

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 8 August 1984

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Max Brown)** took the Chair at 11.45 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: SALE OF RED MEAT

A petition signed by 17 340 residents of South Australia praying that the House support the sale of fresh red meat during late night shopping and Saturday trading was presented by Mr Olsen.

Petition received.

PETITION: HENS

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit battery egg production and de-beaking of hens and provide for the labelling of free range eggs was presented by Mr Oswald.

Petition received.

PETITION: TEACHERS

A petition signed by 22 members of the school community of Christies Beach Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to convert all contract teaching positions to all permanent positions, establish a permanent pool of relieving staff, improve the conditions of contract teachers and improve the rights and conditions of permanent teachers placed in temporary vacancies was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 70 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but that the House support the use of funds derived from gun licence and registration fees for the promotion of sporting activities was presented by the Hon. P.B. Arnold.

Petition received.

PETITION: CHILDREN'S SERVICES

A petition signed by 82 members of the Happy Valley Kindergarten community praying that the House urge the Government to delay implementing proposed changes to children's services in South Australia relating from the Coleman Report until the implications of the report can be discussed by all groups affected was presented by Ms Lenehan.

Petition received.

PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 52 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Before calling for questions, I indicate that any questions which normally would go to the Minister of Mines and Energy will be taken by the Minister for Environment and Planning.

PAROLE LAWS

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say why the six prisoners who escaped from Yatala Labour Prison on 28 June have been given the full 15-day remission on their sentences for the month of June under the Government's new parole laws? The escape involved the improper use of prison equipment and a shoot-out with prison warders. Yet, I have been informed that the six prisoners involved have been granted the maximum remission on their sentences for June even though the Act states that such remission applies only if the Director of Correctional Services is of the opinion that a prisoner has been of good behaviour. It has been reported to me that there is resentment and confusion amongst prison officers that such remission should have been granted. I am also advised that every prisoner in Yatala Prison was granted the full remission for June, whereas only 27 full remissions applied at Adelaide Gaol.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As I understand it, remissions are granted on the advice of the prison officers, but I have no knowledge of the particular matter that the Leader of the Opposition has raised in the most speculative and sensational sense. But, I guess that is what we have come to expect from him. I will refer the question to my colleague, the Minister of Correctional Services, in another place.

RESERVOIR DRIVE, FLAGSTAFF HILL

Mrs APPLEBY: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning give an assurance that every consideration has been given to the residents about the realignment of Reservoir Drive, Flagstaff Hill, in relation to noise abatement and the safety of the Happy Valley Reservoir from accidental run-off? With the recent announcement of the amended realignment plan for the construction of this important residential road link, it was reported in the press that the planned road would move between 10 and 100 metres closer to the reservoir, thus alleviating the noise problem from the housing development along the planned realignment. As the Minister is aware of the extensive public comment process that is taking place on this matter, residents are seeking assurance that the construction can now commence.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I am confident that the road can now proceed, although there may have to be some redesign in view of the fact that the alignment it will follow is other than what was previously envisaged. The Government was concerned in respect to this matter that there be a balance between two rather different sorts of environmental considerations: first, those environmental considerations which would arise from the possible impact of traffic on the reservoir which, of course, dictated I suppose as easterly an alignment as possible and, secondly, those considerations which arose from the impact of traffic on the amenity of local residents, which dictated as westerly an alignment as possible.

When an alignment was designated I gave a commitment to local people that we would proceed with that alignment only if noise amelioration measures satisfactory to the Government could be identified. A study was then undertaken which indicated, at least to me and to the Government, that in fact satisfactory noise amelioration measures could not

be adopted in relation to the more easterly alignment which was then proposed. Therefore, the Government re-examined the project in terms of the capacity to be able to protect the reservoir from the impact of traffic, possible accidents, and so on. We are now satisfied that it is possible to construct a road which is sufficiently far from the subdivided areas in Happy Valley for noise amelioration measures to be effective, but at the same time that it could be engineered in such a way that the impact on the reservoir is minimised.

The member for Brighton, who asks this question, and the City of Happy Valley have taken a very early interest in this matter, and correspondence is on the way to all of those people, as well as others who have raised it directly with the Government, indicating the content of this decision and the reasons for it. To return to the honourable member's question, yes, the project certainly can proceed.

PAROLE LAWS

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Is the Premier aware that a prisoner recently granted parole under the Government's new parole laws now faces a charge of murder, that another prisoner convicted of armed robbery and sentenced to 10 years gaol is due for release in October after serving only 16 months, and that another prisoner, gaol for seven years for manslaughter but recently released after serving only two years, is now back in gaol for a breach of parole?

The Opposition has been given information on each of these cases which raises serious questions about the application of the Government's new parole laws and the right of the public to protection from hardened criminals. I am informed that a man named Bromley was sentenced to five years gaol in March 1981 for rape, robbery with violence, common assault, assaulting police and breaking parole. He was released in April this year, but very soon after his release was charged with murder. The prisoner due for release in October, whom I will not name, was sentenced in June last year to 10 years imprisonment for armed robbery. Under the Government's new parole laws, he will serve only 16 months whereas, under the previous system, he would have served six years eight months, less time off for good behaviour. The third case that I raise involves a man named Graham, sentenced in April 1982 to seven years for manslaughter.

The Hon. Peter Duncan: Trial by—

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Elizabeth should be the last to get up in this place to criticise others for naming people in this House or to complain.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member will please come back to his explanation.

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Graham was released in April this year, but is now back in Adelaide Gaol for breach of parole and another offence. In view of these facts, I ask the Premier to investigate immediately the workings of his new parole laws.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: If the Opposition was serious in its attempt to raise questions about the operation of the Parole Act, the workings of the Parole Board and the release of prisoners, I would have thought that the appropriate venue to do it was in another place with the Ministers responsible for that, who then could be directly questioned.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have no objection to the Opposition's asking all the sorts of questions it wants, but quite clearly its intention in doing it in this way is to ensure that, by not asking the appropriate Minister, who may well have the facts and figures at his disposal because it is his area of portfolio responsibility and he may be able to respond

and thus spoil a good story, by asking it in this place in these circumstances, it can allow some time to elapse before answers will be educed.

It is very interesting that the Deputy Leader talks about circumstances that have been reported to him, alleged facts, persons whom he will not name, and so on. It is all very much caught up in information, received from who knows what source, which has been put here in order to try to get something running and not allow the facts to come out.

I simply say that I will refer all these matters to the appropriate Minister, who will in due course bring down a reply. If the Opposition is seeking the satisfaction of having its allegations running without any kind of response or reply, I guess that it can have that for a few hours.

LEISURE ACTIVITIES

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport inform the House whether he or his Department intends to take more positive action to encourage the community to participate in more energetic programmes following the release of the recent survey on South Australian leisure activities? The Minister released yesterday a survey on leisure activities of the community in South Australia. The survey indicates that a significant proportion of South Australians do not participate in active leisure pursuits, preferring a more passive type leisure. Perhaps there is a need to reverse this trend.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The purpose of the survey was to establish baseline data not only for the Department but also for commercial and community organisations seeking to provide the needs for leisure activities in South Australia. This is the first of four surveys which will be conducted over a period of time, not only from the departmental viewpoint but to give the community at large the opportunity to assess the needs from a recreation or leisure viewpoint. The first section of the result of the survey certainly indicated that people desire to do their own thing. They do not want structured or organised participation, particularly in recreation and leisure activities.

As I said, the public at large desires the opportunity to relax and utilise that leisure time, and that comes out fairly significantly in the reply. Many of us have varied interests. Not all of us desire to participate in more active forms of recreation and sport and the Department has to cater for the needs of the whole community. Those needs, of course, are determined by the community itself. We all have different needs and different opportunities to participate in recreational pursuits. A lot of us go to various functions which, as members of Parliament, we are asked to attend on a number of occasions, limiting the opportunities for Parliamentarians, I might add, to participate sufficiently in more active recreation.

As I mentioned yesterday, many of us are invited to functions. I have received a letter from the Hon. Murray Hill, on Legislative Council paper, addressed to the Enfield ALP Club. We remember, of course, that the Enfield ALP Club was the subject of quite a discussion in this House in the earlier part of this year, so the Enfield ALP Club has been honoured—privileged, perhaps—to receive this letter, which states:

I am writing to you and your association to invite you to our International Soiree, to be held at the Renaissance Tower in the Rundle Mall on 15 September 1984, at 7 p.m. John Olsen, the Leader of the South Australian Liberal Party, will be the guest of honour with his wife Julie. Fashions from Jennies of Unley and Bonacelli Menswear of the Hilton International will be paraded . . . The cost per person is \$16 for a four course dinner. I might add that it is much dearer than whiting and chips at the Windsor Hotel. The letter continues:

I would be delighted to see you and your friends [from the Enfield ALP Club] on this special night and be pleased to introduce you to John and Julie Olsen.

If that is the sort of activity that members of the public at large desire in South Australia, they are welcome to it.

SUPREME COURT INSPECTION

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Will the Premier investigate why a hired, chauffeur driven Mercedes Benz was used to transport an accused person to the scene of an alleged murder during a recent jury inspection of the scene? On 17 July the jury hearing a murder case in the Supreme Court inspected the scene of the alleged offence at Royston Park. The jury was driven to the scene in a minibus, while the accused was transported in a hired, chauffeur-driven Mercedes Benz. This inspection received wide media coverage, and a number of people have complained to me about this matter after having seen on television the accused's arriving in a Mercedes Benz. They want to know (and I believe that members of this House should know) why a more economical form of transportation was not used.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: What a grossly trivial question with which to waste the time of this House: what a grossly trivial matter on which to ask the Premier of South Australia to comment. Apparently I have some special knowledge of what sort of vehicles the courts are ordering to transport jurors and accused. The very hilarity of members opposite on the asking of this question indicates that it is not serious. It indicates the total sterility of the Opposition in coming up with any questions with which I, the Deputy Premier or any of the other front bench Ministers could deal. I will refer the question to the appropriate Minister and it will be dealt with in the appropriate way.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Local Government say what action will be taken in regard to the recently released report of the South Australian Waste Management Commission? In the *Advertiser* of 7 August 1984 the release of the report was referred to briefly on page 8. It was stated:

Adelaide could save about \$4 million a year on solid waste collection and disposal if the industry were better organised, according to Adelaide's first 10-year draft waste management plan.

Accordingly, I ask the Minister to comment on this.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: If I outline a little of the background of this matter it might put the whole subject into perspective. When I first became Minister of Local Government earlier this year, the now Minister of Public Works drew to my attention the situation that applied in South Australia in relation to the disposal of both our solid and our toxic liquid waste. Therefore, as one of my first tasks as Minister of Local Government I had a look at the system that applied in South Australia. Frankly, I must say that it seems to fall far short of an acceptable standard. At the time I did not really have anything with which to compare it, and it was recommended to me by people who know about these things that I should have a look at what is being done in Sydney, which was considered to be an ideal system that we might contemplate introducing here.

At the same time, I had received a report from the Waste Management Commission for consideration by the Government and for subsequent release for public comment. I held up that report for as long as was required to enable me to

have a look at the situation in New South Wales and also to allow the new members of the Waste Management Commission to have a look at that system. I know that in the interim period the contents of that report have become reasonably well known within the community. There is no big problem with that, although some members may have heard about some of the recommendations in the report while noticing that the report has not yet been released for public comment. That occurred because of the delay during the interim period to which I have referred.

As a result of what I saw in New South Wales I was convinced that we need drastic changes here in South Australia, because the standard here is not at all comparable. Also, when I was in North America recently I took advantage of the opportunity to have a look at the systems used there. I anticipated seeing some rather modern technological answers to the problem of waste disposal. However, I was surprised to find that in North America they still largely use landfill, and it seems to be the appropriate method to use in South Australia, particularly as we have a number of suitable areas, for example former quarries, that can be used for this purpose.

The disposal of waste is an incredibly important matter for us all to consider, and I would welcome the interest of members of Parliament to see how our waste disposal is managed in this State. Members might be interested in looking elsewhere to see how poorly a large number of our depots operate, because I think that they would be just as surprised as I was.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick interjecting:

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I do not believe that that interjection is relevant at this time. It is important for the community to have an appropriate disposal system, not only for reasons of health and environment, but also for tourism and a whole range of matters. It makes the city a better place in which to live and neater and tidier if waste is disposed of effectively. As a result of our inquiries, I have been able to release the report for public comment, and I expect comment from all interested bodies such as the waste management industry, local councils, the unions involved, and interested persons generally. I welcome the widest comment on this important matter. The Government's decision will have to wait until those comments are in and we can assess them. Then the Waste Management Commission, a statutory body, will assess those comments and make another recommendation to the Government. In reply to the honourable member's question, I will, as Minister, await the response to the report and then, hopefully, act with the utmost urgency to implement in South Australia a modern and effective waste disposal system.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Will the Premier guarantee that he will not allow the costs involved in the formation of the new Children's Services Office to bring about an increase in fees paid by parents to kindergartens?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I cannot answer that question.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am not sure what fees are referred to in relation to kindergartens. This question is almost identical to one that was asked last week by the honourable member. I have said that there will be a budgetary allocation for the establishment of a Children's Services Office and that, in fact, the overall costs of establishing such an office will be offset against efficiencies that will be produced by its establishment. I am at a loss to understand what the honourable member's question is aimed at. I simply

say that there will be efficiencies. I understand that as recently as last Monday the Board of the Kindergarten Union discussed the matter and formally supported the initiative taken in the matter, just as I told the House last week that the Kindergarten Union operatives (the professionals) supported it. So, I think that there is a general understanding—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: For the reasons I have given, we will see in this State an improvement and extension of children's services the like of which we have not seen for many years.

COUNCIL SITTING TIMES

Ms LENEHAN: Is the Minister of Local Government aware of a press report in the *Southern Times* which states that the new provisions of the Local Government Act requiring municipal councils to meet after 5 p.m., unless they unanimously resolve otherwise, will not come into force until after the next periodic council elections, which are due to be held in May next year? Can the Minister clarify this situation? There appears to be some confusion, particularly in my own area, about the provisions of the Local Government Act and when they will come into force. I have been contacted recently by a number of councillors in my area seeking clarification about this important matter.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Yes, I am aware of the report in the newspaper mentioned by the honourable member and, of course, the facts are wrong. The new amended Act which was passed by this Parliament last session will be proclaimed on 16 August, and it will be a requirement of councils to make a decision at the first meeting after the date of proclamation as to the hours of council meetings. Unless unanimously desired by councillors that they should meet at other than after 5 p.m., they will have to meet after 5 p.m. I know of one council in the honourable member's area, namely, the District Council of Noarlunga, which meets at 4 o'clock in the afternoon and it will be required to make a decision about its meeting times at the first meeting after the proclamation of the Act on 16 August.

I would like to take this opportunity of commenting briefly on the decision of the Adelaide City Council to meet in the evening. I was pleased to read a newspaper report of that meeting suggesting that the meeting was successful. Certainly, as it was reported, more ratepayers attended that meeting than normally attend meetings of the Adelaide City Council. Of course, that was one of the reasons for the Government's introducing legislation. I commend the City Council for meeting in the evening, and I hope that its experience allays some of the fears that it had about the difficulties of meeting in the evening. I also hope it allays some of the fears that were expressed by Opposition members when we debated that matter in this House. I expect that the Adelaide City Council and its ratepayers will benefit from that decision, as I expect the councillors and ratepayers of Noarlunga will benefit if that decision is made by the council at its first meeting after the proclamation date of 16 August.

CHILDREN'S SERVICES

Mr BAKER: Can the Premier state whether it is the policy of the Government that there be a progressive integration of child care within existing pre-school centres?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

SHIPPING TO JAPAN

Mr TRAINER: I address my question to the Minister of Marine.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRAINER: I am waiting for members opposite to calm down.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr TRAINER: I am waiting for them to calm down on the other side, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member for Torrens not to interject. The member for Ascot Park.

Mr Mathwin: When he starts his question, I will—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair is finding some difficulty in trying to stop this so-called interjection period that we are going through. I intend to get a little bit tougher on the situation. I think I have given fair warning.

Mr TRAINER: Is the Minister of Marine aware of speculation in Australian shipping circles that the South Australian Government is seeking to step outside the recognised conference system to arrange container freight between South Australia and Japan? A report in the shipping press last week and in the *Advertiser* on Saturday suggests that the Government is looking outside the conference system. This was rather a surprise to a number of people in the shipping industry, because the South Australian Government is known to have supported the conference system in the past.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: Yes, I am aware of those speculations. The whole question of direct shipping between Japan, South Korea and Port Adelaide remains unresolved. The South Australian Government through the Department of Marine and Harbors has been negotiating with ANSCON for a number of years. Those negotiations are being frustrated by ANSCON's refusal to reach agreement on a service to South Australia.

We must consider all options to provide South Australian importers and exporters with a shipping service. In the past, negotiations have been concluded successfully with conference operators for services between South Australia and both Europe and the Middle East. In fact, such gains have been made in those services that State Cabinet last Monday approved the calling of tenders for a second container crane at Outer Harbor I understand that that has been detailed today in a press release that was issued by the Premier.

The expenditure on this piece of equipment can be justified purely in terms of existing shipping services in and out of the port of Adelaide. These days, turnaround times in port are critical for modern container ships, and it is our responsibility to make our port as efficient as possible. We feel that the provision of a second crane should also make the port more attractive to shippers on the Australian north-bound routes. While we have always been strong supporters of the conference system, our faith in and respect for that system has not been reciprocated by ANSCON. Conference lines have been given monopoly powers under the Trade Practices Act, specifically for the purpose of providing services to Australian ports. Unfortunately, in the case of our negotiations with ANSCON, we believe that the members of that conference are failing to live up to their responsibilities.

As the Premier has said in his press release, it is clear that the subsidies on South Australian containers being offered by the port of Melbourne are playing a part in keeping ANSCON vessels out of Port Adelaide. This Government, at Ministerial and departmental levels, has taken up this matter with our colleagues in Victoria, who, understandably enough, are unmoved by our submissions. How-

ever, we feel that the subsidies they are offering are untenable and would not stand the test of commercial viability. We are pursuing shipping services between South Australia and Japan with the greatest vigour possible. I can assure the House that we will leave no stone unturned in our endeavours to try to achieve those direct shipping lines.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Then talk to Mr Cain.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I have said already that we have spoken to the Victorian Government.

CHILD PARENT CENTRES

Mr MATHWIN: Will the Premier give a guarantee that when the proposed Children's Services Office is formed Kindergarten Union teachers will be placed on the same footing as teachers in child parent centres in regard to terms, conditions and promotional opportunities? Does the Premier agree that all teachers in pre-school education should be placed on the same footing?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As the detailed administrative arrangements are worked out there will obviously be consultation and discussions with all those affected by this. That is under way at the moment.

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, indeed. The Minister of Education has a responsibility in a particular area. His responsibility includes the Education Department's parent child centres. It also includes the Kindergarten Union, so for education institutions of the type that are the subject of the question, at present that is the responsibility of the Minister of Education. I point out that children's services go well beyond that. They extend also to areas in which the Minister of Community Welfare has important responsibilities, and they extend to areas in which the Minister of Health has important responsibilities.

There is a wide departmental grouping of children's services responsibilities, so there is nothing out of order in the Minister of Education's having specific knowledge and responsibilities in respect of institutions about which the member asked in his question. I simply say that as part of this process we will of course be discussing with the various bodies exactly how they will operate. It is not the intention to intervene or affect the way in which individual kindergartens are running and delivering their services. On the contrary, I am suggesting to the House—as we have suggested throughout—that we are attempting to strengthen, expand and develop the whole range of children's services, as has been required. It is not before time that action was taken, because we inherited an enormous mess from the previous Minister in this area.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: So, the questions that are being asked on this matter will all be addressed and resolved over the next few months as we develop the proposals.

TRUCKING LOAD LIMIT

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: Will the Minister of Transport urgently reimpose the 10-tonne load limit on Heaslip Road at McDonald Park, and introduce a 60 km/h speed limit on that road? During the hard times of the Tonkin Government the Highways Department removed the 10-tonne load limit on Heaslip Road at McDonald Park, and thus converted a relatively minor country road into a speedway for semi-trailers and other through traffic. Heaslip Road now provides an alternative road connection between the Port Wakefield Road and the Gawler bypass road.

The sorry result of the Tonkin Government's actions can best be illustrated by quoting from a letter I have received from a constituent that amply demonstrates the importance of this matter and clearly indicates that this is not simply a question of parish pumpery. It is from Mr J. Stolcs, Heaslip Road, McDonald Park. I might say that I have also received a number of other letters concerning this matter. Mr Stolcs's letter states:

Dear Mr Duncan,

The residents of Heaslip Road, from Petheron to Curtiss Roads, are deeply concerned with the unsafe road conditions which have developed since the removal of the 10-tonne load limit on Heaslip Road in September 1981. They now request that the open speed limit on Heaslip Road from Womma Road to the Angle Vale Road be reduced to 60 km/h, and the 10-tonne load limit be reinstated in the interests of safety to local residents. The removal of the load limit in September 1981 has changed the previously safe and quiet local Heaslip/Angle Vale Road route into an unsafe and noisy interstate highway-bypass route. Because of the open speed and dense traffic growth, the single lane road is inadequate to provide for safe turning manoeuvres at intersections and for local residents trying to execute a right hand turn into their driveways. Overtaking manoeuvres also endanger opposing traffic, hence the presence of intense and long tyre marks are evident along the Heaslip Road pavement. Five residents from the Petheron-Curtiss section of Heaslip Road have had their cars written off or extensively damaged on Heaslip Road since September 1981.

Four people have been killed in three separate vehicle accidents on Heaslip Road between January 1984 and April 1984—

That is a very short period. Fatalities have been frequent on this road since the lifting of the 10-tonne limit in 1981. The letter continues:

A reply received from the Department of Environment and Planning on 12 July 1984 indicates that an Environmental Impact Assessment was not carried out by the Highways Department prior to the removal of the load limit on Angle Vale Road in September 1981. I also refer to the 'Notes on Administration', January 1982 publication.

I understand that is related to the guidelines for conducting environmental impact assessments. He continues:

Clauses 1.1.3 fourth paragraph reads: ensure that urban, regional and environmental considerations are fully assessed prior to the initiation of new transport systems or further development of existing systems.

Clause 1.1.4, third paragraph reads: improve safety of roads by reducing traffic accidents and the social impacts of these accidents on the community.

Were any of the above guidelines to the Act considered or implemented? The removal of the load limit certainly provided local residents with intolerable and unsafe road conditions. Examine the substandard turning truck manoeuvres on the Angle Vale/Heaslip Road Junction. This problem alone could not pass the Environmental Impact Assessment procedure. I am personally incensed that the Statutory Road Authority, the South Australian Highways Department, is permitted to exceed the powers vested to it under the Act.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now entering into comment.

The Hon. PETER DUNCAN: No, I am quoting from a letter forwarded to me. There is only one further paragraph, which states:

An Environmental Impact Assessment, if properly considered and implemented, I believe would not have resulted in the death of my son or of the many other fatalities which have occurred on the Heaslip and Angle Vale Roads since the removal of the load limit in September 1981.

That road has become known in the area as death row. It is urgently necessary that action be taken. I ask the Minister to consider this matter as quickly as possible.

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: There was considerable detail in the honourable member's question. I do not know why the restrictions were removed but, of course, I shall be happy to look into the matter. With respect to speed restrictions and limits, there would be a need to talk to the local council.

BANKSIA PARK FAMILY CENTRE

Mr ASHENDEN: Will the Premier give an assurance that the Banksia Park Family Centre will be given the same status as a child/parent centre and that it will be allowed to remain under the control of the Education Department, rather than being a part of the Children's Services Office? The Banksia Park Family Centre is unique in that it is a distinct part of the Banksia Park Primary School and Junior Primary School campus. However, it is controlled by the Kindergarten Union. At the same time, it is staffed by both Kindergarten Union and Education Department personnel.

I refer to a letter that has been forwarded to the Minister of Education by the President of the Management Committee of the Banksia Park Family Centre, as follows:

The Management Committee of Banksia Park Family Centre hereby expresses its great concern that the Kindergarten Union will become a part of the new Children's Services Office as announced by the Premier, Hon. J.C. BANNON.

The letter goes on to outline the reasons for concern. More importantly, it also states:

The Banksia Park Family Centre, currently a Kindergarten Union responsibility, and situated in the Banksia Park School campus, has a unique background and is strongly linked to both the Kindergarten Union and the Education Department by virtue of its history, location and staffing provisions.

The Premier's announcement leads us to believe that our centre will become responsible to the Children's Services Office. This decision is of great concern to the Management Committee of the Banksia Park Family Centre. As we have no guarantee that the Minister of Education will be in control of this office, we foresee that the unique nature of our centre may be threatened.

We strongly urge that the centre be preserved in its present form with no changes whatsoever to staff and structure and that it remain responsible to the Minister of Education.

Will the Premier give an assurance that the Banksia Park Family Centre will be given the status of a child/parent centre?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly prepared to look at the precise circumstances of the centre mentioned by the honourable member. However, I really think that the basis of the question and the reasons for concern raised by the centre, as mentioned by the honourable member, are quite misapplied and that there is a large misunderstanding of what the Children's Services Office concept is intended to do and what the effects of its operation will be. In other words, as I understand it—and I do not recall seeing the specific letter that the honourable member is referring to—

Mr Ashenden: It has gone to the Minister of Education.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Minister of Education tells me that he has replied to it. The Minister of Education may have something further to add after I have finished my reply. I will address myself to the general questions raised and leave the specifics to the Minister of Education. The general question, and the way in which those concerns have been raised, indicates a complete misunderstanding of what is intended. A series of assurances have been given, a number of false rumours have been spread (and I dealt with this last week) about what will happen with the Kindergarten Union. For instance, there was concern that standards and availability of pre-school education would somehow deteriorate. On the contrary, the Government has emphasised, and the whole Coleman exercise and all those things that have gone before it indicate, that we are attempting to achieve the very opposite. What Government in its right mind would want to ensure a deterioration of standards? What absolutely nonsensical proposition is that? That is the first point.

There is concern that the high level of parent and staff involvement would somehow be dissipated by this move. That is absolute nonsense! The intention is to reinforce that involvement and to reinforce it very strongly. We are told

that any additional funding will be at the expense of the education element, but that is not true. The funding provided for child care, considerably increased funding, we hope, will come from an association of programmes with the Commonwealth Government. That is another one of the impetuses, of course, behind the overall Children's Services Office. Specialist staff will still be employed. The member for Torrens keeps raising the questions, 'What of the administrative costs? Will they rob these kindergartens of their funds?' Of course they will not. I am not able to give precise costings, because the Budget has been formulated, as I announced, and a task force is in the field talking to people. I can assure the House—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I can assure members that the funds needed will be taken into account in the Budget. The overall intention is, in fact, to reduce the administrative costs in this area. Members just have to look at the administrative arrangements proposed to see why the cost is reduced. Members opposite keep talking about inefficiencies of administration and too many bureaucrats with not enough people out there, but that is precisely what we are addressing. The rumours go on and on. All I ask of members opposite is that, instead of for political reasons attempting to foment distrust and suspicion—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON:—they look at the information we are providing and listen to what people, not just from the Government but the operatives in the field, including the Kindergarten Union, are saying. Plenty of information has been provided and members can be assured that all their questions will be answered. It is as simple as that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Returning to the specific points made by the honourable member, I simply repeat that, in terms of the overall structure, the Government's intention and the way in which this will be funded, their fears are groundless. As to where they fit precisely in the administrative arrangements, that is something we will work out with them.

EDUCATION STANDARDS

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister of Education aware of the allegations made by educationist Mr Geoffrey Partington that 'schoolchildren are being driven out of South Australian Government schools in droves', that 'parents were switching children to private education because of widespread dissatisfaction with Government education', and more particularly that 'sex education courses were designed to change the sexual mores of the population'? I have received a number of angry teachers in my office who are concerned at the reflection on their integrity and their professional standards. Understandably, these teachers have taken strong exception to the statement that 'sex education courses were designed to change the sexual mores of the population'.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question on education. I might say that a number of the other specific questions asked earlier this morning could have been directed to me as the Minister whom the Premier has chosen to assist him in the Children's Services Office.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The basic issue of the Banksia Park family centre, the salary award rates of the Kindergarten

Union staff members and issues such as that are quite specifically within the purview of the Minister of Education. I would have thought that it would be appropriate to address such matters to me, especially as the member for Todd said that he had written to me but then chose not to give me the opportunity to answer the letter that has been written to me.

I think that that is a discourtesy in this House. As to the matter that has been raised by the member for Albert Park, I must also say that I was concerned about the attitude taken by Mr Partington in the *Sunday Mail* a couple of weeks ago. It is unfortunate that he chose such a negative attitude to try to discredit the education system in this State and, in particular, to attack the Government education system in this State. I do not feel that that is at all a constructive way of handling concerns he feels he has.

Not only has the member for Albert Park received angry calls from teachers and parents, indeed, I have received similar complaints from parents and teachers throughout South Australia who are concerned at the image that Mr Partington is seemingly trying to create. I will deal with a number of issues he raised regarding this matter. First, Mr Partington said that children are being driven in droves out of Government schools. I suggest that somebody who says that he deals with and studies education should have taken more time to study the demographics of what is happening between the Government and non-government sectors in this State. If he were to take that time he would understand some of the unusual features that really need explanation in this House.

First, it is not true that students are leaving Government schools and going to the non-government school system in droves. There has been an increase in non-government school enrolments in recent years in this State and the rate of that increase is slowing down. There has been a decline in the primary school sector due to demographic features in the Government sector, but an increase in the secondary school sector in Government schools in this State.

