planning, who has the problem of preserving the heritage of our State is in the Chamber—to the question of the Bridgewater mill. I say to the Minister that I was rather disgusted, disappointed and amazed, when I did learn fully what was inside the mill, that there was very

little of it left. I do not blame the Minister for that; it was gone years ago. I always thought that it was stacked away inside that building, but all that is left of the mill is the big wheel on the outside and a big open space inside. So the inside could be used as a theatre if it was upgraded, as a restaurant, as a workshop for various people in the craft field, or as an historic museum. It sits on the piece of ground where the first school was built in Bridgewater in 1882, and was restored in 1982 by the district council to its original condition.

It is part of our heritage. The local community hall was built in 1913 and the local hotel is adjacent. The Heysen Trail passes the building but, as I have stated previously, it is impossible to use the trail at that point because it is overgrown with bush. One has to pick up the trail further on. This is a heritage area. I know that the Minister is considering the matter, and I give him credit for that, but I ask that he ensures and does all in his power on the day of the auction to see that the Mill stays in Government hands and that it does not pass to those who will not make the best use of it. The performing arts and crafts people are prepared to work at it if the Government gives them the opportunity.

I refer now to millipedes—and I will keep on talking about millipedes until people feel them crawling over their backs, until they are in people's homes and until they affect families so that everyone knows that this is not a joke. Millipedes are a curse, and they affect family life. The Government has told Dr Geoff Baker that he can go to Portugal next August. I believe that that is unfair when over \$200 000 was spent on the project when the Liberal Government was in office, half the funds coming from the Federal and State Governments plus contributions from local councils.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We started that when I was acting Minister of Agriculture. It was the only thing I did.

Mr EVANS: No, the Federal Government put up the money. Senator Messner was involved. He moved to Bridgewater and, having found out how bad millipedes were, put pressure on the Federal Government; that is how we got the money. The Minister makes the point that his Government was in power when the State money was made available. I am not sure about that, but if I am wrong I apologise to the Minister. However, I know that the Federal money was put up before the State Government moved. The Government must pick up the challenge and do something about this problem. This is an important matter.

I refer now to filthy water. If any member in this Chamber had seen what was claimed to be water pumped through the mains in the Hills this summer, he would be disgusted to think that he had to attempt to wash his clothes or his body in that filth. Taking a half-litre jar with a base of four inches, three ordinary household kettles of water when boiled would produce three-quarters of an inch of mud in the bottom of the jar. When people in the Hills clean out their hot water service, they find that in the bottom of most of them there is six inches of mud. It is not fair. These people are paying the same for water as people in Adelaide are paying, and the Government through the Minister is saying that it never intends to filter the water in the Hills. In other words, those people will continue to pay for filtering and pumping costs, which all people in Adelaide have to pay, but they will never be given the opportunity of using filtered water.

That is totally unfair. I assure the Premier and the Minister that the number of people who are signing petitions and writing letters of anger and disgust indicate that this is an issue of which his Government should be conscious. I challenge the Government to clean up the so-called potable water that is supplied to households in the Adelaide Hills.

I support the Bill, because the money must be provided to run the State, whether it is being run well or badly. That is part of the proposition. I support the Bill for that purpose only, but I hope that the Government will take note of some of the issues I have raised.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend to detain the House long in reply. As I said when introducing this Bill, there are a number of ways in which supplementary appropriation can be found in order to ensure that any changes or adjustments as between departments can be met as we approach the end of the financial year. Supplementary Estimates through an Appropriation Bill is just one such method. This year, in fact, technically, we need not have introduced such a measure, but I felt that in the interests of having made general comments on the State's finances, because it is a very fundamental question, such a Bill should be brought in. So, I introduced the Bill on that basis, and I think the debate that has taken place has justified that action.

Members have made contributions which have ranged very widely. At the Committee stage I hope we can confine ourselves to the actual Estimates that we have before us, because that is the crucial point. I appreciate the support of members opposite on the principles of the Bill. I must admit that there have not been too many compliments to us on the way in which the Budget has by and large been kept very firmly on course, but I am not surprised at that. The fact is that at least for this financial year our finances are in a pretty reasonable shape. Future years pose problems, as I said. Having concluded those remarks, I move:

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take it that the Deputy Leader is the lead Opposition speaker.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. I shall not be taking the full allotted time but, nonetheless, I am the lead speaker in this grievance debate. I want to refer to a couple of matters, the first of which is the phenomenon that has burst on the national scene in relation to the peace movement. The concept and desire of the citizens of this nation, indeed the world, for peace is entirely understandable, because we are all part of that movement in the sense that none of us wants to see war under any circumstance. Certainly, the last thing that any responsible citizen or normal sane human being wants is a global or any other sort of nuclear war. But, there is to my mind certainly confusion of ideas associated with the people who make up the peace movement.

Boasts have been noised abroad that the peace movement is gathering together crowds of protesters larger than the nation experienced in the anti-Vietnam demonstrations which occurred some years ago. But, it seems now to be the focus of the anti-uranium movement. I remember some years ago Dr Helen Caldicott coming to this country. She is South Australian born but now resides with her husband in America. They have been leaders in the anti-nuclear movement. The line that they took some years ago, particularly just prior to the Roxby Downs debate in this place, was that they were anti-nuclear energy as such and were opposed to any sort of nuclear programme—civil, military or otherwise.

The major thrust of what was said then by Dr Helen Caldicott was that she was totally opposed to uranium mining and the civil nuclear programme. Now, all these issues are confused in the so-called peace movement. There are people in that movement for a number of reasons. Those who are anti-nuclear, such as the Campaign Against Nuclear

Energy, and so on, are mixed up in it. There has been quite a distinct and in some cases a deliberate blurring of the issues. The first thing that I want to do is separate them, because two separate issues are involved. The first important point to be made is that there is a clear distinction between the civil nuclear programme and the nuclear weapons programme.

As members would no doubt recognise some of us have done quite a bit of research and reading in relation to this matter. Probably the best article that I have read in relation to the interconnection between these two issues is a paper called 'Uranium power and the proliferation of nuclear weapons', which was distributed by the American Nuclear Society and which has been available in Australia for some time. I would like to recount to the House one of the examples given by one of the experts of international repute who come to South Australia during the nuclear debate when we were discussing the Roxby Downs issue. I heard him put to a gathering (I think that it was in one of the conference rooms in Parliament House) that there were all sorts of ways of making TNT, a more conventional and long-standing explosive. He said that one could make TNT a chocolate factory: all the ingredients (and members who were there may recall this illustration—I thought that it was quite telling) which are required to make TNT (the explosive) are available in a chocolate factory.

