

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 9 August 1984

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Max Brown)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: TEACHERS

A petition signed by 27 members of the community of Gepps Cross Primary School praying that the House urge the Government to convert all contract teaching positions to 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. J.C. Bannon.

Petition received.

PETITION: POINT TURTON WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 231 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to give consideration to the upgrading of the reticulated water supply at Point Turton was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITION: TARPEENA SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by 237 residents of the South-East praying that the House urge the Minister of Transport not to increase the speed limit through the northern section of Tarpeena was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intention to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by the Hon. D.C. Brown.

Petition received.

PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence and registration fees for the promotion of sporting activities was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: HENS

Petitions signed by 52 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to prohibit battery egg production and debeaking of hens and provide for the labelling of free range eggs was presented by the Hons Lynn Arnold, D.J. Hoppood, and J.W. Slater.

Petitions received.

SUPERANNUATION ACT: ACTUARIAL INVESTIGATION

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)** laid on the table the report of the Triennial Actuarial Review of the South Australian Superannuation Fund, as at 30 June 1983.

Ordered that report be printed.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SUPERANNUATION FUND

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.C. BANNON**: The Triennial Actuarial Review of the South Australian Superannuation Fund has been conducted by the Acting Public Actuary, which I have now tabled. It is in two parts: the first part relates to the requirement under section 15 of the Act for the Public Actuary to report on the financial position of the fund and whether, as a result of this investigation, there should be any reduction or increase in the contribution rates.

The second part comprises a report on the cost to the State Government of the fund. This is the second time that this second part has accompanied the triennial review and it is worth noting that the report in 1981 on the cost to the Government was the first time that any Government in Australia (State or Federal) had made available information of this kind, a point for which I give my predecessor due credit. To date only the Commonwealth Government has followed the example set by South Australia.

In line with the practice of the previous Government, I am tabling both parts of the triennial report. However, on this occasion I am able to table them together, whereas in 1981 the report by the Actuary on the financial position of the fund was tabled in March and the report on the cost to the Government was not received by the House until July. I am also tabling the letter from the Superannuation Board that accompanied the Acting Public Actuary's report. Although the Superannuation Act does not require this to be tabled, I believe it will help members to better understand the position of the fund.

The South Australian Superannuation Fund provides superannuation benefits for employees of the State Government (apart from the police who have a separate scheme) and employees of many State Government authorities. Membership of the fund is voluntary and members must contribute at specified percentages of salary. Their contributions are paid into the fund, which is invested by the South Australian Superannuation Fund Investment Trust.

The cost of pensions paid is shared between the fund on the one hand and the employers (the State Government, the authorities, etc.) on the other. The extent of the share of current pensions which the fund can support is assessed at each triennial actuarial investigation of the fund. The employer share of pensions being paid is financed by the State Government through the Consolidated Account at the time the pension is paid (for former employees of the State Government) or by statutory authorities (where persons were employed by an authority).

The purpose of the triennial review is not to make an historical assessment of the fund, but rather to indicate the direction the fund should be taking to ensure that it can meet its obligations, given the experience of the period since the last review and various assumptions concerning the future.

On the basis of his valuation the Acting Public Actuary has reported that the fund had an actuarial deficit of \$19.9

million as at 30 June 1983. He attributes a large part of this deficit—approximately \$8 million—to a change in the valuation basis of the fund, namely, an increase in the assumed longevity of pensioners. The other significant factors he identified as contributing to the deficit were a lower level of new entrants than assumed, an abnormal level of withdrawal of younger contributors, relatively higher salary increases than those assumed, and the introduction of spouses' pensions for marriages after retirement of at least five years duration.

The Acting Public Actuary has made the point that the size of the deficit is in fact quite small when related to the total liabilities of the fund. Honourable members will also note that the Superannuation Board, in its letter accompanying the report, has pointed out that the deficit in fact represents only 3.5 per cent of liabilities.

The main recommendation that the Acting Public Actuary has made as a result of his investigation is that contribution rates should be increased if the level of benefits is to continue unchanged. It is worth noting that the previous review of the fund for the period ended June 1980 indicated that an increase in contribution rates may be necessary. However, at that time the uncertainty of forecasting real increases in salaries led the Public Actuary to conclude that it was reasonable to suspend judgment on whether the rates should be increased.

This report now makes it clear that, on the basis of changed circumstances and a new set of assumptions concerning the future that incorporate real increases in salaries, this question must now be addressed. Both the report and the letter from the Superannuation Board indicate that the recommendation concerning the contribution rate is not related to the current financial position of the fund but rather to what the fund might reasonably expect to earn as a result of its future investments. The recommendation is aimed at maintaining the principle that contributions by new entrants to the fund should be sufficient to support 28 per cent of their benefits. The Board notes that this principle has been a feature of the superannuation scheme since its establishment.

The Board has also proposed an alternative to increased contribution rates which could be offered to contributors, which would provide for contributions to be held constant in return for lesser benefits being paid. The Government appreciates the importance of the Superannuation Fund to its contributors and does not believe that any decision should be taken in regard to the contribution rates and/or benefits until full consultation has been held with representatives of the contributors, and I have invited them to make their views known to me.

QUESTION TIME

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

Mr OLSEN: Can the Premier say whether the Chief Justice has refused a request from the Government to provide a judge to be Chairman of the Motor Vehicle Compulsory Third Party Insurance Premiums Committee, and has this delayed an application from the State Government Insurance Commission—and I will delay the question while the Premier obtains some advice again from his Minister—for higher premiums to cover another large loss in its compulsory third party fund last financial year?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: In reply to the Leader of the Opposition, no decision has been made at the moment with regard to the replacement of Mr Justice Sangster, who has retired as Chairman of the Motor Vehicle Compulsory Third Party Insurance Premiums Committee. A recommendation

will be put to Cabinet on Monday for a replacement. I should apologise to the House for the delay, but we have been searching for a good period of time for a replacement. I hope that that will be settled on Monday and the committee can meet and consider the question of third party premiums.

SUPERANNUATION FUND

Mr KLUNDER: Now that the Premier has tabled the triennial review of the South Australian Superannuation Fund, can he advise the House whether there is any substance to the recent claims by the Leader of the Opposition that the Government has received a secret report on the costs of superannuation?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I returned from a short break last week to find that the Leader had made quite extraordinary allegations. I was not sure what he was trying to accomplish by these allegations, but apparently the claim was that I had, contrary to some presumed undertakings I had given, commissioned a behind the scenes study or secret report on the Superannuation Fund. Of course, that is absolute nonsense. First, I commissioned nothing. Under the Act there is a requirement that a triennial investigation take place, and if anyone knows anything about the Superannuation Act—and instead of just trying to make sensational statements about it has actually studied the procedures—one would know that. The Leader apparently did not.

There is no secret. It is there in the Act itself that a triennial review of the fund was being conducted. If one had not consulted the Act or was not aware of its provisions (as apparently the Leader of the Opposition was not), he could in fact have had some memory of the Estimates Committee debate in which some questions were asked concerning projections about the fund. I told him then (last September I think it was) that the new evaluation which was being made in accordance with the Act would be tabled as soon as it was available. So that is an interesting aspect of this whole extraordinary little exercise that the Leader of the Opposition undertook.

On 9 May this year, the Hon. K.L. Milne asked the Attorney-General in another place whether the Government would table a report on the cost of the Superannuation Fund and I replied to the Hon. Mr Milne by letter on 19 June, which sets out the position and from which I will quote. Again, the Leader of the Opposition would have known this. The letter states:

The Public Actuary's projections of these costs are expected to be presented to the Government shortly. At this stage I would anticipate tabling these projections at the same time as the Public Actuary's report on the triennial investigation of the Superannuation Fund at or soon after the resumption of Parliament in August.

In fact, that is precisely what I have done today. I received the report on Monday. Under the Act I have two sitting weeks in which to table it, but I have tabled it at the first opportunity after preliminary assessment and preparation of the accompanying statement. So it was on the record that the report was being done, and it was on the record that it would be tabled as part of the triennial review, as indeed it was in 1981.

Apparently this was not good enough for the Leader. Despite the position having been explained by the Acting Premier about there being no secret report, the Leader decided to work up another story on a behind the scenes study. One of the interesting aspects of this was the turn-around in tactics. On the one hand, and this is typical of the 'having it both ways' attitude of the Opposition, the Leader wanted to create some sort of sensation about a Superannuation Fund that was crippling us—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: —and thus would have to result in drastic increases in contributions or drastic reductions in benefits. He was saying on the one hand to an audience out there in the general community, 'Look at this terrible rort, this Superannuation Fund.' That was his day one approach. His day two approach was turned inward and was a message to public servants: 'What a terrible thing is going to be done to your superannuation benefits by this dreadful Government.' What does he want? Is it a rort about which stern and hard action should be taken, or is it, in fact, a scheme that is of value and is appropriate for the Government as an employer of persons in this State? I would like the Leader to make this quite clear in any further statements he makes about this matter. Secondly, having tried to whip up that story, he made a number of claims—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You've kept this thing going too long.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the Leader that he has already asked his question, and there is no need for him to carry on as he is at present. I ask members to come back to some reasonable standard of behaviour. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. There were even claims that the report recommended that lump sum payments on retirement should be abolished. I think that the Leader will find that that is not mentioned anywhere in the report tabled. The fact is that the report has been tabled at the first available opportunity. I have already pointed out why and how there is a section on the cost to the Government of this fund and, indeed, I draw attention to that part of my statement where I point out that the previous Premier tabled that report in two separate sections, with some months in between. I have at least been prepared not to sit on the report and work it up in the way that the previous Government did. I am prepared to release it right now, immediately, so that this nonsense about secret commissions ceases. It is absolute nonsense!