It is also true that there is, according to data recently provided to me, still spare capacity in the non-government school sector. If it were the case that children were being driven in droves, one would assume that the non-government school sector was full to capacity and could take no more students. In fact, that is not the case. A number of the new places that have been provided in the non-government school sector have been as a result of new non-government schools that have been built in areas that previously had been, according to the State average, under provided for in terms of non-government school bases—areas such as the northern suburbs, the southern suburbs and the like. In the past nine years schools have been built in those areas which means that the per thousand population number of places available in the non-government school sector has improved in those areas and come up to the State average.

The other reason is, of course, that there are some parents who are choosing to take their children out of the Government school system and put them into the non-government school system for reasons that, quite frankly, I regard as spurious and would reject. Indeed, I know that some of these reasons are the cause of anxiety to the Catholic Education Office and the Independent School Board. They are concerned that some of the motivations that parents give for moving their children from one sector to the other are not a fair reflection of the good quality of education that exists in both education systems in this State. They are wanting people to make conscious educational decisions on the basis of the particular philosophies that their schools follow as the basis for the reason for enrolling their children in those schools—not such sweeping statements as ‘There

is not enough discipline,’ or ‘There is not enough of this kind of curriculum or that kind of curriculum.’

In fact, the basic answer to that kind of situation is that Government schools provide an education for all children in this State who want that education and they, therefore, must provide for the diversity of expectations of all parents in South Australia. Of course, it is within the purview of non-government schools to set more limiting parameters as to what range of students they will seek to provide for. Therefore, that may make it easier for certain issues, such as discipline, to have a more distinct policy in certain non-government schools than is perhaps ordinarily the case in Government schools.

The other point made by Mr Partington was about widespread disaffection. That is quite clearly not sustained by examination of, among other things, survey data of people in South Australia. There was a very interesting survey of the community done some time ago now that analysed attitudes towards education. It is true that there were some people who had very negative attitudes towards education. It is also true that there were some people who had very negative attitudes towards various sectors of that education.

But, what is very interesting is that when that survey data was broken up into two groups—parents of children presently in schools and those who are not parents of children presently in schools (either their children have left school or they have never had children at school)—it was found that the most positive responses towards the education system in South Australia were from those who have children presently in schools. In other words, those who have the most immediate contact with the education system in South Australia are much happier about the quality of education in this State than are those who do not have children presently in schools and who are operating, for the most part, upon hearsay or upon the kind of stirring up that Mr Partington is assisting. I do not think that Mr Partington is helping in that kind of broader community understanding of the good quality of education we have here in South Australia.

The next point that Mr Partington raised, to which the member for Albert Park referred, related to sex education courses. Of course, we can all remember a certain honourable (or dishonourable) member in this House who took a very forthright line on this matter. Indeed, I can think that the campaign he conducted before the last election is one reason why we are here and the Opposition is where it is. That was a scurrilous attack on sex or health education courses in this State. Do members recall just how scurrilous that was, and that the then Victorian Liberal Minister of Education took a sideswipe at the former member for Brighton about the scurrilous remarks he made about the Victorian health education courses? So, he did not even gain any supporters in his own Party.

The facts of life are that the health education curriculum in this State has been carefully designed, starting in 1973, involving parents, teachers and health educators in various areas of the community. That very same health education curriculum that was designed after such careful work is being used in many non-government schools in South Australia—precisely the same curriculum! But, where did Mr Partington make the statement in that article that non-government schools in South Australia are undermining the sexual mores of students in this State? He did not say that, but the curriculum being followed in those schools is identical to the curriculum being followed in Government schools.

I believe that that kind of approach is negative. It will not promote a positive educational debate. I do not want to shy away from an educational debate about educational issues. It is important that there always be a positive and creative educational debate about differences in educational philosophy, which is entirely valid.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Self-examination.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, self-examination. But, I do not believe it is positive to have this kind of almost bear-baiting tactic. I also refer members to the article in the *Sunday Mail* last week which stated that Ardrossan Area School had taken exception to this matter and had referred it to that newspaper. That is an excellent example of the kind of things that are happening in schools throughout South Australia. I have visited more than 180 schools in this State since I have been a Minister. I have found numerous things that excite me in all the schools I see. There is something educationally innovative or exciting everywhere I go. More time and attention should be spent in promoting public debate in those areas, rather than harping in this bear-baiting type of tactic that Mr Partington has chosen to use.

CHILD CARE FUNDING

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Will the Treasurer say what undertakings have been provided to the Treasury by the Commonwealth Government regarding the ongoing responsibility for the cost of setting up and running subsidised child care centres? Will those subsidies be extended to include the many privately run child care centres in South Australia which, at the moment, are not eligible for assistance?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Extensive discussions are going on with the Federal Government which has announced, and I think demonstrated in the period in which it has been in office, that it sees Commonwealth support for child care services throughout Australia as being a very high priority indeed. It is one of the features, of course, of these programmes of which one must be in a position to take advantage. In other words, the Commonwealth does not simply say (and I think it is quite appropriate) that we should divide the money up on a per capita basis, and we will deal with that accordingly.

It is attempting to formulate a programme which is directed to need and to efficient use of those funds. We will not know, of course, until the Federal Budget just what further steps will be taken in this area by the Federal Government, but I know that my colleague the Minister of Community Welfare, in his discussions with his counterpart, and I, at a Premier to Prime Minister level, have been encouraged by the major financial support that the Commonwealth Government is prepared to put into this area. But I stress that it involves responsibilities of the States, too, to get their act together to ensure that those services are being delivered. The situation in relation to private child care centres I am not able to comment on at this stage, but no doubt further information on that will be forthcoming after the Commonwealth Budget.

[Sitting suspended from 12.51 to 2.15 p.m.]

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: REFERENCE TO MEMBER

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ASHENDEN: During Question Time the Minister of Education, in answer to a question from the member for Albert Park, referred to me. He said:

I would have thought that it would be appropriate to address such matters to me, especially as the member for Todd said that he had written to me . . . I think that it is a discourtesy in this House.

He was referring to the fact that I addressed a question to the Premier rather than to him, as Minister of Education. I wish to assure the House that there was no intention on my part to show any discourtesy to this House or the Minister of Education. The reason I addressed my question to the Premier is that he is now the Minister in charge of the matter about which I have been questioning. At the time I wrote the letter to the Minister of Education he was in charge of that matter. I want to make it clear that that is why in the first case I wrote to the Minister, but in the second case addressed my question to the Premier. As I said, I assure the House that no discourtesy was intended by me either to the Minister or the House.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 7 August. Page 80.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support the motion. At the outset, I express my personal sympathies to the families of those former members who are no longer with us, in particular, Ernest Claude Allen, who was the member for Burra from 1968 to 1970 and member for Frome from 1970 to 1977, of Charles John Wells, the member for Florey from 1970 to 1979, and also the families of two members who passed away earlier, namely, of Harold Welbourn King, who was member for Chaffey from 1956 to 1962 and of Howard O'Neill, who was member for Florey from 1979 to 1982. I express my deep sympathies to the members of their families in their sad losses.

I intend to deal with a number of issues raised in His Excellency's Speech as they relate to this Government's running of South Australia and, in particular, I will consider the current unemployment levels; the massive tax increases that have occurred; activities in the housing industry; the rural recovery and the rural sector generally; the industrial situation; education; pride in our State; matters relating to Aborigines; the uranium nuclear issue and energy generally; and the compulsory classification of video tapes.

When we see it stated in the Governor's Speech on behalf of the Government that things appear to have improved in this State, we certainly must look at the position realistically and not be blinded by figures. On the one hand, while one has to be pleased that there apparently has been a strong growth in employment, with more than 20 000 jobs being created in the past twelve months, we must not forget the fact that this rate of growth in employment has been below the national average. In the year to June, employment in South Australia increased by about 3.7 per cent, whereas the national growth was 3.9 per cent. If one wants to consider specific States, one can take as a comparison with our 3.7 per cent growth the growth in New South Wales of 3.9 per cent, of 5.2 per cent in Western Australia and of 5.7 per cent in Queensland. So, South Australia is still running behind, unfortunately.

Again, we should not forget that South Australia still has about 1 200 fewer people in employment than was the case in November 1982 and some 2 400 more people registered as unemployed. Therefore, although the figure of 20 000 sounds very positive (and to some extent it is), unfortunately the State is not progressing as perhaps it should be.

I refer to a table of comparative figures based on estimates, published in the summer 1984 journal of the Institute of Public Affairs Review. Although the figures are some six months old, the table shows State taxation increases from 1982-83 to 1983-84 as follows: Western Australia led the way with a 23.4 per cent increase in taxation; second was South Australia with a 14.3 per cent increase at that stage;

Victoria had a 13.7 per cent increase; and New South Wales had a 9.2 per cent increase. Queensland had a rise of 4.9 per cent, and Tasmania a 4.8 per cent increase. It can be seen very clearly that the two non-Labor States had a very low increase in State taxation charges for that period as compared to the increase in South Australia. Since those figures were released on estimates we now have an indication from IPA figures that there has been an increase of 21 per cent in State taxation over the past 12-month period. This is very disappointing at a time when we are trying to get the economy going. How can that be done if State taxes continue to place unnecessary burdens on people?

The housing sector is mentioned in the Governor's Speech. The way things are progressing in that respect all looks very pleasing; I am aware, for example, that many new houses are being constructed in the electorate of Goyder by the public and private sectors. I must thank the Minister of Housing for the assistance that he has given to quite a few residents in my electorate. However, there are some disconcerting factors associated with this increase in housing activity. In fact, the Real Estate Institute has just released figures which show that home prices in Adelaide are increasing at a rate faster than that in any other capital city. According to the Institute's figures, in 1983-84 home prices in Adelaide leapt by 25 per cent. By way of comparison I point out that the rise in Melbourne was 17 per cent; in Sydney, 5 per cent; and in Brisbane, only 3 per cent. Therefore, we must be very careful to ensure that the mad price spiral does not start all over again because in the long term that will not benefit the State.

In regard to Housing Trust development, it is disappointing that in Maitland, for example, the Trust has not taken into account at all times the aesthetic appearance of houses. About two years ago, four Housing Trust homes were constructed in Maitland. They were very neat, brick veneer, tiled roof houses. In fact, in certain cases they uplifted the area in which they were constructed and people were happy to see such houses being constructed. However, unfortunately, the latest house to be constructed in Maitland was of fibro construction, built in an area where all the other houses are of brick or stone construction. That house is not in keeping with the surrounding area at all. This is surprising when one considers that 12 months previously the trust had built brick veneer houses for almost the same price.

If the price differential had been enormous, one could have understood a reversion to the fibro type of house construction, but it is disappointing to the residents and to me because this type of fibro house is not in keeping with the area. Further, another house is planned for the area. When the Trust has shown in past years that it can blend in with the environment and has done everything possible in that direction, I do not know why it should take such a backward step.

His Excellency's Speech states that the economy remains uneven and fragile. Certainly, that statement acknowledges reality. The following statement is also made:

The rural uplift which marks the turning point in the cycle of recession cannot be expected to continue in the absence of good seasons.

There then follows a passage about the rains. I am pleased that the seasonal factor is acknowledged, because the rural recovery must be seen as a major factor in the recovery of the State as a whole. I remember going around my district during the drought when business after business expressed gloom—and rightly so. One machinery dealer said that he had a debt of \$600 000 with no possible sales on his books. He was then employing 10 persons but, within a few weeks of my seeing him, all but two of them had been put off—tragically. Since the recovery, that business has recovered from that enormous debt and is now trading satisfactorily,

but the disappointing feature is that it is only employing three persons whereas 10 were employed about two years ago. The rural industry is on tenterhooks at present and must be watched carefully. Often it is easy for us to think that the economy is going from strength to strength when really it is much in the balance. I hope that we have a good season, possibly an above-average season, although indications of the latter are lacking at this time.

Other things that have influenced the well-being of the rural sector include the need for people to be put on to a four-day instead of a five-day working week. Another company has put its employees on to contract time so that they can be brought in for the day if and when they are needed. If they are not needed, they are not employed. This sort of thing is often missed in the analysis of figures when considering the recovery of the State as a whole. True, people are being employed, but how many are employed on contract? In conjunction with the rural uplift, I refer to the following statement at page 6 of His Excellency's Speech:

The Government's economic strategy will continue to be directed towards encouraging South Australian industry to become more competitive.

However, I question how genuine the Government is in making that statement. Let us be honest: industry in South Australia is not competitive in many areas at present. Why not? Most of the reasons can be traced back to things introduced over past years; for example, the 17½ per cent holiday pay loading. When I was employed at the time the loading was introduced, unfortunately I misread the instruction on it and said to a workmate, 'Well, I guess it's a bit disappointing that we have to take a 17½ per cent pay cut for our holidays, yet we should be thankful that we are getting some holiday pay.'

The truth came out that we were not getting a cut in wages for our holidays but we were getting a bonus for holidays. I believe that that had a significant effect on the small business sector very quickly and it has had an effect on large business over some time when it was realised just how much it cost them.

Mr Gregory: Did you give that money back?

Mr MEIER: I do not think that was a point at issue at that time. The second point I wish to raise is the nine-day fortnight that has crept in. Certainly, I suppose any normal person in any area of employment would opt for a nine-day fortnight instead of a 10-day fortnight if he was given the chance to do so. I suppose if he was asked whether he would like to work seven days instead of 10 days in a fortnight for the same money he would be a fool to say that he would prefer to work for 10 days for the same money. Of course a person will take benefits that are offered, but what is that doing for the economy of our State?

If it had the effect of increasing employment I would be the first to give it the stamp of approval. However, recently I asked a person who was working a nine-day fortnight whether it had meant an increase in employment in his particular industry. He said that the opposite had happened and the firm was still putting people off. The effect has been negative. Of course, if an employer pays the same money for a nine-day fortnight as he does for a 10-day fortnight he is losing one day's productivity from each worker.

Long service leave is another factor that has had a definite effect on the economy. We are very fortunate to have long service leave but I believe it can be overdone. I was pleased to see in the *Sunday Mail* of 5 August an article by a Mrs Ivy Taylor which stated:

Cleaning lady Ivy Taylor has an angry message for the South Australian Labour Department: 'Don't rock the boat. If they can't help us they shouldn't hinder us,' she said yesterday, mop in hand and verbal guns blazing. Mrs Taylor was giving her view

on the department's warning that cleaners should expect long service leave from their casual employers . . .

'The department is putting in jeopardy the few bob that people like us can earn,' she said indignantly. 'How dare they jeopardise our jobs. Nobody is going to employ us if they have to pay long service leave too. It's just too much—it's absolutely ridiculous,' she said.

It is a pity there are not more Mrs Taylors around. I often wonder just how often the—

Mr Gregory: He supports sweat shops.

Mr MEIER:—ordinary working person has any input into policies that will guarantee employment for the maximum number of people.

Mr Gregory: On a minimum wage.

Mr MEIER: Listen to the member for Florey, who says that I support sweat shops. I wonder what his support is for the unemployed.

Mr Mathwin: Would he know what sweat was?

Mr MEIER: It is not for me to say whether or not he knows what sweat is. Recently I attended a meeting of the Triangle CYSS (Community Youth Support Scheme) at Kadina, where it became obvious that many of the unemployed youth at the meeting believed that the privileged people who have jobs are making sure that they cement their positions so firmly that there is little likelihood of others getting work. These employed people have terrific long service leave, good superannuation schemes, holiday pay loading, and the highest possible wage the employers will agree to. I believe many people would love to get a job at a lower rate of pay, but cannot.

It was interesting to hear on the radio last week a report that General Motors might become simply an assembly plant. When I heard that, it went through my mind that it is obvious that this situation could occur. General Motors could be pushed into becoming an assembly plant because of the people who demanded better conditions, better pay and all the privileges that they could possibly get. General Motors is being pushed into the position of being unable to afford to manufacture motor vehicles here and it could become an assembler of imported parts.

They are the people who decided they wanted the best 10 or 20 years ago and who were determined that their job was the most important thing and who, in relation to the others who did not have jobs, said 'Well, too bad. See how things go; there might be a chance in some industries for you to get employment.'

Furthermore, in the Governor's Speech, in relation to workers compensation, there is the following statement:

Accordingly a Bill to overhaul existing legislation will be put before you—

that means us, the Parliamentarians—

during the coming session. A further area of industrial law requiring review is that of workers compensation legislation.

I hope that the Government will look at the Liberal Party policy on workers compensation which would mean a reduction in costs overall of about 20 per cent. It will be interesting to see the workers compensation legislation that comes before us. The Liberal Party has recognised this problem for a long time and it has seen the negative effect it has had on the development of business and industry in this State. I will be looking forward to seeing what sort of legislation is forthcoming in this respect.

In relation to education I wish to quote from the Governor's Speech as follows:

The education, health and welfare of all its citizens remains the highest priority of my Government.

It then itemises specific examples as follows:

. . . a significant number of contract teaching positions will be made permanent to ensure greater stability and certainty within the education system.

All of that sounds very good. However, I am very disappointed to have been approached by a contract teacher recently who showed me the SAIT rep's newsletter dated 12 July 1984, which states:

The current issues of the Teachers Journal carries a notice that a list of SAIT members who are seeking permanent employment will be published in a forthcoming issue of the Teachers Journal. Only members who indicate to SAIT that they wish to be placed on the list will be on that list.

Further on it states:

The publication of this list is a step to ensure that both SAIT's and the Government's policy of preference of employment to unionists will be adhered to. It will be a statement to the Government and to permanent members that these are the teachers who should be given jobs.

Unfortunately, in this State the right to work is not automatic. In the teaching game the right to work depends on whether one is a member of a union or not. In other words, it is clear blackmail, clear discrimination. It makes a mockery of the other aspect in the Speech where there is reference to discrimination laws on sex and race but when it comes down to work, discrimination will remain. These types of things will not help the development of this State.

The teacher who saw me said that she wanted to get off the contract situation and become a permanent employee of the department. She said that she would be quite happy to take a lower salary as a teacher and acknowledged that unionists fought for higher wages. However, she also acknowledged the right that she does not have to accept it and yet, to gain a teaching position, she has to become a union member. It is disappointing when people have the right to accept the wage rises but in turn have to be a member of a union. We heard some classic examples yesterday from the Leader of the Opposition about the blackmail tactics going on in various industries in South Australia. There is no other word for it.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Did the principal have to take that step? Do you know?

Mr MEIER: The teacher had not made up her mind whether she would become a member of the union or not, yet she knew that if she did not she would have little chance of becoming appointed permanently and she would not have equality of opportunity for a teaching position in this State. I have not seen the advertisement, but I have heard on the radio *Advance Australia Fair* played slightly out of tune and some mention of the accord. We should have the Concorde flying the present Labor Government out of this country and then we might be able to get on with re-establishing Australia to the position it once held.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It would not be fast enough!

Mr MEIER: As the member for Torrens said, it would not be fast enough. I raise another point about the education issue, which many people in this State do not appreciate. It is about religious freedom not being inalienable. I shall read from an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 7 July this year, in which it was stated:

The Supreme Court yesterday ruled there was no inalienable right to freedom of religion in South Australia.

That relates to a judgment of the Full Bench of the court and to a refusal of registration for a small Christian fundamentalist non-government school. Further on in the article it is stated:

Mr Justice White said in his decision that if a particular statute impinged 'upon the rights to freedom of religious worship and expression of opinion of a sufficient number of citizens, the remedy lies in the ballot box, not in an appeal to the Supreme Court to declare the law invalid.'

I bring that matter to members' attention because we are often told in this State how lucky we are to have religious freedom and freedom in so many other areas. Yet we must acknowledge that we do not necessarily have the inalienable

right to freedom of religion. At the Commonwealth level it is a different matter. In fact, the report continues:

Mr Justice White said that while the Commonwealth Parliament was prevented from restricting religious freedom under the Australian Constitution, this did not fetter the Parliament of the State of South Australia.

So, we see that the Commonwealth Parliament cannot impinge on religious freedom but that the State Parliament can.

It is interesting to compare ourselves with the Eastern bloc countries. In a sense it could well be that we are not necessarily any better off than they are with respect to freedoms.

The other matter relating to education and to the fact that the Government is giving it higher priority made me smile on one occasion because, as the Minister would be well aware, there was a TAFE college at Kadina on Yorke Peninsula which for some 17 days from 1 July in this financial year did not have an official principal or acting principal in charge of it. Members of the council were disappointed that this happened because it was not as though they had sat back and done nothing about it. Overtures had been made some time before 1 July reminding the person in charge of the appointment that no principal had yet been appointed or that no-one had been appointed to act in that capacity. More than two weeks later it was found that still no-one had been appointed after the start of the new financial year.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: An amalgamation was involved and a good deal of reorganisation was taking place in that regard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I hope that the Minister of Education is not making a speech.

Mr MEIER: I acknowledge that the Minister has commented on what I said. I do not think that it is appropriate to use as an excuse the fact that there was also an amalgamation issue going on at the same time. I acknowledge that the situation has been corrected and was corrected very promptly once the council brought it to the attention of the appropriate department. I hope that what is said in the Address in Reply debate will be true and that high priority will continue to be given to education, because the Minister of Education hears from me quite regularly about some of the 34 (I think) schools in my electorate.

The next point in the Governor's Speech which I wish to consider very briefly is the following:

The success of the South Australian Sports Institute is now being reflected in the performances of South Australian sports men and women at an international level.

My word! We must be very pleased with the performance of our South Australian athletes at the Olympic Games and certainly what the South Australian Sports Institute has done in this respect must be commended and it must be congratulated on that. Another thing that emerged from the Olympic Games and the South Australian Sports Institute is that I feel that South Australians and Australians generally must have had a real sense of pride to see our athletes win gold, silver and bronze medals, and to see the Australian flag and hear the Australian anthem being played certainly did something to my inner feeling. It is in this respect that I draw to the attention of this Government the fact that we, as South Australians, should be doing something for our State in this respect by waving the South Australian flag a little more.

I am still terribly disappointed that the Premier has not gone back on his word and states that he will not make a mere \$16 000 available to supply some 400 flags so that schools and certain other organisations that would fit into the criteria could get free South Australian flags. Since bringing up that matter, many people have approached me

and expressed their disappointment. Of course, the Commonwealth flag is being flown far and wide, and that is very pleasing, too. However, I think that since the South Australian flag is available and used to be made available freely and this Government now states, 'No, we are not interested in that—'

Mr Gregory: Have you got one flying out the front of your house?

Mr MEIER: No, I have not.

Mr Gregory: Why haven't you?

Mr MEIER: I have got one on my office desk. I have a photograph. I do not know whether the honourable member wants me to decorate the whole thing with flags. What is the reasoning of the interjection, anyway?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Appleby): Order! Would the honourable member continue the debate?

Mr MEIER: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. I hope that the Premier rethinks the matter, especially as we heard the Deputy Premier say yesterday that an approximate figure (and he did not want to be held to it) in relation to policing the Roxby Downs demonstration could be of the order of \$1 million. I am talking about \$16 000—not \$1 million, not even \$500 000, not even \$250 000, not even one-eighth of \$1 million. However, the Premier said, 'No, we have other more important pressing things towards which the money could go.' I would like to see our State promoted a little more, especially in view of the approaching sesqui-centenary.

Mr Hamilton: Would you like to carry the flag up and down King William Street?

Mr MEIER: If the honourable member understood what the money is to be used for, he would not make such inane interjections.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: The next point concerns the Aboriginal community and aspects that have been mentioned in the Governor's Speech. It drew to my attention a report in the *Advertiser* recently, by reporter Eric Wisgard, entitled 'South Australia's "Third World" Disaster Zone,' which states:

An outspoken Ceduna dentist is fighting to take Aborigines out of Third World conditions at the Yalata community on South Australia's Far West Coast and into the twentieth century. His name is Dr Don Urquhart . . .

Many statements are made in the article, but Dr Urquhart is further reported as follows:

I am appalled at the continuing saga of violence, disease and despair . . . Alcohol abuse among Yalata Aborigines had reached endemic proportions. Nothing is sacred. Tribal elders have been known to be bashed by gangs of drunken, marauding Aboriginal youths looking for thrills. 'The fractured skulls, femurs, ulnars, tibias, pelvises, facial bones and stab wounds, chest injuries, etc. arrive monotonously on our hospital doorstep,' the doctor said.

Alcohol abuse has led to a marked decline in health. Venereal disease, diabetes, tuberculosis, skin disorders, trachoma, infections of all types and kidney and liver malfunctions are rampant. 'The community is physically destroying itself through the constant, unrelenting alcohol abuse,' the doctor said.

I feel that the House might in its wisdom reflect back to 1967 (I believe it was), when the then Attorney-General was one pusher to see that the Aborigines were allowed access to alcohol. This is what has happened. However, that was the first part. Next, we see a report in the *Advertiser* by Eric Wisgard the following day in which the Minister of Health voices off as follows:

A Ceduna dentist was told 'in no uncertain terms' by the South Australian Minister of Health, Dr Cornwall, yesterday that he had done a disservice to the Yalata Aboriginal community by making out-spoken comments about it.

Dr Urquhart said yesterday he had rung Dr Cornwall to question him about statements he (Dr Cornwall) had made on ABC radio about the establishment of community-based Aboriginal health programmes. He had been told Dr Cornwall was at a meeting and unavailable, but as soon as he identified himself, Dr Cornwall had come to the telephone immediately. 'He then abused me for 10 minutes,' Dr Urquhart said. 'He said I was insensitive and

unintelligent and that I had done the Aboriginals at Yalata a grave disservice.'

So, the Minister is entitled to his comments, although one questions whether we are entitled to our comments. From the way that the Minister went off at the dentist, it seems that even freedom of speech might be questionable in this State. However, yesterday (August 7) an article by Matt Abraham, which appeared on the front page of the *Advertiser*, stated:

The State Government will introduce tough controls on alcohol on Aboriginal lands in South Australia, including powers for total prohibition. The Yalata Aboriginal community will be able to ban or confiscate alcohol throughout its 456 000 hectare reserve on South Australia's Far West Coast. All other South Australian Aboriginal communities will be able to apply for similar controls.

I wonder about this. The Minister of Health seemed to go overboard in saying that there was no right to bring up this matter, yet a short time later we hear the Government of which he is a Minister acknowledging the problem, thankfully, and saying that it will endeavour to do something about it. Perhaps the only disturbing feature of the article was the paragraph which stated (and I think that it is attributed to the appropriate Minister, the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs):

The Yalata problems had begun when the people were removed from their Maralinga lands for the atomic testing programme in the 1950s and attempts had been made to solve the problems by authorities ranging from church missionaries to governments.

Let us be honest. There was one fact missing: alcohol was introduced in 1967, thanks to the efforts of the then Attorney-General, Mr Dunstan. The Aboriginal problem is certainly a long way from being solved. I am pleased that we still have the right of freedom of speech, despite comments from the Minister in South Australia which perhaps gave an indication that one has no right to bring up this issue. However, unless we do so these problems will not be solved.

I refer to another aspect of the rural sector. At paragraph 18 of his Speech the Governor stated:

The prosperity of the rural sector remains an essential base of the continued prosperity of the State as a whole. My Government is well aware of the need for continued agricultural research and development, and has undertaken a programme to relocate and develop the Department of Agriculture's Research Centres to ensure a more effective service for the rural community.

That is a vague statement. The Government has acknowledged the importance of the rural sector, but as I have said before the rural sector is still a really downtrodden sector, unable to get on its feet properly, and the Government is not helping it at all. I refer to the vegetation clearance controls and the hassles that occurred in that respect, which still have not been solved by any means. We will probably hear more about that in the present session, and I refer also to the pressure on the Port Lincoln abattoirs and on meatworks generally. In fact, local meatworks have suffered real disadvantages due to small, often one-man butcher shops being told to spend up to \$12 000 or \$20 000 to get things up to a certain standard and having a very limited time to do so. A maximum amount of time should be given in which to raise standards.

Mr Gregory: Allow them to keep on doing that and destroy our livestock meat export trade, I suppose.

Mr MEIER: These local small slaughterhouses are not exporting any meat. They process local meat and have been doing so for many years. Weed and pest control in national parks has not been looked after in the past year, although the Minister gave an undertaking last year that money would be made available this year for pest and weed control. I certainly hope that that will be the case, because farmers are being put under terrific pressure and in fact are subject to fines if they do not look after their weeds, yet over the past 12 months or more the Government has escaped that responsibility which it should have accepted.

The rural sector has suffered a lot from Australian National rail cartage charges rising phenomenally in some cases while the service that the rural sector would like is not being provided. I realise that the State Government has no control over that, but I wish it would put more pressure on the Commonwealth, and therefore on Australian National, so that the needs of rural people can be met. Australian National should strive to become really competitive and thereby attract freight that is currently being transported on our roads, causing their rapid deterioration.

Mr Hamilton: That is a rather interesting comment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Will the member for Albert Park please desist from interjecting.

Mr MEIER: We have a rail system that I believe can offer an excellent service to certain areas and it is a tragedy to see those services being decreased. I have certainly written to Australian National and to other people imploring that certain services be reinstated and that further closures do not occur, but I seem to have had no success.

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: If we are to start pointing the bone, we had better start looking at both sides very carefully. I am talking about what has occurred during the term of the present Government. Many taxes have increased. I think the latest count indicated that about 134 increases in taxes and charges have occurred since the present Government came to power after promising that there would be no increases in taxes and that charges would not be used as a form of backdoor taxation. At the time I applauded that, but the Government has broken that promise 134 times.

Mr Ferguson: But you wanted to buy more flags.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Henley Beach refrain from interjecting.

Mr MEIER: It should be remembered that the flags were in when the Liberal Party was in Government. I wish members opposite could convince the Premier to spend a measly \$16 000; his Deputy is happy to spend a million on Roxby. I want to refer to some of those taxes as they affect rural people. The petrol products licence fee on the value of motor spirit has been increased from 4.5 per cent to 7.5 per cent. That affects farmers and the entire rural economy, because it is so dependent on transport and farmers have massive fuel bills, simply from preparing and getting the grain in. Liquor licences have increased from 9 per cent to 12 per cent. There are some 36 hotels in the electorate of Goyder, and that increase will possibly affect part-time jobs. We have heard much about the financial institutions duty. I am sure the Premier acknowledges that that was a retrograde step. People on Yorke Peninsula who have previously banked with their local bank in some cases have taken their banking to another State (and I was told this by a bank manager). Need I say that they have taken their business to Queensland.