However, he could think of no less convenient way of making TNT than in a chocolate factory. If one wants to make TNT, one will not go to the chocolate factory where the ingredients are and make it. Likewise, he made the point that, if one wants to make nuclear weapons, one certainly would not go to a commercial nuclear generator which is being used for the generation of electricity. He could not think of any less convenient way of embarking on a nuclear weapons programme and trying to get the materials required for making nuclear bombs than from a civil nuclear reactor being used for the generation of electricity. That is the first point I make.

If a nation wants to embark on a nuclear weapons programme it will not use a nuclear reactor which is being used to generate electricity; so the two programmes are quite distinct. I think that that is the first point that needs to be realised. Civil nuclear programmes are a fact of life that is with us on a global scale. It is with us to an increasing extent, and anyone who suggests seriously that the world civil nuclear programme be closed down (as those who previously said just this, and now where the issues have in some cases been blurred deliberately in a peace movement) are not facing reality, because the hardship, the economic decline, the unemployment, and the starvation which would be visited on this globe would be enormous.

There is no way in the world that the civil nuclear programme can be altered, let alone even wound down. The fact is that, if the human lot is to improve by the supplying of energy to nations which have no other source, then the civil nuclear programme will certainly play an increasing role. I do not know whether honourable members take any notice of the Uranium Information Centre newsletter which is sent to them monthly. However, if they take the time to cast their eyes over it and refer to the February issue, there is a list on the front page of that publication indicating what is happening in terms of the electricity generation programme from nuclear energy around the world. I will take the time to read quickly through that list. It refers to the number of nuclear powered reactors being used around the world for the generation of electricity. I repeat what I have said in this House on a number of occasions: there is no technology yet devised by man for large-scale generation of electricity which has a safety record approaching anything like that of the nuclear industry.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Well documented.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Well documented—there is no other technology yet devised by human engineering and technology which approaches anything like the safety record of nuclear energy, which now stretches over 30 or 40 years on a large scale. We had an enormous amount of hoo-hah in relation to the Three Mile Island accident, but the President's Commission of Inquiry, which comprised environmentalists, scientists and the whole gamut of people interested in the question, came to the clear conclusion that no-one was damaged physically as a result of the malfunction on Three Mile Island.

A lot of people were damaged psychologically because there was an over-reaction, evacuation and all the hoo-hah that goes with it, but not one person was damaged physically. The amount of radiation received by anyone as a result of the accident was much less than they would get from a normal medical X-ray. They were hurt psychologically and mentally because of all the emotion which surrounds any nuclear accident, and that certainly was not a minor one. Any nuclear accident around the world is newspaper headlines. I remember there was a radioactive spill where liquid in a civil programme leaked on to the floor of a nuclear reactor in Japan. That news was flashed around the world, and the morning dailies seem to be hung up on this nuclear question. It was front page news, but the safety record in the coal-fired power stations, for instance, where people are quite frequently injured, is not so well publicised. I think it was only two or three weeks ago when there was another tragedy in a coal mine somewhere or other overseas, and it hardly rated a mention. The whole question of the safety of this industry has been blown way out of proportion in the imagination, particularly of the media around the world.

As I have said before in this place, if we are talking about relative risks that we face in modern society, future generations will think we are insane to accept the road toll. They will think we are absolutely insane. In three or four years in South Australia we kill several thousand people on the roads and yet, when looking at the world-wide record of the nuclear industry, not one person has been killed in a civil nuclear programme. I just wonder what has happened to our judgment and our scale of values. It is absolutely ludicrous to have all this hoo-hah in relation to nuclear civil programmes. Future generations will look back at us and think we are absolutely insane in terms of our scale of priorities and importance of the risks and hazards we face every day of our lives in modern life. As I say, this is one area in the twentieth century where we will be judged as crazy, and I am talking about our means of locomotion, that is, the motor vehicle. We kill more people on the roads than we kill in warfare and, in the main, they are young people, yet we have all this hoo-hah about a small radioactive leak on the floor of a nuclear reactor in Japan which damaged nobody.

The anti-nuclear movement has in many cases deliberately confused the civil nuclear programme with the weapons programme. I make the point that they are quite separate. If you want to make nuclear weapons, the last way you would go about it is to try and make your weapons from a nuclear reactor specifically designed to generate electricity. In Argentina they have two nuclear reactors generating power, with one under construction; in Belgium they have five, with two under construction; in Brazil they have one, with two under construction; in Bulgaria they have four, with two under construction; Canada, 14 with 11 under construction; Cuba, one under construction; Czechoslovakia two operating, and six under construction; Finland, four operating; France, 36 operating and 27 under construction. I repeat again what I have said here on several occasions, that at the turn of the century the French will be very well

placed economically in terms of the cost of its energy, because more than any other nation on earth it is turning to a massive nuclear programme to generate by far the largest slice of its electricity, because it has no alternative in terms of indigenous power sources.

France will be very well placed, having made the capital investment in nuclear energy, in terms of the cost of its energy in relation to the rest of the world, which is still messing around with fossil rest of the world, which is still messing around with fossil fuels. Its programme is the most ambitious by far of any nation's programme in the world. They have 36 operating and 27 under construction. Nothing that socialist Mitterrand has done since he came to office, despite his promise to the environmental lobby, has interrupted to any extent the country's civil nuclear programme. That is despite the misleading sort of information that he fed to the environmental lobby during his campaign to win office. The German Democratic Republic has five plants operating, and eight under construction. The German Federal Republic has 15 operating and 12 under construction; Hungary has one, and three are being built; India has four, and five under construction; and Italy has three, with three under construction.

Japan, I would suggest, is second to France in terms of its commitment to the nuclear civil programme. If any nation should fear the effects of radiation, it is Japan, but it has no option. Like France, Japan will be well placed in terms of the cost of its energy and it will give it an even greater advantage over that which it currently enjoys in terms of cost of energy. That country has 25 plants operating, and there are 14 under construction. Korea has three plants, and six under construction; Mexico has two under construction; Netherlands has two; Pakistan has one now, with one under construction; the Philippines has one under construction; Poland has one under construction; Romania has two under construction; South Africa has two; and Spain has four plants and 10 under construction—so, the Spanish are getting into nuclear energy in a pretty big way. Sweden has 10 plants and two under construction; Switzerland has four plants and one being constructed; and Taiwan has four, and two under construction.