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My Deputy did nothing other than state the truth of the matter.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: My intention was explained first during the Estimates Committee, and secondly in a letter written well before this event in June to the Hon. Lance Milne. It is on the record; there is no question about that. This is an absolute nonsense story from the Opposition. Let me get down again to the factual situation in relation to the report.

Mr Olsen: You've got a time limit on this.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is a very important matter. It is certainly true that the report recommends an increase in rates and that the Government must make a decision on that matter. I have indicated that we are not going to make a snap decision on it. We must study the report. I invite honourable members to study the report and its basis. Also, we will be consulting with those people affected by the implications of the report, so there is no question of our hastening into any kind of decision. We will look at the factual information provided and take appropriate actions accordingly.

In conclusion, I would suggest that this report does not disclose any shocking or horrific state of the superannuation position. On the contrary, the \$19 million deficit (which it should be borne in mind is not an immediate day cash deficit that must be met in today's values immediately) is

based on a number of assumptions going well into the future. The Actuary's report on costs does not reveal an horrific or overwhelming problem in that area. In fact, it suggests that the computations of real increases in payments to the fund and the impact on the Budget represent something like a 5½ per cent increase phased in over 35 to 40 years. I suggest that that is not something about which, as an employer or something in budgetary terms, we should be totally alarmed.

The report goes on to recommend that in order to keep the fund on course some adjustment to contribution rates should be made, and that will be discussed. I suggest that the Leader should concentrate on the facts and not try to sensationalise them and that he should perhaps try to shake off the obviously profound effects that his experiences in Disneyland during his recent trip had on him.

THIRD PARTY INSURANCE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Transport say whether the State Government Insurance Commission's compulsory third party fund recorded a significant loss last financial year? Further, when did the SGIC apply to the Government for a rise in premiums to cover this loss; by how much does the Commission want to increase premiums; and when does the Minister expect a final decision to be made?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: I am not able to advise the Deputy Leader of the losses suffered by the State Government Insurance Commission through third party premiums. I would have to obtain details of that figure. No application has been made to the Government at this time. I understand that the SGIC will not approach the Government until the Chairman of the Third Party Premiums Committee has been appointed. I imagine that when that person is appointed an approach will be made, at which time the committee will determine the relevant rates.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

Mr PLUNKETT: My question is addressed to the Minister of Public Works. I have noted, as I am sure all other honourable members have done, the successful completion of repairs to parts of this Chamber. Will the Minister provide to the House some details as to the cost of the work?

Mr Gunn: Are you short of questions at the moment?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I am sure everyone would agree that a grand job has been carried out here during the recess. The job required the replacement and injection of acrylic adhesive on columns and the ceiling to prevent deteriorating plaster from falling on the heads of unsuspecting members below. Safety helmets, and so on, could have been provided, but that would have resulted in members opposite diving for their Standing Orders to question whether hats should be worn in this Chamber. The work also required redecoration of friezes, column caps and mouldings, using as near as possible the original colour scheme, including gold leaf highlights. This was successfully achieved as a result of research undertaken by the private contractor involved.

It is not really known what caused the deterioration of the plaster, but I am moved to assure all honourable members that it was not, as has been rumoured, the result of all the hot air generated on the other side of this place. However, the experts seem to think that moisture content variation may have played a part. The project was completed on Thursday 26 July, five days ahead of schedule, although

there is a small amount of work to be touched up in December.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The total cost was \$117 566.70, which I believe is money well spent in preserving this historical asset of South Australia.

HOUSING TRUST DESIGN AND CONSTRUCT PROJECTS

The Hon. B.C. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the Government will review its policy which forces all subcontractors employed on Housing Trust design and construct projects to join a union, in view of the fact that the cost of building design and construct homes has increased by an average of 28 per cent during the past 15 months, a major reason for this rise being the imposition of union conditions on building contracts?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: That will result from the recommendations of the Pryke Inquiry.

SPORT FUNDS

Mr WHITTEN: Can the Minister of Recreation and Sport say how the projected huge increase in funds in the Federal Budget may be available to sporting bodies and how the increased allocation will be beneficial to South Australia? I refer to yesterday's *News* and the report headed '\$60 million bonanza for sport'. Under a Canberra dateline the report states:

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 21 August.

The report further states:

This is an increase from \$26.5 million last year to \$60 million projected this year.

Mr Becker: Perhaps we can get a hockey field.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I am aware of the *News* report about the increased allocation in the Federal Budget for sport, but I am not aware, of course, of the allocation and distribution of those funds and how they will be allocated within the Budget. I hope that, on the basis of performances, perhaps while we are in a euphoric mood in regard to sport, the Olympic Games and other events, South Australia's contribution to those successes will be recognised by the Federal Government so that South Australia will receive a just and fair allocation of funds. There are still plenty of sports in South Australia that require good facilities of international standard, including a hockey field, as the member for Hanson suggested, and cycling. It may be that, of that \$60 million, if the Federal Government or the Federal Minister desires to diversify the Sports Institute, perhaps South Australia will have an opportunity to obtain some of that \$60 million for that purpose.

Mr Oswald: A velodrome?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: It could involve cycling.

Mr Mathwin: Lacrosse facilities?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know whether lacrosse is played at Olympic level, but it is still an international sport. I point out to members opposite who are interjecting that over the past two years the Government and I have been doing everything possible for sport. I refer to the record over the past two years compared with that of the three

years before that. Despite the hypocritical motion of the Leader of the Opposition the other day about the Sports Institute and other matters associated with sport, the record shows that the openings and additions that have been made to facilities, and the number of requests that I have received to attend openings for the laying of plaques, have increased greatly. I have been advised that I am only 239 plaques behind the former Premier, David Tonkin.

Mr Whitten interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The point is that most of those plaques were laid in the last two or three weeks of the former Government's term. One can find them on gum trees, toilet blocks and in all sorts of places. Our record not only in sport but also in other areas of activity in South Australia is proven by the fact that we are progressing in that way. I hope that part of the \$60 million Federal Budget allocation will provide South Australia with an opportunity to do more in the future.

POLICE COMMUNICATIONS TOWER

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Does the Deputy Premier consider the construction of the communications tower at Mount Barker as being essential to the much needed improved communications system for the South Australian Police Force and, if so, what action is he, as the police Minister, taking to ensure that construction of the tower will not be delayed and that the project will proceed as scheduled?

The Minister for Environment and Planning last week stopped construction of a 30 metre radio communication tower following very new claims that the Summit has become an Aboriginal sacred site. I wish to refer to an editorial in the Hills paper, the *Courier*, in the way that it has described the current situation. It states:

It was the sudden discovery that the Summit is apparently a site sacred to the Aborigines that caused the construction work to halt, and a great furore to erupt.

Prior to this discovery, every attempt had been made to minimise the environmental impact of the tower, and the location had been changed to an already cleared area on the south-eastern side of the mount, not the Summit itself.

Later, the editorial states:

... as the population of the Hills has grown, so has the expectation that police assistance should be readily available whenever it is needed.

For this to be possible, it is essential that police communications should be able to cope—which is why the new tower is urgently needed...

The present emotional outbursts relating to the 'desecration' of the Summit will be but a gentle hum compared with the protests if the lack of communications should result in lives being lost in the next emergency.

It all comes back to a matter of priorities. Which is more important, the protection of a hitherto unknown, possibly sacred site—or the reduction of danger to human life and property?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The short answer to the honourable member's question is yes, certainly I support the construction of the tower. There is no question about it. I have done so from the beginning and I do so now. However, it is not quite a simple as that. There have been allegations (and I place it no higher than that) that this particular spot could be (and I place it no higher than that) a sacred site. The Minister for Environment and Planning is looking into the matter and I am in constant contact with him as to what progress has been made. Our latest discussions occurred this morning before we came into the Chamber and I understand from him that he will be getting a full report on this matter some time this afternoon or if not this afternoon tomorrow morning. I expect a statement from the Minister sometime this afternoon or tomorrow.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

JUBILEE 150

Mr PLUNKETT: Is the Premier aware that Wednesday 15 August is the 150th anniversary of the proclamation of the South Australia Act and will he arrange for some recognition to be given in the House to this significant date? Towards the end of last year, one of my constituents, a Mr Rodney Balfort of Flinders Park, wrote to me pointing out that we were approaching the 150th anniversary of the proclamation of the Act which enabled the establishment of South Australia. In his letter to me Mr Balfort said:

This Act of British Parliament 'the South Australian Colonization Act' was passed opening the colony to settlement by British subjects, but under no condition were convicts to be admitted, making South Australia the only State to be settled by entirely free peoples.

So I write to inquire as to what the State Government will be doing to advertise and celebrate this most historic date.

The Premier will know that I forwarded this letter to him and I understand that he has had discussions with the Jubilee 150 organisation and the History Trust. I would appreciate any information he has as to what has been the result of those discussions.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I was certainly pleased to receive Mr Balfort's suggestion from the member for Peake. I do not know whether this particular anniversary had been brought to anyone's specific attention. It certainly has always been the Government's concern that the Jubilee is not something that simply happens on one day, with a blaze of fireworks or some ceremony on a particular day, but is an event that involves everyone throughout the State, has a wide range of activities and takes place over a considerable time.

In relation to the Jubilee, as has been said in this House previously, there has been a commendable bi-partisan attitude to it. I congratulate the previous Government on the arrangements and events it set in train which, of course, are continuing and are being developed. This Jubilee will involve all South Australians. It is essential in that process that we lead up to the Jubilee with a series of events, announcements and so on, and where it can be publicised it should be publicised.