Pastoral rents have risen 50 per cent. The Fisheries Act licence fees have increased by 33 per cent to 50 per cent. That occurred in June 1982. Pilotage, wharfage and tonnage rates have risen by between 12 per cent and 50 per cent, with particular effect on the CBH operations, as it applies to barley, wheat and peas. There are many charges associated with the handling of grain and this increase simply adds another impost on the rural producer. Registration of stock medicine is up between 233 per cent and 500 per cent, a significant increase. The licence fee for firearms is up between 33 per cent and 50 per cent. Fees for abalone authorities have risen between 84 per cent and 107 per cent. In many of these instances we are not looking at small increases. The cost of log books is up by 733 per cent. Even people involved with keeping the books for transport operations are finding it more and more difficult to make a living. Licence fees to keep l.p.g. and flammable liquids on premises have risen by 25 per cent. It is all very well for the Gas Company to

say that gas provides cheap heating: I agree that it is effective, but people in the country are particularly affected by the storage costs associated with having l.p.g. Rock lobster pot fees are up 233 per cent. The poor old fishermen are really getting hit for six. Authorities to take prawns in the St Vincent Gulf are up 121 per cent.

Mr Groom: When was that?

Mr MEIER: October 1983. Registration fees for all courses and tuition fees for some courses introduced for the 1984 academic year at TAFE colleges have increased. TAFE is one means by which people who have left school are able to further their education. Under the Meat Hygiene Act licence fees for abattoirs and slaughterhouses are up 233 per cent. Further, annual rents are to rise by 300 per cent for shacks, and people are very disappointed and upset about that. I do not know whether the Minister has a shack at Edithburgh. Other people in adjacent council areas are most disturbed. It is obvious that in many areas the Government is ruling by tax and not by economic development.

Today, we have a classic case where Mr Hayden (Minister for Foreign Affairs) has apparently made a veiled threat toward America by saying that it should get down to some sort of nuclear arms talks or else Australia might not let it use our bases.

Mr Becker: He's never in Australia.

Mr MEIER: Yes, but I suppose that he is on a winning wicket compared to the Prime Minister in that respect. This nuclear issue is a complete bugbear within the Labor Party and within the Labor Government. Does the Labor Party intend to take us back to the horse-and-buggy days and deny us the benefits of technology in the future by holding us back? If we are to progress we must be realistic and take up future challenges including the provision of appropriate safeguards in the nuclear industry. We have already come a long way in that respect and have shown that we can look after nuclear waste. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition showed clearly that the nuclear countries overseas requiring the uranium have no idea where they stand in relation to Australia and say, 'Why waste our time trying to negotiate for markets in Australia?'

People should be made aware that uranium and the nuclear industry have much to offer us by way of benefits. I could refer to statistics showing how much radiation we experience in our daily lives and proving that the radiation escaping from a nuclear plant in normal circumstances would be infinitesimal compared to the amount to which we are subjected daily. For instance, in a stone building a person is subjected to greater radiation than if he or she were in an asbestos or other non-stone building.

Rather than knock the nuclear industry, let us consider the benefits to be derived from it. The uses of radiation have brought tremendous benefits to our everyday lives during the past 20 or 30 years. Radioisotopes and controlled radiation are used, for example, to sterilise medical supplies, to improve the keeping qualities of foodstuffs (for example, onions, potatoes), in industrial processes and in medical science, in the study of the environment and of environmental pollution, in agriculture and in hydrology. These benefits are largely taken for granted if they are realised at all. Medical diagnosis and treatment is the main source of public exposure to man-made radiation, but the benefit in terms of human lives and health is enormous. Radiation is a major tool in the treatment of certain kinds of cancer. Radioisotopes play an essential part in some medical diagnostic procedures. Together with improved imaging devices and computers, radioisotopes can be used to assess the condition and functioning of various body organs such as the heart, lungs, brain, liver and kidneys. Without radioisotopes these assessments would be difficult or impossible.

The use of radiation to sterilise medical products, such as surgical dressings, sutures, catheters, spare body parts, syringes, etc., is now a normal procedure. Radiation does not introduce undesirable residues, whereas sterilisation by chemicals or gases may. Many of these products are difficult to sterilise by heat or steam. Since it is a cold process, sterilisation using radiation can be applied to heat-sensitive materials such as plastics (for example, heart valves) and appears to be the only means of sterilising a number of heat-sensitive pharmaceutical items such as powders, ointments and solutions.

Yet, despite these benefits we find so many people on the Government side saying, 'Too bad about the medical benefits. Let people die. We won't be able to do some of the things we have done for mankind hitherto, because we want to ban uranium.' If members opposite want to ban uranium, they must also ban the benefits to which I have referred. At present their policy is to allow some uranium to be mined. Roxby may proceed, but what about Honey-moon and Beverley and the thousands of jobs that would be created there and the millions of dollars that would pour into South Australia as a result of their development? The millions of dollars not being poured into this State as a result of the non-development of these mines must be raised by increasing taxes. I have already referred to the 134 tax increases since this Government assumed office. Most of these increases could have been avoided had we expanded our mining industry, especially uranium mining. The benefits for mankind from the development of the uranium industry are untold.

We are told that legislation is to be introduced to amend the Classification of Publications Act to provide for a compulsory scheme for the classification of video, and I assume that that refers to video tapes. I can only applaud such a move and will await with interest to see the provisions of the Bill. Our society cannot be reminded often enough of the negative effects of some video films.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Especially the X-rated videos.

Mr MEIER: Yes. An R-rated video film is permitted to show decapitation and disembowelment (if briefly shown), while an M-rated video film may show dismemberment (if shown in flashes only). Rape may be shown if it is shown discretely on M-rated films. I point out, however, that if a child is operating a video machine in a home the part showing rape in a discrete manner may be replayed over and over again. A child may also hold the 'flash' showing dismemberment. Therefore, I believe that we are trying to control something that distorts the truth and that should be one of our primary responsibilities as members of Parliament. It is the pursuit of truth to control the distortion of truth. I could refer to many aspects of video nasties and even of television nasties. Only recently the influence of television on children was brought home to me. My two sons, aged 7 and 9 years respectively, watch most of the series entitled *Bodyline*. They seemed to be impressed with it and were given permission to sit up late in order to see it. However, when I came home I found that the football season had been interrupted. No longer did they want me to come outside and kick a football with them. They wanted to play cricket. I asked, 'What's wrong with football? We're in the middle of winter.' They replied, 'Yes, but we have seen *Bodyline* and we're now playing cricket at school.'

Mr Groom: What's wrong with that?

Mr MEIER: Nothing, but it is a complete about face. When a bouncer came along or a ball came close to the body while they were playing cricket in the backyard, my lads would say, 'That's bodyline. It's not allowed.' I then realised that they had been indoctrinated in two or three nights by a televised sporting feature. I wondered what would happen to young children of that age or even older

who viewed video nasties, if a televised programme on cricket could have such an impact in the middle of the football season. Pornography could have a massive impact on the minds of people, unfortunately for life.

I wish to quote briefly from an article that appeared in the *Australian* on 27 April 1984. The article, entitled 'Ultimate Degradation', referred among other things to some tapes that had all the hallmarks of Nazi Germany tortures. The article stated:

The New York Daily News.

Two teenage girls, who thought they were getting \$500 to appear in a porno movie, were apparently murdered for a 'snuff' type film. Their skeletons were found in March 1983 seven months after their disappearance. The victims, 16 and 19, were just two girls who didn't have jobs and needed money...

... the following reaction to a crowd of 100 men who paid to see the movie *Snuff*...

The audience cheered when the film began and from then on cheers and clapping greeted every killing, with which *Snuff* was, of course, liberally endowed.

Remember, many of these would have been actual real killings and the audience watching loved it. The report continued:

The audience anticipated each mutilation, clapped and shouted... they seemed to feel that this woman deserved to be killed...

Reflecting on the atrocities of this century, people often ask, How could this have occurred?

It could also be asked how the Jewish holocaust could have occurred, and how other mass exterminations occurred in the past. I hope that this Parliament will certainly look at this issue of video nasties.

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): In supporting the motion, I would like to convey to the families of Mr Claude Allen (the past member for Frome) and Mr Charlie Wells (the past member for Florey) my sincere condolences on their sad loss.

I would like to join all South Australians and indeed all Australians in congratulating our Olympic teams in Los Angeles and those who participated in the Para Olympics in England. I particularly congratulate Glynis Nunn, who teaches at Sienna College at Findon, in my district, and Mr Turtur for their success at Los Angeles. Our South Australian Para Olympics participants brought home seven gold, one silver and two bronze medals. Indeed, I speak for all members of this House when I say that South Australia is truly proud of their successes and achievements in their particular fields.

The front page of the *News* today reports recognition by the Federal Government in Canberra of the success the Olympic team has achieved. The report states:

'\$60m bonanza for our sport'

Canberra: Sporting bodies across Australia are certain to receive a huge cash injection in the August Federal Budget following the green and gold successes at the Los Angeles Olympic Games.

The Federal Government is expected to provide up to \$60 million when the Budget is delivered on August 21.

I believe that is well overdue. The article also states:

This is more than double last year's \$26.1 million, and exceeds the \$35 million to \$45 million earlier predicted by the Sports Minister, Mr Brown.

I congratulate my Federal colleagues in recognising the needs of the sporting communities in this country.

Many issues were raised by the member for Goyder. I do not mean to be offensive, but I do not believe that was one of his better speeches. When he talked about the trade union movement I listened very intently. Having come from a disadvantaged background and having had a considerable involvement with the trade union movement, I am aware of the benefits that have accrued to workers in this State. As a union official I am amazed at some of the statements

coming from Opposition members particularly when they refer to preference for unionists. During the term of the previous Minister of Transport, I raised the question of the way the then Government was talking about preference for unionists. When prospective employees were to join the State Transport Authority, they were required to join a particular social club. Call a rose by any other name, the principle is still the same, yet we heard nothing from the Opposition benches about that.

Similarly, in some shopping centres in this State business people are required to join particular business organisations. Let us not hear any more of this hypocrisy from Opposition members about compulsion and blackmail. Let them get their own house in order before they start peddling this garbage in this place. If they want to be fair dinkum about compulsion, as they call it, let them get their own act into gear. I have heard nothing in terms of the requirements of some business organisations and shopping mall owners in this State that require a business to join a particular association. That is a fact well researched by this side of the House. Let them get their own act into gear before they come in here peddling this sort of bull.

The question of conditions of employees was raised by the previous speaker. I know from my own experience as a worker in the rail industry and as a union official that those penalty rates and conditions were fought for and gained because of a multiplicity of reasons. Some of them related to the adverse conditions the workers had to put up with, walking through mud and slush out in all sorts of weather, working in adverse conditions particularly near boilers, working all hours of the day and night, getting up at all hours of the day and night, and having very little family and social life. As one who has experienced that, I believe the workers in this country are entitled to some benefits because of the adverse conditions under which they work. I am not prepared to accept this garbage that is being peddled here today by the member for Goyder. Let him understand what the worker has to go through.

I know some of the adverse conditions under which workers worked particularly where people lost their lives. Because the workers were no longer prepared to accept that situation, they banded together and said that they would take no more. I have visited workers in hospital and seen people with arms and legs chopped off and seen their families destroyed as a result, yet we hear these unemotional people standing up and criticising the trade union movement for the conditions it has fought for.

Reference was made to the fact that some people are prepared to work under less than award conditions in this State. We should look at some of the contracts under which the people in this State work, and the constant complaints being underpaid by some unscrupulous employers in South Australia. I could say a lot more about this, but I want to get on to the more relevant issues in relation to the Address in Reply.

Let me say at the outset that it pleases me to be a member of a political Party that is addressing many of the economic ills and social problems this Government inherited as a legacy from the Tonkin and Fraser Liberal Governments. It is true that we have a long way to go before overcoming the problems confronting the unemployed, the disabled, the elderly and disadvantaged in our community but, given that the wages and prices accord, amongst other things, continues and the economy continues to expand, I believe that this Government in conjunction with the support of our Federal colleagues in Canberra can reduce many of the hardships that are obvious to us all.

The economic recovery of this country has drawn support from many sectors of the Australian community including

the business sector and even from some of the more pragmatic members of the Liberal Party. To support that statement, I refer to an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Thursday 8 March 1984, as follows:

Hawke re-election vital for recovery, says McMahon

The performance of the Prime Minister, Mr Hawke, was praised yesterday by a Liberal predecessor, Sir William McMahon, who predicted it could be five years before the Federal Opposition had a hope of victory. Sir William said it would be important for Australia's economic recovery that Mr Hawke was re-elected at the next election. Warmly applauding Mr Hawke's first year in office, Sir William said the Prime Minister was doing 'remarkably well'.

'I have to say I believe that for some time it would be very difficult for us in the Federal Liberal Party to believe that we would be able to displace him at an election,' he said. 'Certainly at the next election he would be needed in Australia to ensure that the foundations were built up very strongly and that internationally we were able to compete in the market.'

There is more there in terms of personal support for the Prime Minister in this country, even if it comes from some of his predecessors in the Liberal Party itself. So, it is quite clear that some of the more pragmatic people in that Party recognise the ability of our Prime Minister which is being reflected in the economy of this country.

These economic indicators represent sound planning by the Bannon Government, coupled with the support from the Hawke Government. Naturally enough, any State Government would prefer larger amounts of financial assistance from the Federal Treasurer. Indeed, to reiterate, the economy is certainly on the move and I refer to an article in today's *News* (page 34). Under the headline 'Grounds for bright outlook on our economy', it is stated:

There are grounds to be optimistic about economic growth in Australia despite recent weakness in retail sales, according to the chief economist for Citicorp Australia Ltd, Mr Ian Martin. In Citicorp's latest financial survey of the Australian economy, Mr Martin said the expected tax cuts in the August Budget would boost real household disposable income, which had also been boosted by the last two relatively large wage indexation decisions.

It then goes on to talk about employment factors, which I will not refer to because of time constraints. An article in the *Advertiser* of 7 August 1984, under the heading 'Major investment recovery forecast', states:

A major recovery in private investment is forecast this financial year as the economy undergoes its second successive year of strong growth, falling inflation and increasing employment.

The Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research makes the forecast in its latest examination of prospects for the economy this financial year. Since its last series of projections for 1984-85, made in December, the Institute has become much more optimistic about the outlook for inflation, economic growth and investment.

And there is much more for those people who are particularly interested in the subject. There are numerous articles from which I can quote. For example, an article in the *Advertiser* of 20 June 1983, under the heading 'More manufacturers optimistic', states:

Manufacturers are increasingly optimistic that Australia's economic malaise won't worsen—and the percentage expecting an improvement has doubled.

An article in the *Advertiser* of Monday 6 February headed 'Strong Surge for South Australia' states:

The South Australia economy is recovering strongly, according to an Australian Chamber of Commerce-National Australia Bank survey issued yesterday. The survey, for the December quarter, shows a significant improvement in the performance of the business community.

It shows that 72 per cent of South Australian firms surveyed achieved satisfactory or good trading results in the December quarter and nearly 70 per cent of firms expect a similar result in the March quarter. A spokesman for the chamber, Mr A. Downer, said yesterday the results compared very favorably with other States and showed there had been a significant improvement in business activity in South Australia over the past year. 'It is encouraging also to note that well over half of South Australian firms in the survey have reported they are happy with their

profits', he said. 'In the same period last year 66 per cent of South Australia firms reported poor profitability.'

In the *Advertiser* of Thursday 16 February there is a similar article headed 'Things looking great', which states:

Australia's consumers have reached an all-time high of confidence in the economy and the future.

This comes from the Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research and the Roy Morgan Research Centre. There is a further article in the *Advertiser* of 24 April headed, 'Growth predicted for South Australian companies' and another in the *Advertiser* of 25 May headed, 'Business steps up investment'. Yet another article in the *Advertiser* of 13 July, under the heading 'South Australia leads jobless rate drop', states:

South Australia's unemployment rate has dropped by more than 2 per cent over the past year—double the fall in national unemployment. . . The State-by-State breakdown shows a fall in unemployed in South Australia of 10 800 to a total of 48 700, or a drop from 11.2 per cent to 9.1 per cent over the year. South Australia's jobless rate fell from 9.3 per cent to 9.1 per cent from May to June this year.

I could cite many more articles in relation to how this State's economy is going. It is an interesting reflection to consider the article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Friday 13 April 1984 headlined 'The changing face of Adelaide'. The article includes pictures coupled with the following statement about 'Tomorrow's Adelaide' and showing a hive of development sites:

A marked increase in developments proposed, approved or under way within the past six months could see more than \$300 million worth of property development in the city during the next two to five years.

It points out the areas within the inner city business district of Adelaide where those buildings are to be built or are in the process of being built. These are as follows: Citicom and Baulderstone site; Mail Exchange tower; Palace Court building; SGIC office building; City Cross; Trikon Corp; Telecom building; Satisfac centre; Topham Street redevelopment; Light Square offices; Light Square; South Park Motor Inn; Light Square TAFE College; Westpac Data Centre; Remand Centre; Westronics Shopping Centre; and the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment.

Clearly, from that \$300 million investment there will be a snowballing effect throughout the South Australian community which will generate more work within the small business areas and indeed will affect the employment arena. The State Government's role in this recovery is quite clear. There was a capital works programme allocation of \$860 million in the 1983-84 State Budget, an increase of \$80 million. The housing programme allocation of \$224 million in the 1983-84 State Budget represents an increase of 18.5 per cent, and this is a matter to which I shall return later in my contribution, given sufficient time.

There is direct job creation funding of \$77 million with 7 000 people having worked on 900 community programmes. The tourism budget of \$5.7 million shows an increase of 39 per cent, which is another issue I will return to later in my speech. The exemption level for pay-roll tax concessions for small business was raised to \$160 000 in May 1983 and \$200 000 commencing in July this year. There was a \$38 million grant from the Federal Government for bushfire relief, an \$11 million interest free loan over three years to assist with the salvage of timber destroyed in the South-East (19 000 hectares of pine plantation), and a \$22 million semi-government borrowing through the Loan Council. There was the Port Adelaide redevelopment project, including \$1.1 million for a maritime museum and park, and \$983 000 to establish Port Adelaide as a commercial, residential and tourist centre by 1986.

I certainly applaud the Government for that measure. In relation to assistance for the racing industry there has been

an increase of \$750 000 for the SAJC, as well as increased support for all racing codes of \$7.6 million from the TAB. Other Government issues which will continue to assist in South Australia's economic recovery include the GMH Woodville plant, the South Australian Enterprise Fund, and the \$27 million Porter Bay marina and tourist resort.

With respect to the Small Business Corporation there is the \$150 million Asian development which includes a 400-room international hotel, a convention centre seating 3 000 people, office facilities, a car park, restaurant, retail areas and a casino incorporated within it. Under the Jubilee 150 projects there is the bid for the Grand Prix, the greening of Adelaide, the Wakefield Press (the public interest publishing house), and \$8 million for educational, historical, sporting, nautical and artistic programmes. We also have a marketing campaign to attract the RAN submarine replacement to Port Adelaide. The submarine construction will be a \$1 billion project which will create 600 construction jobs and 300 maintenance jobs. South Australia is involved in the Americas Cup Challenge. The State Bank of South Australia came into operation on 1 July. We also have the State Financing Authority and Technology Park, including Innovation House. I could talk about many others; however, there are other issues about which I want to speak.

We have received support for South Australia as a result of this Government's policies. One only has to read the local press to see that, not just selectively but over a period of time. I have taken particular note of articles published and will quote from some of those. For example, in the *News* on 24 July there appeared an article headed, 'South Australia Sales Campaign Amazes', by Craig Bildstien, part of which states:

The Department of State Development is amazed at the response to a campaign to sell South Australia interstate.

In less than a month, it has had more than 2 500 inquiries from people—mainly Sydney-siders—interested in coming to South Australia. 'Our advertising people told us we'd be doing well if we got 50 or 60,' said the department's executive director, Dr R. Sexton. The department already has run out of 5 000 'Living in South Australia' brochures printed for the campaign, and has ordered 7 500 more to meet continuing demand. It is promoting South Australia in a series of full-page advertisements in Sydney newspapers, plus *The Australian*, the *Financial Review* and the *Bulletin*.

The campaign is aimed mainly at the 20-35 age group, particularly those with capital, expertise and entrepreneurial skills to generate employment.

There have been three advertisements, all with the theme 'South Australia—the secret is out.'

They promote Adelaide as a cheaper capital city for housing, a place where you can buy a home much closer to the city and a healthier environment to 'enjoy the good life'. Dr Sexton refused to disclose the budget, but said it had proved cost-effective.

The article continues:

'We have flushed out some people contemplating retirement who don't want to retire in Sydney,' he said. 'And we have had specific inquiries about our investment opportunities and incentives. Others have seen our ads and simply arrived on the doorstep, and some look fairly promising.'

There is no doubt that this campaign by this Government to encourage business people not only in this State but also from interstate is certainly bearing fruit much, I might suggest, to the chagrin of members opposite. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* of 12 June headed, 'Scheme helps jobless start their own business', which states:

Thirty-four people running successful South Australian businesses were unemployed 12 months ago. They had the ideas, the skills and the motivation to venture into the competitive world of private enterprise—but the dollars were elusive. When you're out of a job and relying on Government benefits, the traditional lending institutions won't look at you for enterprise capital. But a little-known State Government scheme will, provided the proposed business is viable, give unemployed people a leg-up into self-employment.

It's the Department of Labour's Self-Employment Ventures Scheme. And, although seemingly tucked away in the Rechabites

Building in Victoria Square, it's making its presence felt in South Australia and other States. In a little more than five years it has helped establish 133 small businesses through granting small, interest-free loans. The success rate of those businesses—

this is the important factor—

is pushing 70 per cent. And, more than just surviving, many have expanded.

Quite clearly this has been a very successful scheme for South Australia. Other areas in which assistance has been given by this State Government include a major review of the industrial and business incentives. The article continues:

Small business has too often been regarded as the forgotten sector of Australian industry.

I believe that most members in this House recognise the importance of small business not only in this State but indeed in this country as one of the major, if not the major, supplier of employment for our community. Coupled with that of course is the industrial situation that applies in South Australia, one of the least prone States to industrial action in the whole of this country. This is well supported by an article that appeared in the *Advertiser* on 10 July headed 'South Australia leads in strike loss improvement', which reads, in part:

Australian industry lost fewer working days because of industrial disputes in the past 12 months than at any time since the Australian Bureau of Statistics began issuing monthly records.

I repeat that that was since the Australian Bureau of Statistics began issuing monthly records. The article continues:

And the figures for South Australia are easily the nation's lowest. Bureau figures issued yesterday show the number of working days lost per 1 000 employees fell 20 per cent in the 12 months to April 1984, compared with the previous 12 months. Australia lost 245 working days per 1 000 employees in the 12 months to April, the lowest since the bureau started publishing monthly industrial dispute figures in October 1970. The figures defy the usual pattern of increasing union militancy during economic recovery and employment growth.

South Australia's figures fell by 59 per cent in the same period with 52 working days lost per 1 000 employees. Victoria, with 152 days lost per 1 000 employees, has the next best record, while Western Australia and Tasmania had 10 times the South Australian figure with more than 500 days lost per 1 000 employees. South Australia has lost fewer days through industrial disputes than other States for most of this century.

Clearly, this is one of the great selling points for South Australia. It has been well recognised by members on this side of the House that we have a great industrial record, aided and abetted I believe by the policies formulated by this Party in conjunction with the trade union movement. We recognise, as the political wing of the trade union movement, the importance of having consultation and discussions with the movement to try to work out ways and means by which we can not only assist their members but, indeed, improve the economy of this State. That has borne fruit time and time again in relation to industrial matters in this State. I believe that we can continue along these lines with the wages and prices accord. I could relate many other examples, but unfortunately because of the time and the other subjects I want to address I will have to leave the matter there. I know that the member for Mallee and others are disappointed, but nevertheless I will have to wait for another time, perhaps a month or so. I now return to the question of tourism. In his Speech, the Governor states:

26. My Government will continue to encourage the growth of the State's tourism industry as an important component of its broad economic development strategies. In addition to the Adelaide Railway Station development, major construction projects are also being undertaken at Port Lincoln, and a new ferry is being constructed to service Kangaroo Island. Advertising and promotional activities within Australia are being concentrated on the large markets of Sydney and Melbourne, and in South Australia specific initiatives will be aimed at encouraging South Australians to holiday in their own State.

I could not agree more about the need to encourage South Australians to see more of their own State. How often does

one see people journey interstate and overseas before they visit their own State? We have many tourist attractions, and I for one am probably as guilty as any other member of this House of going overseas and visiting other States without first seeing the benefits that we have in this large State.

An article which appears in the tourist magazine *The Hotel Gazette*, in June 1984 under the heading 'New jobs forecast in South Australian tourism growth', states:

South Australia's tourism industry could create about 1 200 jobs in the 1984-85 financial year, an Adelaide conference was told. Addressing the 1984 South Australian Tourism Conference, the Tourism Director, Mr G.J. Inns, said this could be achieved if tourism repeated the growth rate of the current year... Mr Inns said travel within South Australia by South Australians was up 4 per cent in the first six months of the financial year. The number of visitors from other States rose by 5.2 per cent. Travel within South Australia by Australians rose 4.3 per cent—slightly above the national average.

A survey of tourist accommodation by the Australian Bureau of Statistics revealed a 3.8 per cent rise in the number of occupied rooms in South Australian hotels and motels. This year, inquiries at South Australia's three Government travel centres rose 11 per cent. Bookings were up 21 per cent and total bed nights booked rose 44 per cent.

Quite clearly, the money that the South Australian Government has been putting into tourism is paying off. Of course, coupled with that, we have the \$20 million spent in the Barossa Valley, the 40 000 people who have used our new international airport, and the fact that the Outer Harbor passenger terminus will be visited by an additional number of ships during the next year will certainly bring additional money into South Australia. An article in the *News* on 7 June states:

Twenty thousand jobs have been created in the Australian tourist industry this year. Tourism Minister, Mr Brown, has told Parliament. He said a campaign headed by TV personality Paul Hogan to encourage Australians to spend their holidays at home had been an outstanding success. Tourism was Australia's biggest industry, employed 400 000 people and was 95 per cent domestically oriented.

Clearly, these factors, coupled with the activities of our Premier and other Ministers, have led the way to this economic recovery in South Australia. I know that there is a long way to go before all the problems have been overcome in that regard.

Of course, another area that has provided much enthusiasm in the community has been the large increase in the motor car industry, with sales of motor vehicles being the highest for many years. If my memory serves me correctly, it was in 1976 that we last had such a dramatic increase in sales of new motor vehicles in this country. Of course, in support of that I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* on 20 July headed 'New vehicle sales close to record', which states:

South Australia is heading for its biggest sales year in new motor vehicles since the 1976 record year. New vehicle sales for the first half of this year were up more than 21 per cent over the same period last year. Figures given yesterday by the South Australian Automobile Chamber of Commerce show 26 032 new cars, station wagons and commercial vehicles were registered in South Australia this year to 30 June. This compares with 21 461 for the first six months last year and is the best since the 30 787 of 1976...

The auto chamber's executive director, Mr R.A. Flashman, said yesterday the rural recovery plus increased confidence in the economy generally were probably behind the sales increase this year. The trend seemed to be national.

Of course, this is supported by many articles in the press, particularly one that appeared in the *Advertiser* on Tuesday 1 May and which states:

National vehicle sales continued to race ahead in March, fulfilling the hopes of the struggling car makers and backing up the promising economic indicators emerging from other industries.

There are many other articles in support of what is happening in the economy in this State and indeed in the country. I feel that I would be remiss as regards tourism if I did not

mention some of the more positive things that I believe can happen here, particularly in my electorate, which may surprise some people, but I am prepared to continually push it.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Is your electorate office one of the tourist attractions?

Mr HAMILTON: It will be in the future; I am relocating it. One of the things that I find somewhat surprising is the fact that in South Australia we do not have a taxi-drivers guide to metropolitan Adelaide. Recently it was brought to my attention by a very close and personal friend of mine (my wife), who pointed this out during a recent visit to Victoria. Subsequently, my wife obtained a copy of this for me and I received it only last evening. Contained in this booklet, which, I understand, is issued to all taxi-drivers in Melbourne, are details of exhibitions, a city map, the type of taxi that can be hailed, multi-purpose taxis (a scheme that operates in Victoria for the disabled), where banks are located, credit card facilities, licensing laws, coach travel, hire cars and rental cars, car parking, the rules for motorists in Victoria, emergency services, general services, hospitals, pharmacies, veterinary emergency facilities, radio and television stations, a plan of the metropolitan transit train system, Melbourne tram routes, tourism information and publications, post offices, accommodation, hotels and motels, a leisure guide (a number of pages), theatres, and restaurants.

One of the most important facets of this booklet is that the Metropolitan Transit Authority's suburban map includes taxi tariffs. I am not reflecting on the industry as a whole, but unfortunately we have some unscrupulous people who are prepared to overcharge in that area. I know from past experience in this country and overseas that some people are prepared to rip off the tourists. If tourists had a guide setting out the tariff for a particular radius, they would have some indication of what they should pay for taxi fares.

This is an aspect that the Minister of Tourism and the Minister of Transport should implement. I believe it is very important, because nothing is more galling than being ripped off by an unscrupulous taxi-driver, and, of course, that is bad publicity for the industry as a whole. I certainly hope that the relevant Minister will take these points on board, because I believe this will be advantageous for interstate and overseas visitors who come here and who take a taxi to journey around Adelaide. Unfortunately, many people see only the inner city area. With a guide such as this they can perhaps go further afield and gain a greater appreciation of the city and other areas.