These emerging nations will leave us behind, the way they are going. The United Kingdom has 32 plants and 10 under construction. The United Kingdom has been using nuclear energy for 20 or 30 years, and it has not had a union problem; it is not a Labor Party problem in the United Kingdom, because that country has lived with it for years. The United States of America has 86 plants and 52 under construction. Of course, the USA has a very large nuclear programme, but that country is the most profligate user of energy of any nation in the world—there is no doubt about that. It has come to terms with the decreasing stocks of liquid hydrocarbons, petroleum and locomotion, and the like.

The Hon. H. Allison: Did Russia declare its programme?

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The USSR has 40 operating, and 31 under construction.

The Hon. H. Allison: And yet it is trying to discourage us.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is right. The Russians and the satellite countries have been in it since about 1956, and there are no demonstrations in those nations in relation to the civil nuclear programme.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Or in relation to anything else.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: That is true. I was interested to hear a speaker at a meeting yesterday comment about a visit to Germany and East Germany. He said that they are not bothered with demonstrations in East Germany; that is just not part of their life. They all have an extensive

civil nuclear programme. Yugoslavia, another satellite country, has a nuclear plant operating. So in referring to these programmes, there is not a thing that peace marchers can do, or should do, in my view to deter a civil nuclear programme. However, the other strand that I believe should be separated in terms of the proliferation of nuclear weapons is a different story altogether.

Again I refer to the Caldicotts. Helen Caldicott and her husband, Bill, have been fairly prominent in their most recent excursion to Australia. The claim is being made (I heard him interviewed), although none of us is in a position to verify it, that the United States is ahead of the Russians in its nuclear weapons programmes. President Reagan claims the opposite, namely, that Russia has superiority and that America is hell bent on catching up. I do not know the facts. However, none of us under any circumstances would want a nuclear holocaust to occur. But I simply make one point, namely, that I have found that in anything I have had to do with in public life or with anything else, one cannot successfully negotiate with an opponent or some other competing party from a position of weakness. I do not want to push the point any further, but I have lived long enough to know that peace in our time discussions were a prelude to the Second World War when nations were rearming as fast as they could.

All I know is that in any realistic assessment and negotiation to wind down a military programme, one is not in a strong position to negotiate if in a position of weakness. I do not want to push that, but I simply make the point that there is a clear distinction between the issue of a civil nuclear programme for generating electricity and a weapons programme. If a nation wishes to go down the track of producing nuclear weapons, it will not follow the technology of the civil nuclear power programme. I refer again to a comment made by the Prime Minister, Robert J. Hawke, who has been a protagonist and advocate of the nuclear programme for as long as he has been making public statements on such issues—long before he became a member of Parliament.

Speaking at Monash University years ago, when Robert Hawke was then associated with the ACTU, he said it is all fine and dandy for the anti-nuclear protagonists to say we should leave it in the ground. All we will be doing is denying energy, not only to the developed world but also to the developing world and making the cost of energy to those nations more expensive and delaying their emergence and the improvement of their people's lot. We will be able to sit back and feel that warmth, that moral glow flow over us. He said it is about as sensible as saying we should not mine iron ore because that is turned into metal which is turned into guns which are used in warfare. We should not mine metals because they are used in warfare but, of course, we know that is an absurd proposition.

There is a clear distinction between these two issues. I have no objection to the peace movement. We all want to see peace, but do not let us kid ourselves. I believe the anti-nuclear movement has a clear plan to confuse the issues and to try to whip up people's fear of war and their antipathy to war, to try to suggest therefore that we should not mine uranium and we should close down the civil nuclear programme. It is a quite meaningless proposition in view of the information I have given to the House. Let me quote from this publication, *Uranium Power and the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*. I will quote the conclusions from that cogent and coherent, well-reasoned paper:

In summation, therefore, the common international policy of the reactor supplying States should be to (1) assist the developing countries in an efficient expansion and management of their uranium power plant capacity; (2) provide a system for an assured supply of fuel for these plants and for the handling of spent fuel; and (3) strengthen the international safeguarding system of civilian

activities in order to discourage diversion of material for military use. Turning to the issues raised in the preface to this paper, the following conclusions are drawn:

- (1) International trade in uranium power equipment and fuels will grow and will not be diminished by restrictive U.S. domestic activities or U.S. foreign policies.
- (2) The reduction of U.S. activities in uranium power systems also diminishes U.S. influence in achieving prudent and appropriate international nonproliferation controls.
- (3) The world-wide expansion of uranium power reactors has not been and will not in the future be an influential factor in determining whether additional nations will choose to become nuclear weapons States. Even in the absence of uranium power, the nuclear weapons potential would remain.

It simply highlights the point I initially made. If one wants to make TNT one does not do it in a chocolate factory, although one could and if one wants to make nuclear weapons one does not make them from a power reactor used to generate electricity, although that could be done because they are both equally convenient.

I make one other point which is very close to home as far as I am concerned, and that is in relation to the Government's activity in preventing bushfires in the Adelaide Hills. I make no apology for referring to an area very close to where I live. As I have said before, when the Hills face zone falls under Government control, as it has almost completely done now, the bushfire hazard will escalate dramatically. The last area of the Hills face zone to fall under Government control is the area between Ansteys Hill and Tea Tree Gully Hill which previously used to be in private ownership.

A section of this land was taken over to build the new Ansteys Hill water filtration plant. That land is now under the control of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. The residue, which is several hundred acres running from the edge of the Engineering and Water Supply land to the Tea Tree Gully hill, is finally under the control of the National Parks and Wildlife Service. The end result is that that land has all returned to wilderness.

The Engineering and Water Supply land was cleared and was formerly grazed by sheep, but had a wonderful crop of weeds and wild oats so high last year, because of the wet season, that one could hardly walk through it. This is a wonderful source of fuel for a bush fire. There are bush fires there every year but the CFS in the past has always managed to put them out because the growth was short and well grazed and the CFS could get in and tackle it. The rest of the land, which is scrub land, has gone to wilderness. I have seen the odd kangaroo and rabbit in there, but nothing else. The rubbish that grows unchecked proliferates each year. The twigs and limbs that have fallen from trees over the years build up.