The decision to colonise South Australia was not something that simply happened in 1836: it was the result of long debate and argument. One of the most significant dates, of course, is the one to which the honourable member referred, when the South Australia Act was passed in the British Parliament in 1834. This Act was actually later repealed, but nevertheless is historically important as it paved the way for the founding of South Australia and the colonisation arrangements and funding. Indeed, I am indebted to the historian, the late Mr Jim Main, of Flinders University, whose death was a tragic loss not only to the general field of history but specifically to South Australian history. At the time of his death Mr Main was working on some papers and essays concerning the foundation of South Australia. In fact, he had supplied me with a copy of a paper that he had prepared on the South Australia Act itself, its passage through the House of Commons, its subsequent fate and some of the implications of it. That paper and work will be very useful as part of the on-going historical exercise for the Jubilee.

We believe that it would be appropriate next Wednesday when the House meets, the date that the honourable member mentioned, for a simple motion to be moved which will enable me, the Leader of the Opposition and any other member to formally record the significance of the date. The

Leader's office has been contacted and advised of this intention and there will be some consultation on the form of the motion. I am not suggesting that the time of the House be taken up unduly, but I think that something should be placed on the *Hansard* record simply to recognise the fact that on 15 August 1834, 150 years ago next week, the colonisation of South Australia was set in train with the passing of the South Australia Act.

GLENELG RIOT

Mr OSWALD: Apart from supporting the liberalisation of the availability of alcohol from hotels throughout the State on Sundays and bearing in mind that there are only four months left this year in which Parliament sits and is able to pass legislation, can the Premier say what legislative and administrative measures the Government intends to implement to ensure that residents of Glenelg will not experience a repeat of the riot and violence that occurred last summer.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Much was learned from that experience. The community concern that was raised was very genuine and deeply felt. It resulted in a reassessment on the part of everyone involved—the State Government, local government, community organisations, the police, and the hotel industry—concerning the implications of Sunday trading if, indeed, that was a root cause of the events. Of course, the suggestion and much of the analysis has reinforced the fact that while that may have acted as the trigger, there were certainly more fundamental and underlying problems which led to that dreadful experience at Glenelg.

Mr Mathwin: Alcohol was the main cause.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that while it was certainly the trigger, and the presence and involvement of alcohol was obviously very crucial to what happened, nonetheless, all the investigation (whether by the police, social or community welfare workers or others) when assessing what happened points to some much more fundamental problems—problems that relate to the whole structure of the community, youth unemployment, the futility of life that so many people in the community feel and a whole lot of other factors like that.

There is no simple answer to the problem raised by the honourable member. However, I assure him that that experience has been taken to heart. To the extent that changes to the licensing laws can assist in obviating those problems, those steps should be taken. The honourable member would be aware that Mr Peter Young has tabled his report—a very full and thorough report which contains an enormous amount of material to digest. The process of digestion and response to that report is proceeding at the moment.

I know that the Attorney-General hopes to have proposals ready for Cabinet certainly in time to see legislation enacted during the current session. However, it is not something that we will rush into. I think what we do must be effective: there is no point in simply making a show of attending to the problem in a superficial way and not really getting down to its basis. I assure the honourable member that matters are being set in train to ensure that we do not have a recurrence of an incident such as the Glenelg riot.

STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Deputy Premier aware of the call made by the Insurance Council of Australia for the establishment of a national register for stolen motor vehicles and that the Chairman of the Police Ministers Council (Hon. Race Mathews, MP, Victoria) has drawn the Prime

Minister's attention to the problem of differing registration procedures in the various States and territories to make re-registration easy? Can the Deputy Premier advise what action the Government is taking in conjunction with the Federal and State Ministers to reduce vehicle theft?

I read with much interest in the ICA Bulletin of May 1984 an article on stolen vehicles and the need for a national register. In part, the article states:

'The Insurance Council has information to suggest that vast numbers of stolen vehicles are transported interstate. A register of stolen vehicles available to police and insurers would assist in detecting stolen vehicles at the time of re-registration and alert insurers to "hot" vehicles,' the Chief Executive of ICA Mr Rodney Smith said.

The article points out that about 100 000 vehicles are stolen each year throughout Australia and, if all these were insured for theft at an average claim of \$3 500 (based on police figures), this represents about \$350 million a year. The article also states:

The stolen vehicle operation is costing the insurance industry millions of dollars each year and is certainly a major contribution toward the high cost of motor vehicle insurance.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The simple answer is that of course the South Australian Government would support a national register to deal with this very serious problem. I congratulate the honourable member for bringing this matter forward. I do not have an up-to-date report with me on exactly what is happening in this field. The matter was discussed briefly at the only Police Ministers conference that I have attended. I will obtain a full report on what is happening from the Chairman, Mr Race Mathews, and from our police and bring down the information for the honourable member so that he is fully aware of what is happening in relation to this very important problem.

GEPPS CROSS ABATTOIR

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: Will the Premier explain to Parliament why the casual employee and proportionate staff levels have not been adjusted in accord with livestock throughput at Gepps Cross Abattoir, resulting in a \$2 million trading loss at these works during the 1983-84 financial year just ended?

The Premier would know that the whole idea of adopting a strict policy of employee throughput ratio was to avoid financial losses during periods of low and fluctuating livestock movement. Following consolidation of Samcor's capital debt into the general revenue account by the previous Government in 1981, and simultaneous instruction to the Board to employ and retrench both shop floor and proportional staff levels in accord with fluctuating livestock throughput, a substantial annual trading profit was attained in 1981-82 and again in 1982-83.

On the change of Government in late 1982 and during the short subsequent period in which the Hon. Brian Chatterton was Minister of Agriculture, the Opposition understands that that Minister continued with the previous Government's commercial policy and instruction in that regard. Meat industry reports now reveal that, quite unrelated to the availability of livestock from farm and station sources, the policy under the current Minister has relaxed, employee and staffing levels have become grossly out of step with throughput over sustained periods at Gepps Cross, and hence the dramatic financial deterioration, as I have outlined, in the year just ended.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: This is a rather curious question. Certainly, Samcor is experiencing major problems, as are most meatworks. Indeed,—

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, all meatworks in the present situation nationally are experiencing major problems in the supply of livestock, export markets, and so on. The honourable member is aware of that and acknowledged it in part in his explanation. It means that Samcor at present is experiencing a loss situation with no easy solutions and no immediate sign of a return to profits in the short term. As a result, the Government has had to make very hard decisions indeed about its whole involvement in this area, the most difficult of all being the closure of the Port Lincoln meatworks. That was absolutely inevitable and necessary, but nonetheless resulted in great opposition from the local community, not surprisingly. We accept that people were not exactly going to congratulate us for taking a hard decision, but more surprisingly our action was not supported in the way it could have been by the Opposition, which knew just how necessary the closure was. However, Samcor is still experiencing major problems.

I am surprised at the honourable member's question, because surely he must know that one of the problems at Samcor is that we are committed, by the policies or undertakings of the previous Government, in relation to a certain section of the workforce. The white collar or clerical workers (or PSA members, to put it in union terms) were given undertakings that there would be no retrenchments and no application of the rise and fall position possible under the meatworkers award.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That's not true.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is true. Cabinet has had to grapple with that very difficult problem. Attempts are made to redeploy. It is all very well to say that people can be shifted—the guarantee given by the previous Government is that, if a suitable job cannot be found, those people must remain. What do we do with a meat inspector or someone in the tallow area—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: You are talking about meat inspectors and not—

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Sorry, not meat inspectors: I am talking about those involved.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I did not mean meat inspectors. I cannot recall the precise classification, but the honourable member will understand, because he knows something about meatworks, that people are in jobs precisely because of their skills and experience as meatworkers, not because they are clerical officers, accountants, or anything else. In what other areas of Government is there a need for skilled meatworkers?

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: As a former Minister, the honourable member ought to know about this, but he is demonstrating a considerable degree of ignorance about, first, the failure of the redeployment policies of his Government and, secondly, about the present problem. Let me repeat again that, if we were not facing that problem, the loss would be significantly reduced. The Minister of Agriculture has had to go to the meatworks, call the workers together, and embark on difficult negotiations, because the Government cannot accept continuing losses to this extent at the Samcor meatworks—it is as simple as that. We are tackling the situation as best we can, bearing in mind that the position has been made very much more difficult because of the arrangements made by the former Government.

LARGS BAY PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr PETERSON: Is the Minister of Education aware of the concern of parents of primary school students about the

effect upon their children's education when teachers are replaced during the school year? What consideration is given to such replacement procedures? I have received a letter signed by 36 parents of a year 3 class at the Largs Bay Primary School, the subject of which is the lack of teacher continuity for classes in 1984. I quote briefly from the letter:

We, the undersigned parents, would like to draw your attention to this matter which has been under consideration by the Education Department since the end of the first term 1984 and, as yet, we still have received no definite decision on the matter. This year 3 class was appointed a teacher in late January this year. In the class of 26 children, there are six children with specific problems and, it has been revealed, another four children, who also have special needs. That totals 38 per cent of the class.

During the first term the present teacher was able, after considerable effort on his part, to meet the needs of these children, some of which have serious behavioural problems, and proceed with teaching the class. However, at the end of the first term, we learnt that this teacher is only to have the class for two terms, as a teacher returning from maternity leave has been allocated the class for term 3. This news was very concerning to parents of children in the class for the following reasons:

1. Probability of teaching time lost in the third term, to the detriment of all children in the class, due to a new teacher having to take time to understand and then attempt to meet the needs of these children with special problems.

2. Psychological effect on the special needs children, having to undergo change and even a 'grief process', in losing someone whom they now respect and identify with.