I want to refer now to the exciting developments that have been taking place within my electorate, coupling my remarks with those I made on Thursday last. These developments will affect all the north-western suburbs. On 4 April this year a \$8 million resort hotel at West Lakes was announced in the media. It was stated:

This is the latest in an explosion of multi-million dollar prestige projects which are changing the poor cousin image of the north-western section of metropolitan Adelaide.

I could not agree more, and you, Sir, as the member for Price, would agree with the Government's spending money and promoting the area in regard to tourism. Many benefits will accrue from the developments in the area. The new resort hotel is certainly an exciting project and, coupling that with the other developments that have taken place in the north-western suburbs, I see a bright future for that area of Adelaide. In conjunction with other projects in South Australia the West Lakes Resort Hotel will generate many jobs. At the launching of the project the Minister of Tourism stated that:

The Australian Tourist Commission has been conducting, under the direction of Federal Tourism Minister, John Brown, a startlingly successful promotion campaign on the West Coast of the United

States. One immediate result of this campaign, which has involved Paul Hogan, is a leap of 213 per cent at Los Angeles in the issuing of holiday visas to Australia. Further pressure is coming onto our accommodation as a result of our spending almost \$1 million on media promotion of South Australia in our biggest markets—Victoria and New South Wales.

The Minister added:

What is most encouraging about today's announcement of activity at West Lakes is that a major tourist hotel is being built, not in central Adelaide, but out in the suburbs.

The project at West Lakes will involve the employment of 170 people on the lake front. It is very exciting, not only in terms of employment opportunities that will accrue as a result of the project but also in regard to the amount of work that will be generated in terms of spin-off to other small business people in the area. Many of the businesses that have had difficulties will benefit from this project. The managers of the proposed complex have stated:

The proposed West Lakes Resort Hotel will offer the only hotel in Adelaide which has direct access to the lake or beach. It has the same facilities and amenities which make the Queensland resorts such popular tourist attractions, i.e., leisure activities, outdoor and water sports, fun, sun, and nightlife—currently there is no other establishment in Adelaide which offers all of these in one package deal.

Close to the proposed hotel there is a complete range of external activities offered within the West Lakes Complex which appeal to the younger tourists, including Lifestyle Centre; Football Park, with its developing range of activities as well as regular winter football matches, local and interstate; hiring of yachts, windsurfers, canoes and pushbikes for exploration of the waterways and local sights.

People who have not journeyed around West Lakes have missed out on a lot. I took some of my colleagues down there last Friday to have a look around the West Lakes area, many of whom had not previously journeyed around the area. Many of them were pleasantly surprised by the development that has occurred and by the exciting prospects the area offers, particularly in regard to the spin-off that will come from the West Lakes Resort Hotel. Other activities offered in conjunction with the development are:

Simply walking along the lake or sandy beaches (only five minutes from the proposed site); swimming or sunbaking; golf at any of the four top South Australian championship courses immediately adjacent to the area; cruising aboard the m.v. *Platypus*.

That is certainly worth while as it journeys around the 17 kilometres of the West Lakes waterway. There is a varied cuisine offered by the local restaurants which I have sampled over a period of years and which I can recommend to members of the House. Further activities include: squash, tennis and lawn bowls. It is pleasing to see that the West Lakes club has been advised that the State Government has provided \$250 000 and has purchased the land required by the club which will be used for purposes including the tennis activities that will be carried out there some time in September of this year.

That is very exciting, and I am pleased to be involved with the Woodville council's endeavour to obtain that money from the State Government. That complex will be worth about \$2 million. I envisage that it could be used as a venue perhaps in 1986 for international, interstate and intrastate bowling competitions. Further, the West Lakes area has the third largest regional shopping centre in South Australia. It also provides the opportunity of fishing for bream and many other species on the waterfront. I believe that currently the lake is being used 87 times a year for organised aquatic sporting activities. However, currently there is no hotel offering accommodation to cater for the interstate and international participants and spectators who come to West Lakes each year for the Australian rowing selection trials, for example. We will hear more and more about rowing competitions at West Lakes in years to come.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: It is one of the best courses in Australia.

Mr HAMILTON: Indeed, as the member for Torrens has said, it is one of the top rowing sites in Australia. Those who have rowed there have agreed that because of the shelter provided by houses and, indeed the sand dunes in the area, it offers very good rowing conditions. Other events that are held at West Lakes are: the Kings Cup rowing regatta, the Head of the River rowing regatta, the Australian canoeing championships, the national football championships, national marathon running championships, and international golf events, to which I referred briefly earlier.

An application has been made for the world rowing championships in 1986. These events will occur over a two-week period and will require accommodation for spectators and entrants alike. Interstate, intrastate and international visitors are attracted to the four championship golf courses and the pitch-and-putt course, which stage annual events such as the internationally recognised Westpac Golf Classic and the South Australian Open Championships. These events, held over a period of three or four days, require high-class accommodation to house the organisers, sponsors and celebrities associated with these events. The proposed Lakes Resort Hotel is the only establishment in the area to provide for and cater to these requirements.

The Football Park Oval is the headquarters of the South Australian National Football League. Regular interstate and intrastate football matches are staged at this oval and these attract players, officials and spectators who require accommodation and entertainment during their visit. I have no doubt that within a short time there will be a national football competition with certain South Australian teams joining eight Victorian teams. People who do not believe that this will happen are hiding their heads in the sand. Much money has been spent on football in this State and in Victoria, and a national football league is the natural outcome of current developments. Concerts and live shows staged at Football Park create a need for accommodation for the stars, promoters and organisers. Near West Lakes is the headquarters of the world-renowned South Australian Film Corporation, and its studios in that locality are within 3 km of the proposed Lakes Resort Hotel. This hotel development will provide much needed accommodation and catering for the cast and crews of this new and expanding film industry.

In summary, the proposed hotel will be a multi-storey development incorporating 42 first-class bedrooms, a restaurant, a bistro, three function rooms, a beer garden and barbecue, a cocktail bar, a front bar, and a bottle shop. Other facilities of the proposed hotel will include a swimming pool with lawned surrounds; 24-hour room service; a full publican's licence; a self-dialling telephone PABX system; an in-house laundry; two passenger lifts to upper floors; tennis courts; windsurfers and canoes for hire; a pontoon bar; an exhibition area; and secretarial and office facilities.

From that description, members will see the benefits that will accrue from the erection of this hotel, not only to people living in the immediate vicinity but also to residents of the north-western suburbs. Transport facilities to serve the locality from the north-western suburbs will be a consideration. It takes only 15 minutes to travel from the Adelaide International Airport to West Lakes. I see an exciting future not only for local residents and business people but also for others who may have been unemployed in recent times. Many jobs will be generated in this area and I believe that this development will lead to the upgrading of many facilities and amenities in the north-western suburbs, especially the road from Adelaide to Port Adelaide. The Woodville and Port Adelaide councils have recognised the need to upgrade the scenic view available to travellers along the Port Road to the north-western suburbs.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Someone suggested an O-Bahn bus for that route.

Mr HAMILTON: This Government is open to all sorts of suggestions and that could be considered. It is interesting to note that the Port Road itself was originally designed as a canal to run from Port Misery to Hindmarsh. I found that out only recently. Indeed, it is interesting to learn what research can reveal about the early days of this State and the tourism industry.

I turn now to the positive attitude taken by the Commonwealth and State Labor Governments in respect of housing. From the Commonwealth Record, volume 9, No. 26, dated 1 July this year, regarding the first home ownership scheme, states that 50 000 Australians had received assistance into home ownership under the scheme. It is stated that Mr Hurford's Department had received 50 000 inquiries and 91 000 applications under the first home ownership scheme since the inception of the scheme in October last year. The Department is currently receiving applications at the rate of 2 500 a week with inquiries running at over 15 000 a week. Mr Hurford said that 50 000 approved applicants brought the amount paid out by the Hawke Labor Government to \$134 million. Mr Hurford further said that the outstanding feature of the first home ownership scheme was that it helped the family on only one income to acquire a home. For too long the most disadvantaged in our community have not been the beneficiaries of Government housing initiatives. This scheme has helped redress that, and the Federal Government's economic management designed to bring down interest rates will provide greater assistance to many home owners and aspiring home owners.

Clearly, many spin-offs result from the initiatives of Federal and State Labor Governments. For instance, the white-goods manufacturing industry benefits. People setting up a new home require refrigerators, stoves and washing machines and other domestic products. The furnishing trades industry will also benefit from the construction of more homes. All these industries produce durable items for use in the home. I was recently talking to a man in a local hotel. He told me that he had been flat out. A member of the housing construction industry, he did not know who I was because he came from another district. He said that the industry was in a tremendous state and that it could not keep up with the demand. That has been reflected in the statements of many other people who have spoken to me about the state of the housing industry.

Housing conditions and the number of people seeking Housing Trust accommodation must be matters of concern to all members of this Chamber. Despite the huge sums set aside by the State Government to meet housing needs in this State, we still have a long way to go before the problem is solved. However, that is not to say that this Government has not done a wonderful job in terms of the number of houses that have been erected, as a result of this huge financial support. In this State most of the applicants for public housing depend on income support. In 1983 almost 63 per cent of Housing Trust applicants relied on pensions and other social service benefits for their income. That is a big proportion of the total demand. Most of those applicants are living close to the poverty line. Statistics prepared for the National Economic Summit showed that pensioners at best are less than 20 per cent above the Henderson poverty line; at worst, they are well below.

(In contrast, someone earning \$20 000 with a dependent wife and two children would be 63 per cent above the poverty line.)

In 1983, the average weekly household income of applicants for public housing in South Australia was only \$168, slightly less than half the level of male average earnings. This reflects the large number of applicants dependent on

income support and the fact that working applicants also have relatively low incomes. In 1983, 77 per cent of working applicants had incomes below 85 per cent of average earnings.

Over the past six years the gap between the incomes of applicants and those of the average community has widened significantly. In the past we have inherited a real problem both in the Federal and State arenas, and I believe the Hawke and Bannon Governments are seeking to redress these particular problems. Unfortunately time does not permit me to refer to those people in crisis, major groups applying for public housing, including the aged, one-parent families, Aboriginal families, the unemployed, invalids and youth.

The other question I would have liked to address is the question of granny flats in relation to an area which I visited in Victoria some months ago. I believe that it is very important that this State Government has a close look at this matter. The Government, as I understand it, is sympathetic towards the installation of granny flats in Adelaide and South Australia and in particular in my own area.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON (Torrens): I support the motion. I also support the condolence motions that have been moved in this House referring to the late Claude Allen and the late Charlie Wells. I add my condolences and best wishes to the families of those two friends of this Parliament. I also add my condolences and sympathy to the families of the late Harry King, a former member for Chaffey, and the family of the late Howard O'Neill, who was my shadow while I was Minister of Transport. I have on a previous occasion paid a tribute to the late Howard O'Neill when he voluntarily resigned from the House because of illness.

I wish to deal with the subject of non-government school funding, amongst other things. I am prompted to do so because of the answer the Premier gave to a question I asked yesterday in which he did not agree that there was a danger of some non-government schools in this State becoming elitist if the current funding policies of the State and Federal Labor Governments were to continue. I start by quoting the resolution passed at the last State ALP Conference held in June this year which concerned funding for non-government schools. It stated:

1. Convention strongly urges the Federal Government to immediately implement its promise in relation to funding of \$111 million extra per annum to Government schools after three years (Year 1—\$37 million; Year 2—\$74 million; Year 3—\$111 million) \$9 million per annum for early childhood education . . .

The Opposition would support that part of the motion, although I know it is strange for this Opposition to support any part of a resolution passed by a State ALP convention. The resolution continued:

. . . and the phasing out of all financial support for wealthy private schools which operate above the resources level of comparable Government schools.

In addition convention urges the Federal Government to establish a three-year moratorium on all funding to the private school sector (that is, to maintain its current total funding in real terms with no extra funding for new places or new schools), to allow a period of public discussion to enable the development of a responsible non-government school funding policy that addresses need.

2. Convention is gravely concerned at the continuing private school bias evident in the Schools Commission proposals and demands that the Federal Government ensure that the Schools Commission acts and provides advice consistent with the Schools Commission Act (1973) which requires the Commission to reflect a 'primary obligation to Government schools'.

3. Convention demands that the State Government stop subsidising wealthy private schools which operate above the resources level of comparable Government schools and redistributes these funds to Government schools and the poorer private schools.

That resolution was moved by M. Hussen and seconded by J. McCombe. Coupled with the policies of the Federal Government it is a direct attack on the question of per capita funding.

The present funding for non-government schools, and I am talking only of the recurrent funding, consists of per capita funding, that is, funding for each individual student at the school regardless of the resource level of the school, plus needs based funding. I want to make quite plain that the Liberal Party in this State is a supporter of needs based funding; it is part of our policy. The difference between this Party and members opposite is that we also believe that there ought to be per capita funding as well because the Liberal Party believes that one cannot have freedom of choice in education without per capita funding. We also believe that if per capita funding for non-government schools is done away with there is a danger of many non-government schools becoming elitist.

In my question to the Premier yesterday I said that the Federal Government intended to freeze recurrent funding in dollar terms. This means that there is a reduction through inflation for 55 non-government schools throughout Australia, so-called wealthy schools according to members opposite, certainly so-called high resource schools. That is an increase, as I pointed out yesterday, from 41 last year to 55 this year. We will know for certain whether this will occur, because I understand that Senator Ryan is addressing the National Press Club tomorrow. There will be another two or three schools at least in this State added to what I called the Government's hit list of non-government schools. The Premier took great offence when I used the words 'hit list'. He accused me of emotionalism.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: I thought you were close to the mark.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The honourable member knows that I am not an emotional person and when I used the words 'hit list' I used them advisedly, because it is nothing more than a hit list, and that will mean that there will be at least five schools in this State on that hit list where their recurrent funding is to be frozen. That means that there is a danger that some schools will become elitist. Knowing the personnel of those schools, I think they will fight to their very utmost to prevent that from happening, but it is a danger.

Let me say first that the Liberal Party's policy is quite clear. I repeat that the Liberal Party supports needs-based funding, but it also supports per capita funding. In this State the Liberal Party is committed to increasing funding for non-government schools to 25 per cent of the State's standard. That is current Liberal Party policy, which I stated in the press only a few weeks ago. This House ought to be in no doubt that the Liberal Party supports the dual system of education now applicable in this country and in this State. It also supports per capita funding as a component of recurrent funding.

To develop the elitism argument, because it is very important, the Premier, in reply to my question yesterday, virtually told the House that he was ideologically committed to needs-based funding as a total. That is an ideological argument. He talked about elitism because I had used it in my question. I suggest that the Premier does not understand what ramifications can flow from a total needs-based funding formula.

I will provide an example of what could happen to one of the so-called elite schools if they tried to gain more needs-based funding from the State and from the Commonwealth. In the resource formula for funding, class size is a very important factor. In other words, if a school can show that it has higher class sizes than another school, the school with the higher class sizes is deemed to have lower resources and, therefore, under a total needs-based formula it receives more money.

I refer to a so-called wealthy school which is presently in Category 1 for funding and regarded as a high resource school. I am sure that it would not do this, but it could

restrict entry to the school to only those students with academic merit. It could set examinations for entry and a student would not be able to gain entry unless the student reached a required academic standard.

If one has a school full of students with high academic ability, the class size could be increased. It is quite simple to teach a large class of students who are all—I will not say brilliant—of a high academic achievement. By restricting student entrance to academic ability and increasing class sizes a school could then say to the State and Federal Governments 'Look, we are a school with large class sizes, therefore, we are a lower resource school than last year and we should get more money under a needs-based formula.' That is really becoming elitist, not only financially elitist but also academically elitist. I believe that parents should be able to send their children to the school of their choosing. That should be their choice. However, if academic entrance standards are placed on children by a school, the parents will be denied that choice because of the policies of the present Federal and State ALP Governments.

That is just one thing that can flow from having a policy of needs-based funding only. For the Premier's benefit, I will develop that argument a little further because he obviously does not understand the ramifications. I will use as my basis a speech made by the Principal of Pembroke school, Mrs Diana Medlin. She gave the speech at the National Council of Independent Schools Fifth National Conference in June this year. She developed the argument of how the present Federal and State ALP Government policies can drive a school towards elitism.

Mrs Medlin is a very well respected educator in this State, a former member of the Keeves Committee and the Chairperson of the Advisory Committee on Non-government Schools. In her argument, Mrs Medlin transfers the present funding formula to entrance in 1985 and uses Pembroke school as an example. I am happy to do this because I do not believe that Pembroke school would go along the lines that Mrs Medlin says is a possibility in her paper.

Mrs Medlin postulates that, if the present funding policies apply in 1985, parent contribution fees at Pembroke school will have to rise by 14.4 per cent. The more the Government follows the needs-based formula alone, the higher the percentage rise will have to be. As I have said, Mrs Medlin postulates a 14.4 per cent rise.

Mr Lewis: And they can't claim that on income tax.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: No. She asks whether the school community can tolerate an increase in fees of the order of 14.4 per cent to cover the Government subsidy reduction. Mrs Medlin then goes on to consider what would happen if the school community or the school council agreed that that particular increase was not tenable, that the school had to do something to try and keep the fees down because of the policies of the present Government. What are the options for Pembroke school in trying to keep its fees down? First, it could close the boarding house. Many non-government schools have already done this, because the boarding houses of non-government schools run at a considerable loss. In fact, boarding houses are subsidised by the day scholars, there is no doubt about that. If Pembroke closed its boarding house, there would be 160 children from overseas, the country and isolated areas who would be deprived.

Mr Lewis: I don't like the thought of that.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: My colleague, the member for Mallee, would be aware of the problems for isolated children and children in country areas as far as education is concerned. However, if Pembroke closed its boarding house, it would be better off financially: it would have less resources, which would give it more input to needs-based funding. What else could Pembroke do? It could shut down its hearing unit. Pembroke school has a hearing unit with

12 deaf children and three trained teachers, which is a student/teacher ratio of 4:1.

If one has a hearing unit and it is used properly, one must have that student teacher ratio. Certainly, the Pembroke hearing unit received some assistance from the present Government, but the net result of closing the hearing unit would be to save almost two teachers' salaries (1.8 teachers' salaries). That is an option: if Pembroke school wanted to keep its fees down it could close the hearing room. Would the Premier really want a school that is providing such a community service to close down its hearing unit?

Another option is for Pembroke to remain an open entry school as it is now, with no academic qualifications required, but for it not to provide any remedial teaching or help because, as all members know, remedial teaching needs a much lower student teacher ratio than there is in the normal classroom. That is another option for the school. If the school decided to do that, another five salaries could be saved.

These are the possible results for a school with a total Government needs-based funding policy. Of course, the school could increase academic scholarships and retreat further to the end of the spectrum—that is, becoming more elitist both financially and academically, as I mentioned earlier. The school could also remove all compassionate remissions of fees.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: That would be a tragedy.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: In cases where children need the stability of their school, for instance where the father has died and the mother has a family that has disintegrated, or where a business has failed, schools such as Pembroke provide remissions of fees so that those children can continue their education. The school could say 'No more of that' because of State and Federal Government funding policies; no per capita funding, which is the end result of ALP policy. It is because of those policies that that is an option a school like Pembroke could take.

I do not believe that you, Sir, or the Premier really would like to see that happen. But, from the Premier's answer to the question yesterday, he obviously does not understand the implications. The school could also decide, that, if one has brothers and sisters at the school, they will not receive any discount on fees, when the idea is to keep brothers and sisters together at the same school. Instead of becoming a family school it becomes academically selective. If the school moves in this direction, which staff will become redundant? Which staff would have to be put off, because that would be a natural result. The school has the option too, of course, of cutting back on arts and crafts, even though the Schools Commission found that Pembroke had a real need in that area. It would become less well resourced, but that is, once again, a possible result. It will not happen, but that is a possible result of the Government's policy.

What about reducing the quality of music education at Pembroke school? Surely I do not have to tell members in this House of the world fame of the school in that area, particularly of its girls choir. It could reduce the quality of music education. It is expensive to provide and teach. That is another option for the school in following the present Government's policies. What about the present proposal of that school to subsidise by \$300 000 a community project to be built on the Kensington sports field in conjunction with the Burnside council and the South Australian Amateur Athletic Federation? The school is prepared to put \$300 000 into a community resource which it will never own. Obviously it could say 'No' to those other bodies—'Because of the Government's policies, we cannot afford to let you have \$300 000 because that will mean we will have to increase fees.'

Mrs Medlin goes on to refer to this new fangled idea, the friend raising-fund raising development office, which has come to us from United States of America as a method of raising money for the school. That is, of course, an option which all schools will have to look at anyway, but not an option that I think is particularly desirable.

I make those points to try to convince the Premier and the Minister of Education of the dangers of a totally needs-based funding formula. Per capita funding is essential not as a be all and end all; needs-based funding must be there and this Party supports it, but there are dangers in going into a totally needs-based funding formula. I have enumerated the dangers using Pembroke school as an example. Pembroke school, as I know it, will not do any of those things, but they are the options that are available to non-government schools rather than increasing fees. Finally, I wish to sum up by quoting directly from this report, because I think it is something that everyone in this House should know and think about. Mrs Medlin says at page 11 of the report:

There are some issues, some problems, which no amount of money will ever solve. They are issues of teacher commitment, self-denial, never counting hours or minutes, dedication, professionalism, a vocation, love, concern, compassion, stability.

She continues at page 12:

I am concerned (and my colleagues are concerned) with the educational health of all Australian children. I believe that that health can best be promoted by Government and non-government schools working side by side in mutual respect. Nothing is to be gained by promoting one group at the expense of the other. Both will always exist, at least into the foreseeable future. Concensus and conciliation are of the essence. All children are important, for themselves as people and especially because they are the major resource for the future of this country and for the future of this planet. Excellence and humanity in education are qualities we are striving for. Governments must help all children, all schools and all educators to achieve those aims.

I believe that everyone should take note of those words. I now wish to leave that subject and refer to childhood services. Today we had a good deal of discussion on that matter in Question Time.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It is a pretty good demonstration of the lack of knowledge or the implications of it.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, and I inform my friend from Light that I will deal with that in a little more detail shortly. I first became associated with childhood services (other than as a parent on a kindergarten committee, I might add, many years ago) as a member of Parliament in the first year I entered Parliament, 1977, when I found to my horror that proposals existed to disestablish—which is a word we seem to use nowadays—or put the axe through Kingston College, which was the kindergarten training college and was situated in my electorate. I became closely involved with the college and ever since that day both I and my colleague from Coles have been trying to help the Kindergarten Union fight a rear guard action to continue to exist. Unfortunately, we came to Government in 1979 only two or three months too late to save Kingston College from being disestablished. The early childhood services course moved out to what is now the Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education.

I will deal with the course later. Now we have the situation where it is proposed that the Kindergarten Union be disestablished. Flowing from the recommendations of the Coleman Report, the State Government has selectively implemented some of those recommendations, and the main loser in the whole group of organisations concerned in the Coleman recommendations is, in my opinion, the Kindergarten Union. If the Minister or the Government had not selectively implemented the recommendations, I think that there would probably have been a general acceptance of the disestablishment of the Union and its incorporation into a

Children's Services Office, which is to be another statutory authority and not an office of Government as we know it. However, the Government has not accepted the recommendations of Ms Coleman. It has accepted only those recommendations which it wished to accept, and it is the Kindergarten Union which is to be incorporated into the new Children's Services Office along with child care.

Other organisations that were recommended by Ms Coleman to be incorporated into the office, such as CAFHS, Catholic and Lutheran pre-schools and Education Department child parent centres, are not, certainly at this stage, to be included in the new office. It is that selective implementation of the Coleman recommendations that has enraged the parents in this community. It is that selective implementation that has enraged many of the teaching staff of the Kindergarten Union. It is that selective implementation that has upset the Pre-School Teachers Association. It has even upset the South Australian Institute of Teachers. The selective implementation is the problem and, whatever the Premier might say in answer to questions today about the support of the Kindergarten Union Board and 'operatives' (I think that was his word, which was an extraordinary name to apply to teachers)—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: People who operate machines are called operatives.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes, indeed. Whatever the Premier might say about the support the Government has from those people, that support is not shared in the community. He has accused the Opposition of fostering a campaign to try to negate the Government's will in this matter. The Premier says that we have deliberately stirred up trouble. Let me make quite plain to the Premier, who now has charge of this business, that it is not the Opposition that has stirred up the general community on this matter; it is the parents and teachers in the community who have stirred up the trouble, and the Opposition is representing very strongly their viewpoint and their concern about this matter in this Parliament. They have a right to have their position put, and it does not matter what the Premier might say. Whether or not he is trying to find words in not answering a question, we will continue to make sure that the case is put time and time again in this House.

One of the other problems that has arisen in this matter is that the Government has made the decision to disestablish the Union and formed the new children's services office without doing the homework first. The Government has set up a steering committee, and then that steering committee has made certain recommendations. The Government stated, 'We will form the new Children's Services Office and worry about all the problems afterwards. We will worry about all those problems about which people are talking now'—problems about which we have asked the Premier in the past few days and which he cannot answer.

Of course, one of the problems is that the Premier has the carriage of the matter. One of the causes of great dissatisfaction in the community is that the Minister of Education does not have the carriage of the matter. We saw the problem. We thought that that was a mistake, because the office of Premier is a very onerous office indeed and requires intense concentration, work and attention to detail, yet the Premier has taken over the carriage of the Children's Services Office. I can only postulate the reason. I believe that it is because he cannot solve the dispute between the Minister of Community Welfare and the Minister of Education. The Premier said that he had taken over the office because the Government regarded the matter as so important that it had to be taken over by the Premier.

However, then he says in another place, in a letter which he has sent to various people, that this would probably be only temporary. He cannot have it both ways. Nothing more

supported my contention that the Premier should not have carriage of this matter than did his performance today during Question Time when he was obviously embarrassed, did not know the answers to questions, and had to receive briefings from other Ministers. He was obviously floundering. The Premier is adept at fudging answers to questions, but not even he this time could give the appearance of knowing his subject, and that was most apparent to everyone in this place.

We got to the ridiculous situation where the Minister of Education answered another question and deplored the fact that we were not asking questions of him, because he implied that he knew all about it while the Premier did not. That is an extraordinary situation and really confirms the fact that this matter should have been handed over to the Minister of Education in the first instance.

Mr Evans: We would have got longer answers.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, we would have got longer answers, and maybe it would have saved the embarrassment of seeing the Minister of Education sending notes or messages to the Premier when he was trying to answer questions.

Mr Lewis: He'll be the next Premier, anyway.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I must say that it is predicted that the Minister of Education will succeed the Premier (probably as Leader of the Opposition, I would suggest). What are some of the things that have not been addressed by the Government in this matter? It was obvious from the Premier's answers to my questions that no cost analysis was done of the new office before the decision was taken to set it up. Ms Coleman stated in her report that it should be possible to set up a statutory authority without any further cost to Government. However, it is obvious that the Premier's Department did no cost analysis before the office was set up.

Mr Evans: They are relying on the Federal Government—

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Indeed, and that is another area—in answer to my colleague the member for Fisher—in which the Premier could not tell us—although he is Treasurer of this State—the financial arrangements that would ensue between the Federal Government and the State Government. If he does not know the cost of setting up the office, he cannot guarantee that there will be no additional costs to parents because if the office is to cost a lot of money (and we know how the ALP sets up statutory authorities), and if a cost analysis has not been done, then of course the Premier cannot guarantee that parents will not have to pay more to send their children to kindergartens.

Mr Evans: Do child care centres now employ their own staff?

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Of course, that is another question that the Minister was unable to answer. Further, in answer to a question from the member for Mount Gambier, the Minister of Community Welfare could give no information on the staffing situation in regard to the child care centres. Even more extraordinary was an answer given to a question asked by the member for Mitcham about the progressive integration of child care with pre-school education. The Premier gave the most definite answer that I have ever heard him give in this place—he said 'No'. Perhaps I am a simple soul, but I thought that that was the whole purpose of Marie Coleman's recommendations, namely, the integration of child care and pre-school services.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: We are all glad that the Minister of Education has entered the Chamber. He was a bit embarrassed about that matter, because I saw him pass out another message. Although the Minister was asked only one question today, he had a very busy day. I want to list the unanswered questions that have been raised. As I have

said, the Government took this action and then worried about answering questions afterwards. We had a steering committee but that has now gone and we now have an implementation committee instead. But, of course that is really acting as a steering committee because it must answer so many questions, to which I will now refer. We have asked some of these questions already. Will there be parent involvement above the local level? The Premier has in fact said that there will be but what will be the parent involvement? Will there be parent involvement above local centre level? Is there a guarantee that fees will not rise? That matter has already been covered. Will the staff pupil ratio be maintained to the present Kindergarten Union level? What will happen to the Kindergarten Union Council? What will happen to the assets of the Kindergarten Union? It has quite considerable assets—I assume that they might be transferred to the new statutory authority, although the kindergartens will not like that. It is an enormously complicated matter because there is a considerable number of loans outstanding.

How will it all be put together? As I have already mentioned, Ms Coleman reported that there should be no additional cost associated with the amalgamation of the various childhood services under one umbrella. The Premier gave no answer to my question about whether a cost analysis had been undertaken before the decision was taken. What plans are there for the new organisation to function on a regional basis? What administrative conflicts will arise as a result of the continuation of parent child care centres under the education umbrella as separate entities as distinct from those centres which will be amalgamated? So that the Minister will not have to take pains to point out this to me, I point out that I realise that the Government will receive a report in some eight or nine months as to whether child care centres will be amalgamated. However, I want to say something about that, because the Assistant Director of Early Childhood Education in the Education Department has stated that:

Child parent centres must remain within the Education Department in order to maintain the status and career prospects of the child parent centre teachers and retain the status of pre-school teachers within mainstream education, which at the moment is on an equal footing with primary and secondary school teachers. To take out all pre-school education would not only lessen the status of pre-school teachers, but remove their influence on schools and continuing education.