On Ash Wednesday this Government land was an enormous fuel source for a bush fire and, by the time the fire came out of that land, it was completely uncontrolled. What sticks in our craw and that of local residents who live above it is that the Government does not seem to have learnt. Those residents are waiting for a fire to break out again. I am told by the hard-working member for Todd that this season the Government bought fencing material to put around the Engineering and Water Supply land so that it could be grazed. We were also told that the Government had run out of money and did not have money to put the fence up. So, there is a heap of fencing material there but no money to erect it. Therefore, no grazing can take place. It is lucky that this year we did not have a repeat of the Ash Wednesday bush fires.

Since that bush fire I have been arguing (and one will never have a time more propitious to argue it) that, if the Government does not do something about the hills face zone in terms of reducing the fire risk, we could well have a fire situation that will be worse next time. If the fire gets

up south of the area I am talking about, the Blackwood and Belair area, hundreds of people will be affected, not tens of people. It is all very well for conservationists to argue that one must not slow burn the rubbish in these parks, but if one does not, the time will come—maybe not in our lifetime, but perhaps once in a generation; as sure as the sun rises and sets at night—when a disaster will occur. It has happened in Hobart once in my lifetime. It has happened twice in Victoria in my lifetime. It has happened where I live twice in my lifetime. Because of the population now living in that part of the hills it will happen again. It was fortuitous that the wind changed during the Ash Wednesday fire or it would have happened then. People in my electorate sheltering with children in the Crafers Primary School could quite easily have been burnt. People on the Old Belair Road when the wind changed could have been trapped and burnt to death.

I am alarmed about this. I know that there is an inquest concerning the area around Ansteys Hill, but that has gone quiet because someone has been charged with lighting a fire. If the Government does not act now and take on the conservationists and others who will not come to grips with the fact that we have to reach a compromise concerning the preservation of the hills face zone and take realistic fire precautions, we will have the same crisis again. As long as I am in this place I will keep repeating it and pressing the people who make the decisions. Indeed, the CFS in my area have the unenviable task of trying to come to grips with this conflagration that comes from Government land.

The only time one can control a fire is when it gets into private land that is well looked after, well cared for and worked. In the Gumeracha council area in which I live, a third of the land is under Government control. Nearly all of that land was burnt out, either the reserves in which the fire started or the forest land. It was almost all wiped out and nobody, including the CFS volunteers whose job it is to come to grips with the problem, had any hope of controlling it in the Government land. The only time it can be controlled is when it gets on to private land, and even then it takes a long time to come to grips with the situation. The fire cannot be controlled along the border of Government land because it is so fierce.

It would be wrong to replant forests in that area. Decisions were made initially during the life of the Liberal Government, but to suggest that forests will grow in that area of the State—in the Chain of Ponds, Kersbrook, Gumeracha and Cudlee Creek areas—and expect that they will reach maturity in 40 years and be harvested is quite unrealistic. The chance of those forests being destroyed within 40 years is very high indeed. They were almost all wiped out this year, and it would be folly to replant them and expect an economic return in that part of the State. I have taken longer than I anticipated, but I have spoken on two subjects which I believe are important, one of world-wide significance and one of major State significance.

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): I wish to resume where I left off a little while ago in the half-hour debate by further extending the argument on conservation matters and reforestation of pine areas destroyed in the bush fire. Certainly the comments I intend to make are also relevant to those made a few moments ago in the Deputy Leader's concluding remarks. It is all a question of management and, while we are essentially very much in support of conservation of the remaining scrub land which exists in the South-East of South Australia, I do not think that the attitude taken by the present Government—in particular, by the Minister for Environment and Planning and his Department—is realistic. It has put virtually a total prohibition on the clearing of any more land.

It seems unfair on two counts. First, the South Australian Government itself has been responsible over the last several decades for quite massive land clearance. From 1945 to 1948 onwards, tens of thousands of acres were cleared in the South-East alone for the purpose of resettlement of returning troops from the Second World War, and the soldier settlement blocks occupy huge areas of land that were scrub. One would hardly find a single item of scrub on those blocks because they were cleared in their entirety. One would not find a tree in many areas south of Moorak, south of Mount Gambier. In addition, the afforestation programme which began in the late 1920s on a large scale in the South-East has also meant that the Government has cleared some 120 000 or 130 000 hectares of land while private enterprise would have cleared another 10 000 or 12 000 hectares.

Now that so much land has been cleared of native vegetation, it seems quite unfair of the Minister and his Department to expect the landholders occupying the remaining acreages containing natural scrub, to be held entirely responsible for conserving what is left of the State's natural environmental heritage. I say 'entirely responsible' because the Minister has virtually said that there will be no clearing of the land and no compensation paid to owners who bear the expense on behalf of the State. Those landholders who have a long-term clearance programme are, in many cases, conservationists themselves and are being expected to carry the entire responsibility and expense for conservation of the remaining flora and fauna in South Australia. It is an unfair situation.

So, reverting to the pine argument, which was my concluding subject in the previous debate, the Minister should be encouraging Government and private pine plantings in the South-East if South Australia is not to become the poor relation in the face of that substantial competition from Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland.

We are losing control of the pinus market, not only in Australia but also overseas, in the face of competition. Unless we continue planting quite substantially, we will find that our existing problems get worse. What are the existing problems? For years we have had too few markets for thinnings for the small timber which is abundant in the South-East pine forests. Forest hygiene is quite critical, and unless forests are thinned and small timber is taken out to allow remaining trees to thicken and grow taller and stronger then the forests will deteriorate in condition and we will not have really good quality timber in years to come. That is an existing problem.

Recently, one of the two mills at Tantanoola in the South-East closed down. It was the mill that manufactured paper and board for packaging. It closed because the equipment in the mill was antiquated and because more modern mills were built interstate to cope much more efficiently with that market. South Australia was unable to compete because we did not offer incentives to that company to stay, but that is history. However, unless substantial plantings are encouraged and take place in the South-East, there will be little or no possibility of another mill ever being constructed in the South-East to cope with that small timber, which is ideal for pulping. What we have to do is look overseas and sell on those markets, probably at substantial discounts with a subsequent loss to the South Australian Government and to private enterprise. That is a situation that we cannot tolerate, and I believe that the present Government is being shortsighted in not giving some consideration to those private applicants who wish to plant pine trees on land that they have acquired. The Minister could surely consider making his approval conditional upon the retention of at least the better scrublands that exist on private acreages that are presently subject to applications for reforestation.