It has been put to me that there can be no doubt at all that situations such as this one do affect children at this level of schooling, especially children with special needs, and that often a further degree of consideration should be given in such cases.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: It is certainly true that there are concerns expressed from time to time about the turnover of teachers that may occur in certain year levels. I very much appreciate the concern of parents at Largs Bay Primary School and the fact that it is also being felt by the member for Semaphore. Two things need to be taken into account: first, the desire of parents, the Department, certainly myself as Minister, and of schools to provide continuity in classroom situations and, secondly, of course, the recognition that teachers have industrial rights and that there are questions of equal opportunities that are quite clearly involved in this matter. Of course, in the Education Department there are opportunities for maternity or accouchement leave. As has been mentioned, this case is as a result of that. It is not within the realistic or, in any event, reasonable powers of the Department to determine when people shall take accouchement leave. That is a matter determined by factors well beyond our control.

While we attempt to plan the taking of various kinds of leave over which we can have a greater degree of say, it certainly will not always be that that will perfectly work out in relation to classroom needs. In this case, a teacher is returning from accouchement leave at the end of second term or the beginning of third term. According to the conditions for accouchement leave, that teacher is given a right to return to the school so that she must return to that school. That is an established industrial agreement and is quite clearly in accord with equal opportunities decisions that have been made now for a number of years and under a number of Governments.

However, we are concerned about stability of teaching in classes and all officers of the Department who are responsible for staffing do try to minimise disruption to classes. When I received the letter from Largs Bay Primary School (and I have a copy myself) I was concerned to note what particular disadvantages there may have been for the year 3 students who are affected over the period that they have been at the school to date.

In 1983, when those students were in year 2, there were no changes at all. It was continuous staffing right through

the year, as the students were in a three-teacher unit. In 1982 when those students were in year 1 there was one change for one of the three classes at the year 1 level. That was when a contract teacher filled the position for one term of the year for one of those classes. The majority of students in the year 3 level have had relatively minimal disruption of classing over their schooling to date. I know that the school and the area office will be concerned to ensure that staffing for that group for the remainder of its schooling is as stable as possible.

I also say that the officers of the area in which Largs Bay Primary School is situated will be concerned to offer support to the school if in fact the problems that parents are fearing occur. The honourable member mentioned the type of grief process that may be experienced by certain students. Officers of the area will certainly want to offer support to the school if those problems eventuate.

It was mentioned that secondary school students face the problem as well. That is certainly true, but it is perhaps more severe in the primary situation where the contact with one particular teacher is for a larger proportion of the school week than is the case in the secondary situation, where a student meets a number of different teachers during the school week. We are concerned about it. We do, however, have industrial and equal opportunities issues that we must and, indeed, desire to respect, and it is a case of trying to balance both of those very legitimate sets of interests.

GROUND WATER INTERCEPTION SCHEME

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: I ask the Minister of Water Resources: what is the present status of the Lock 2/Lock 3 ground water interception scheme, and when is it anticipated that this project will be completed? The Minister would be aware that the initiative for this project was taken by the former Liberal Government and announced by me in 1982. However, in September 1983 the Minister stated that he would seek a 50 per cent subsidy from the Federal Government. The Minister also referred to this project while in the Riverland last week.

It is certainly of grave concern to a lot of people that there is no mention of this vital project in His Excellency's Speech to Parliament last week. What is more, when one takes into account—and it is readily acknowledged—that this project has a net value benefit to South Australia of in excess of \$3 million annually, based on the value per EC unit reduction, that \$3 million annually (based on 1983 values) is a figure that will continue to escalate significantly as South Australia develops and as greater use is made of the Murray River waters. So when this ground water interception scheme at Woolpunda will be completed is of vital concern to all South Australians. South Australia would certainly like to have that information.

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: The Lock 2/Lock 3 Woolpunda salinity ground water interception scheme is in its preliminary investigation stage. I am not able to give the member or the House the exact details of that investigation at this time. It is proceeding, and I will bring down a further report and advise him accordingly.

STRATA TITLES COMMISSIONER

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Corporate Affairs inform the House whether his Department has considered reintroducing the 1978 Bill that provided for a Strata Titles Commissioner? Many constituents have complained to me about the running of strata title companies. It is alleged that some strata title companies

are being run in an unbusinesslike way. Some complaints relate to the storing of rubbish on common ground, illegal parking on strata title land and introducing structures such as shade houses contrary to the strata title rules.

In addition, there has been a steady stream of complaints about charges being levied for maintenance, insurance, etc. It is alleged that some companies are being run in such a haphazard fashion that no sinking funds have been established for the outside maintenance of units. As a result, surprisingly high charges are then being struck in order to provide for the maintenance in due course. Other States, including New South Wales and Queensland, provide for a strata title referee or commissioner. Recent reports in Western Australia have strongly suggested that a Strata Title Commissioner be introduced into that State.

It is of particular interest to me in my electorate of Henley Beach. Many applications have been lodged now for redevelopment in that area and I understand that there are applications on the drawing board. As a result of that, there is no doubt that there will be an increase in the number of strata title units in that area, and I am anxious that the Department take some action to try to reduce the number of disputes that are occurring, especially in my electorate.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. It is obviously a matter of concern not only to the member but to many other members who have large numbers of strata title units in their electorates. It is a matter about which I receive many inquiries in my electorate office. I understand that the Attorney-General does have this matter under review. An inquiry undertaken some years ago has not been acted upon, and I will obtain from the Attorney further information on the current situation of this proposal and legislation surrounding it and convey it to the honourable member.

PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Mr BECKER: Will the Premier say why Mary Beasley was overlooked for appointment as Chair of the State Public Service Board, when she is demonstrably better qualified for the position than is any other candidate, and was she discriminated against by the Government because she is a woman? I understand that feeling has run high amongst women in the South Australian Public Service because Mary Beasley was overlooked and was not appointed as Chair of the State Public Service Board. I refer to an article in the *Weekend Australian* on 28 July 1984, written by Peter Ward, which states:

The South Australian Premier, Mr Bannon, returns this weekend from a week's holiday in Penang probably unaware that in part of his constituency all hell is breaking out. It started at a recent party to celebrate the appointment of Ann Dunn, formerly Women's Adviser in the S.A. Education Department, as Deputy Public Service Commissioner in the Northern Territory.

A nice appointment, a piece of laudable affirmative action by the Everingham Government.

But it is so unlike the example set by the Bannon Government on 13 July, when it appointed Mr Andrew Strickland, 43, as Chairman of the Public Service Board. . .

The women have seen red and are acting. A petition signed by them is charging the Bannon Government on eight points as having the worst record in respect of female employment of any Government in the country.

It accuses the Premier of being so disinterested in the issues relating to women in the Public Service that key reports have languished in his department for more than a year and never been put before Cabinet.

It urges the Premier to have weekly meetings with his Women's Adviser and meet monthly with all women's advisers.

That is document No. 1. No. 2 is a letter of protest to him by Deborah McCulloch, the first women's adviser appointed by the Dunstan Government.

The letter protests 'in the strongest terms' about the passing-over of the widely respected Mary Beasley.

And I agree with Deborah McCulloch. The article continues:

'Equal opportunity is not a matter of interest to your Government or policy makers, or so it appears from your record. S.A. women in the Public Service are worse off even than those in Queensland. The profile of women in the Public Service is the worst in Australia . . .'

At a recent ALP conference the following motion was moved by B. Hughes and seconded by P. Duncan:

That the State Labor Government urgently develop and implement a strategy plan for ensuring that by 1990 a minimum of 25 per cent of executive and administrative level positions in Government departments and statutory authorities are held by women and ensure that an affirmative action policy aimed at ensuring equality of opportunity and outcomes is implemented throughout the public sector.

The Public Service Board Report for the year ended 30 June 1983 provides a certain amount of statistical information.

At the Administrative Officer (AO) level there are 634 positions in the State Public Service, 585 held by men and 49 by women; at the Executive Officer (EO) level, the benchmark of the senior positions, as at 30 June 1983 there were 226 positions, 219 of which were held by men and seven by women. In 1982 there were 230 EO positions, 224 held by men and six by women; in 1981 there were 220 positions, 217 held by men and three held by women. The salary at the EO range is \$45 000 to \$69 763. I think that I have clearly demonstrated the concern of women in the Public Service and, like them, I want an assurance from the Premier that all women employed by the Government have equal opportunity to reach the highest level in that service.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: On the general point, the Government is totally committed to equal opportunity and, in fact, is taking initiatives and working on plans to ensure that much greater equality of opportunity is provided. I agree with the honourable member that the situation at the moment is deplorable. The imbalance and the lack of women in senior administrative positions is a reflection on the way in which the Public Service system has operated over the years. There are many reasons—historical, social and others—for it and I think it is incumbent on all of us to try to overcome it.

In relation to such appointments, both within the service and to boards, committees, and so on, I think that my Government has a very good record, indeed. However, I do not wish to canvass that situation in response to the honourable member's question. As to the specific question whether Commissioner Beasley was overlooked, of course she was not. In assessing who should be Chairman of the Public Service Board the Government obviously looked at all those people who would be appropriate and available. The Government has great confidence in the ability of Commissioner Beasley, but made a decision which appointed Mr Strickland as Chairman of the Board.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not think that it is appropriate for reasons why appointments are made, particularly in circumstances such as these, to be canvassed in Parliament. I am surprised that the honourable member raises the question in that form. It is quite appropriate for him to talk about the general situation, but he would understand that it would be quite improper for me to canvass the respective merits of candidates for a position.