That is a very strong statement. We also need to consider the status of the Kindergarten Union. In a very good question asked today the member for Glenelg asked whether those teachers involved should also be on the same footing, and whether they should have the same promotion opportunities. If it is the case that pre-school teachers are to be able to achieve promotion to junior primary level should not that opportunity be available to all pre-school teachers? These decisions should have been taken before the final decision was made. Why was the announcement to abandon the Kindergarten Union made prior to the investigation into the most appropriate administrative structure for early childhood services? To maximise available resources, is it intended that child care and pre-schooling will be undertaken within existing pre-school centres and, if so, what educational requirements will be necessary for those centres performing a dual function? The list of questions goes on—it is endless. Certainly, some of those questions should be addressed by an implementation committee as they involve matters of fine detail. However, there are matters of great moment in some of those questions that I have raised which should have been addressed before the decision was taken to disestablish the union and to implement Marie Coleman's recommendations on a selected basis.

That is all I wish to say on that matter at this stage, but no doubt the Minister will hear more about this matter from many of us on this side of the House. This leads me naturally into what I believe is the final twist of the knife as far as the Kindergarten Union, and more importantly, early childhood education in this State are concerned. I am beginning with a very reasonable premise here. I am not blaming the Minister but just asking him to intervene in regard to what appears to be a likely decision to be made by the South Australian College of Advanced Education on the restructuring of the course for early childhood education.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am meeting with the Acting Principal.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am delighted to hear that. I hope that the Minister will report to the House the results of that discussion. The proposal was put forward at a most incredibly inopportune time, almost at the same time as the opening of the new De Lissa building. It is proposed to split into two the early childhood education course currently being taught in South Australia for the age range of 0-8 years. There will be a course for the three to five year age group, which is to be moved to the Underdale campus, and a course for the five to eight year age group (shall we say the junior primary component), which is to be left at Magill. As I said at the beginning, I do not blame the Minister for this, but I will blame the Minister if he does not do something about it.

That is my answer to his question. This is an extremely important and unfortunate matter. The early childhood services course, especially that taught by the Kindergarten Union, has been devastated. It was shifted from Kingston against opposition from this side. My Party went into Government too late to stop the move. The course had to put up with temporary and incredibly inadequate accommodation at Magill. It was promised a new building, and it was to be known as the De Lissa Institute for Early Childhood Education, 0-8 years, agreeing with and conforming to the United Nations Children's Organisation definition of early childhood education. That building cost \$2.2 million and it opened this year. However, is it the De Lissa Institute?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: As Minister, I approved the funds for that. My predecessor did not permit the funds to be made available.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: It is called the De Lissa Building, not the De Lissa Institute.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: If it had not been for this Government there would be no building at all.

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: The Minister should not be so sensitive about the matter. Almost simultaneously with the erection of the building we get the proposal floated by the college to split the course. That is the final twist of the knife for the Kindergarten Union: Kingston devastated, the union disestablished; and now all that remained of the course—

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Vandalised!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Yes. That is a grave injustice perpetrated on the staff and students of the college, not to mention all the ex-students who have passed through the original Kindergarten Union training college at Kingston and at the Magill campus. It is a great injustice and a sorry saga. Surely it is about time that we had some stability in this area. I should have hoped that we would eventually get the one course in early childhood training to enable teachers to transfer to junior primary or from junior primary back to pre-school. I would have thought that, if we had wanted to rationalise, that would be a sensible rationalisation. However, we are going in the opposite direction. There may be some academic reason for it but, although I, like the Minister and the member for Coles, have seen the documentation, I cannot agree that that documentation justifies the disesta-

blishment of the course. The member for Coles may wish to deal with this matter at another time. I have seen a record of an interview between the students and Dr Gaites, but nothing that Dr Gaites says in that document convinces the reader that the move is justified.

Mr Lewis: A clandestine, political motive!

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: I am not prepared to say that yet. I wait to see how effective the Minister is in stepping into this breach. I understand that the Minister has no power of direction over the college, but I suggest that he has tremendous moral persuasion. I ask the Minister to intervene in the strongest possible fashion and to report to this Parliament as soon as a decision has been made. At this stage we will let him off the hook in relation to blaming him for what has happened with the early childhood services course. At the moment, I am not prepared to let his 1977 predecessors off the hook but, depending on the answer he gives when he reports to this place, I may let the present Minister off the hook.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON (Coles): I am pleased to support the motion. I also extend my condolences to the families of the late Mr Charles Wells and Mr Claude Allen. Mr Allen retired immediately before I entered Parliament, but Mr Wells was serving his last term as a member of Parliament concurrently with my first term. I well remember his friendliness. In fact, I was quite touched when it was he who was the first person to congratulate me when I completed my maiden speech. I thought it was a rather nice touch that an old stager from the opposing Party should be the one to make that gesture. I appreciated it very much, just as I appreciated the reputation that Claude Allen earned among his constituents and among his colleagues who remained in Parliament after he had left.

In addressing myself to the Governor's Speech I will refer to that section which deals with the Government's tourism policy and its intentions in regard to tourism development. I must confess that, given the Premier's and the Minister of Tourism's talking up of tourism, I had to be very patient in waiting for some reference to tourism in the Governor's Speech. In fact, it was not until paragraph 26 that the subject was mentioned at all. The amazing thing about paragraph 26 is the sense of *deja vu* one gets when one reads it, as follows:

My Government will continue to encourage the growth of the State's tourism industry as an important component of its broad economic development strategies. In addition to the Adelaide Railway Station development, major construction projects are also being undertaken at Port Lincoln, and a new ferry is being constructed to service Kangaroo Island. Advertising and promotional activities within Australia are being concentrated on the large markets of Sydney and Melbourne, and in South Australia specific initiatives will be aimed at encouraging South Australians to holiday in their own State.

With the exception of the new ferry being constructed to service Kangaroo Island, which incidentally is a private enterprise initiative and not an initiative of government, every word in that paragraph was valid for the previous Government in the years 1981 and 1982.

In those years the previous Government undertook advertising and promotional activities in Sydney and Melbourne, and we undertook specific initiatives to get South Australians to holiday in their own State. They were highly successful initiatives. We were also working to develop the Adelaide Railway Station project and to assist the development of the Porter Bay marina at Port Lincoln. If the present Government after two years in office cannot come up with one single new initiative, I believe that the tourism industry and the Opposition are entitled to believe that all the Government's talk is nothing more than lip service.

There is nothing new or substantial whatsoever in regard to tourism in the Governor's Speech. It is worth noting that part of the Government's tourism policy was an undertaking to establish a tourist commission in South Australia, which means legislating to establish yet another statutory authority. Nothing happened in that regard last year and there is no word about it in the Governor's Speech this year. One wonders whether the Government is getting cold feet about this proposal, whether it intends to implement its promise, or whether it will ignore it altogether.

It is well known that the tourism industry has, or at least had, strong reservations about the Labor Party's intention to establish a tourist commission. At this stage, it appears that the Government has no intention of doing anything about it. It seems reasonable to suggest that we should have been entitled to expect to see reference to it in the Governor's Speech. However, the fact that we saw no such reference seems to indicate that the Government has had second thoughts and is now aware that it has made a promise that it cannot or should not implement.

As far as the Governor's Speech and its reference to tourism goes, it was disappointing. My colleagues and I can only hope that compensation for the poverty stricken reference to tourism in the Governor's Speech will be made when the Government introduces its Budget. If the tourism budget this year does not represent a substantial increase on the previous year, particularly in regard to capital grants for the development of tourism resorts, the Government will stand open to the severest criticism, which will be well justified, by the tourism industry in South Australia.

Like other members I would like to express my appreciation of the opportunity afforded to us during the Parliamentary recess to travel overseas and to reinforce the remarks of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition as to the benefits that I personally gained from that trip. I chose to visit Singapore and Hong Kong to examine first hand our biggest tourism markets, that is, our South-East Asian markets. It was the first time that I had visited South-East Asia and I freely admit that looking down on Australia from the north is very different from looking up at South-East Asia from the south. It gives one a sense of perspective about Australia's place in the region and it certainly reinforced my determination to ensure that South Australia, as part of Australia, is marketed much more effectively in South-East Asia in future than it has been in the past and than it is being at present.

In fact, from both the point of view of Government involvement and private sector involvement, I was deeply disappointed at the lack of action which is occurring in South-East Asia. I direct my criticism as much to the private sector as to the Government sector because it was very apparent in both Singapore and Hong Kong that private enterprise in the other Australian States, notably in Western Australia and Queensland, is actively developing the South-East Asian market, whereas South Australia is lagging very much behind.

I regard it as a tragedy to see leading travel agents in Singapore and Hong Kong presenting their clients with maps of Australia which obliterate the gulfs of South Australia by drawing virtually a single peninsula in rough symbolic form, and which mention the only cities as being, in equally prominent order, Melbourne, Sydney, Khancoban and Canberra, and the Gold Coast (Khancoban, obviously, being an overnight stop for visitors from South-East Asia to the eastern seaboard of Australia).

We must do a lot better than that. I can only endorse the Leader's statement that the South Australian Government needs to appoint representation in Hong Kong to take advantage of the significant outflow of capital which is being directed to other parts of Australia and to Canada as a

result of the uneasiness in the Colony and the lead up to 1997. The Hong Kong Chinese are looking for investment opportunities in Australia but they are not being wooed in the manner that they should be wooed by South Australia.

This State could certainly use that investment, but we have not got to first base as far as Hong Kong goes. The same situation applies with Singapore. The significant emerging middle class in Singapore will increase in size, strength and financial backing with each year that passes for the rest of this decade and beyond. It is a potentially enormous market for tourism in Australia.

The other States are exploiting this situation. It is true that the South Australian Government has appointed a representative to work with the Australian Tourist Commission in Singapore and that person takes up his position in the near future. But, much ground will have to be covered to make up for the loss of effort over the past two years.

I was pleased to find that the Australian Tourist Commission is held in high regard by the tourist industry in South-East Asia and that Qantas is, likewise, held in high regard. I personally pay tribute to Qantas not so much for the cabin service and its in-flight arrangements, of which I am in no way critical, but for the work of the Qantas managers based overseas on the ground who work in Australia's interests. I was enormously impressed in both Singapore and Hong Kong by the efforts of the Qantas managers (Mr Richard Chandler in Hong Kong and Mr Peter Barnes in Singapore). I noted that their work went way beyond that of an airline manager and, in my opinion, extended into areas normally covered by trade commissioners and diplomatic missions. Australia is extremely fortunate in the calibre of its Qantas representatives overseas. More Australians should be aware of the ambassadorial and trade responsibilities that those people fulfil not only on behalf of their employer (the airlines) but also on behalf of their nation (Australia). In both locations I chose to stay in Hyatt hotels in order to become familiar with management styles and general operations of Hyatt, which will manage the hotel in the ASER redevelopment.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold interjecting:

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: It was not a question of nobility; it was a question of political common sense.

Mr Becker: You must be very wealthy.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: No. As a matter of fact the accommodation in both those cities was extremely good value on a Jetabout ticket. The point I want to make in referring to the quality of South-East Asian international hotels is the need for Australia to recognise that much more assistance needs to be given to the hotel industry in this country if we are to be competitive on the international market.

It was part of the Federal Australian Labor Party's 1982 platform, constitution and rules (page 161) to retain the existing tax concessions available to the hotel industry and to review the depreciation allowances. As yet nothing has been done about that undertaking and the depreciation for new tourist accommodation stands at the same level of 2.5 per cent as introduced by the late Sir Phillip Lynch when Minister for Business and Commerce. That is not good enough when one looks at the fact that our competitors—South Africa, the United Kingdom, Ireland, New Zealand, Canada, the developing nations of the Pacific, and the Asian nations in the main—provide initial allowances of between 10 per cent and 50 per cent.

Very few of those countries have a base rate for tourist accommodation which is lower than that of Australia. In fact, most of the base rates are around the 10 per cent mark. The relevance of that depreciation allowance cannot be overstated. South Australia has a very fine heritage of nineteenth century hotels in both the metropolitan and country

areas. The depreciation allowance must be increased in order to ensure not only that those hotels are preserved but that their facilities are updated to meet contemporary visitor needs.

Mr Lewis: Like Macs, in Mount Gambier.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed, that is a classic example. There are hotels throughout the State in towns such as Burra, Strathalbyn, Mount Gambier, Clare, Pinnaroo, and Robe, which would be a classic example. But, certainly hotels of more recent vintage must also be encouraged to renovate in order to maintain high standards of service and accommodation. I believe that the Federal Government should allow not only new hotels but also the refurbishing of hotels as part of the depreciation allowance so that repairs such as repainting and refurbishing can be included in that allowance. If this were done it would provide a much needed incentive for upgrading of accommodation throughout the hotel and motel industry.

The extension of the depreciation allowance from 2.5 per cent to 10 per cent would go some way towards compensating for the present very low levels of assistance to the tourist accommodation industry. Given that that industry has a greater capacity than any other industry in Australia at the moment—be it manufacturing, commerce, or primary industry—to employ people, it surely makes common sense for the Federal Government to give levels of assistance which are at least comparable to those other industries to the accommodation industry in order to develop employment through improving plant and attracting more visitors. If this policy were pursued it would generate significant employment in the construction and associated industries, in the service and supply industries to hotels, and it would lead to an upgrading of tourism plant at a time when there is an increasing need for accommodation of varying standards and charges.

We need our Hiltons and our Hyatts, but equally we need those nineteenth century pubs in the tourist regions of South Australia, and indeed in the Adelaide city and throughout the metropolitan area. In this State alone the hotel industry employs almost 10 000 people. Its input into the State's economy is tens of millions of dollars, and it warrants far more incentive than is currently being provided. One particular point I make is that there should be specific recognition by the Federal Government of the disadvantages associated with the development of resort facilities in areas which reflect Australia's unique natural heritage, notably the outback areas of Australia and, in particular, South Australia.

If, for example, a resort hotel were to be built in the Flinders Ranges, it would be almost impossible for that hotel to be competitive in its rates unless it received assistance of that kind. The sheer costs associated with building in remote areas would mean that such a resort would have to price itself virtually out of the market. But, by reducing the initial capital cost through a depreciation allowance such a hotel would become a possibility. I urge the State Government to make such representations to the Federal Government in the strongest possible terms. I have not heard a word said by the Minister of Tourism on this subject nor by the Premier. The Federal Budget should reflect a sensitivity to and a recognition of the points that I have been making about the need to assist the hotel industry by increasing the depreciation allowance.

I turn to the tourism conference that was held in South Australia in early July, shortly before I left for overseas. Because of the strenuous efforts that were made by the former Liberal Government to build up the tourism industry and try to develop a sense of integration and co-ordinated

sense of purpose amongst what had been and still is to a large extent a very fragmented and naturally segmented industry, I have deliberately refrained from criticism of a kind that I believe could jeopardise that sense of purpose and integration that we had tried so hard to build up, but it would be wrong and negligent to remain silent when things obviously are not as they should be and when honest and constructive criticism should be directed at people who are responsible.

In many ways the recent South Australian tourism conference was successful. Certainly, those who heard the splendid keynote speech by Mr Phillip Ruthven, of Ibis Enterprises, would have been inspired by the breadth of understanding of tourism in terms of its economic importance to this country, and in terms of its cultural and social significance. As we move from a work oriented society into a technological era where it is inevitable that we have become more of an activities oriented society with not everyone entitled or able to expect payment for a 40-hour week job, we have to appreciate that tourism will not only have huge economic significance but will have enormous social, cultural and political significance because it will provide in many ways the outlets and the personal and professional satisfaction for people who otherwise would not be able to either obtain jobs or fulfil their wish for leisure, recreation, travelling, self-education and personal experience.

So Mr Phillip Ruthven was an inspired choice as a keynote speaker. I will not go into all my criticisms of the conference. I know that many delegates left that conference dissatisfied because a sense of purpose that had been generated by the previous year's conference (on which I commend the Government and the Department of Tourism, because this Government was responsible for the 1983 conference) was not evident at this year's conference. Certainly, I was absolutely stunned to find that the South Australian tourism development plan, which has been endorsed by this Government and which was the product of previous conferences, was not even presented to that conference for consideration. It had always been the clear intention that the annual South Australian tourism conference would examine the plan in order to make recommendations for updating of the South Australian Tourism Development Board and the South Australian tourism industry.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order! I find it rather difficult to hear the member for Coles with the audible conversation in the Chamber.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: The audible conversation on the part of Ministers on the front bench and of some of their colleagues seems to indicate a lack of interest in a subject that is of vital importance to South Australia. After that conference I wrote to the delegates who attended. I sent a copy of my letter to the Minister of Tourism, because it is fair and reasonable that he should know the communications that the Opposition has with members of the tourism industry. I try, certainly, to work constructively with the Minister, and I appreciate his efforts to do the same with me, because we both know that the industry wants a bipartisan approach.

In terms of general policy I believe that the industry has a bipartisan approach from both Parties in regard to tourism policy. However, when it comes to implementation, sloppy administration and failure to fulfil timetables that have been laid down by the industry for the tourism development plan, I think that criticism is warranted and should be levelled. I had a very impressive response to that letter which I sent to all delegates, stating that I believe that all future conferences should monitor the progress of the plan. One letter stated:

Your reference to the lack of review of the tourism development plan is very pertinent.

Perhaps I could be sceptical enough to suggest that close scrutiny of the plan could have embarrassed too many people. In short, I believe that in some cases those who have the responsibility for either monitoring or achieving the objectives have not done their job properly. It would be an absolute tragedy if this plan, which has been endorsed by both major political Parties, was allowed to flounder and if a sense of direction which had been so firmly established under the previous Liberal Government and which was reinforced at the 1983 conference was allowed to dissipate.

At this stage I say no more than that, but the Minister of Tourism is the one who is answerable in the final analysis for the implementation of the South Australian tourism development plan. If he fails to ensure that all those who have obligations fulfil those obligations, then he has been negligent in fulfilling his role. At the conference one of the groups which felt let down as a result of lack of recognition of its role in the scheme of things was the South Australian Regional Tourism Association. Certainly, the high profile it had enjoyed at the 1983 conference was not evident at the 1984 conference in terms of the programming of the conference, and all members would recognise that.

Yet, as I travel around the State I am impressed by the amount of work that has been done in the regions and the achievements of the regions. I could probably mention each of the 12 regions, but by way of example I will refer to two and the newsletters of each of those regions. The Flinders Ranges Regional Tourism Association makes the point that its membership has increased from 61 to 80 during the current year. When one considers that the Flinders Ranges is a remote region with very few operators, very small towns and not many potential members, one sees that to build up membership of that order in one year is a very impressive achievement.

The same thing has happened on Eyre Peninsula, where membership has been built up from approximately 83 (I think) to 125. That is a very impressive achievement, particularly when one considers the kinds of members who are being recruited. No longer are they people from hotels and motels: they are newsagents, pharmacists, the local butcher, the local baker, and the people in local industry who really stand to benefit from tourism development. However (and this point needs to be stressed, it must be said that the voices in the regions and the industry voice in Adelaide and State wide need to be much louder than they are presently).

In the Chairman's report of 1983-84, reprinted in the *Flinders Tourism News*, the Chairman, Mr Modras Ozolins, is reported as saying:

As an organised industry we have failed in giving Ministers of Tourism the strong arguments they require to secure meaningful funding from Government Budget committees.

It is timely to read those words, although the Budget has probably by now been fully framed and set in concrete. However, it is never too late, as we read in yesterday's *News*, to add a few million dollars. It was reported in yesterday's *News* that the Prime Minister has just done so for the benefit of sport—or was it today's *News*?

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: Today's.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Right! The Prime Minister has found \$60 million in order to recognise Australian sport and to recognise the commendable, and I think triumphant, contribution of Australian athletes, sports men and women, to the Olympic Games.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And the paraplegic games.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: And indeed the paraplegic games, which in their own way, many of us would find even more inspiring because they are a triumph of the human spirit that is an example to us all. The Prime Minister has found \$60 million extra for sport. Will the Minister of

Tourism and the Premier find another \$6 million, or even another \$600 000 for various aspects of tourism? That is the key question. It will be answered in two or three weeks time and, if the answer is not as it should be, this Government will stand condemned for lip service, false promises, setting false expectations and for failing the community of South Australia in terms of establishing job creation opportunities which are second to none. Nothing else that the Government can do will create as many jobs as boosting tourism through boosting its marketing, research and development and the capital works budget of the Department of Tourism. I believe that every member opposite knows that. If they are not working in their Caucus and Caucus committees putting pressure on the Premier and the Minister to increase that budget, those members are failing in their jobs and should be answerable for that failure to every tourism region that they represent.

I was impressed to read in the *Australian* on Monday of this week, 6 August, a message to business from Sir Arvi Parbo. Although the message was directed principally to the mining industry, there was a message in his speech for the tourism industry. Sir Arvi stated that he believed that Australia's big business had fundamentally failed in its duty to communicate with the Australian public. He went on to say that the three groups who speak the loudest in this country—the politicians, unions and single issue groups—hold the floor. They speak the loudest and their message is the one that is heard by the public. The message of business, which has the task of providing the economic bases for the whole community, is often not heard, and Sir Arvi is critical of business for its failure to make itself heard. He said the following:

Participation in public policy discussions is one of many obligations. The more demands are made on enterprises by actions of government, unions and particular interest groups, the less time is available for general policy debate.

Of course, politicians, unions and interest groups are fully aware of that. Sir Arvi went on to say:

Leaders of enterprises, corporate staff and business and industry organisations have to deal with the combined efforts of the other three groups—

that is, politicians, unions, and special interest groups—

over a wide spectrum of issues. The practical effect is that business is mostly reduced to reacting to initiatives by others—to being defensive.

He continues, later, as follows:

It is not easy for business leaders individually to be openly critical of the Government, the unions or particular interest groups. Such criticism is not always accepted as being a natural part of free speech and the functioning of a democratic society.

Of course it should be, but all too often in this country, and in this State particularly, because it is a small State and because one is likely to find oneself sitting at a dinner table next to a person one has publicly criticised, people tend to be even more intimidated by the power of Government, of unions and of special single interest groups. I observed that at close hand when I administered the health portfolio. I believe that I am now observing it in the tourism area. I found it extraordinary that no tourism industry group, burning with resentment though they all were, publicly spoke about the scandalous grant made to the Storemen and Packers Union ahead of a whole string of applicants who were seeking Commonwealth Employment Programme grants in order to develop local tourism regional resorts. I find that quite frightening in its implications. I understand that all the reasons that Sir Arvi Parbo listed are good and sound reasons why business and business related organisations should keep quiet.

Mr Ferguson: How do you know the application was not justified?

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: This matter is listed for debate, and it will be debated at that time and not by response to interjections. I simply say that when industry is angry, if it fails to speak out through one fear or another (and goodness knows we appreciate that these fears can be very soundly based and very well justified)—

Mr Groom: Tell us who these mysterious people are who are complaining.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Those fears can be very soundly based and well justified, but if the tourist industry is looking at the long term, just as is the case with the mining, manufacturing or primary industries looking at the long term, unless its voice is heard publicly espousing what it believes to be right, it cannot justifiably expect advocacy from politicians in a publicity vacuum. I think that that point needs to be made. Sir Arvi Parbo makes the point that associations can help in conveying their message, but that cannot be done simply by a few articles or advertisements or the occasional speech by spokesmen, mostly to the converted. It must be done consistently and it is best done by businesses which themselves have credibility. A business man or business woman speaking up honestly and truly for what he or she believes in (and the most classical example of this recently was in regard to Mr Mick Mabarrack) will earn the respect of the public. Such a voice will be listened to. I believe that the voice of those involved with tourism in South Australia must be heard more loudly and strongly on the issues which relate to that industry.

One of the issues to which I want to refer briefly concerns Qantas and the extraordinary con trick that the Federal Minister for Tourism (Mr John Brown) has perpetrated on the South Australian international travelling public with his so-called beneficial domestic fare deal. Most of us who have travelled overseas in recent times would be aware that there is grave dissatisfaction amongst overseas visitors concerning a deal which now means that, instead of flying 1 000 kilometres within Australia to qualify for the 'See Australia' 30 per cent discount, people must now fly 1 600 kilometres. It means that expatriate South Australians living in Hong Kong who previously qualified for the internal fare applying between the Eastern States and Adelaide (and there is still no direct flight from Hong Kong to Adelaide, as there should be) now must come in via Broken Hill.

Those persons must fly to Adelaide via Broken Hill to qualify for that fare. Has the House ever heard anything more grotesque than having to fly to Adelaide from Hong Kong via Broken Hill in order to qualify for a domestic air fare reduction that the Federal Minister for Tourism says is a new benefit? It is absolutely laughable and it is making the Federal Government a laughing stock among travel agents, airline operators and international visitors. There is a fair bit of hostility, I can tell the House, with expatriate South Australians who are now having to come into this capital city via Broken Hill in order to qualify for a reduction in the domestic air fare.

I would say that Mr Brown has made an even bigger boo boo than the one he made in asking why anyone would want to fly into Adelaide. The House can see that his punitive attitude to Adelaide has been very much reinforced by this crazy policy, and it is worth quoting from the 20 July issue of the *Travel Trade Gazette*, Australia Section. Mr Peter Barnes, the Manager for Qantas in Singapore, says:

Qantas is pushing for a return to the previous Australian domestic fare structure as it believes that the new qualifying distance has made an Australian holiday more expensive for overseas visitors, particularly from South-East Asia.

That is only our biggest market. We have hiked the price and made it a little harder for South-East Asians to travel

within Australia, and particularly to South Australia. That is what John Brown has done. The report states:

Qantas has been supporting a call to revert to the previous 1 000 kilometres travel requirement, which was changed on 1 July to 1 600 kilometres. Prior to that date, visitors travelling 1 000 kilometres in Australia were entitled to a 30 per cent discount under the 'See Australia' fare.

Citing a comment made by Qantas General Manager-Marketing, Mr John Ward, at the recent Australian Tourism Exchange, Mr Barnes pointed out, 'The decision to raise the minimum distance in the See Australia fare from 1 000 kilometres to 1 600 kilometres meant that overseas visitors were paying 42 per cent more for their travel within Australia.'

Everyone knows that one of the first things, if not the first thing, that Chinese particularly look at when it comes to fare structure is the price. They will take the lowest price every time.

Mr Becker: Everyone seeks value for money, not just the Chinese.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Indeed, as the member for Hanson says, we all look for value for money, particularly the Chinese. It is well known in the travel industry that a difference of \$10 or \$20 will determine their decision. How will they take to being charged an extra 42 per cent to come to Adelaide? What will be their reaction to that kind of policy? It will be to wipe us straight off the map. Of course, that is what is happening. Any tour operator trying to sell South Australia in the face of that insane policy might as well knock his head against a wall because there is no chance. If members opposite have any influence whatsoever with their Federal colleagues, I implore them to get the Commonwealth Minister for Tourism to turf out his so-called new deal on domestic air fares that was commended by the Minister of Tourism in South Australia and, at the very least, revert to the previous situation. Better still, give international visitors a decent deal when it comes to air fares in South Australia.

Much more could be said about tourism in a wide-ranging debate but, because my voice is about to give out, these other matters can be taken up in the Budget debate. In particular, I give notice to the Minister of Tourism and the Premier in regard to supplying adequate funding to the Adelaide Convention and Visitors Bureau to enable it to market the Adelaide Convention Centre as part of the ASER project, which the Opposition will be scrutinising closely.

It is absolutely futile for the Minister of Tourism to say that a centre cannot be sold until it is completed—what absolute nonsense! I do not know to whom the Minister was talking or whom he was quoting when he referred to overseas sources, and what he learned when he was in North America, but the reality of the situation is that there is a four, five or six year lead time for international conventions. One has to start marketing them before the centre is built; otherwise, one would find that there would be a three or four year gap with no bookings at all. It is worth noting that the World Trade Centre in Kuala Lumpur is already half booked for 1986, the year when our centre will be completed.

Mr Ferguson: It is more than half way up.

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: But it is not completed. How many bricks can be piled on each other before a dollar is allocated to marketing that centre? How slack can one get? Talk about spoiling the ship for a halfpence of tar! In deference to other speakers in the debate I will not pursue this matter now.

However, the Government certainly has dragged the chain in providing marketing funds for the convention centre. It runs the risk of imposing terrible operational costs which will have to be picked up by the South Australian taxpayer through not allocating marketing funds and, if it does not lift its game in that area, it will stand condemned by future

generations of South Australians who will have to foot the bill for its failure.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I, too, want to extend my condolences to the families of the late Mr Wells and Mr Allen. I, too, formally support the motion.

I want to extend my congratulations to the Premier and his Cabinet on the very fine way in which the Government is managing the State's economy.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten): Order!

Mr GROOM: I know that this issue is very painful to members opposite. The Government's record speaks for itself. It is quite clearly underlined in the Governor's Speech. Let us contrast for the benefit of members opposite the position when we left office in 1979. At that time there was a surplus in the Treasury, yet three years later there was a record deficit of \$63 million. Make no mistake—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GROOM:—the facts speak for themselves. After three years of Liberal Party mismanagement this State faced a record deficit of \$63 million and there is no doubt that in a very short space of time—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens and the member for Coles were heard in near silence and I would hope that the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Whilst I am speaking I hope to be heard in silence, too. I would hope the same privilege will be accorded to the member for Hartley so that I can hear him even if others do not wish to.

Mr GROOM: I know that the Opposition has a lot of difficulty understanding the manner in which the economy functions. That was certainly reflected in their performance whilst in Government: to run up a record deficit of \$63 million in three years speaks for itself. That is what this Government had to contend with when it came to office, not a balanced Treasury like the one which the Liberal Party inherited in 1979, not a balanced financial situation—we had to start \$63 million behind!