I am quite sure that there can be a happy compromise situation rather than the present blanket exclusion that seems to exist. I say this not from guesswork but from representations made to me by applicants who are currently waiting for the Minister to exercise some compromise or discretion. I hope that common sense does prevail. The other issue where I said that environmental policies are diametrically opposed to reality is in the *Swamplands Report*—a two-volume report released last year recommending that the Government negotiate for heritage agreements or for the purchase of substantial acreages of swamp in the South-East. There the reality is that, for a variety of reasons, the water table in the South-East has been falling. It has been falling for the past 30 years, from my personal observation. The Leg of Mutton Lake in the Mount Gambier Blue Lake area has virtually disappeared. It was there in the early '50s, but it has now reached a stage where it is just a very small puddle.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It hardly looks like a leg of mutton now.

The Hon. H. ALLISON: One would hardly call it a swamp, and it is not much chop at the moment. The water table has consistently fallen, and that was the reason why I asked whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department still maintained records of the lake levels. The real issue is that some of those swamps are capable of being retained because they are on a clay base. Others are on limestone and the water table is such that they will never reappear. What we should encourage is for the surface waters of the South-East to be harnessed and managed; for the weirs over the drains to be increased in number so that the water does not just flow as a waste commodity out to the sea; for those drains and swamps to be managed by being used for production in the summer months; and for the people to be encouraged to use those swamps for the State's good rather than for the Minister simply to say, 'Nothing can be done; we will simply leave them alone.'

Many of those swamp areas will not be reclaimed by the teatree scrub that used to be there, but they will be claimed by the existing grasses which will overcome very quickly any natural vegetation that may remain. It is only good management and careful grazing that has kept those swamp areas under production and safe from the threat of bushfire. Management is the key to this whole situation, and careful conservation plus the sensible use of scrub lands and swamp lands in the South East will be to the State's advantage in increasing productivity and in diminishing the possibilities of bushfires.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): In the 10 minutes available to me tonight I will speak on the matters that I would have canvassed had there been an opportunity for me to participate in the debate on the technology strategy for South Australia, which took place in the House of Assembly on 12 April. That technology debate was diverse and very interesting but, naturally enough, in the two and a half hours available we could not canvass a lot of the important matters.

One matter upon which the debate did not touch was the relationship between tourism and technology in South Australia and the interesting links and parallel development that could occur between what can be described as two target industries upon which this State should focus very strongly in the next decade. In his Ministerial statement to Parliament, the Minister for Technology stated that, following the completion of the debate, the Minister for Technology would rewrite the strategy one more time and the strategy would then go to Cabinet and the Government for adoption as policy. I hope that my contribution tonight is not too late to be considered as part of the total debate on technology,

and I hope that some of what I say might be taken into account by the Ministry.

I say that because two years ago the tourism industry in South Australia, in consultation with the Government, developed a tourism development plan which, in some respects, is not unlike the technology strategy for South Australia. In both cases the Government identified a need for public debate and for a sense of direction. I may be biased, but I believe that the South Australian tourism development plan in its composition, structure and substance, will be a more useful tool to the Government than the technology strategy paper that was debated early this month. I say that not in any critical sense, but simply because it is a true strategy. The member for Davenport in his speech identified or defined 'strategy' as 'the science and art of employing the political, economic, psychological and military forces of a nation to afford the maximum support to adopted policies'.

A second definition was 'the art of devising or employing plans towards a goal'. That is precisely what the tourism development plan did and yet, in my judgment, those criteria have not been used as successfully in the technology strategy paper, which is more in the nature of a discussion paper. The tourism development plan identified the factors in the current picture. It examined the tourism industry, the current levels of tourism in South Australia, the South Australian tourism product, and major trends relevant to the future of the industry. Had that same process been undertaken in the technology strategy, I believe that we would have had a more useful basis for future direction.

The development plan outlined the prospects for the industry, and finally it dealt with the objectives and the implementation of those objectives. That process was not undertaken in the technology strategy paper and, while it may not have been intended that it should be undertaken, certainly in the case of tourism it has given the Government and the industry a blueprint for the next five years, ensuring a common sense of direction and a real cohesive working relationship between all concerned. Of course, that is an equally desirable goal for technology in South Australia.

In the identification of objectives for the tourism industry, the development plan identifies the objectives and the impact of the objectives, it itemises the constraints upon realising the objectives, and it outlines the strategies for realising the objectives and the bodies that are responsible for fulfilling them. That is an extremely systematic way of achieving the goal, and I warmly recommend it to the Ministry for Technology for adoption as it pursues its equally important goals for South Australia.

South Australia was the first State in Australia to develop a tourism development plan and a technology strategy, and that says something about the spirit of this State and the spirit of co-operation that is so readily obtained when people work together for a common goal. The industry devised the tourism development plan and the strategies with intensive consultation. The technology strategy was essentially a Government devised paper, no doubt with consultation, and certainly widely put forward for public debate. I challenge the Minister of Tourism to seek the concurrence of his Cabinet colleagues to have the tourism development plan, which will be updated at a conference to be held in Adelaide in early June, noted and debated in this Parliament in the same way as the technology strategy was noted and debated.

I regret that this opportunity was not taken when the plan was first developed, but we were approaching a State election at that time. However, it is certainly not too late for that, and I urge the Minister to take that action. All members will no doubt be well aware of the links between tourism and technology. Already there are important uses for technology in the transport and accommodation sectors of the

tourism industry. There is enormous scope for information services to be provided through technology to assist marketing and promotion, planning, and research in the tourism industry.

The scope there is almost unlimited, particularly for direct provision of information to consumers by both Government and the private sector. Looking at page 13 of the technology strategy and examining the criteria by which the Government will judge which key technology should receive priority, I believe that the tourism information technology should be regarded as a high priority by this State Government.

As the member for Davenport noted in his speech on the technology strategy, there are important attractions in South Australia which make it an ideal base for technology industries. Not the least of those attractions is our lifestyle. It is worth noting that the development of technology which will ultimately lead to greater leisure will give direct impetus and momentum to tourism development not only here, of course, but throughout the world. So, for that reason and many others, including the fact that both these industries can complement each other, first in terms of creating greater leisure, and, secondly, in creating a greater number of jobs—both having a non-polluting effect, and both being benevolent industries in terms of their social and environmental impact—they should be regarded as twin target industries for South Australia.