Mr Becker: Was she discriminated against?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

SCHOOL TERMS

Mr GROOM: Will the Minister of Education say what is the current situation with regard to proposals for a four-term school year in South Australia? It was announced in the *Advertiser* two days ago that Mr Fordham, Minister of Education in Victoria, had decided that Victorian State schools will have a four-term year from 1987. In addition, the Victorian decision is reported to have followed recent action taken in Queensland, the Northern Territory and New South Wales to introduce a four-term school year. Will the Minister comment on the situation in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Before the last election we put forward a policy saying that we would investigate the possibility of having a four-term school year. This had been a matter that had raised some interest, not only in the education community but in the tourism industry, which expressed its views on the matter. Indeed, those views were contained in a report on tourism released before the last election. Last year I initiated an inquiry into this matter. The initial reaction I got from the education community was one of considerable excitement about the possibility of a four-term school year being introduced in South Australia.

We had an inquiry and asked people to come up with a discussion paper that could provide some real options as to what would happen if we had a four-term school year so that the community could consider the matter. The working party came back with a series of options that were released for discussion. It gave a wide range of options that could be considered for either keeping three-term school years or for modifying to a four-term school year.

The problem was that when that was released for discussion the initial enthusiasm that had come across last year, which had been quite considerable, suddenly seemed to have abated, and after this had been available for discussion for some two months we had received some eight responses compared to 83 responses that were received last year. I then made a press announcement, indicating that I was disappointed with that and that if that was the total community response then clearly there was no desire for the introduction of a four-term school year and that accordingly I would recommend against it.

However, I gave the opportunity for there to be another month of discussion. As a result of that press release more responses have been received. The Institute of Teachers has now decided to hold a poll amongst its members, and that is currently taking place. We are analysing the responses that were received following that final month of discussion, and we certainly want to see the result of that survey conducted by the Institute of Teachers. Further, we are anxious to know the views of the tourist industry in regard to this matter, and I urge those involved to let us know their feelings on this matter and whether they still hold the views that were expressed previously. We will then make a decision on the matter.

Certainly, it cannot occur in 1985 as we are now too close to that, and the Jubilee 150 Committee for the sesquicentenary celebrations have said that it should not be in 1986 because so many things are in place dependent on a series of dates that were understood to be applicable from back in 1982. I would have to agree with that. So, if the Government proceeds with this proposal, it will be in 1987. I know that that is a long way off, but with respect to the very important 1986 Jubilee, it cannot be done until 1987. If it is introduced at that time, as Minister in 1987, I will be very eager to evaluate how successful the four-term school year is.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: PREMIER'S REMARKS

Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr OLSEN: I claim to have been misrepresented on two counts by the Premier as relating to a question asked by the member for Newland on the Superannuation Fund report, which was tabled today: first, relating to the existence of two separate reports on the state of the State Superannuation Fund, and, secondly, as relating to a variation of my view concerning the necessity to review provisions and factors relating to that report. On the first count I draw to the attention of the House the Ministerial statement of the Premier which indicated quite clearly in the first paragraph:

The second part comprises a report on the cost to the State Government of the Fund.

I refer to the report tabled by the Premier in Parliament today which clearly can be identified as two quite separate reports: it is not bound and has a clip folder placing the two reports together. In addition, the third paragraph of the first page of the Premier's statement clearly indicates:

... that on previous occasions after the actuarial report has been received a further study was undertaken by the former Administration in relation to the cost of the report to the Government.

Quite clearly, in this instance there is a second report. The Premier told the House:

The main recommendation of the report is that the contribution rates should be increased if the level of benefits are to continue unchanged.

In my statement of 24 July, to which the Premier referred in responding to the question before the Parliament, I indicated that the Government had received a report in addition to the assessment. Quite clearly, that has been substantiated by the report that was tabled in Parliament today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair cannot allow the Leader of the Opposition to enter into a debate. The honourable member sought leave to make a personal explanation, but I am sure that he is going quite beyond that. I ask the honourable member to return to his personal explanation.

Mr OLSEN: The personal explanation is that I have been misrepresented in relation to the existence of a second report. I draw to the attention of the House a statement made by the Deputy Premier. There is no doubt that the endeavour today was to cover the tracks. The Deputy Premier clearly indicated publicly in response to my statement that a second report did not exist.

The Hon. J.D. Wright interjecting:

Mr OLSEN: He maintained that there was only one report. The Deputy Premier said that he was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair will not allow the Leader of the Opposition to carry on in this vein. The Leader is now entering into the field of debate and I am sure that, if he is allowed to carry on, there will be some reaction from the Government, and that will not be tolerated.

Mr OLSEN: With due respect, Mr Deputy Speaker, I am attempting to demonstrate to the House that I have been misrepresented. I am demonstrating the evidence upon which that misrepresentation has taken place in this House today.

The Hon. J.D. Wright: Before you go getting any deeper in—

Mr OLSEN: I am not getting in any deeper at all. The Deputy Premier knows full well that to cover up—

The Hon. J.D. Wright: You are trying to cover yourself.

Mr OLSEN: No. The cover up has taken place today to cover the tracks of the Deputy Premier, who said that there was no second report.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I rise on a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Surely this has gone beyond a personal explanation. The member believes he has been wronged. He is now debating across the Chamber, pointing his fingers, and generally carrying on a debate—

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: He is clearly indicating—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has taken a point of order, which I uphold. I reiterate that the Leader sought leave to make a personal explanation. As I have said, and as I say again, that personal explanation is going far beyond the realms of the leave sought. Unless the Leader can come back to a personal explanation, leave will be withdrawn.

Mr OLSEN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will heed your advice. I clearly stand on the points that I have put to Parliament thus far as being clear and indisputable evidence that there are two reports. In regard to the second point about a variation in the position, as has been put down by myself on behalf of the Liberal Party, I again draw the attention of the House to the statement of 24 July to which the Premier referred. What I said was conveniently overlooked by the Premier in responding to the question in Parliament today. I stated:

I have said before that a review needs to be undertaken of the superannuation scheme because of its escalating cost to the taxpayers of South Australia.

That is totally consistent with the speech that I gave to the State Superannuation Fund of South Australia some time ago. My concern was that my statements have been frank, open and honest to the Public Service Association and public servants in South Australia, whereas this Government has sought to prepare a report without openly discussing it with those people directly affected by the implications of the report and the recommendations contained in it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 8 August. Page 143.)

Mr WHITTEN (Price): I support the motion that the Address in Reply as read be adopted as so ably moved by the member for Florey and seconded by the member for Newland. I commend the member for Newland for the manner in which he seconded the motion because of the short notice that he had in being asked to do so. I support the second paragraph of the Governor's Speech and extend my condolences to the family of the late Harry King. While I never knew Harry King well, I knew well of him. Certainly, I knew the period when Reg Curren was able to defeat him in 1962 and become the member for Chaffey. The other three late members mentioned in the Governor's Speech I knew extremely well.

Howard O'Neill was a lifelong friend of mine whom I miss greatly. I worked with Claude Allen closely, as did you, Mr Deputy Speaker, on the Land Settlement Committee. I knew the input of Claude Allen to that committee. He was a good member of that committee and you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and other members of the House would agree that he did a good job whenever he was able to do so.

I knew Charlie Wells extremely well. He was Secretary of the Port Adelaide Branch of the Waterside Workers Federation before he entered Parliament in 1970 as member for Florey. I knew him as a member of the State Executive

of the ALP for many years. Indeed, I never heard anyone speak ill of Charlie Wells. Whilst he was rather forthright at times and did bang the desk a little, Charlie did a great job in representing the District of Florey prior to the present member for Florey and his predecessor.

I was also interested in the various travelogues related to the House in this debate. I have been in the Chair many times to hear these travelogues and they have been very good. The Parliament should be complimented for enabling members to visit places overseas when they so wish because it has certainly broadened the outlook of some members opposite.

The Leader of the Opposition, supported by the Deputy Leader and the member for Eyre, told us of their dealings with Urenco-Centec. It seems that those three members had a great input into the uranium industry. I do not know how successful they were but I hope that they were more successful with Urenco-Centec than they have been in this Parliament. Yesterday, the member for Torrens and the member for Coles were keen to tell us of their overseas experience. The only thing about which I am disappointed with the member for Coles is that I think she contracted Hong Kong flu when she was in Asia and that I have picked it up from her. However, the travelogues were certainly interesting.

I wish to compliment the Governor on his Speech. In particular, I would like to refer to paragraph 8, which deals with the industrial relations record and the intention to amend the Industrial Safety, Health and Welfare Act, which has been in operation for 12 years and is now in need of amendment to bring it up to date. I was also pleased with the notification that workers compensation will be altered. It is now an antiquated Act and certainly in need of updating. The Governor gave notice of that and I am very pleased to hear it.

The third point I wish to mention is the section in the Speech dealing with electoral reform and the fact that there will be constitutional and electoral alterations made in this term of the Parliament. The Constitution Act will be altered to provide for simultaneous elections with a minimum Parliamentary term of three years and a maximum term of four years. The great thing about this is that the House of iniquity, as I like to refer to it, will come out at the same time, regardless of the time that members have served. I do not think—and I have always expressed this view—that there is a need for a Legislative Council or a Senate. It is only there to delay legislation.

In the past 140 years there has never been in the Legislative Council Labor majority when Labor has been in power in the House of Assembly. Labor never had more than four members in the Legislative Council until 1973, when it increased to six members. The Liberals could see what would happen at the next election if they continued behaving in the way they had done in the past 140 years; they only passed legislation with which the Liberals or Conservatives agreed. One can therefore see that there has been a great need for reform.

The last part of the Governor's Speech on electoral reform referred to the removal of the right of the Legislative Council to block Supply. There has always been that threat, that Labor legislation would be thrown out or that Supply would be blocked, thereby forcing a popularly elected Government to the polls.

So, they are the three points I wanted to deal with from the Governor's Speech. I will now turn my attention to my own electorate, the electorate of Price, and the great things that have happened there in the past eight years. In about 1977 the then Dunstan Government appointed Mr Hugh Davies and Miss Terry Quinn (his assistant) to assist in the redevelopment of Port Adelaide and, with the Joint Com-

mittee on the Redevelopment of Port Adelaide, they have done a remarkable job.