The Premier has done a very fine job in managing the State's finances in a very short period of time. Make no mistake, the Liberal Party had run the State's finances into the ground. Had it won the 1982 election, make no mistake it would have moved very quickly to massively increase taxation in this State because it would have had no alternative. One cannot run up deficits of that magnitude and somehow expect them to mysteriously disappear.

Members opposite knew that they were facing an election and that if they increased taxation during that period they seriously risked losing Government. So, they were prepared to run the State's finances into the ground but knew that immediately the election was over, had they won, they would massively increase taxation. That is the fact of the matter. There was a \$63 million deficit at that time and members opposite knew that had they won Government they would have massively increased taxation. The facts speak for themselves.

The Premier and his Cabinet inherited that situation and it was a very critical situation for the State to face. Had it not been for the election of the Hawke Government in March 1983 our situation would have been more critical. Had the Liberal Party been in Government at Federal level, heaven help this State, because we would have been squeezed by the types of policies that that Party had inflicted on the people of this State and Australia.

Paragraph 3 of the Governor's Speech clearly shows the signs of renewed confidence in the future. That statement

is justified and there is no question that this confidence is being reflected in the community. An article appeared in the *News* on 17 October 1983 which was remarkably accurate in terms of its predictions. Under the heading 'South Australia leads way to recovery' it states:

Like the fabled phoenix, South Australia is set to rise from the economic ashes and soar towards a new era of commercial success.

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Well, it is, but it is remarkably accurate. When one analyses what is written in this article almost 10 months ago, one sees predictions about what would occur this year. For example, the article continues:

This follows the June quarter survey which reported that the State's economy appeared to have 'bottomed out' . . . In summary, the chamber believes the September quarter in South Australia [1983] will most probably mark the start of a 'substantial recovery in the State's economy' . . . More than \$78 million worth of building jobs were approved in South Australia in August, a 72 per cent increase over August last year. . . In the June quarter 2 500 dwellings were being built in South Australia, an increase of 25 per cent over last year while the national rise was only 4 per cent. . . In August, 4 723 new vehicles. . . were produced nationally or 1.4 per cent and 15.3 per cent better than for August last year.

All the indicators were there. They were all put in place by policies initiated by this Government, hand-in-hand in many ways with the election of the Hawke Government. So, there is no doubt that congratulations are due to the Premier and his Cabinet for steering South Australia through some very difficult economic times—difficult times contributed to not only by the general economic state of Western world countries but also by the types of deliberate policies that were inflicted on this country and State by the Fraser Government and by the Tonkin Government from 1979 to 1982. There is no question that there is renewed confidence in the economy in South Australia and, indeed, the Governor's Speech records that there has been a strong growth in employment with over 20 000 jobs being created in the past 12-month period.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What does it say about unemployment?

Mr GROOM: I will come to unemployment later. Again, South Australia is leading the nation in getting the unemployment rate down because of the types of policies embarked on in South Australia. The Governor's Speech clearly reflects the renewed confidence in South Australia; this State is leading the way to recovery with 20 000 new jobs being created in the previous 12-month period.

Mr Becker: What policies?

Mr GROOM: One has only to look at the employment indicators. The *Advertiser* of 4 July 1984 sets out a graph that plots the average unemployment rate from 1979 through to 1984. What do we see? The worst unemployment period was in 1979-80. There was a slight improvement, but the average unemployment rate started to increase again in 1981-82. It reached a peak in 1983, but quite clearly in 1983-84, as a consequence of the policies adopted by this Government, there is no question that the average unemployment—

Mr Becker: What are your policies?

Mr GROOM: I will come to that later for the benefit of the member for Hanson. I know he has difficulty in absorbing things that are going on around him.

Mr Becker: I want the precise policies.

Mr GROOM: I will come to the precise policies, but for the benefit of the honourable member I suggest that he read more thoroughly the Governor's Speech, because it contains a lot of material about the Government's policies. I have before me a copy of the 1983 Governor's Speech, which sets out the policies which have proved to be a successful formula for this State. Again, on the subject of unemployment, an article written by the *Advertiser's* political reporter

was published on the front page of that newspaper, because it was important news, on 17 May 1984. More specifically, relating to unemployment, the author said that there had been a 4.1 per cent increase in South Australian employment between April 1983 and April 1984, while the increase in employment in Australia as a whole was 3.6 per cent. That is significantly above the Australian average increase in employment.

There is no question that things are happening in South Australia above the national average. In the *Advertiser* of 13 July, only a few weeks ago, an article appeared written by that paper's political journalist headed, 'S.A. leads jobless rate drop', as follows:

South Australia's unemployment rate has dropped by more than 2 per cent over the past year—double the fall in national unemployment.

These are the facts honourable members opposite are looking for. They asked for the facts: they are contained in the Bureau of Statistics figures, as reported in the article:

Australia's jobless rose from 8.9 per cent to 9.3 per cent between May and June, lifting the seasonally adjusted total by 29 500 to 664 500.

If the member for Hanson wants a copy of the article, which is very detailed, it is available. The article continues:

The State-by-State breakdown shows a fall in unemployed in South Australia of 10 800 to a total of 48 700, or a drop from 11.2 per cent to 9.1 per cent over the previous year. South Australia's jobless rate fell from 9.3 per cent to 9.1 per cent from May to June this year.

There is no question; a 10 800 fall in unemployment in South Australia speaks for itself. Something has to be working to produce that result. Opposition members have gone very quiet now that the facts are starting to emerge.

Mr Becker: I am waiting for you to tell me the specific policies initiated by your Government.

Mr GROOM: Not only will I outline them, I will spend some time with the honourable member later, if he so desires. There is no question that, after looking at the objective figures, something is happening in South Australia above the national average. There is no question but that unemployment is coming down in South Australia as a result of the policies implemented by this Government and by the Hawke Government.

All the bleating in the world by honourable members opposite will not alter those figures and will not alter the trend that the *News* reported in October 1983. The information contained in that article headed, 'South Australia leads way to recovery', has proved to be remarkably accurate during 1984. Of course, as I have said, things are happening. There is no doubt that the State and Federal Labor Governments are proving to be better managers of the South Australian and Australian economies than were the previous Conservative Governments.

There is no question about that. One has only to look at the record. Federally, honourable members opposite, for all but three years up to 1983, have had something like 32 years in Government. What have they done during all that time? What major reforms did honourable members opposite implement during those 32 years?

Mr Becker: We haven't had enough time.

Mr GROOM: I would like members opposite to tell me of one major, permanent reform in those 32 years. What did they do in those 32 years? We have the legacy of their Prime Minister leaving office in the most discredited way. Here in South Australia the failure of their policies is evident from the type of deficit that was left by them and inherited by this Government. There is no doubt that Labor Governments in Australia are proving far better managers and administrators of the Australian and States' economies than previous conservative Governments. I know that it is painful for honourable members opposite to have to listen to these

facts; they do not like to come to grips with the stark reality of what is happening with the Australian economy.

The member for Hanson wanted to know about the specific policies that are responsible for these trends. Look at the merger, for example, of the State Bank and the Savings Bank, which took place on 1 July 1984.

Mr Becker: That has just happened.

Mr GROOM: Of course it has just happened, but it was planned for a much longer period. I will look at the effects of this type of merger. We now have a new State Bank with 200 branches and sum total assets of \$3 000 million. What is one of the first initiatives that the new bank announced? It is going to pay interest on all business cheque accounts on credit balances. Small businesses will be very happy with that initiative. Had it not been for that amalgamation, I dare say that this initiative would never have come from the private banks.

An honourable member: Blah, blah, blah.

Mr GROOM: The honourable member can go, 'blah, blah, blah.' I know that it is painful for him to listen to these facts.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I am indebted to the member for his interjection. If he listens for a little longer, he may absorb a little more information which he can take back to his constituents and inform them of what the State Labor Government is successfully doing. The honourable member says, 'This has only just happened; you have done nothing.' However, immediately following the merger, a significant advantage has been gained for small business in the form of interest on business cheque accounts. The new bank has \$3 000 million in assets, and capital and capital reserves amount to \$140 million. The Bank has a 26 per cent shareholding in the Adelaide-based merchant bank CCF Australia Limited.

An honourable member: Who set that up?

Mr GROOM: It does not matter who set it up. This is the net effect of bringing the two banks together, because it strengthens the financial basis of South Australia. The merger will have a major impact in financial and employment terms and in increased business activity in South Australia.

Look at the other major initiative that will provide enormous benefits and carry us on into the next financial year: the Adelaide Railway Station redevelopment, which is itemised in the Governor's Speech:

Major construction projects such as the redevelopment of the Adelaide Railway Station will also provide an immediate stimulus to our economy while establishing the infrastructure for further employment and development within the State.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Whose idea was it?

Mr GROOM: The fact of the matter is that it is this Government that has brought it to fruition. I have forgotten how the honourable member voted on the Casino Bill. I suspect that he may have voted against it.

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: Quite. That would have virtually put a dampener on this project. If the honourable member had had his way on the Casino Bill, what sort of impact would—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton interjecting:

Mr GROOM: One only has to see the renewed confidence in this State with the passage, in economic terms, for business—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The establishment of a casino in South Australia will benefit business in this State, and it will benefit the economy. It will benefit small business. The complex will employ something like 700 people. That is what the member for Murray voted against. There is no doubt that the redevelopment of the Adelaide Railway Station, from an objective standpoint, has made it that much

more attractive to investors. That is probably inescapable. However, it is a major project which, over the next few years, will assist this State to overcome the difficulties that it will continue to face as a result of the downturn in the economies of Western world countries. I have no doubt that this project will again serve as a booster for business and employment in South Australia.

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

Mr GROOM: Before the dinner adjournment I was congratulating the Government on the very fine way in which it has managed the plight of the economy in South Australia and got the State moving again. I was running through various initiatives which have been undertaken and which have brought about this economic recovery. Another factor that has had a significant effect in South Australia has been the pay-roll tax concessions, and it is well to remember that shortly after the 1982 election the Premier moved to exempt small businesses with pay-rolls totalling \$140 000 or less, which was a significant improvement. In 1983 the exemption was raised again to \$160 000 and, of course, we know that as from 1 July this year the exemption level was increased to \$200 000. The Premier recently announced that the exemption will be lifted further next year to \$250 000. So, by progressively raising the exemption level the Government has created a climate to assist small business in employment growth in this sector of the economy.

The initiatives that the Government has undertaken in relation to pay-roll tax have been very significant. Of course, we all know that the small business sector of the economy is very important, and the establishment of the Small Business Corporation quite clearly has been a significant step in the right direction, which will again provide the necessary climate for small business to develop and grow and prosper in South Australia. The Premier announced the Enterprise Fund as part of his election policy in 1982. He recently announced that Enterprise Investments, formerly known under the working title of the Enterprise Fund, will specialise in providing equity finance and loan finance to South Australian business with growth potential. Indeed, the Enterprise Fund was referred to in the Governor's Speech. It has been designed to fill a recognised gap in the State's financial sector and will become operational by the sale of shares and debentures to the public. These initiatives have been particularly important in bringing about continued economic growth.

In regard to housing, we all know that in the last financial year some \$224 million in capital funds was injected into the housing industry and it was predicted by the Housing Industry Association that some 4 000 jobs would be created. As a result, the growth that has taken place in housing has been the best since 1976. The revival and the stimulus that the housing industry has been given by the policies of the Government have been very important for South Australia, for economic activity and providing jobs, and there is no doubt that it has been a contributor in South Australia's being able to lead the jobless rate drop that has taken place in Australia.

It was announced on 6 February that the Government had increased eligibility for low income families seeking home loan assistance under the home ownership made easier programme. These types of ventures that the Government has initiated have been particularly important for the housing industry. All in all, the Government can take considerable credit for the economic revival that has been taking place in South Australia. In regard to the inflation rate on a national level, the latest consumer price index figures that were released in July revealed that Adelaide's annual c.p.i. rate was 3.6 per cent, compared with the national average

of 3.9 per cent. In fact, the c.p.i. for the June quarter was only .2 per cent in Adelaide, and there is no doubt that the new inflation rate figures have revealed a significant drop in the inflation rate. It is certainly true that Medicare, of which members opposite have been vigorous in their opposition, has been a tremendous thing for Australian families.

I think that about 95 per cent of people have Medicare coverage. This has been a very important factor in reducing the inflation rate, which has consequential cost savings to business right throughout Australia. Adelaide's annual c.p.i. rate was announced in July as 3.6 per cent compared with the national average of 3.9 per cent, showing that South Australia is faring very well in comparison with other States. Of course, if one gets the inflation rate down one keeps interest rates at an acceptable level, because interest rates tend to be geared to the inflation rate. If one goes back to the inflation rate of the Fraser years of 16 or 17 per cent (although it was certainly reduced to some extent, but to nothing like the extent that has taken place under the Federal Labor Government), one sees it is true that interest rates are geared to the inflation rate. Therefore, getting the inflation rate down has been very important for business in South Australia.

There is no doubt that the Governor's Speech contained warnings regarding economic recovery. He said:

However, my Government is still concerned that the recovery within our economy remains uneven and fragile.

There is quite clearly a word of caution contained in those words, so we must all work together in the community of South Australia to ensure that the Government is supported in its programmes and that they are carried out, because they are bringing significant gains to the economy of South Australia. The Government, as I have said, can take a great deal of credit for that. I want, finally, and I will only be a few moments, to say something about capital punishment.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I do not think that in these debates one needs the full hour. If one cannot summarise what one is saying in half an hour one is only being repetitious. I want to say something about the capital punishment issue, because it lurks beneath the surface of the Liberal Party. If one lifts the thin veil of the Liberal Party and the National Party one will find that a desire to bring back capital punishment still exists. The member for Flinders is in an unenviable position because of a motion passed by the Strathalbyn branch of his Party over the weekend. That branch moved a motion to reintroduce capital punishment. I understand, from a newspaper report, that the final motion was considerably watered down.

I find this incredible after a Royal Commission of the dimensions of the Splatt Royal Commission. Members opposite voted against the abolition of capital punishment and there are still a considerable number of those members in this House. There are 11 honourable members opposite who one can only presume still hold those views. If they do not, they ought to get up and say so particularly after a Royal Commission of the magnitude of the Splatt Royal Commission because if honourable members had had their way Splatt would have been hanged for murder.

Mr Ashenden: Don't talk rubbish.

Mr GROOM: If capital punishment is on the Statute Book then there is the risk that it will be carried out. Do not say that it would not be carried out. What is the purpose of putting it on the Statute Book.

Mr Ashenden interjecting:

Mr GROOM: I would be interested to know the views of the member for Todd on the capital punishment issue because, of course, he was not here in 1976.

Mr Ashenden: I am opposed to capital punishment.

Mr GROOM: I am pleased to hear the honourable member say that. He ought to do a little more work in his Party Caucus, because many members opposite still hold the view that we should reintroduce capital punishment. The member for Flinders supports the reintroduction of capital punishment, although he might water it down a bit. He is now at loggerheads with the Federal National Party Leader, Mr Sinclair, because a newspaper report states:

The National Party South Australian Leader, Mr Blacker, has put himself at odds with Mr Sinclair by supporting the move.

The member for Flinders is reported as saying that there is growing public outrage over increasing violence, terrorism and contract killing.

Mr Blacker: Of course there is.

Mr GROOM: Of course there will always be community outrage about murder—it is a terrible crime. But it is another thing to take someone else's life. If one supports capital punishment one supports killing, because that is what capital punishment is. It means death and it is final. If honourable members had had their way, Splatt would have been facing execution after his conviction for murder. Because of mistakes having been made in our system of justice, innocent people have been executed for crimes that they did not commit. Such cases are documented. In a humane society there is no need for capital punishment. The member for Flinders sees a growing need for capital punishment. Apparently, that is now part of the National Party's policy. The editorial in today's *News* referred to this matter and pulled no punches whatsoever. The editorial on page 6 states:

What was worrying about the vote (and this is referring to the vote of the South Australian branch of the National Party) by this relatively small group was that it was symptomatic of a nasty trend on the non-Labor side of politics. Another obvious instance is the mock frenzy with which some Liberal politicians are treating immigration—treating it with thinly veiled racism.

We all know what honourable members are on about in regard to the immigration issue, that they are using it for blatant political purposes. At the next election they will try to use the bogey so-called immigration issue in an attempt to win some votes, but that will not wash with the Australian community. The editorial continues:

Instead of looking ahead, their eyes are in the gutter. They demean Australian politics. They demean themselves . . . It is to Mr Sinclair's credit that he realises this and will not be distracted from the mainstream into the murky backwaters . . .

I think this is a very strong warning. I believe that we all know that beneath the public veil of the Liberal Party there is a very strong move to bring back capital punishment. I would have thought that the Splatt Royal Commission would put an end to any such sentiments, that the issue never would have got off the ground at the National Party's conference. Yet, it did, notwithstanding the Splatt Royal Commission which was a public example of how mistakes were made and how it is possible for people to be executed for crimes that they may not have committed. I said that I would limit my time to ensure that other members were given the opportunity to speak this evening. I support the motion.

Mr OSWALD (Morphett): I want to extend my sympathy to the relatives of the late Claude Allen and the late Charlie Wells. Other members of the House have expressed their thoughts very well. Although I was not around at the time when these members were in the House, I know that the thoughts expressed by the other members were well founded and very sincere. I support the motion presently before the House. In regard to the Governor's Speech, it is well known that the Premier writes the Speech and that it is not written by the Governor. We can all recall that last week the Premier was sitting in the Legislative Council expecting accolades from the gallery for the recovery in this State, for the improvement in the unemployment figures, the lowering of

interest rates, the resurgence of the building industry and the stimulation that is occurring in the rural sector.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: There are more people out of work now than there were when we were in Government.

Mr OSWALD: Of course; the honourable member is quite right, there are now more people out of work than there were in 1982. However, the Premier used the Governor's Speech to create a most devious impression, expecting the public of South Australia to accept that the Premier was responsible for the breaking of the drought and for other circumstances occurring around the world.

The Premier and the Prime Minister of this country have had nothing whatsoever to do with the turn-around in the United States economy, with the ending of the drought, with the reduction of interest rates around the world, particularly with our trading partners or with the reduction of inflation amongst our trading partners. Indeed, it is well known, although the Labor Party will never admit it, that if Malcolm Fraser had hung on for another 12 months and not gone to the people he would have been around for the upsurge in the economy and now would be looked on as a national hero. Unfortunately, he did not do that and history has moved on. If Malcolm Fraser had been around the place he would have reaped the benefit and not the Labor Party, or Mr 74 per cent or Mr 68 per cent as he is now. Instead the Liberals would have been there to reap the rewards as they have flowed on to us from overseas.

Instead, we had this disgraceful but sad spectacle of the Prime Minister nationally and the Premier in South Australia strutting around claiming credit that is not theirs. Unfortunately, the public has been asked to wear it. I suppose it is today's politics, but it is extremely dishonest politics. Through the Governor's Speech the Premier made one true statement. He claimed that the economy is still fragile. This State will continue to remain fragile as long as we have this democratic socialist Government which masquerades under the guise of a moderate centre left; it pays lip service to its support for private enterprise and small business while at the same time it turns around and attacks the living standards of every man, woman and child in this State with the imposition of State taxation and charges the like of which we have never known in the history of South Australia.

The Government has increased taxes and charges not to prop up services that all Governments are expected to provide in this State, not to prop up the normal services of transport, water and the like but to prop up the Government's Party ideological aims. All honourable members know what I am talking about. The latest Australian Bureau of Statistics figures show that every person in South Australia is paying \$438 in State taxes, quite apart from the direct and indirect Federal taxation that every person in this State must pay. No wonder the living standards of the public in South Australia are declining under the Bannon Government.

Between June 1982 and June 1984, State taxes have risen by \$83.30 for every man, woman and child in this State. No wonder we are heading down the track. Under the Tonkin Administration, South Australia was the lowest taxed State in the Commonwealth. Under the Bannon Government we have risen from being the lowest taxed State to the fourth highest, and we are on the way up. There has been an increase of \$83.30 over the past two years, and South Australians are now paying \$438 tax for every person in this State. That is not bad in regard to the now proven dishonest Premier who promised faithfully that, when he came into Government, he would not increase taxes or create new ones in that term of office.

We have become used to this tactic from the ALP, both in Australia and in South Australia. Honourable members well recall what happened in the Victorian elections when the then Victorian Opposition claimed it would not touch

taxes and charges and was then elected and changed its mind. Suddenly the coffers were bare, according to the new Government. The Western Australian Opposition did exactly the same thing and was followed by Mr 68 per cent who did exactly the same thing in Canberra. He came into Government on the promise of not playing around with taxation.

As soon as they get in they throw the same line there is no money in the coffers, and up go the taxes and charges to cover their programmes. It is their track record, it is totally dishonest and it should be condemned.

I have two areas of concern to canvass during the time allocated to me this evening, and they relate to the track being taken by the socialist Government. The first is that both State and Federal Governments are not sufficiently aware of the enormous revolutionary changes in business and commerce that has already taken place around the western rim of the Pacific, particularly in North America.

The world of today is far removed from that of the boom years of the 1940s and 1950s when there was a world hungry for trade in food, commodities and natural resources. Not only did the world want our products in those days but also there was a rapid increase of immigration to our shores, and this naturally created demand for our products within and outside Australia. We all can remember the scenario.

However, one must remember that this was happening not only in Australia but also in North America. Here, as well as in the United States, Canada, and Britain, the boom years resulted in high rising personal incomes and times were good. Naturally along with these times of rising high personal incomes there came a high demand for public services, not only in Australia but overseas. As a result, Governments grew like topsy and no-one complained. The demand from the public grew daily, and at each election there were Prime Ministers and Premiers making offers. Better education facilities and better schools were provided. In the health area there were new hospitals and new facilities, free medicine schemes and the like. In the area of transport there were better trains, trams and buses.

In those days Governments had no difficulty financing these programmes. At that time there was plenty of employment; there was also private development and high employment, and Government coffers were full. No difficulties were experienced, and no-one can take the blame for what happened in those days. Few economists and politicians at the time really foresaw the end of a bountiful if, shall we say, brief period of prosperity.

However, those boom years left a legacy on their country at both a national and a State level. It must be recognised that it has left an indelible mark, both on the Australian and South Australian economy. It will require great understanding and flexibility on the part of this Government in its administration over the next five to 10 years and by the Federal Government. The intellectual legacy of that bountiful post war period should be quickly addressed. First, in those days, all major countries including Australia believed that they were large enough to be called a powerful trading nation and that they could always therefore, at any time in the future, if in financial difficulty, trade themselves out of trouble.

All that wealth came predominantly from the private sector. We then found the drift whereby Governments believed that it was their job to start to civilise the process of the accumulation of wealth and when they started to transfer income to regions and individuals that were believed to have been bypassed by prosperity. Governments then became the largest employers of labour, at the same time seeing it as their duty to teach the private sector how it should treat its workforce. We then saw many Governments supporting the right to strike, and unions quickly moved to

increase the wages and conditions of the worker. Once again this was in a time when Governments had large incomes and were prosperous. Wage growth commenced and confrontations occurred between unions and the large visible institutions, in both the public and private sectors.

Naturally, this led to wage increases, because it was then passed on down the line to the small businessman and the entrepreneur who did not have much option but to try to absorb it or pass it on. With urbanisation, the real action was happening in the cities. People then started moving to the cities, which resulted in a big growth in private and large public sector institutions which became the main employers. The small businessman and the farmer became a bit of an anachronism in those days in the world of big business, were seen to be out of step and were cast aside. This was an era when parents assumed that their sons and daughters, if they obtained a university degree, would have an automatic ticket to an instant well-paid job in the public sector or a large private institution. Unemployment in those days was, as we all know, for those who did not want to work.

Then, by the end of the 1970s, things began to change. OPEC put its prices up, inflation took off and the recession set in more or less permanently, with the recession of the 1980-81 period simply being the longest in a series of recessions. Well, what did Western Governments, including the Australian Government, do to solve this problem? Those Governments tried in various ways to stimulate the economy by using the Keynesian theory; they tried price and wage control, which was the Kenneth Galbraith theory; and they tried tight money and strangling interest rates, for which an economist called Freidman was responsible. However, none of these theories worked. By this stage the public was starting to cry out for action and ideas but, unfortunately, Western Governments had run out of both ideas and money. Large Governments and companies were no longer capable of employing Australians, Americans, New Zealanders, or Canadians—whatever one likes. It was not a problem created by Malcolm Fraser or David Tonkin in his period of Government between 1979 and 1981, as the Labor Party would have us believe; it was a world wide problem.

At that stage the myth that Australia was a strong nation that was capable of trading itself out of trouble was exploded once and for all. Australia found itself in the same boat as every other trading nation with which it was a partner, and it could not rely on trade alone to get out of its difficulties. With hindsight it was very clear what was going on. I think that this is very important. While workers in Australia and other similar countries were paying themselves high wages and building up this large business community and this impressive Public Service (with regulations associated with those public services—regulations to control the lifestyle of the community) the basic structure of the market place had quietly shifted out from underneath us.

Then, new resources from countries such as Japan and around the Pacific rim suddenly overtook us. North America overtook Australian economies and industries. Industries such as the car and electronic industries moved in from the Third World countries and virtually took over in one large lump.

The information revolution based on the chip, the laser beam and the satellite, made the world smaller in time, space and technology. Suddenly it was realised that the Third World countries were making not just products such as shoes and textiles but sophisticated high quality component parts. It was also realised that they had reorganised their work-force, that they were better educated and that they wanted to expand their work force. They had large markets both within Asia and the Pacific rim as well as outside and they were prepared to work and make sacrifices.

Also, it must not be forgotten that they were resourceful. That is terribly important. It has to be remembered that they had no natural resources but they had those other attributes that I have just mentioned to the House. Almost too late it was realised in North America and later down here that the Third World countries were now, in fact, our new major competitors—not other trading nations.

Members of the South Australian Government may well ask how the Third World countries got away with it at a time when recession was sweeping the Western world. I am still talking about the last five to eight years. I am not talking about history that has gone way into the past. Apart from those attributes about the workforce that I have outlined, the South Australian socialist Government should take very careful note of the attitude of those Third World countries. These countries do not have large Governments, which is the aim of the Government opposite.

They do not have large income transfer programmes. They do not pay for social programmes by taxing small businesses. They use small businesses to provide jobs, not welfare, for the aged, the young people and the unskilled in the community. It is a totally different political philosophy from that carried out by the Australian Labor Party. Yet, it is the Third World countries around the Pacific rim which, using these policies, have suddenly found that they can make a dent in the massive United States economy. I do not think that that should be lost on any member in this place.

It was at the beginning of the 1980s that some very interesting trends began to emerge from Canada and the United States. Lessons are to be learned by all of us which will have great relevance to the future direction we take here in Australia and, particularly, in South Australia. By the late 1970s employment, as members will recall, had stagnated quite dramatically. By 1980 it was only the small firms in North America that were creating jobs. The situation was similar to that which applied here, but the Americans realised it a little earlier than we did.

Both business and Government leaders had realised that the continuing recession was much more serious than met the eye and that it had left an indelible mark on the business community around the world. More importantly, the recession closed the doors on the Old World economy in which we grew up. There was no turning back. The realists in North America had realised that. The EEC has not realised it, and they are still in diabolical strife. The United Kingdom does not seem to have realised it and they are also in trouble. Those countries which have realised that the recession has marked the end of a commercial era and there is no going back will succeed. Those countries and States within countries that pick up the message that the recession marked the transition to the realities of the 1980s and beyond will survive to the year 2000. Those that do not will not be around the place to even worry about it.

I know that some members on this side of the House are aware of it, as I am sure some members of the Government are, but, because many are not, it bears bringing out. The reality of the situation is that the world is moving into the new era called the information society based on closer communications brought about by the laser, computer, satellites and, particularly, fast commercial transport. What the United States was quick to grasp, while we in Australia have been a little slower off the mark, was that the information society was one with which the Third World can compete and, in many cases, it can win. This message was loud and clear to me last month when I was in the United States talking to a senior businessman. The United States has recognised this threat and is moving towards doing something about it. We must also do something in that regard.

We cannot just pay lip service. We cannot fool ourselves on this matter because, as I said a minute ago, we will not be around to commiserate with each other. More importantly, they have realised that the countries around the western rim of the Pacific—from Japan across to Korea, all the way down to Singapore—are denuded of natural resources but rich in manpower and in entrepreneurs and now have become a direct threat to the United States economy.

In the United States and Canada small firms are now rapidly adapting to new technologies or are dying. This is where the Government, through our Small Business Corporation, can play a specific role. The large multinational companies and corporations that were so visible in years gone by to the politicians and economists need years to turn around and change direction, some of them taking five to 10 years to turn around. If they have not been able to do it or cannot make up their minds where to go, they are dying; by that I mean that they are going bankrupt. A company like General Motors will take at least five to 10 years to turn around and adapt itself to new competition, but it takes only a matter of months for a small business to turn around, unhampered by the rigidities of the bureaucratic process within that industry and by trade union restrictions.

At last, in the middle of the 1980s, small business has come into its own. The South Australian Government has a very real responsibility now to ensure that South Australian business men and women thoroughly understand the commercial revolution that is currently sweeping the Pacific rim from Singapore around to Japan and North America because, as I keep repeating, if we do not recognise it and cannot get the message through to our business community—that it has to change direction now or it will not be around in 10 years time—we are not doing our duty as a Government and as an Opposition.

This Government should do all in its power to allow entrepreneurs in this country to operate and compete and, having assisted them through the Corporation or by whatever means to change direction, the Government should then step aside and allow the small businesses to get out there and run and regulate themselves, and I emphasise that last point. They should let the market place sort out the competitiveness side, but we must support our entrepreneurs.