I commend to the Minister of Tourism and the Premier the notion that the South Australian Tourism Development Plan, following its update at the 1984 Tourism Conference, should be presented to this Parliament for noting and debate in the same way as the technology strategy was debated in the House earlier this month.

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3), 1984

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL, 1984

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

Explanation of Bill

It imposes a moratorium on the further grant of some types of liquor licence. In 1983 the Government established a review of the Licensing Act. That review is almost completed and, among other things, it will propose a restructuring of the licence categories now available under the Act. It will propose that some categories be amalgamated, and that the criteria to be satisfied before some other licences can be granted be altered. In some cases, it will propose that the trading conditions applying to licences that have been granted be liberalised. Transitional provisions will deem the holders of some current types of licence to hold licences in these new categories.

As a result, during the period between the release of the report and the implementation of amendments to the existing Licensing Act that may follow, it will be an attractive proposition for some persons to apply for an existing type of licence and so take advantage of liberalised trading conditions that may apply as a result of transitional provisions. In order to avoid this speculative obtaining of licences, the Government has decided to impose a moratorium on the further grant of those types of licence which it will be attractive to gain.

To be effective, the moratorium will apply from the date on which this Bill was introduced. However, all those persons who lodged applications for licences before that date will not be disadvantaged. Their applications may be determined by the Licensing Court as if there was no moratorium. The five classes of licence to be subject to the moratorium are set out in the Bill. Only these categories were selected, rather than apply the moratorium to all categories, which would unreasonably disadvantage persons applying for licences in those other categories for genuine purposes. The reasons for selecting only these five categories will be explained in the report of the review.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides that the new Act shall be deemed to have come into operation on 18 April 1984, the date of introduction of the Bill into Parliament. Clause 3 enacts new section 4a of the principal Act. This new section imposes a moratorium on the grant of wine licences, distiller's storekeeper's licences, cabaret licences, club licences and twenty litre licences. It will prevent any such licence being granted on an application made after the date of commencement mentioned above.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2), 1984

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS (Minister of Housing and Construction): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate, I wish to refer to the problems that have occurred in my electorate in relation to the current building boom. The stimulus given to the building industry by this Government has been very pleasing indeed. The home building industry has increased substantially since the introduction of the Bannon Government, and the job multiplying effect on the State and on the retail industry has been very pleasing indeed. Although it is extremely pleasant to see the increased activity within the building industry and its consequential job multiplier effect, this in itself has produced problems for my constituents, particularly in relation to the completion of building contracts. The non-completion of home building puts financial constraints upon the consumer, in this case the customer of the building company, in many ways. Many of my constituents, in taking out building contracts, have committed themselves to every possible cent that they have.

A delay in being able to take occupancy of a house stretches their budget beyond a reasonable consideration, and it is easy to see that the longer a building company takes to complete a contract then the greater the financial

impost that is put upon the consumer or the builder's customer. I have had a constituent approach me in relation to a building that was more than 13 weeks behind in schedule for the completion date. This particular constituent was committed to continue renting his present accommodation at a cost of \$110 per week. I suggest that this is not an isolated case and that large rents are being paid by constituents, especially young constituents, who have committed themselves to the great Australian dream of purchasing their own home. Not only is rent a financial consideration but usually arrangements have been made with a bank or lending institution to commence taking loan moneys at a certain date. Interest rates must be paid on all moneys borrowed and the longer the repayment of capital is delayed the more money it eventually costs the borrower.

A report from the Consumer Affairs Branch presented to the last Parliament referred to the problems of building contracts being undertaken under normal Housing Industry Association building contracts. The report stated that not only are consumers paying the costs that I have previously referred to but they are also being asked to pay extra costs claimed by builders under home building contracts. The reason for the additional costs is, in fact, the builders' delay in completing a contract. Consumers believe that they have completed a contract under the assumption that the contract is a fixed price. The fact that consumers believe that they have signed a contract at a fixed price leads them to believe that they are not liable for any further costs that occur in relation to the delay in completion of their homes.

Unfortunately, under the normal standard Housing Industry Association building contract, this is not so because other clauses in the contract relate to what is deemed to be a 'practical completion'. Complaints have been received that have shown that in some instances builders have claimed completion when very obviously there is still work required to be done or major defects are evident. I hope that there can be an agreement between the Housing Industry Association and Consumer Affairs to produce a contract which will not mislead consumers into believing that they have a fixed price and that the late completion of a building is of no financial penalty to them when, in fact, the exact opposite is the case.

It is unfortunate that many young people, and indeed other people, who are contemplating building do not know that they can seek advice from Consumer Affairs about the actual building contract. It would be of great benefit that wide publicity be given to the fact that people can seek advice before they actually sign a building contract, and I urge them to do so. I find it difficult to believe that the general public has to accept the situation that nothing can be done about the present situation because of the upturn in the building industry and because builders are working to their full capacity.

I believe that it should be mandatory upon builders to provide their customers with the correct information of the completion date of a home. It seems to me to be absolutely scurrilous that a company will continue to accept contracts and will continue to advertise and advise people that it can complete a building contract within, say, 15 weeks and knowing full well that at the time people sign these contracts it simply cannot be done. If people were given as near as possible a completion date of their home, they would be able to manage their finances accordingly and would not have to come up against the budgetary difficulties that I referred to earlier.

It would appear that building companies are accepting as many contracts as they possibly can without disclosing to their potential and their actual customers that they cannot complete the home building on the date specified. I fully appreciate that the industry is going at full bore and it is

not possible at all times to provide the necessary tradesmen, but I do believe that a more accurate date of completion of a building can be given than is the case at present. I have received correspondence from a Mr and Mrs A.R. Walker of 9 Sierra Nevada Boulevard, Pasadena, who are not constituents of mine, but I felt that their correspondence was so vital to this debate that I intend to read it to Parliament. Their letter states:

After reading the item in the 16 April 1984 *News* about the building situation, I felt compelled to write to you. Although we are not in your electorate, I feel someone must listen to our plight. We, too, are building our home through a building company, at Morphett Vale.