The largest development that is proposed to take place is the old Port canal redevelopment where a super K Mart will be erected at a total cost of \$20 million. This will be the greatest thing that has happened in Port Adelaide for a long time. Many things have happened in the Port over the past eight to 10 years but this project will complete the redevelopment of the Port as far as retail business is concerned.

Many members will recall that in 1973 Myers bought a large tract of houses at Queenstown and sought permission to build a large retail complex on that site. I am very pleased that Myers were refused planning approval. That block of land has now been returned to housing (it always should have been used for housing) and the Housing Trust has established about 250 homes on that land.

Returning to the Port Adelaide redevelopment, I point out that on 24 July the Premier, in conjunction with Mick Young, the Federal member for Port Adelaide, and the Minister for Environment and Planning, made an announcement that the super K Mart \$20 million redevelopment would take place. This K Mart will be the first of its type in South Australia with all manner of goods on sale including furniture, food and hardware. It will be a very large complex with 37 check-out lanes going all the time. In conjunction with that, there will be new Commonwealth offices for the CES and the Customs service. Those offices will be built on the same site, which is a vacant block of land north of the old Port Adelaide railway embankment.

One of the things that the Premier said at that time was that this project is not a stand-alone development; it is part of a long-term plan for revamping and revitalising the Port. That is certainly what it will do. The old Customs House in Port Adelaide is antiquated and has been there for 100 years. It is a fine old building, but is not suited for the purpose for which it was built. Things have changed quite a bit in the past 100 years and the facilities are not adequate for the Customs service at the present time. I believe some great things could happen regarding the use of the old Customs building. I do not want to canvass that at the moment. This is a Commonwealth building and I have spoken to the Federal member, who is quite receptive to the proposals I put forward for the use of the building. The CES building will be built immediately and should be occupied by the end of this year.

The CES is presently housed in the Commonwealth building in Dale Street, Port Adelaide. That building will be wholly used by the Department of Social Security and the CES will have a new building south of Dale Street. The new Customs building will be a three-storey building and it will be occupied within 12 months. That is a good time scale: first, to get the CES building up and away this year and, secondly, to have the Commonwealth building built by May or June next year.

There is provision for car parking facilities for 1 100 vehicles. Dalgety (Australia) Limited and the Consulere Group of Companies will construct the development in conjunction with Coles and K Mart. The development will provide employment in Port Adelaide and I think it will attract a lot of people to the area. The good thing is that the development has the support of the Port Adelaide Retail Traders Association. President of that Association, Mr Barry Schultz, applauded the Port Adelaide Council and the State Government for their initiative in encouraging the new \$20 million shop and office redevelopment.

However, it will not stop there. Once these offices have been built, along with the new retail marketing complex, a lot of people will come back to Port Adelaide to use the shopping area. As I mentioned previously, Dalgety and the

Consulere Group of Companies are the design engineers and builders, and I am sure they will do a good job. They are very good and well known companies. As I have said, the CES expects to move into the new building at the end of this year, and the Customs Department will move in within 12 months. The Commonwealth offices are being constructed on a lease-back agreement of 12 years for the Customs and 10 years for the CES. Work on the new Coles/K Mart department variety store and supermarket will begin by the middle of next year, with a scheduled opening date towards the end of 1986. I am a little disappointed that it will take so long to build. However, it is a large building. I am sure that it will be well built,—and it will be a great adjunct to Port Adelaide.

Mr Lewis: What will become of the plant quarantine facility?

Mr WHITTEN: I do not know. At the moment I will deal with the new development at Port Adelaide. Perhaps at some later time I will discuss the plant quarantine facility, but it is not included in the redevelopment of Port Adelaide. During the Premier's announcement of the redevelopment, he said:

After initial investment of approximately \$3 million by the State Government and the Port Adelaide Council, the redevelopment of Port Adelaide has now attracted a further \$35 million investment.

I think that is great. Ten years ago people were saying that Port Adelaide was dead, that nothing happened at the Port, and that West Lakes would take over as the shopping centre for the area along with Arndale, Kilkenny (which is now owned by Westfield). Port Adelaide is springing back and it will now become the major retail centre for the western region.

In 1979 we were within a couple of weeks of obtaining a decent court and police complex. This entailed an exchange of land between the company that has now built on Commercial Road and the State Transport Authority. The Port Adelaide police and courts complex was to be built on the Port docks station site. Unfortunately, the Government of the day left office in 1979 and in 1980 the then Deputy Premier announced that the Liberal Government did not intend to continue with the Port Adelaide police courts complex. I was very sad about that.

I shall be extremely pleased if, before I leave this Parliament, the last part of the real redevelopment of Port Adelaide takes place, the police are adequately housed, and we have a decent court complex. The police at Birkenhead are not adequately housed at present and, while some work has been done on the old cells in the police complex at St Vincent Road, Port Adelaide, they are still not suitable. At a high spring tide, the cells in which prisoners are housed have been flooded so that the prisoners have had to walk around in water. That indicates how antiquated they are—and they are 130 years old, so one can understand that. I would also like to see the establishment of a community health complex. The project has gained approval and is now in the design stage. That complex will be established in Church Street, on the site of the old building that belonged to Motor Traders. Port Adelaide has certainly gone ahead in the past 10 years, and I am very pleased about that.

I am also pleased that representations have been made by the Premier in relation to the proposed submarine project. It would be a good thing if we could get that project, and I do not mind whether it is in the District of Price or on the other side of the river in the District of Semaphore. Eglo is a very progressive company, and while it was attracted to South Australia by the Liberal Government I give it full support, because it does a good job. It is competent in its trade. Although I would have liked to see Eglo established on the other side of the river in the District of Price, I

acknowledge that that could not be, but the company has certainly done good work.

I hope that the Premier can convince the Commonwealth of the necessity to build the new submarines, which will replace the old Oberon submarines, in South Australia so that the people of Port Adelaide can obtain work. It is a \$1.5 billion project, and it will be a great thing not only for Port Adelaide but also for South Australia, because as well as the building of the submarines there will be related technology and other industries will have an input.

Mr Lewis: Do you think they should be horse drawn or motorised?

Mr WHITTEN: I will treat that interjection from the member for Mallee with the contempt it deserves.

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: It has been suggested that we could use dolphins. I will ask the member for Mallee later to comment on whether it would be more appropriate to use dolphins.

Mr Lewis: Or sea horses!

Mr WHITTEN: I will not be distracted. The Premier has been involved in many discussions in an endeavour to obtain the submarine project for South Australia, and I do not think it is a joke—it is a very serious matter, because it will help South Australia. When the Premier went to New Zealand he had discussions with David Lange, who is now the Prime Minister of that country.

The Hon. H. Allison: He believes in horse-drawn submarines!

Mr WHITTEN: I will treat the member for Mount Gambier with the same contempt that he deserves when he says that the Prime Minister of New Zealand believes in horse-drawn submarines. At present, New Zealand does not own one submarine. Probably the member for Mount Gambier would not even know that.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood: The member for Mount Gambier would be glowing in the dark.

Mr WHITTEN: I hope that they are not automatic submarines. I think that is what the Minister for Environment and Planning was referring to, because the interjection he made referred to the member for Mount Gambier giving a glowing account of submarines, referring to his pro-uranium and atomic energy views. The New Zealand Government will require at least four submarines for its fleet. So, if we can get New Zealand to say, 'Yes, we will be prepared to have our submarines built in South Australia,' that will be another factor against New South Wales and Victoria when the Federal Government decides where they will be built and where the contract will be let. That is about all I need say so far as the submarine project is concerned, because half my time has already gone. However, talking about submarines brings to mind the maritime activities at Port Adelaide, particularly the maritime museum. I know that the member for Mallee has inspected it. He has great respect and support for Port Adelaide and its early maritime history, as I have.

In the electorate of Semaphore we have the *Annie Watt*, the *Fearless*, and other tugs will be brought there. I think that the *Yandra* will be placed in the old bond store, which is the proposed maritime museum. I should also mention the old Customs House, which would be an admirable place for some of the relics to be stored and be readily on view. It would not cost nearly so much if we could get that from the Commonwealth and use the Port Adelaide Customs House for closed exhibits with the old bond store housing larger open exhibits. I have a copy of the first edition (a small issue) of the *South Australian Maritime Museum News*, which gives a background, from which I will read:

The South Australian Maritime Museum is one of the major projects planned for 1986, the State's 150th birthday year. It will be a significant historical and tourist attraction for South Australia,

incorporating full-size vessels, modern displays and outdoor exhibits and drawing tens of thousands of visitors each year. It is funded by the Jubilee 150 Board via a \$1.1 million Commonwealth grant for construction costs and State Government funding for staff and operating costs.

The museum is to be established in Port Adelaide and will incorporate historic buildings in the heart of the State's first declared heritage area and the National Trust's Maritime Park site on the waterfront at Birkenhead. The buildings include warehouses built for Elder and Co. (predecessor of Elders-IXL) in the 1850s and a sailmakers' and ship chandler's shop, store and sail-loft probably dating from the 1870s, all in Lipson Street. The waterfront site is equally appropriate, being what remains of Cruickshank's Corner, the site of several early slipways.

The museum will bring together the extensive collections of the Port Adelaide Nautical Museum (Australia's oldest nautical museum) and the Port Adelaide Committee of the National Trust of South Australia, together with other smaller collections such as that of the Port Adelaide Historical Society.

The paper also states that donations for the historical and maritime museum will be greatly appreciated.