To illustrate the trends in North America, I quote from a document put out by the President of the United States, called 'The State of Small Business: a report of the President'. It gives the trend of what has happened there over the past four years. I am doing it to illustrate my point that it is happening now. It is not an historical fact—a change that took place some 10 to 15 years ago; this trend is happening at this point in time, and it is fortunate that we have been able to recognise it. If the Yanks go ahead and go down the track and other countries do not follow we will miss out and be a backwater. The report brings forward some startling data. For example, between 1980 and 1982, 1.7 million jobs were lost in firms in the United States with over 100 employees, but 2.6 million new jobs were created in firms with fewer than 100 employees. The trend is pretty clear there.

Secondly, new small businesses account for 43 per cent of the net increase in jobs during the same period. The rate of growth of new business formations is accelerating in the United States. New business births 1980 and 1982 added 2 million more new jobs than for the period between 1978 and 1980. In the most recent period—November 1982 to November 1983—the number of self-employed workers increased by 6.6 per cent, compared with a 3.7 per cent rise in the number of wage and salary employees. I did some more research and found that that applied to the under 35

year olds, who are now getting out and looking to start a business of some sort for themselves.

The report further states:

During the period September 1982 to September 1983, in the six major industries from which small and large business-dominated industry subsectors can be identified, small business-dominated subsectors registered net employment growth of more than double the rate of large business-dominated subsectors.

I refer to the set up in Canada and a research study by the Canadian Federation of Independent Business which revealed that firms employing fewer than 50 employees created 100 per cent of all new jobs in Canada. Firms employing more than 50 employees prior to the recession had contributed 30 per cent, but all these and more were lost between 1980 and 1982. I hope that those statistics illustrate the current trend in the United States. One will see quite clearly that large businesses and large firms are no longer providing more jobs, but small businesses are taking off. These findings in the United States and Canada are having very radical implications on those countries and the way they govern themselves.

I will return to that and highlight the fact that in Australia we have no option, regardless of our ideological outlook, but to do exactly what is happening in North America in regard to our attitude towards small business if we expect small business to provide jobs in the future. If it is safe to say that large firms in North America as well as their public sector counterparts in those countries will make only a minor contribution to new job creation during the rest of the 1980s (and I believe that this view is shared by most developed nations), then their employment policies will have to be consecrated on new venture formation and the growth of small business. There is no other direction that those countries can take, and there is a lesson there for us in Australia.

Traditionally, Government's efforts to assist small business in South Australia have taken the form of direct grants and loan programmes. Most of those programmes miss the target group (the young and small business) and have tended to concentrate on medium sized businesses. I think that, if one casts around for some examples, one will find that that is right. Unfortunately, no matter how good their intentions, slow moving bureaucrats do not mix well with fast moving entrepreneurs. Never let it be forgotten that entrepreneurs are like lovers: they just need a little encouragement, without which they are inclined to hang back. Most of our young and small businesses are not aware of programmes or have not the time or money to apply for programmes. Most of our businesses are already carrying too much debt, and a little more from the Government is the last thing they need at any time.

Any business finds it hard to finance itself from retained earnings, especially if it is being hit by what we call other labour costs—and we are all familiar with those—and other taxes that are imposed on its profitability. However, all small business operators can be reached very successfully through the taxation system. I believe that it will require co-operation between the Federal and State Governments. However, that co-operation should take place in the interests of job creation and the small business community. I accept that this Government cannot act alone; it desperately needs the help of its Federal counterpart. Without that help we are wasting our time. Small business can be reached and assisted by reducing the burden of profit insensitive taxes.

Profit insensitive taxes are State taxes, workers compensation, penalty rates, insurance, and all those charges which are lumped on the business community. Small business can also be assisted by altering the risk reward ratio for individual entrepreneurs who are willing to share the risk of their potential rapid growth in business. There are two ways in

which Governments can help small business, but the quickest way is to reduce profit insensitive taxes.

In that way the Federal and State Governments will go down the track a long way towards helping small business to get on its feet. I am saying that there has to be a rapid change in the system of collecting taxes from small businesses at both State and Federal level. To ignore that statement is to turn a blind eye to what is happening in the real world around us and is to close one's mind to the argument that the economic recovery of this country is now firmly at the feet of the small businessman, the entrepreneur and those businesses that basically employ 100 people or less.

The better use of tax resources will also attract money away from personal savings accounts, which is not a bad thing, and Government bonds, which is also perhaps not a bad thing, provided it can be brought back and reintroduced into entrepreneurial ventures. The Government will then reap the reward, because that person will be a taxpayer and the money will go back to the Government. It will start money circulating and, as a result, it will start creating jobs, which I believe is the prime responsibility of caring Governments in the 1980s.

We are only a small State. I believe that the South Australian Government should be playing a much larger role in finding markets in South-East Asia for our manufacturers. The Leader of the Opposition highlighted this point in his speech earlier during this debate. He was quite correct when he referred to the need for trade officers in Hong Kong. There is a desperate need for us to have a large impact on South-East Asia, because that is where the population and the markets are located. The fastest growing market in the world is in South-East Asia, on the Pacific rim and right on the edge of the shores of Australia but, unfortunately, we have captured only a pitiful share of that market. The Canadians are busting themselves to get into that market as an alternative to the United States market, and the United States is busting itself to get into that market, too.

The Hong Kong dollar is moving out of Hong Kong to be reinvested, but at this time we have a pitiful share of what is a most vast and growing market. When one compares the EEC, which is in diabolical strife, Britain and our former trading partners with the trade potential in South-East Asia, it is frightening to realise how little we are doing up there. State Governments can, and should play a role in this matter. I believe that as a nation we have four problems at the moment: we are insufficiently technological, insufficiently market orientated, insufficiently cost conscious, and as a nation we do not think like traders. Honourable members who visit Hong Kong or Singapore (and I know that many members have) will note the trading atmosphere that pervades the place. The inhabitants are small businessmen, but they are also traders. In Australia we do not have that feeling and we have to do something about that.

To correct the present situation we will have to make further and far greater use of the medium of public education. The average citizen of Australia, like his counterpart in Japan and Singapore, must begin to understand that his or her contribution and wage rate is vitally important to the productivity and competitiveness of the nation as a whole. We do not have that feeling pervading Australian society. However, it pervades areas north and south of us and in North America. It is up to us, and to the Government, to ensure that the public thinks this way. The State Government can play a part in this through the education process.

While I am on the subject of public attitudes and education, I must say that I believe that the biggest challenge of all is in our schools, particularly in our high schools, colleges and tertiary institutions. In blunt language, our educational infrastructure system is turning out a generation of young people who are poorly qualified for both the world

of small business and the international environment of today's major companies and corporations.

If we are very frank with ourselves we will admit that the qualities of perseverance, self discipline and enterprise are so necessary for self employed people. All self employed people subscribe to those principles, without which one would not survive. However, these are not being emphasised in our present institutionalised, bureaucratic education system. That must be redressed. For young students who aspire to careers in Government, major corporations and companies we have downgraded foreign languages, mathematics and communication skills, which I believe is a disaster. Next to Europe and North America our major trade link growth is that with Japan, China and the Pacific rim. I believe that a knowledge of Japanese and Chinese languages will in future be far more important to a business man or woman than European languages with which we are familiar because of our ethnic population.

In Japan 25 000 schools teach English. Further, on the whole educated members of the business community in South-East Asia speak up to three or more languages. I think we should take heed of those statistics. Those people will be our trading competitors in the future; they are the ones for whom we really must gear ourselves up. I hope that there is a recognition by members of the House of the revolutionary change that is taking place in the world of business in the 1980s. In this regard we will have to make radical changes in the educational system in Australia and South Australia to implant a sense of discipline, better work attitudes and a spirit of enterprise amongst our young people. If we do not do that, we will become an economic backwater.

Above all, we need a Government with political leaders who can establish a co-operative relationship with the private sector and who will give investment and development priority over income redistribution and regulation. It seems that all the present Government can think about is income redistribution and regulation. However, the Government must think past that, start to look for co-operation with the private sector, help the private sector to become established, and to then step aside after having given the entrepreneurs some assistance to get going and let them get on with making the business work, involving the creation of jobs and their own self regulation.

The leadership of that type of Government comes from a Liberal Government, but while the Labor Government is still in office it must pick up the situation that exists overseas, readjust its policies and act accordingly, because time is running out very fast. If this is not done, economically we will be in diabolical strife and the rest of the world will pass us by. Earlier I said that I had two main concerns about the Government: the first is its attitude to the business community, both here and abroad; and the second is its attitude to the nuclear cycle in Australia as compared with the attitude abroad and the effect that this will have on Australia in the short and long term, particularly on our uranium industry.

I want to address myself now to the nuclear fuel cycle and convey some relevant and extremely important remarks that were made to me about the unreliability of Australia as a source of uranium. I refer particularly to the attitude of senior Government and industry officials in France and Switzerland towards the Labor Administration here. The remarks to which I refer were made by extremely senior officers in industry in France and Switzerland only last month. They are important comments and must be borne in mind and never forgotten if we are to be fair dinkum about getting off the ground with a long-term uranium industry in this country.

First, let me explain that in Europe where there are socialist Governments it is those socialist Governments that are

pushing uranium to be the basis of electricity generation. They are the front runners: they are pushing the industry. It is the Communist Party in Europe (including the countries behind the Iron Curtain) which is advocating the use of plutonium and fast breeder reactors.

Yet in Australia the socialist Governments are the ones doing their utmost to undermine the uranium industry. People in Europe cannot understand it. They ask what is going on in Australia. They say, 'You have socialist Governments in Australia, so why will they not change their attitude? Socialist Governments in Europe are the Governments advocating the uranium strategy.' I was given a clear message by the executive official in charge of the purchase of all nuclear fuels for the Swiss power generation programme, who said, 'We are happy to sign up long term to purchase uranium from Australia. All we ask is that the price be right and, if it is sold to us, that it be sold without commercial strings to the extent that, if we want to enrich it and convert it to rods for sale, for example, to France to put into its power stations, they be allowed to do it, and that it be a commercial judgment. They might wish to retain the uranium and use it in their power stations. That final decision is to be theirs.' Officials will not enter into any long-term agreements with us because they see Australia as an unreliable source of supply. The message to me was loud and clear: tell the Australian Government that it has about 18 months to sort itself out. If it cannot come up with some sort of decision within the next 18 months, they will pass us by, and they were not joking. They will go elsewhere.

In other words, the ALP in Australia has only 18 months to sort itself out on the whole question of the supply of uranium oxide to the rest of the world, which otherwise will pass us by. That is a fact of life. If Government members want to talk to Government and company officials purchasing fuels for these nations, they will be told exactly the same thing: sort yourself out in the next 18 months or we will go elsewhere for our purchases.

It is about time that the Labor Party realised that its personal attitude to uranium and nuclear power generation around the world is totally irrelevant to the rest of the world. There are many other countries who will step in to fill the breach. What the Labor Party thinks is totally irrelevant. It may believe that it is big time in Australia, but it is a very small cog in the rest of the world.

Mr Meier: If they don't sell it, we will pay even higher taxes.

Mr OSWALD: True. Nowhere is it more evident than in France, which has just had bans placed on the supply of uranium by Mr 68 per cent.

Mr Gunn: He dropped a bit today.

Mr OSWALD: I think he has dropped from 74 per cent to 68 per cent. Nowhere is this more evident than in France, which has had bans placed on the supply of uranium in protest to its atomic testing on Mururoa Atoll. These bans will have no effect on the French and their testing, but it will destroy completely our chances of long-term contracts with France. France is second to the United States in conversion to nuclear power. Those countries have unambiguously tied themselves and their energy future to atomic energy. That fact of life will not change. Presently they have plans afoot to increase significantly their share of the uranium cake, and it is essential that we get in there and get a piece of the action because, if we do not become a regular supplier of uranium oxide to them, many other countries will fill in the gap.

It was most evident to me while I was in France last month that France is not about to change course after having committed itself to this extent because some country down in the bottom corner of Asia that has no need for nuclear power at present is handing out gratuitous advice

to the French Government. France could not care less what the Labor Party is thinking in Australia. It will not change its view. France is going down the nuclear track and, if we like to sign contracts to supply uranium oxide, we can do so. But we do not have to. We have 18 months to make up our mind.

Let me tell the House about France's commitment to the uranium industry to which the Labor Party is at the moment trying to jeopardise our access. In specific terms, 45 per cent of the output into its national grid for electricity comes from nuclear power stations. The rest is 25 per cent from coal fired and 30 per cent from hydro. The French programme is to have 75 per cent of electricity nuclear generated by the 1990s. This will lift the total of the nuclear energy cake from 30 to 50 per cent. It is a lucrative market which the Labor Party will lose if it continues as it is going, particularly now that it has banned the supply of uranium oxide to France; it will lose this market.

It is not good enough for the Labor Party to allow Roxby Downs to go ahead. It has done this only so that it will not lose the next South Australian and Federal elections. There is no other reason. It is not good enough to let the mines go ahead and then take action overseas which will mean that there will be no markets in which to sell the uranium. The net result is that we will end up producing uranium at Roxby Downs and having nowhere to sell it. Then the Western Mining consortium will have to say, 'We have to stop the process because we do not have the market.' All it is doing is undermining that market.

Mr Meier: It's the Clayton's mine: the uranium you mine when you're not mining uranium.

Mr OSWALD: It certainly ends up more than Claytons in the end. It is vital that we get that under way. In France there is little public opposition to nuclear power and as a result France has 35 nuclear power stations in operation. In the simplest terms, nuclear power is indispensable to France and denying it uranium will result in denying other European countries uranium, because under the EEC rules one cannot cut off supply to one country and still expect to supply it elsewhere. It is not legally possible under the way it is constituted, and it can do nothing but damage to ourselves. It will mean that Canada, the United States and South Africa will be laughing all the way to the bank. If that is what the Labor Party wants to do so be it. That is the track down which it is headed with its attitude of trying to cut off supplies of uranium oxide to France.

I have always contended, and will contend as long as the Labor Party exists in this country, that the socialist left seems to have a vested interest in doing everything that it can to prevent the economic recovery of this country. Whether it is because an economic recovery will set back the socialist cause 50 years and put it back on the seat of its pants, I do not know. Whatever project it is, the socialist left wants to prevent the economic recovery of this country, for which it should be condemned.

If the Labor Party decides to keep us out of this lucrative market then the other suppliers around the world will thank it from the bottom of their hearts. It is probably what the other countries want to see happen. Talking to the French and Swiss, we are told that they will buy uranium from us provided we can sell it at the right price and be a reliable long term source. The Labor Party seems to be hell bent on making sure that we are not seen over there as a source of vast tonnages.

While on the subject of vast tonnages, I would like to place on record some of the tonnages we are talking about and the vast sums of money involved. In 1982, France needed 5 400 tonnes of uranium concentrate. It received 2 553 from its own mines and a further 3 830 tonnes from French holdings in Niger, one of its possessions. Word has

it that France wants to keep some of its reserves for its own strategic purposes, perhaps for defence in the future. It does not want to dry up its own reserves, which is understandable, and hence the desire to diversify the supply elsewhere. In 1990-91 the French Atomic Energy Commission estimates that it will need about 9 600 tonnes, and estimates that it has only 11 400 tonnes in reserves under French control, which means that there is a vast market on which we can break in.

Once again, through the actions of the Federal Government our chances of breaking in on that market are in jeopardy. Flowing from that we will lose the Swiss market and, flowing from that, probably the Dutch market—all over this left wing attitude of getting the stuff out. I know that the Prime Minister has said that he will allow existing contracts to go on, but the public must not lose sight of the fact that it is one thing to let existing contracts run their course, but countries in Europe are talking not about existing contracts, but about future contracts to be drawn up. It is about time Australia started to think and act big.

Australia should be planning today for conversion and enrichment plants in this country. I know that the ALP is firmly against it, but I believe we should be going down that track. We should be planning today for a fully operational nuclear power station in South Australia linking into a national power grid. It is not impossible. In talking about a nuclear power station we are talking about the year 2 000, and we should be starting to plan. A report from the Advisory Committee on Future Electricity Generation Options goes into the question of comparative costs, and the argument put up is that because South Australia is small we would be able to put up only a small unit, and small units mean that the cost per unit of electricity is high. In actual fact, we need a large unit and could share it with other States. The argument is then put forward through most of this report that, if one compares the cost of power produced from fossil fuels, the final product is much cheaper than with power produced from nuclear fuels. One paragraph destroys the whole report. On page 27, it states:

However, a recent article by the Institution of Engineers stated that Victorian Brown coal plant and nuclear power had comparable generating costs.

Now politics comes into it. It continues:

The SECV Act [State Electricity Commission of Victoria Act] now specifically prohibits the SECV from studying or planning nuclear power stations in Victoria. Therefore, a large nuclear power station could not be considered a viable option for South Australia either alone, or in conjunction with Victoria.

It appears that there is a report around the place that compares favourably the cost of producing nuclear power from fossil fuel and nuclear fuel. We know that if a large power station is built and the output shared across the border it will be comparable.

This document smells to me very much like a political document that has been put out to satisfy the arguments of the Government. At the beginning of the section dealing with 'Nuclear', the report states:

However, it should be noted that present Government policy does not support the establishment of nuclear power stations in the State, and consequently nuclear power is not an eligible option.

At least a few pages of the report are devoted to nuclear power. I suppose that one of the authors managed to get that one sentence in, which clearly indicates that under certain circumstances there are comparable costs but that the political implication is such that it would not be developed. This whole document now becomes a political document.

While on the subject of nuclear power—and I have not discussed this with my colleagues—referring to the submarine plant that we are talking of constructing at Port Adelaide to eventually produce diesel-electric submarines, I see no

reason, because of Labor Party ideology, why we should not be offering to produce the nuclear powered submarine that will give our Navy the necessary speed, range and increased capability that comes from a nuclear powered weapons platform. I leave that with the House. I see no reason why we should not also offer to produce nuclear powered submarines. We are Australia; we are a developing country; we can think big and achieve these aims.

I have four minutes available to me during which I would like to convey to the House a picture of a fascinating sight that I saw in California a couple of months ago. It is on the lighter side. It relates to generation of electricity by wind power. We are all familiar with the freelight which one sees at the back of farm houses. It is a windmill with two blades some two feet long which generate power into some storage batteries for the use of the family. I was travelling out towards the back of California and came across a rise. As far as the eye could see was hectare upon hectare of enormous freights with blades 20 feet long standing on towers in the distance, probably 40 to 50 feet up in the air. It appears over there that in the dry land farming area the farmers have found it is uneconomic to grow grain and they have now gone out and erected literally hundreds and hundreds of these windmills as far as the eye can see.

They churn out electricity; they do not grow crops any more. They feed this electricity into the State power grid and it is used around the towns. Never let it be said that it is not feasible for a country to look to wind generation as a source of electricity, because it is a sight to behold to see as far as the eye can these hundreds of windmills.

The interesting quirk I suppose is that because of Federal legislation the State Power Authority is compelled by law to purchase the power of the farmer, so he has an assured income. It would probably please many farmers if they could swing over, in dry arid areas, to this method as a source of income. This system is feasible; it works in California. It is lighting townships in the area and was something that I found quite interesting.

In closing, I wish to express to the Governor the loyalty of the people of Morphett during this coming session of Parliament.

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I am pleased to take part in this debate, which gives members the opportunity to address themselves to a number of matters which are of concern to them and also to raise matters on behalf of their constituents.

I wish to add my condolences to the families of those members who have passed on since the House last met. I did not know Mr King but I knew Mr O'Neill. I knew Mr Wells, who entered Parliament on the same day as I did and, of course, I knew Mr Claude Allen very well, because when I first came to Parliament we shared an office together for a number of years. Then, in 1977, my electorate of Eyre and the electorate of Frome were amalgamated. I knew him very well and he was a very fine member of Parliament. I am sure that the people in the areas of South Australia that he represented appreciated the representation that he gave them.

Like a number of members of the House, during the Parliamentary break I had the opportunity to travel overseas to look at a number of issues which were of interest to me and which, I believe, will benefit the people of South Australia in the future. I want to say at the outset that I greatly appreciated the assistance I received from the Department of Foreign Affairs in Washington and in Greece, South Australia House in London, the secretary of the United Kingdom branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, and other people in British Columbia. It made my trip enjoyable and I found that the organisation was good.

The first place country that I visited was British Columbia in Canada. I went there for a number of reasons. First, I wanted to have a look at its correspondence school, in particular because one of the officers of the correspondence school spent some time in South Australia on an exchange basis. I also wanted to look at British Columbia because it is a province in Canada that has a moratorium on uranium mining. Also, it has a policy of protecting its natural gas requirements for its own producers; so it was a most interesting exercise.

The staff of the correspondence school was dedicated, hard working and was endeavouring to give a service to those people in the isolated parts of that province. I believe on reflection that the South Australian Correspondence School has nothing to learn from British Columbia. The only advantage that that province had over South Australia was that some of the students had access to the university satellite. The 59 education districts that that province had would in my judgement be more of a hindrance than a help. So, from what I saw in British Columbia, I believe that the South Australian Correspondence School is as efficient as any in the world.

I looked at the uranium industry. Some years ago the Government of British Columbia decided that there would be no uranium mining for seven years in British Columbia, even though the rest of Canada has a programme to develop its uranium industry. It has large deposits. At the very time the Government of British Columbia brought down its decision to inflict its moratorium on the province it had an inquiry running into the uranium industry. Even though the Government of the province of British Columbia determined that there would be no uranium mining for seven years the expert committee that the Government had set up recommended that uranium mining continue in British Columbia and found that there were no logical reasons to prevent uranium mining.

All that the ban has done is to prevent exploration because the policy is that if there is 5 per cent of uranium ore in that area exploration cannot continue. The only people, from my assessment—and I had a lengthy discussion with the officers of the Mines Department in British Columbia—to miss out were those in the province of British Columbia. There was no logic in the decision because the rest of Canada was going full steam ahead.

I also had the opportunity to discuss at length with their officers their arrangements for the export of natural gas to the United States. I did that because we are aware of the predicament in which the Dunstan Government placed the people of South Australia. It is no good saying one thing and meaning another: we had the statement earlier this week by the Minister of Mines and Energy in which he briefly referred to the problems.

In May 1982 a commission that the Government appointed reported to the Government. I will read the terms of reference of this inquiry so that the House can have no doubt as to what it was looking at. I will then read the basic recommendations. The full report is about three or four volumes, which have been posted to me, and I intend to place it in the Parliamentary Library. I hope that the Minister of Mines and Energy will examine it. I understand that his senior officers have already examined this report. Whether the Minister and his political officers have had the chance to examine it I do not know; I sincerely hope that they have. The terms of reference were:

- (i) estimate present and future annual and peak day requirements in British Columbia for marketable natural gas, ethane, propane, and butanes;
- (ii) estimate the present and future annual supply and reserves of each of the hydrocarbons;
- (iii) formulate procedures for determining the quantities of those hydrocarbons which may be considered surplus

to British Columbia's requirements based on the estimates of present and future requirements and supply; and

- (iv) estimate the quantities of each of the hydrocarbons which may be deemed to be surplus in accordance with the procedures to be formulated.

A number of specific issues related to the surplus procedure and conditions for the removal or use of surplus gas were also to be examined.

The Commissioner said:

Under circumstances where natural gas is being exported from British Columbia, the Commissioner believes that conceptually the priorities respecting supply in the unlikely event of a supply shortfall should be as follows:

- (i) Domestic residential and commercial consumers;

May I say that that is unlike South Australia, where Sydney has the first option after 1987. The Commissioner further stated:

- (ii) Export residential and commercial consumers supplied by pipeline from British Columbia;
- (iii) Domestic firm industrial consumers including any so-classified holders of energy project or energy operating certificates;
- (iv) Export firm industrial consumers supplied by pipeline from British Columbia;
- (v) Domestic interruptible industrial consumers including any so-classified holders of energy project or energy operating certificates; and
- (vi) Export interruptible industrial consumers supplied by pipeline from British Columbia.

They are the basic recommendations. I recommend the report for the perusal of honourable members. I hope that, when I put the detailed documents in the Library, the Minister and his staff will look at it because it contains recommendations that ought to be applied in South Australia. If that had taken place before Premier Dunstan signed the contract for Sydney, we would not have endangered our supplies of natural gas.

While I was in the province, I had the opportunity to look at the large stadium which has been built in British Columbia. The member for Hanson made some comments relating to it, and it was a clear example of what takes place when people get together and build one large facility which can serve a number of sports and allow the holding of any sporting event or large public entertainment.

This stadium, which covers some 10 acres and which is completely enclosed, cost \$116 million, but they play baseball and football, have rock concerts, track events, and motor bike events; everything can be held in the one stadium. The only point I would like to make is that I sincerely hope that, before any other stadiums or large sporting facilities are built in this State, some thought is given to a project of this nature. It is completely covered. The roof is kept in place by air pressure. The stadium has an artificial floor and seats 60 000 people under cover. It was certainly an eye opener, and many people thought that it would not be a success. However, until now it has been far more successful than anyone ever imagined, and I thank the people at the stadium who at short notice made staff available to show my wife and me around.

I am going into some detail because, as the honourable member for Kavel said, there has been some criticism by sections of the media of members of Parliament going overseas. I think that it would greatly improve the standard of journalism in this State if the management—

The Hon. J.W. Slater: If they all went overseas together.

Mr GUNN: The Minister may be right. I do not go quite as far as that, but I think that it would improve the standard of journalism and there would be far more informed articles in the press if some journalists were sent overseas to look at issues which affect the people in South Australia, because I believe that it is in the interests of all South Australians that members of Parliament are kept abreast of what is

taking place overseas. It is an important role for members to be fully aware of the facts.

I went to Colorado, and for a quite simple reason: it has a very large uranium industry and a large tourism industry, like British Columbia, where a third of the State's income is generated from tourism, an amount that will increase in the future.

It also has a number of laws relating to the management of national parks in which I was most interested. In British Columbia I had extensive discussions with the management of national parks. The point was made there very clearly by officers that great care should be given to where national park boundaries are put. It was explained to me that during its period of office a socialist Government in British Columbia was hell bent on creating national parks and no thought was given as to whether there might be large mineral deposits in the areas involved.

The National Parks Office made it clear to me that a great deal of work should be done before parks are officially declared, as it would be quite wrong to include in those parks very large mineral deposits that it might be necessary to exploit in the future. They believe that mining should not occur in national parks but that, if it is found that national parks contain areas of mineralisation, the boundaries should be altered. We should not have the nonsense that we have in South Australia with regard to this matter. The other point of interest made in relation to the administration and management of national parks was that wherever possible private enterprise should be involved not only in providing facilities for tourists and people wishing to go into those parks but also in the management of those parks.

I also went to Colorado, first to Denver and then to Grand Junction. It was interesting to learn during my discussions in Denver that laws in Colorado allow for the compensation of landholders whose properties are damaged by native animals. It is accepted in Colorado that all wildlife is owned by the State, which accepts responsibility for that wildlife. Therefore, if animals damage people's orchards, crops or hay, compensation is paid to the landholder. Last year approximately \$1 million was paid in compensation. I point out that some \$27 million was collected in that State from the sale of hunting and fishing permits, so a payment of \$1 million was a fairly minimal one.

Also, large fences have been built near the roads where these animals migrate in order to keep them off of the roads. Another interesting point is that the law has determined what constitutes a fence when dealing with a landholder's straying stock. That is a matter at which we should look closely. I was fortunate enough to get a copy of article 3 of the law which is headed, 'Damage to Wildlife'. I had discussions with the Secretary of Agriculture in the State of Colorado, who advised me to get a copy of this document. The first point I make is that departmental officers are there to advise landholders and provide them with equipment to enable them to try to drive animals off. From discussions I have had, I do not think that throwing crackers at kangaroos would have a great deal of effect in Australia, but they are supposed to attempt to drive animals off before taking other more extreme action. The document states:

Damages caused by those species of wildlife enumerated in section 33-1-102 (3) to orchards, nurseries, crops under cultivation, and harvested crops, significant damage to fences, and significant damage to livestock forage in excess of normal historic levels caused by wildlife to privately owned and fenced areas which are specifically limited to: hay meadows, pasture meadows, artificially seeded rangelands, and grazing land which is deferred to seasonal use. Historic levels expressed in numbers of wild-life shall be established by written agreement between the division and the landowner, based on the 20-year period ending 1 January 1973.

If the landowner and the division do not agree on normal historic levels, the matter shall be submitted to arbitration. The arbitration panel shall consist of one arbitrator chosen by the

landowner, one chosen by the division, and a third arbitrator chosen by the other two arbitrators. The division and the landowner shall each pay any cost in the use of their own arbitrator and shall equally share the cost of the use of the third arbitrator. Historic levels may be included in any appeal to the district court regarding wildlife damage, and the court shall not be bound by the finding of the arbitration panel . . . The division will be liable for only those significant damages caused by wildlife to hay meadows, pasture meadows, artificially seeded range lands, etc.

I have raised that matter because many people in my electorate have complained to me about damage caused to their properties and pastures by native animals, particularly after having been denied permission to destroy kangaroos and emus, and in some cases wombats. It is a matter that should be addressed and I hope that the National Parks and Wildlife Service will take the trouble to look at the law that applies in Colorado and at other similar laws in the United States to see what can be done about the law in this regard.

I also had a look at the programme in the United States for controlled burning off of national parks and range lands. This is a matter which from time to time has caused a great deal of controversy in South Australia. While in the United States I was fortunate enough to be shown some equipment which is in use. I refer to a document headed 'Fuelbreaks, Fire and Brushlands, California Region Forest Service, USDA', which states:

Fuelbreaks and reduced fuel zones are just one aspect of a complex program of brushland protection and management that has continued in national forest lands in California for many years. Although some fuelbreaks are being developed in timber zones, Congress recently expanded the program in the fire-prone brushlands in southern California. Public concern for the fuelbreak program centres on value return for money spent and on short and long-term effects on the environment. The major goals of a fuelbreak system are these:

Improve public safety, access, and useability and provide variety in landscape within the brushland zone.