We are so frustrated, as there is nothing we can do about the pace our house is being built. It has now been three months since our house was physically started yet we have not even got the outside brickwork up. We made many phone calls to the builder and you cannot even speak to them on the phone. Two weeks ago I wrote them a letter pleading our financial plight and they did not even bother to reply to our letter.

We are paying \$100 a week rent plus \$262 on our loan, which has been through a month now. My husband has taken his long service leave, so that he can do jobs around the house. Now, that won't be possible, as he can't defer his leave. We are down the drain financially, and we are suffering mentally, as the financial strain is too great to bear, but whom do we complain to? No-one cares! The builders don't care. They can pass their losses on to the next home, but we can't do anything about our finances, except bear the loss.

We have a contract for our house to be completed in 12 weeks, but the contract is useless. Clearly, had we been told honestly how long we would be building our home, we would not have gone ahead. We feel the builder has been very deceitful. They must have known that they could not build that house in 12 weeks. It is time they were regulated as to how many homes they should be building if they cannot honour their contracts. And we know of other people in the same situation.

It's time somebody did something about it. And thank you for writing to the *News* about this subject. Yours etc.

I have also been contacted by a young lady who has signed a building contract in which the work commenced in September 1983 and should have been completed by 31 January 1984, but it still not completed. The house was so badly built that it had to be demolished in late January 1984. She was promised by the building company that it would be rebuilt and completed by April 1984. To date, the building has not reached the roof stage. It would seem to me to be manifestly unfair that somebody whose home was so badly built in the first instance that it had to be demolished (and therefore was not completed in accordance with the contract that had been signed) should be financially penalised. Unfortunately, a standard housing industry contract does not provide her with any redress in these circumstances.

My electorate office is receiving telephone calls from all over Adelaide naming various building companies which have stated that they would complete a building on a certain date and have not been able to do so. It is not uncommon for some of these home building projects to be at least six months behind schedule, with the consequential financial embarrassment to those people seeking a home. I believe that this situation is in desperate need of improvement. I believe that the situation need not continue as it is now. There is a need for better consumer protection in this area. It is my intention to continue to monitor the situation and, if this situation does not improve, then I intend to continue to pursue this matter in this House.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): Since the Minister of Agriculture announced yesterday his Government's intention to close the abattoir at Port Lincoln and the debate that subsequently followed today on that subject. I have learned that the Port Lincoln community is very upset about the impact of that announcement. None other than the Mayor of Port Lincoln, His Worship Tom Secker, has been on radio and signalled publicly his feelings on behalf of the

community at large. I am aware that Mayor Secker has requested the Government to reconsider its decision and keep open the works at Port Lincoln. The matter was canvassed by both the member for Flinders, understandably, and myself, representing the shadow Ministry of Agriculture on this side of the House this afternoon.

I would like to take this opportunity to summarise a proposal that I believe would be appropriate for the Government to consider, given all the circumstances surrounding the plight of those people on Eyre Peninsula who are involved with this matter. I hasten to add that I know the nature of the pressure that the Minister of Agriculture has encountered from the SAMCOR Board in relation to its desire to have the Government wash its hands of the abattoir service works at Port Lincoln. I know about this, because the SAMCOR people tried the same act on me when I became Minister of Agriculture shortly after the Tonkin Liberal Government took office in 1979. It did not let up throughout the period of the previous Government's term of office in its pursuit of seeking to have that arm of the SAMCOR operation closed down, irrespective of the impact that it would undoubtedly have on the community concerned. I believe that as a result of the pressure applied from that quarter the Minister of Agriculture has caved; he has become a victim of SAMCOR rather than a master of it. He has announced on behalf of the Government a decision which is unfair and unreasonable.

I formally ask in this Chamber that the Minister consider keeping open the present SAMCOR operation at Port Lincoln until the Government, with the assistance that the Minister has signalled may be available, and sees that a private operator is installed in a slaughtering premises that is capable of catering for the local trade at Port Lincoln, that is, a premises that can process about 400 to 500 smalls a week, which is the number of sheep carcasses that are consumed at the local level. Further, I ask that the Government ensure that those slaughter facilities or part of the slaughter facilities currently on the site of the Port Lincoln abattoir capable of coping with drought affected sheep due to seasonal circumstances are maintained and placed under the care, maintenance and control of the private operator in charge of the small service facility on site. When drought conditions occur on Eyre Peninsula such a facility could be reopened and occupied by casual labour for the period required to cater for the overflow of drought affected sheep. That has occurred over the years and undoubtedly that situation will arise again in the future.

I believe that that sort of approach to the matter would show due regard for local needs in regard to locally killed meat, bearing in mind that the Port Lincoln works as it stands is the only slaughtering facility within the Port Lincoln local government area. It is reasonable and indeed appropriate for that community with a population of about 10 000, with a significant growth potential, to have a facility that it deserves. The Government has signalled its intention to withdraw, and it seems to me that the proposal I have outlined is reasonable, having regard to that withdrawal, and that it would show regard for the community and at least some of those skilled workers who, under the Government's present proposal, would be automatically out of work on 30 June. The proposal I have outlined would have regard for those fat lamb producers who practise that farming pursuit in areas near Port Lincoln, embracing the southern region of Eyre Peninsula, and would provide an outlet for their lamb livestock. It would not have regard for the beef needs of that community, but I understand that the population in the area currently consumes an average of 25 bodies of beef a week, and to maintain a facility for the purposes of killing great stock, that is, cattle, to meet that local need would mean that a private operator would run

into the same sort of financial difficulties as indeed the Government has experienced.

I suggest, with due respect, regarding the supply of beef to that community, that the quantity indicated could well be supplied from outside and brought in as and when required. For sheep, the situation would be well covered. For pigs, the situation is already automatically catered for as Lincoln Bacon occupy on lease a section of the existing premises, and undoubtedly it would be wise for it to be retained under that operation. Whether or not the small slaughterhouse facility to cater for local needs is a new facility or is incorporated in the Lincoln Bacon occupied premise would be a matter for on-site consideration. However, it seems to me to be a reasonable compromise to approach the overall subject, accepting that indeed on sheer cold, hard, economic grounds the Government can sustain a case for their action. As indicated in my earlier address to the House this afternoon, on social, industrial, local and rural grounds there is no case at all for the Government to sustain its current announced position.