Turning to the South Australian Housing Trust, I have been disappointed with the attitude of some people to the Trust, particularly those people who protested that they were not going to have second-class homes in their areas, for whom Trust people are not good enough people and the homes are not good enough to be located in their areas. They would be people who believe that they are better than others, which is totally false. Certainly, the Housing Trust has done a great job in South Australia.

Just recently I attended the opening of the 50 000th rental Trust home. It is significant that that Trust home was built in the electorate of Price, as was the first rental Trust home.

Mr Lewis: When was that?

Mr WHITTEN: In 1937. It was built in Rosewater. A contract was let in 1937 to Marshall & Co., which won a tender to build houses from 26 other builders, and construction began on 13 July 1937 under a contract that required three pairs of double units to be completed in 20 weeks. That first Trust home that was built down there in Rosewater is occupied by a Mrs Whelan. That old lady still occupies that home and was able to be in attendance at Queenstown when the 50 000th rental Trust home was opened. She is a grand old lady and is still living in that same home: the original tenant in the original Housing Trust home. She is more than 80 years old now. The house was upgraded for her about five years ago. She is so proud of it that she will never leave there. She says, 'When they carry me out they will carry me out in a box.' I have a note here that says that she is 84 years old and she still occupies the first Housing Trust rental double unit at 35 McNicol Street, Rosewater.

Mr Lewis: Who was Premier then? Who opened it?

Mr WHITTEN: Of that I am not sure. He would have been a Liberal.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Chair points out that Question Time finished some time ago.

Mr Lewis: The member for Price is not a Minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHITTEN: I am sorry that I have to answer members opposite because I believe that when they are ignorant they need a bit of education, and I am only too willing at all times to assist my friends in their education. The people who went into the 50 000th rental Trust home were a Mr and Mrs Golding. Mr Golding is an unskilled worker, working for Australian National on a very low salary. They have two lovely children. They are really thrilled with the house into which they have moved. It is a three bedroom unit. The gardens are all laid out and lawns planted and they do not need to do a thing to it initially. This is a good thing about the Trust, which now establishes the gardens in the front completely. The people have to do something in the back if they want a garden there, but it is certainly good.

The one that they have moved into is the three bedroom unit at Queenstown. I might also mention while I am talking about the Trust that it estimates that 600 000 South Australians have been housed in Trust homes.

Mr Lewis: At one time or another.

Mr WHITTEN: That is right. The thing now is that the Trust is also going away from the designing, and have come into the design and construct stage, where builders are able to design and construct the houses and the Trust buys them from those builders. It gives a little more flexibility. However, I want to compliment the Trust on all the design awards it has won. It has won more design awards than has any other building company of which I am aware.

There are a few facts that I would like to put to the Parliament. The Trust has completed more than 94 000 dwellings throughout South Australia, 44 000 of which were built for sale. This is how many people on low incomes without a great deal of money were able to get into a house for \$100 or \$200 deposit, and then they could get the rest over a period of time; so they are actually rental purchase homes. I think that it is the aim of most people to endeavour to own their own homes if possible.

Another fact is that 282 000 South Australians currently are living in buildings built by the Trust. The Trust, being the biggest landlord, gave low income tenants rent reductions amounting to \$22.6 million in the year ended June 1983. Council rates paid by the Trust in 1983-84 amounted to \$9.7 million, making it the largest ratepayer in the State. Water and sewerage rates paid by the Trust in 1983-84 amounted to \$8.8 million. As I mentioned previously, the Trust has won a great number of awards, and has received 19 Civic Trust of South Australia awards and commendations for its housing developments, so one can see why I am quite proud to praise the South Australian Housing Trust.

I want to pay a tribute not only to the Minister of Housing and Construction but also to Paul Edwards (General Manager) and Jim Crichton (Assistant General Manager) of the Trust. They are dedicated persons who do a great job and I have found that if I have any problems at all, if I need help (I very seldom have to), their door is always open to me. However, I think that the greatest innovation by the Trust in the past 12 months or so has been the opening of an office in Port Adelaide. The old Savings Bank building in St Vincent Street, Port Adelaide, was bought by the Port Adelaide council, and the ground floor and some of the other offices have been taken over by the South Australian Housing Trust. We have a Manager for the Western Region, Mrs Joy Reynolds, who always endeavours to assist the tenants in Port Adelaide and certainly the member for Price, because I talk often with Mrs Reynolds about problems I may have with people needing homes or some of the tenants who are in homes, and Mrs Joy Reynolds deals with many of those personally and does a very good job.

Mr Lewis: Have they got a Medicare down there, too?

Mr WHITTEN: We do not have a Medicare office. There is one in Arndale (Westfield, Kilkenny, as it is now called). I have made representations to the Minister of Health, as has the Federal member for Port Adelaide, and that matter is receiving consideration. I hope that when the redevelopment of Port Adelaide is complete a Medicare office will be established there, because there is a great need for it. People have to go either to West Lakes or to Kilkenny, and Port Adelaide and its near environs on the LeFevre Peninsula need a Medicare office to save people travelling a distance to put in their accounts.

Still on the subject of the Housing Trust and the great job that it is doing, I turn to the subject of the Emergency Housing Office. A total of 9 139 households, including 19 000 individuals, contacted the Emergency Housing Office seeking

assistance during the first 11 months of 1983-84. This represented an increase of 17 per cent over the number of households seeking assistance during the corresponding period in the previous year. There were 9 542 households assisted by the Emergency Housing Office during the first 11 months of the year. I will not read the whole of the table I have here, but financial assistance was given by way of bonds and rental advances to almost 5 000 households in the first 11 months of 1983-84, totalling \$824 000, an average assistance of \$165.

As at 31 May (and these were the latest figures available), 5 557 private tenants in South Australia were receiving rent relief at an average of almost \$19 per tenant per week. The demand for rent relief has been heavy since the scheme was launched in late 1982, more than 9 000 low income households having so far been assisted. This is an initiative of the Labor Government that I am proud to relate to the House.

The other great thing that I can inform the House about is that the Principal of the Port Adelaide Community College is the trainer and coach of our latest gold medallist, Dean Lukin, who has just won a gold medal in the super heavy-weight section of the weightlifting at the Los Angeles Olympic Games. I am glad that Dean Lukin's coach and mentor since he was 15 years of age, Mr Holmes, the Principal of the Port Adelaide Community College, is from Port Adelaide—that is something about which I am very proud.

Returning to the subject of the rent relief scheme, the Trust early this year completed an analysis which showed that the scheme is operating well from an administrative point of view and appears to be providing rental subsidies to a segment of the private rental sector who need it most. This includes needy groups already waiting for public housing, such as lone parents, and groups not well catered for by way of public housing. I refer here to the non-aged single persons.

There has been concern expressed that the rent relief scheme might have some impact on the level of private rents. However, there is insufficient evidence to show that private rents have increased at a faster rate than they would have increased, anyway. Importantly, only 10 per cent of rent relief recipients experienced a rent increase during the first 12 months of occupancy. Responsibility for administration of the Housing Improvement Act was returned to the Housing Trust in November 1982. Have honourable members noticed that all these things happened after a Labor Government was appointed, following the election of 6 November 1982? All the initiatives I am talking about now have happened since November 1982—these things for ordinary people. There was no thought given by the Liberals to assisting these people, but they have been assisted by the Labor Government and I must compliment the Minister of Housing, Mr Hemmings, on the job that he has been doing.

By way of indicating what has occurred since the administration of the Housing Improvement Act was returned to the Housing Trust in November 1982, in 1982-83 there were 109 notices of intention to declare houses substandard, while in 1983-84 there were 209. In 1982-83, 56 houses were declared substandard, while in 1983-84 the number fell to 135. The number of rents fixed or revised was virtually the same for both periods, that is, about 350. In 1982-83, 161 houses were released from control under the Act, the repairs having been completed, while in 1983-84, 217 houses were released.

Also, the Trust and the Minister are negotiating at present with the Commonwealth in regard to continuing the programmes for the traditional skid row homeless, as they are called, as well as programmes in regard to youth, family and women's areas. They are currently supporting a national study of the needs and extent of homelessness, and are

renegotiating the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement which, in part, is intended to direct more resources relating to housing related poverty. In the meantime, the Government will continue its tradition of being most supportive and innovative, providing assistance to homeless people. It was brought to my attention only last week that there is now an organisation in Port Adelaide called PUSH (Port Unemployed Self Help). They are endeavouring to set up what they call a housing co-operative whereby houses will be bought where possible (hopefully with assistance from the Government) and administered by members of the co-operative who will be actually living in them. This will give those people a sense of owning and belonging and provide them with an opportunity to be able to look after their own homes.

The Government's innovative and exciting housing co-operative plan now consists of 74 occupied houses, flats and lodging houses amongst five agencies. Two other co-operatives are further advanced in development. I point out that this project is separate from the PUSH organisation from which I received approaches last week. The co-operatives involve private sector mortgage finance, Government subsidies and local community effort to produce a housing tenure which involves tenants in the management of their accommodation. Some \$2.3 million in private sector finance was secured by co-operatives in 1983-84. These funds would not otherwise have been available to people on low incomes. The Government is now looking to expand this activity and has submitted a job creation project aimed at helping to develop additional co-operatives. I have many newspaper cuttings here which I intended to use, many of which came from a special feature that was run recently when the 50 000th Trust rental home was opened. I will not go through all these articles at this time, but I refer particularly to an article, entitled 'Trust's role vital to State', which states:

The primary role of the South Australian Housing Trust is to provide affordable housing and contribute to the development of the State. The Trust is not a Government department like the E. & W.S. Department or a private company like SAGASCO.

It is South Australia's public sector housing authority—a semi-government organisation created by an Act of State Parliament and responsible to the Parliament through the Housing Minister. It is controlled by a board (currently eight people) who are Government appointed for four-year terms, which may be renewed.