Create safe areas for fire fighters and provide 'anchor points' to start suppression action.

Reduce burned acreage and the costs of suppressing wildfires.

Reduce public and private losses that result from wildfires and subsequent flooding.

Increase production and availability of desirable forage for wildlife and livestock.

Increase the variety and abundance of wildlife.

Provide us with the opportunity for obtaining the benefits of prescribed fire.

California and Colorado have a programme for controlled burning off. A helicopter is used and they have specialised lighting equipment which can light significant areas quickly so that a fire can be managed more quickly. It is about time that our National Parks and Wildlife Service faced reality: it should go to the United States and have a firsthand look at procedures that are in use there. I want to quote from a document that I was given called 'The Burning Ground', which was put out in August 1983. It states:

Tools for managing chaparral: Prescribed burning using helitorch is the least expensive in terms of dollars and environmental impacts. It costs \$5 to \$50 per acre. Mechanical means of crushing, chopping or uprooting plants to gain the most productive mosaic of plants in an area include the use of bulldozers, brush rakes, heavy-duty discs, anchor chains pulled by two tractors to mash brush, a ball and chain dragged by one tractor, and other such equipment. The per acre cost ranges from \$50 to \$250.

The document goes on to state:

The California Department of Forestry has primary fire control responsibility for about 5 million acres of privately owned brushlands considered to be in fire hazardous condition. In order to prevent or limit wild fires on these lands, the State Legislature approved in 1980 a chaparral management programme that offers cost sharing to private landowners to pay for prescribed burning on these lands. The State expects to treat about 100 000 acres annually.

The member for Alexandra would be interested to hear that. The document continues:

The State contribution is directly related to the amount of public benefit, and priority for treatment is determined on the basis of contribution to public safety.

California's Department of Forestry is responsible for leading the chaparral management programme. Other key partners are the Department of Fish and Game, the Department of Water Resources, the University of California and other State, Federal and local entities.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: They certainly can. I wanted to quote from those two documents to make it clear that the United States, which is very proud of its park management, regards controlled burning off as one of the most useful tools at its disposal. Also in the United States I had the opportunity of visiting Washington and having discussions with people involved in the nuclear fuel cycle. I met Mr John Segal of the Atomic Industrial Forum, who clearly explained to me the research that he had carried out in the United States. He estimated that there would be an increase of between 3 per cent and 4 per cent in gross national productivity in the United States in 1980 and 1992. He anticipated that if that took place there would be at least a 3 per cent increase in the demand for electricity. If that increase took place within that period, there would have to be built in the United States 250 nuclear power plants. He pointed out that during the last few years there had not been any power plants built except for one recent exception in Texas where there had been one new coal-powered plant constructed.

Opponents of nuclear power are very quick to point out that in the United States no nuclear power plants have been constructed in recent years, but they fail to point out that no coal-fired plants have been constructed either. If the increase in electricity demand increases annually in that period to 4 per cent, it is anticipated that there could be over 400 nuclear plants constructed, because many of the plants now operating in the United States are old and need replacing.

Further, the United States now has in place a programme to deal with nuclear waste. We are told that it is bad enough having these wicked nuclear power plants, but there is no safe way to deal with waste. I would now like to quote from a document that I was given headed 'Nuclear Waste Disposal: Closing the Cycle' and put out by the Atomic Industrial Forum, 7101 Wisconsin Avenue. I will briefly read what the programme is. Headed 'Nuclear Waste Policy Act 1982', it states:

This landmark legislation provides a complete programme and a detailed schedule working toward availability of the nation's first high level waste repository around the end of the century. Some milestones:

30 June 1983—Utilities executed contracts with the Department of Energy (DOE) establishing a fee of one mill per nuclear-generated kilowatt-hour for its accepting title, transporting and disposing of spent fuel or high level waste.

1 June 1985—DOE will forward to Congress proposed plans and sites for a monitored retrievable storage facility to hold spent reactor fuel or solidified high level waste until a geologic repository goes on line.

6 June 1986—A site will be selected by DOE for a test and evaluation facility to demonstrate deep geologic disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high level radioactive waste.

31 March 1987—The president will recommend to Congress a repository site qualified for applying to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for a construction authorization.

31 May 1987—The affected state or Indian tribe may submit to Congress a notice of disapproval on the repository site recommendation. This veto stands unless overturned with 90 days by a majority vote in both houses of Congress.

An honourable member: It's pretty dull.

Mr GUNN: The hounourable member thinks it is dull, but I am explaining to the House the matters I looked at while overseas. I will not be put off because there has been some criticism of members of Parliament. It is important that we put on the record the things that we looked at overseas, otherwise we would be failing in our duty. The article continues:

1 January 1989—NRC will decide on the construction authorization for the first repository.

6 May 1990—Experiments will begin at the test and evaluation facility.

31 January 1998—The nation's first geologic disposal facility for high level radioactive waste is scheduled for initial operation near the turn of the century. This repository will accept up to 75 000 tons of spent nuclear fuel or 20 000 tons of solidified high level waste.

The United States has reversed the trend of the Carter Administration and is now moving towards a program of dealing with nuclear waste in an effective manner. It is very important that people understand that there are effective ways of dealing with these problems.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I had the opportunity of meeting representatives of Urenco-Centec and the Central Electricity Generating Board in London which supplies power to England and Wales. It has over 60 000 employees and provides power for about 40 million people. The Electricity Generating Board cannot understand the attitude of the Australian and South Australian Governments.

The Electricity Generating Board is committed to a nuclear program, and it is currently involved in giving evidence to inquiries on whether it will be permitted to build a Sizewell 'B' Power Station. The company representatives had no doubt that the United Kingdom has to continue with its nuclear program. As soon as other forms of power become more expensive, as they will, countries will have to turn to nuclear power. The company representatives pointed out that it was cheaper to import coal from Australia than to have it mined in the United Kingdom. They also said that a number of European countries were complaining bitterly about the effects of pollution from the United Kingdom, particularly acid rain in Sweden.

If the people who claim to be environmentalists are concerned about the environment, I cannot understand why these same people are opposed to nuclear power. Unfortunately, if the right decision is not made within the next 12 to 18 months, we will miss out because the company would like to sign long term contracts with Australia. The company is concerned about the instability in Bolivia and other parts of the world. However, unless Australia is prepared to be involved, they will get their supplies elsewhere, particularly from Canada.

Both Urenco-Centec and the Central Electricity Generating Board were fully aware of what took place at the ALP conference, because they received telexes from Australia on the decisions that were taken. It appears from the decision that has been taken that South Australia will miss out on obtaining a uranium enrichment facility. From the discussions we had, it appears that that facility was well on the way. I also had discussions with people responsible for controlling firearms, conducting elections, and redrawing electoral boundaries. Although I do not regard the situation in South Australia as anywhere near perfect, in most aspects it is far better than the situation overseas. The system used in British Columbia leaves a lot to be desired. Recently there was an amendment to the Constitution Act, and the explanation note states:

This Bill establishes an Electoral Commission to determine, on the basis of increases in population, when any electoral district should have increased representation in the Legislature.

Increases in representation will depend on whether the population of any electoral district exceeds a named percentage of standard population. The standard of population is called an "electoral base".

On the mainland this electoral base will be the average number of residents in five named mainland electoral districts. On Vancouver Island it will be the average of two named electoral districts.

When an electoral district exceeds 60 per cent of its named percentage of the mainland (or Island) electoral base, it will become eligible to be represented by two members instead of one or, if it is already represented by two members, to be divided into three new districts.

The "named percentages" of the mainland and island electoral bases are set out in the Schedules.

The first six mainland electoral districts, and the Victoria electoral district, have 200 per cent as their named percentage because they each return 2 members.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: If the member listens, he will understand.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the member was to go back to his chair and interject it would not be so bad, either.

Mr GUNN: The member has been particularly rude, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GUNN: The explanation note continues:

The remaining electoral districts have named percentages between 80 per cent and 100 per cent. This recognises the wide variations in area and population density of these electoral districts.

This is a rather unique method of redrawing electoral districts. I do not think that this method would be accepted in Australia, but it was interesting to examine the way in which the districts are drawn. When I looked at the situation—

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: I am normally fairly tolerant of my own colleagues.

Mr Whitten: Tell him to behave himself. You don't need his assistance to make your speech.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre is quite capable of making his own speech.

Mr GUNN: I have been endeavouring to ignore interjections, as is not normally my way. I have been endeavouring to complete my comments, but I do not appreciate some of the assistance I am getting. I looked at the relatively new electoral system in Greece, which has had an unfortunate experience with a dictatorship. Greece is one of the few places in the world, like Australia, with compulsory voting.

Most parts of the world that I visited did not have compulsory voting, but they have a system of compulsory voting with approximately 280 of the 300 members in the Assembly being elected. They have multi-member districts with a transferable proportional representation system.

Mr Chapman interjecting:

Mr GUNN: In answer to the member for Alexandra, I was in Athens for three days and had a number of appointments. Then I returned to Australia. If the honourable member avails himself of the travel opportunities that are available to members, I sincerely hope that he puts his time to good use, because I believe that such opportunities benefit all members of Parliament. I availed myself of the opportunity and I look forward to doing it again in the future. I understand that a number of other members travelled also. I want to make one or two brief comments before resuming my seat, and I know that the member for Alexandra wants to go home.

Mr Chapman: Yes, dickin he doesn't!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! If the member for Alexandra does not stop interjecting he might go home earlier than he expected.

Mr GUNN: I took the opportunity while overseas to look at firearms controls in a number of countries. I was quite disturbed at a number of the things that I saw. I want to make very clear from the outset that I have always been regarded as being on the pro-firearm side of the argument, and I still am. I believe that there are certain things that we in South Australia can learn. However, I was perturbed when I had discussions in Washington, Canada and the UK at certain trends in the criminal world.

It was pointed out to me that it would appear that in the relatively near future fairly large quantities of self-loading military weapons will come on to the market and that it is most likely that many of these weapons will get into the

hands of the general public. We are not just talking about hundreds; we are talking about millions of weapons. It was pointed out that they could become available at a cost of \$50 or \$60 each. It is a disturbing trend.

I wanted to discuss a number of other matters, but I will not do that this evening because I wish to conclude my remarks in a few moments. But I am looking forward to this session. Many matters were mentioned in His Excellency's Speech to which I will address myself. His Excellency mentioned amendments to the Electoral Act, and I intend to use a considerable amount of the material I collected when I was overseas when that matter is debated in the House. Maralinga Pitjantjatjara land rights legislation was mentioned: I sincerely hope that during this session the Minister will take the appropriate action and bring into line the Pitjantjatjara legislation which urgently requires amendments so that proper exploration work can take place and those roads in the area can be opened to the public.

Some mistakes were made at the time the legislation was introduced, and it is high time that those amendments were brought forward. It was rather unfortunate that the expectations of the community were raised to a level where people believed that they could virtually retain sovereignty over those parts of South Australia. I intend to have a fair bit to say about taxation levels when we are debating the Budget.

In conclusion, when I left on my trip overseas it was the first occasion that I had been to the new Adelaide International Airport. I must say what a pleasure it was to leave Adelaide for overseas from that airport and not have to go to Melbourne, Sydney or Perth. This facility will greatly improve tourism. On returning from overseas, one can go through the airport in under an hour and be at one's destination within a few minutes. It is certainly better than laying off for three or four hours in Melbourne. It must be an added attraction for getting people to come to South Australia.

I commend all those responsible for obtaining that facility. My trip overseas also gave me a greater appreciation of the value of tourism. When one considers the number of tourists in British Columbia and Europe, one cannot help but be impressed by the amount of money and the number of jobs that the tourism industry is providing in those parts of the world. I am confident that the South Australian tourism industry can be developed to even greater levels.

The Adelaide International Airport will certainly assist that. We in South Australia are very fortunate to have an airport that is located in such a central and sensible location, so close to the centre of the city, so that people can get from the airport into the centre of the city within a few minutes, not having to travel 35 or 40 km.

Mr Oswald: It was initiated by a Liberal Government, was it not?

Mr GUNN: Yes, it certainly was initiated by a Liberal Government. It was one of the many things it did. I am sure that the majority of members of the House would agree with my comments. I am doubtful whether the Adelaide Airport will ever be shifted because the cost of relocating it would be astronomical, and there are far more important things for Governments to spend money on.

An honourable member: There is no justification.

Mr GUNN: There is no justification whatsoever. My experience of many airports over the past few weeks reinforces my views. There is no justification and no logic in people continuing to bleat unnecessarily about the Adelaide Airport. I wanted to make those comments because I was impressed with the facilities. They were quite adequate and it was a pleasure to be able to get on an aeroplane and fly out of Australia without having to go to Sydney, Melbourne or Perth.

An honourable member: How did you go with Customs?

Mr GUNN: I did not quite hear the honourable member. I had no trouble whatsoever, being a law abiding citizen. If honourable members opposite cannot fill out a simple form of that nature, they need a reading lesson.

In conclusion, I support the motion for the Address in Reply. I look forward to the session. I look forward to listening to the contributions of other members, and I sincerely hope that it will be a fruitful session and that the Government will bring into force legislation that will benefit all the citizens and, in particular, pay attention to those communities in isolated parts of the State.

I hope that some of the taxpayers revenue will be appropriated to those isolated communities that are only requesting what the rest of the State takes for granted. For those communities in my electorate that do not have sufficient supplies of water, that have inadequate roads and no access to decent educational facilities, I intend to raise all those matters as often as possible in the House. The people in those communities are being penalised by having to pay a 10 per cent surcharge on electricity when that electricity goes through those areas to large cities in which people do not have to pay the surcharge. I will raise those matters until my constituents receive justice.

Mr Ferguson: What about tourism in your area?

Mr GUNN: The people in this State are fortunate to have the wonderful areas for tourists and the tourist facilities in the District of Eyre. I recommend to all members that, if they want to visit a well-represented electorate that has a lot to offer, they should come to the District of Eyre. They will be made most welcome by those fine constituents of mine who live in those areas. I invite the honourable member to be the first to go to the Flinders Ranges, to Eyre Peninsula and to the Far North, as long as he does not get lost. Like most members opposite, he is not used to being more than about 15 km from the General Post Office and he gets lost. However, I can provide him a good guide at a reasonable cost. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion for the Address in Reply.

Mr WHITTEN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this debate I wish to draw to the attention of the Parliament the movement that has developed in both the United States and the United Kingdom towards having consumer contracts of all shapes and sizes to be written in plain English. We have been informed through the report to the Parliament by the Consumer Affairs Commissioner that in the United States the movement towards plain language contracts is very highly developed and six States now have laws requiring that consumer contracts be written in clear language that the average person can understand.

This year in the British Parliament a Bill has been proposed called a plain language Bill. The requirements of the Bill are that a contract to which the Act applies shall:

1. Be written in clear and readily understandable language using words with common and everyday meanings.
2. Be arranged in logical order.
3. Be suitably divided into paragraphs with headlines.
4. Be clearly laid out.
5. Use lettering that is easily legible and of a colour which is readily distinguishable from the colour of the paper.

There are many examples of consumer contracts written in what is commonly called gobbledegook.

In the United Kingdom, the Director-General of Fair Trading (Sir Gordon Borrie), in a discussion paper on problems raised by household insurance, states:

Many consumers find the jargon in which insurance policies are written very difficult to understand.

He went on to say:

Many householders just do not know what they are getting or whether the cover they are buying is adequate.

A survey commissioned by the Office of Fair Trading in the United Kingdom found that 40 per cent of consumers surveyed were unclear about the basic terms in household insurance policies. About 2.25 million claims are made each year in that country on household insurance policies, and most are settled in full and within a month. However, the survey found that the most common complaints by dissatisfied householders were about refusal to pay a claim, or meeting it only in part, and delaying payment.

Consumers disagree about the insurers' interpretation of the cover, particularly in relation to subsidence, theft and 'all risks'. Research in that country has shown that one householder in five does not have contents insurance and many more may be underinsured. I would suggest that a similar situation is occurring in South Australia. Many householders are unable to assess their insurance needs properly and are in need of proper advice on this subject. Insurers should use simple language, clear layouts, definitions and tables of contents to make policies easier to understand.

I have had the experience in following up insurance claims for constituents, where the constituent never ever received a policy in the first place, and one of the excuses that insurance companies put forward is that the consumer would never understand the policy in any event. This statement is probably true and is a reflection on the insurance company itself, because I believe that contracts should be made in plain language.

In the United Kingdom, the National Consumer Council has called for legislation for a plain English law Act to end the jargon surrounding standard consumer contracts and housing contracts so that people can understand what they are signing. The council proposes that under such a law consumers should be able to sue for compensation for any loss caused by gobbledegook in a contract. Progress towards plain English in the United Kingdom has been slow, but I would strongly suggest that it has been even slower in Australia. Legal jargon, long tortuous sentences and crowded pages are still part and parcel of consumer contracts.

The National Consumer Council in Great Britain has suggested that a plain English law would act as a catalyst to ensure that firms use standard consumer and housing contracts written in clear and comprehensible language. The only exception would be contracts on land purchases, long leases or mortgage transactions which are negotiated individually. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs informed us in his last report that consumers often fail to read their contracts until some dispute has developed and they wish to ascertain the extent of their rights and obligations. Even then they find it necessary to contact the department for advice as to the meaning of particular contractual provisions.

Even experienced investigating officers find it necessary to obtain a legal opinion on such contracts before they are able to give appropriate advice to the consumer. Decisions in British courts, which no doubt apply to Australia, have stated that when a document containing contractual terms is signed then, in the absence of fraud or misrepresentation, the party signing it is bound and it is wholly immaterial whether he has read the document or not. Unfortunately, in the case of some consumer documents it is sometimes immaterial whether or not the consumer has read the con-

ditions on the form, because he would have difficulty in understanding the legal jargon contained in that contract.

It is my understanding that South Australian law has moved a very small way along the track by making sure that contracts are printed in certain size type. In fact, the Parliament made a mistake in this legislation and legislated for a size of type that was unavailable in the printing industry. This was subsequently rectified, but the attempt so far to help consumers can only be described as timid. The United Kingdom has at least moved towards a situation where an Act gives the consumer the right to see certain documents and to have them translated into plain English if necessary. So far as I know, even this small step is not available to consumers in South Australia.

The State of New York and six other States of the United States have adopted plain language laws. A Bill modelled on the New York law is being considered by the Parliament of Ontario. The New South Wales Contract Review Act, 1980, enables a court to say that a contract is unjust and void in whole or part if it is expressed in a language which is not readily intelligible, or is printed in a way that makes it difficult to read. It would appear, Mr Deputy Speaker, that it is time that the South Australian Parliament had a serious look at this situation to see whether similar legislation is necessary in this Parliament.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I was intrigued by the comments of various members in the Address in Reply debate, particularly the statements made this evening by the member for Eyre. It appears that we are receiving a travelogue from most members who have spoken. Comments have been made about the beautiful location of the Adelaide Airport, about the new international terminal there, and how handy it is. Not one of those members has said that he or she has been prepared to travel for one, two or three hours in foreign cities to arrive at the international airport, that they have had to wait for two or three hours to get bookings and seat allocations reconfirmed, and so on. The only trouble is that people overseas put up with the problems of vast international airports, not necessarily in the capital cities.

As far as the Adelaide international airport is concerned, there is a very unfortunate side. In the dying stages of the 1982 State election period, I believe around 11 November, the then Prime Minister (Malcolm Fraser) hurriedly declared the Adelaide international airport terminal building open, and it was named the Sir Thomas Playford international terminal.

To this day the plaque has not been fixed in its place. I believe that there have been problems in trying to work out an inscription to go on the plaque. It was suggested that perhaps a boulder should be deposited in the garden in front of the building and the plaque placed on that. It is a tragedy that it has been almost two years since the Adelaide International Terminal was officially opened and that it still does not carry the name of probably one of the greatest persons who served and loved this State, that is, Sir Thomas Playford.

I bring this matter to the attention of honourable members and the Government in the hope that somewhere along the line someone will pick up this matter and support me in pressing the Federal Government and the Minister for Aviation (Mr Beazley) to have the plaque installed at the terminal so that thenceforth it will be rightfully known as the Sir Thomas Playford International Airport. I do not think anyone would object to that, and certainly all honourable members who have had the good fortune to go overseas recently would know that many international terminals around the world are named after famous citizens of the relevant country, State or city.

Another matter which disturbs me concerns the funding and future of some of the programmes under the Technical and Further Education Colleges. I received a letter from the Personnel and Training Manager of the Phoenix Society, Ivor C. Snaith, a good friend of mine, who stated:

Recently, many organisations working in the field received verbal and, in some cases, written information that Courses for the Intellectually Disabled being run by TAFE for these organisations, were to be drastically cut. For instance, Croydon College notified agencies for whom they conduct programmes that they would be cut by 50 per cent in the third term of 1984 and 100 per cent (that is totally) in 1985. This is additional to cuts that were made in 1983 when terms were cut from twelve sessions to ten, and some programmes completely cut, including link programmes.

This, for many of us, is extremely hard to reconcile when one reflects on the Education Minister's speech to the Annual General Meeting of the South Australian Institute of Developmental Disabilities this year, when he spoke of his Government's commitments to these programmes and their plans to extend them.

The Special Education Curriculum Committee has been concerned about programmes in this area for some considerable time and as a member of this Committee, I have agreed to orchestrate an approach to the Minister from as many areas as possible in the next two weeks. I thus ask if your agency would be prepared to write a letter to the Minister to arrive on his desk no later than 22 August 1984, expressing concern at the lack of financial stability for these programmes and particularly the lack of ongoing focus and input at a level that affects decision making within TAFE.

Trust you can help. Please find herewith some comments on which you may be able to base your letter and also a copy of a letter from Croydon College received by one organisation.

The subject matter for the letter to which he refers is as follows:

It could be said to the Minister that Government statements of intended affirmative action in the intellectually disabled area and his own most encouraging statements at the Annual General Meeting of the South Australian Institute of Developmental Disabilities are not reconcilable with TAFE policy:

'It is recognised that TAFE at present meets only a limited portion of a substantial demand for intellectually disabled people to improve their vocational, personal and living skills. It is my Government's firm intention to ensure this role is extended.

I hasten to add the Department now acknowledges in its Policy Statement its responsibility to provide educational/training opportunities for intellectually disabled adults.'

The Minister also made commitment to re direct, if necessary, resources within the Department towards this extension. He also referred in his speech to the Committee Report on the Department of Technical and Further Education Service for Adults with Intellectual Disabilities/Handicaps, which states:

'If the educational needs of persons with intellectual handicaps/disabilities of this State are to be regarded as legitimate and more than mere optional appendages to College programmes and dispensable when funds are threatened, then TAFE Colleges will need guaranteed funds.'

Historic reaction within TAFE to economic times has shown that the education for the disabled has always been the first to receive drastic cuts, because of its almost total reliance on hourly paid instructors. It is our contention that this area should have ongoing tied funding which would make it impossible for college principals to exercise such cuts.

World Health Organisation figures indicate that approximately 1 per cent of the population would be regarded as intellectually disabled to some extent, and thus it would be fair to draw the comparison that TAFE should spend at least 1 per cent of its budget on this area. We understand that TAFE's commitment falls unacceptably short of this figure. One could add that, in view of the needs of this area, coupled with the greater expense involved in running such programmes, a figure well in excess of 1 per cent should be spent. The organisations serviced by TAFE are completely dissatisfied with the Department's *ad hoc* approach to special education. There appears to be a lack of on-going focus and input at a level that affects decision making within the Department; and the question of lack of long-term commitment to this area by the Department makes long-term planning impossible. The almost total input and focus of the Equal Opportunities Unit, within the Department, is for women's programmes and the first paragraph of a very recent statement on general equal opportunity policy concerns us greatly:

The South Australian Department of Technical and Further Education is committed to a policy of equal opportunity for

women, people with physical disabilities, Aborigines and people with non Anglo-Celtic language and cultural background. It will be noted that the intellectually disabled area is completely ignored, which in view of all the Minister's recent statements makes those of us working in the field, doubtful of the future.

The special education area is one that has worried many people involved with sheltered workshops and some institutions in this State. One organisation with which I am involved is the training and placement division of the Epilepsy Association. If these programmes are to be cut out we will be denying opportunities for young adults with some intellectual disability to have the opportunity to improve their skills, no matter how small the improvement may appear initially, but to deny these people the opportunity to work in an open environment is totally cruel.

I believe that these cuts are a terrible blow to the disabled, particularly the young adults, the slow learners. About 1 per cent of the population would be affected; about 13 000 people in South Australia would be involved. Regrettably, most of them try to exist on the invalid pension or a pension of some type. This move is a cruel blow: it is mean, it is a miserably action by a miserly Government. The letter of 13 July 1984 from Croydon Park College confirms what Mr Snaith told me, that the programme will be cut out in 1985. I appeal to the Minister of Education to find out what is going on in the Further Education field before it is too late—

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

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Tonight I would like to speak about my recent visit to Alice Springs just over a month ago. I had the occasion to journey on the Ghan from the new Keswick terminal. The stairs and the ramp from the station platform to the adjacent platforms to join the Ghan were steep indeed, making it very difficult for access to adjacent platforms, particularly for the elderly, the disabled, parents with young children and indeed for any person who wished to take his or her luggage on the train.

Many persons, whether agile or not, wish to carry their luggage on to the train itself. The member for Peake and I heard many adverse comments from the elderly passengers expressing anger at their having to carry their luggage up and down the steep ramp or stairs.

One must also question the apparent lack of concern by the architects and designers of this new terminal, particularly in relation to access by passengers to the adjacent platforms at this locality. What has happened to the concern expressing during the International Year of the Disabled Person? Surely the architects and designers of this terminal could have designed it in such a manner as to provide a lift and/or escalators for train travellers. I found on boarding and alighting from this train, particularly when I had to carry my own luggage (and I believe that I am reasonably fit), some difficulty traversing the very steep stairs.

In this day and age, particularly where many retired and pensioner groups are travelling on public transport in this country, I found it absolutely appalling, to say the least, that this facility with its apparent lack of concern for these passengers had been overlooked. When one looks at a number of passengers who travel on the railway service in the country, one finds a large component of those travellers are elderly citizens. It is absolutely amazing to me that this has been overlooked.

Whilst I am addressing this matter, I would also mention the lack of adjoining services that have been apparent since the terminal was opened. There are no connecting services for interstate or intrastate passengers and, more importantly, I wonder how overseas visitors would regard such a terminal that is supposedly new. It must reflect upon the lack of

concern by Australian people. There is no doubt that, when I have travelled overseas, I have taken into account matters such as this. Indeed, in my opinion, many overseas travellers going back to their respective countries would have expressed concern about this lack of foresight in relation to the obvious need for a lift or escalator.

On boarding the train I found the services by the train crew, particularly the lounge and dining car staff, to be excellent, to say the least. Clearly, the staff took pride in their occupations and in my opinion reflected the professionalism of their trade. Indeed, in the dining car I found the crew to be jovial, and nothing was too much trouble to assist the passengers.

However, I was disappointed to find that one could not obtain a bottle of South Australian wine on this excellent tourist trip. One could obtain New South Wales wine, and a bottle of Northern Territory wine, Chateau Hornsby, but not one bottle of the excellent wines manufactured in this State. It is recognised that in the Barossa Valley, and indeed in the southern parts of metropolitan Adelaide, there are some of the top wineries in the country, yet my colleague and I could not obtain a bottle of South Australian wine.

I hope that the Australian National Railways will take note of this comment, as this State makes some of the best wines in Australia. This is not being parochial; it is a matter of fact. Many South Australian wineries have won national and overseas medals against worldwide competition from numerous countries. I hope that this matter will be addressed by Australian National and perhaps one of our South Australian wineries will be prepared to take up the challenge and if need be, with the support of Australian National Railways, carry out a promotion of South Australian wines on this train.

However, should this not be possible at least give South Australian wineries the opportunity to promote their wine by purchasing a limited amount of the wines on a trial basis for this journey. The Ghan also runs from New South Wales via Tarcoola to Alice Springs. Surely, if we are to promote this State these people should have an opportunity to obtain a bottle of South Australian wine. I strongly question why a small winery, such as Chateau Hornsby in the Northern Territory, which has only a small acreage of vineyards, has the monopoly on this well-known service.

I understand that many of the wines that are sent from Alice Springs are blended with South Australian wines and sent back to Alice Springs to be bottled. I believe that this matter must be addressed if we are to promote the wines of this State.

Another question which I will address in the short time I have and to which I alluded briefly during my Address in Reply concerns granny flats. I went to Victoria some time ago and, with the support of the Housing Commission in that State, visited a number of granny flat units particularly in metropolitan Victoria. The movable granny flat unit scheme was first introduced by the Minister of Housing in 1975 as a new form of elderly person's housing. It was unique in that it enabled elderly home owners to be accommodated on the same block of land as the family house in independent self contained accommodation. The scheme provides low rental accommodation to a broader client group and is primarily directed to elderly people in receipt of the full Australian Government age pension.

The major benefit of this form of accommodation is that it enables people living in a unit to maintain a degree of independence whilst having access to care and support. Granny flats can be sited on a property anywhere in Victoria with the Minister of Housing exclusively handling the distribution and tenancy of the units. The units are architecturally designed with a separate bedroom, living room, bathroom, toilet/kitchen and entry porch. Units can usually

be accommodated on an average size block. The external dimensions of the units are six metres by six metres or eight metres by five metres. They must be sited three metres from a residence and 1.2 metres from a boundary fence and cannot be located over an easement.

I will continue this debate later. I believe that the matter should be addressed in South Australia, particularly because

of the needs of these classifications of people. I am aware that the Minister is cognisant of these needs, and I hope that in the very near future these matters will be addressed in this State.

Motion carried.

At 9.59 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 9 August at 10.30 a.m.