I make no apologies for raising the subject twice on this day. I know the sensitivity that surrounds the subject on Eyre Peninsula. I am aware of and understand their feelings as to their geographic location because I have lived and been involved in the grazing and breeding of livestock in an isolated community of the State, so it is not a new feeling or one that I do not fully appreciate. I can understand the emotion that is running at this stage. We all witnessed that when the member for Flinders rose in his place today to make his contribution. Emotion aside, and looking at the situation square on, it seems to me that an arrangement along the lines that I have outlined would be worthy of consideration, and I urge the Government at least to give the matter the consideration that I believe it deserves.

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I wish to use the time allotted to me in this debate this evening to raise several issues which have recently been brought to my attention by my constituents. The first of them relates to the policies and practices of a company known as Action Home Loans Pty Ltd. This company has recently advertised in the media, not just in South Australia but indeed throughout Australia, offering finance in relation to housing and also offering to sell mortgages at a secure investment.

This company was incorporated on 1 June 1982 under the name Commercial Storey Pty Ltd and on 6 June 1983 changed its name to Action Home Loan Pty Ltd. Being a money lender, this firm does not fall within the usual range of providers of housing finance such as banks, building societies, terminating housing societies, etc. The interest rates that it charges are far in excess of those normally charged for housing finance.

I would now like to quote from the Ministerial statement to the Queensland Parliament made on 7 February 1984 by the Hon. Mr Harper MLA, the Minister for Justice and also the Attorney-General. He said that he wished to take the opportunity to warn the House, and through it the general public, in relation to certain undesirable practices of the company that I have just named. In his Ministerial statement Mr Harper went on to say:

I draw to the attention of the House the provisions of section 4 of the Money Lenders Act whereby provision is made for the re-opening of transactions of money lenders in cases where the interest charged is excessive or the transaction in question is harsh and unconscionable or a Court of Equity would give relief.

From information available to me, it would seem that the firm, Action Home Loan Pty Ltd, is charging interest at rates of 19.8 per cent per annum in respect of a loan for a home, a rate I am certain all members would agree is well in excess of current market rates.

Moreover, in order to obtain such a loan borrowers are required to pay a large loan guarantee fee to a company, No Foxi Pty Ltd,

a company incorporated in New South Wales. What benefit to a borrower which could spring from such a payment is unknown. The Minister continued:

In all the circumstances I would urge persons having dealings with the firm Action Home Loan Pty Ltd to exercise the greatest degree of caution and to seek independent legal advice before entering into any relationship with that firm.

It has been further brought to my attention that an opinion was given by the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor in respect to specific matters relating to the transfer of a second bill of mortgage and additional clauses to second mortgage documents. While I am not at liberty to disclose the people who sought that opinion from the Commonwealth Crown Solicitor, it is important to pick up some of the things that the opinion talked about. Concerning clause 26 of the mortgage document, the Crown Solicitor says:

Clause 26 by imposing interest merely sets out the manner referred to in clause secondly. The only unusual feature about the interest is the automatic application of a 10 per cent higher rate of interest on all arrears. Reading clauses 26 and 28 in conjunction, it is alarming to note that the lower rate of interest is 22 per centum per annum and the higher rate 32 per centum per annum.

It is quite an amazingly high interest rate. The letter continues:

Clause 29 is particularly onerous. It empowers the mortgagee to vary the rates of interest within 62 days (a little over two months) from the date of posting of the notice to that effect to the mortgagor. No limit whatsoever is imposed upon the extent of the variation. The only way the mortgagor may escape the increase in interest is to repay the mortgage in full within 62 days . . . after the date of posting of the notice to the mortgagor advising of the variation of interest. If the mortgagor could not arrange to have the mortgage paid out in full within that time, he would be liable to pay the increased interest for the balance of the term which could be for a period in excess of 21 months.

It is my intention to raise with the Minister of Consumer Affairs this question at the earliest possible opportunity either by way of a question in this House or a direct letter from me. My constituent is very concerned that people in South Australia may be enticed to become involved with this company. In view of the very serious warning that has been given by the Queensland Attorney-General, I think that it would be a very responsible action on my part to raise this matter.

Mr Lewis: Joh is not—

Ms LENEHAN: It was not Joh who actually raised it; it was the Attorney-General, Mr Harper. The second issue I raise is a question that was brought to my attention by a recently retired pensioner who lives in my electorate. This person had decided that, rather than drive to Mount Gambier, he and his wife would take the train, as they were fairly interested in starting to travel more within South

Australia and Australia, and thought it would be a good test to see how well they enjoyed train travel. On making the booking they were asked whether they would like a non-smoking or smoking compartment. As my constituent suffers from very severe bronchial asthma he requested a non-smoking compartment. When the couple arrived at the station and boarded the train they sat in the seats allocated to them and soon discovered that everyone around them was smoking.

Being of genteel temperament, they quietly asked the guard if he would ask the people not to smoke because they had requested and, in fact, had been given seats in a non-smoking compartment. They were told that no non-smoking carriage had been set aside and that that was bad luck. As it turned out, there were five carriages on the Mount Gambier train for that trip, and that is quite unusual. Apparently there are normally only two carriages and my constituent found it strange that, even with five carriages, there was nowhere on the train that he and his wife could sit to have a comfortable journey.

The journey to Mount Gambier is of eight hours duration and, by the time my constituent had arrived, he was extremely distressed and extremely ill. When he came into my office he quietly and calmly said to me that the experience had been so horrendous that neither he nor his wife would travel on a train in the future (I am talking not about STA trains but rather Australian National trains) because they could not be guaranteed a seat where they would be free of cigarette smoke. I have made inquiries to different departments ranging from Australian National and have received conflicting answers about the sort of policy that exists. In fact, that train, the 'Bluebird', has continuous carriages and it is not possible to completely separate two carriages.

Once again I wish to state that I will be raising the matter with the State Minister of Transport and requesting that he initiate discussions with the Federal Minister in respect of the provision of clean air for those people in our community who have a physical problem, such as my constituent has, and who need to have this sort of facility if they are to be able to use public transport. Quite obviously, I do not have to state the effect that this must have on tourism in South Australia, because there are many people who have recently retired, who have money to spend, who would like to travel and see South Australia, who like the comfort and convenience of train travel, but who are not prepared to travel if they cannot be guaranteed a smoke-free environment.

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 3 May at 10.30 a.m.