The Chairman of the Housing Trust is a company director and financier, Mr Paley. The Deputy Chairman is Hugh Stretton.

He is a well known reader in history at Adelaide University and a very forward thinking person. Trust members include Bob Fairweather, the Secretary of the Plumbers and Gasfitters Union. There is great input as far as the workers in the trade union movement are concerned. I have known Bob Fairweather for many years. He is an intelligent person who looks after not only his own members but also trade unionists as a whole. I pay a tribute to Bob Fairweather and I am pleased that he has been appointed by this Government to replace Murray Glastonbury, who had been on the board for many years and who recently retired as Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union. He was appointed by the Dunstan Government, under which the board was set up, and now we have another trade union member on the board. Another board member is Elizabeth Johnson, and I am sure that all members know of her, as she is a barrister. There is also Miss Sheila Hall, Ms Stephanie Key and Gerry Karidis, as well as one other member whose name now escapes me.

I want to pay a real compliment to the State Government, to the Minister of Housing and Construction, to the Housing Trust and Trust employees, and not only those involved in the administration area but also those in the maintenance areas. Gardens are laid out by a Trust gardening service which landscapes them, and the gardeners do a great job, as do all Trust employees. Through the activities of the

Trust, an enormous amount of employment is provided in the private sector. I refer mainly to the building activity but, when one thinks of the spin-off to all the other people who are not directly employed but who owe their employment to the Trust, it is a great number indeed.

The disappointment to me is the number of people on the waiting list for Trust homes, because that number is increasing every year. At present 32 000 people are on the waiting list for houses. I deal with more queries for housing assistance than on any other subject. I might get many more Housing Trust queries or requests for assistance to help people get homes because my district is a disadvantaged one—

Mr Groom: Just imagine what it would be if the Liberals were in Government.

Mr WHITTEN: The honourable member asks how it would be if the Liberals were in Government. I point out that the Trust built 3 000 new rental houses last year. That number will be built next year, and we even hope to increase that number. Much depends on the availability of finance from the Federal Government. However, since we have had a Labor Government in Canberra it has been much more sympathetic than the previous Government to the housing needs of people, especially compared to the Fraser Liberal Government and the McMahon Government.

Certainly we got a fillip from 1972 to 1975 with the Whitlam Government, which was thrown out so unceremoniously by that man who came back to Australia to live and who now intends going back to practise at the bar. I refer to Kerr. If the Whitlam Government had been allowed to carry on as it should have been, we would not be in the awful mess that we are now in. That allowed reactionaries to come from the conservative side of politics and not assist the people of Australia in any way whatsoever.

Mr Lewis: That's all piffle.

Mr WHITTEN: Perhaps the member for Mallee is right: we should not be backward thinking. However, we should look at history and realise what an awful deal ordinary people get from conservative Governments that are only concerned with their own conservatism. The member for Mallee says that one should not look backwards. However, I know that he is very supportive of the historic part of Port Adelaide, the heritage of Port Adelaide, the maritime museum and the maritime park. Then he says that we should not look back, but if we do not look back at history where will we be? It is necessary not only to look back at history but to gain some knowledge so that we can project forward and do some good things. The Liberals live in historic times, in the dim dark ages. They have never progressed into the twentieth century; they are still living back in the nineteenth century, and this is not too good at all.

Recently, the Government published a screed called *HOME*, which stands for Home Ownership Made Easier, dealing with 'The South Australian Government programme of eligibility guidelines'. Members with constituents who are endeavouring to own their own homes should recommend that they obtain this single sheet pamphlet from which they would gain a lot of knowledge as to how people can be assisted in achieving the great Australian ideal of home ownership. I am sure that the member for Mallee would agree with me on that point. Even the member for Mount Gambier, as conservative as he is, I feel sure would support ordinary workers being able to own their own home.

Mr Lewis: Hear, hear!

Mr WHITTEN: I did not hear a 'hear, hear' from the member for Mount Gambier.

The Hon. D.J. Hoppood: I don't think that he is conservative: I think he's a bit pink. He's a pinky all right.

Mr WHITTEN: He is! I was not aware of that, but if it is the case that he is pink I will spread it around the place, particularly in Mount Gambier. I will say that he is not a communist but that he has those delicate shades of pink. If he wants to be a little progressive he should come up to what the Australian Labor Party stands for. If he were to expound some of the Australian Labor Party's policies, he might retain Mount Gambier. At present the reports that I am receiving indicate that there is not a possible chance of the member for Mount Gambier retaining his seat.

What happened when he was Minister? The people in Mount Gambier do not remember Harold Allison as the member for Mount Gambier. They remember that he was such an abject failure as Minister of Education. People have heard the member for Salisbury. I do not know whether there were any people in the Gallery yesterday and today when the member for Salisbury, the Minister of Education, was answering a question and spoke for nine minutes.

The Hon. H. Allison: Just one sentence.

Mr WHITTEN: He had to spell it out in two syllable words because the Premier had been subjected to many questions about the Kindergarten Union and childhood services. Instead of directing questions where they could get the proper answer, Opposition members are too thick between the ears in that they thought they could embarrass the Premier. That is how dumb the Opposition is in thinking that it can embarrass the Premier.

It is very noticeable that the member for Flinders has not asked a question this time, because he is a little afraid about what he is committed to do now—to go back and be with all those reactionaries and to support people being hung, drawn and quartered. That is what it leads to. Once one brings back hanging it will go further, and people will be drawn and quartered. I felt sorry for the member for Flinders—and I should not talk about him, as he is not in the House—when he was committed by his national conference to introduce a Bill for people to be killers.

Mr Groom: He supports it himself.

Mr WHITTEN: He supported it previously. I was here when the Dunstan Government threw out hanging. I thought that the member for Flinders had come out of the 1900s and into the twentieth century.

Mr Groom: He has the League of Rights to worry about.

Mr WHITTEN: He may have the League of Rights to worry about. If he was honest and sincere he would say, 'To hell with the League of Rights. I am not going to be a hangman.' Anyone who supports hanging has to be prepared to pull that bolt. I could never do that. If members of this Parliament went to the Adelaide Gaol, looked at the hanging chamber, saw that awful place, and were unaffected and still supported hanging, they would have no hearts and no brains. It is an awful experience.

Mr Lewis: What about the innocent victims?

Mr WHITTEN: One cannot bring victims back, but one can hang innocent people. If capital punishment was still on the Statute Book the chap recently released, who is a constituent of mine, might have been hanged when he might not have been guilty. I am not saying whether he was guilty or not.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr WHITTEN: But that person might now be dead.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Aren't you a hanger?

Mr WHITTEN: I am certainly not a hanger. The honourable member should have listened to what I said previously and he would then realise that I do not support hanging. Any person who supports hanging is a potential killer when they are prepared to tell someone else to pull the bolt and take the life of another person. This is no different from pulling the trigger of a gun and blowing a person's brains out. When one supports hanging one should

be prepared to stand on the steps of Parliament House and say, 'I am prepared to kill a person,' because that is what they are saying when they say that they support capital punishment. I hope that, when the member for Flinders brings in his private member's Bill, he will not get a seconder. I know that he will, but I hope that he will not.

Mr Lewis: You would rather see life imprisonment for Hitler, would you?

Mr WHITTEN: I would rather see life imprisonment because after 20 years some people have been proved innocent.

[Sitting suspended from 12.48 to 2 p.m.]

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): I support the motion and join with other members of the House in offering my condolences to the families of those members who have died recently. I wish during the course of this debate to bring a number of matters to the attention of honourable members, and will do so in the first instance by referring to several of the points made by the Government in the Governor's Speech about the position as the Government sees it. The first of those points is raised in paragraph 5 of the Speech, as follows:

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

That is a very honest and accurate appraisal of the present situation. The Speech continues:

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

That is also very accurate. Were it not for the rains which spread across most of South Australia's farmlands about a month ago and subsequently throughout July to date, we would have now been in the grip of a drought. I am making this point not only because of its relevance and validity in understanding and explaining whatever economic recovery there has been in South Australia, to which a substantial contribution has also been made by the international improvement of the Western economies as they have also come out of recession, but also I want to highlight in referring to this point the absolutely essential aspect of the rural sector's contribution to our state of economic good health.

No matter what we do, no matter how we see the past, it still remains absolutely true that without a healthy rural economy this State and this country are in dire straits. It does not matter what happens overseas; it does not matter what Governments might do in other areas. If we sincerely wish to see this country continue in prosperity, at least in the short run we must ensure that the rural industries and the primary industry of mining are healthy and continue to develop. None of those industries is in any way able to do anything more on the world market, to which most of their products go, than to take the best price it can get, and the price that is offered by our overseas trading partners as customers is in no way influenced by decisions of the Arbitration Commission and labour costs and wage rates which prevail in our economy. We are fools if we delude ourselves into thinking the position is in any sense different from that. They are immutable facts. Too many people and too many politicians overlook the fundamental importance of the rural sector to our prosperity.

Within a few minutes I will be receiving some figures which I will use to illustrate the stupidity of recent policies pursued in the last decade or so in relation to the way in which we have redirected wealth and prosperity away from those industries into the rest of the economy. If we continue down that road and ignore the implications of improvement in our productive output nationally, per man-hour of work, and relative to the capital invested in agriculture, we will

certainly find that we cannot sell what we produce in this country at prices which enable it to be produced here and which return a profit to those people engaged in that production.

We need to spend sufficient funds to ensure that, through research and extension, new technologies and other improvements in the primary industry sector continue to contribute to our increasing prosperity or at least sustain existing levels of prosperity. It is simple and fair to explain it by saying that, if nothing is redistributed because there is nothing to redistribute, no-one is better off: all people will have an equal share of nothing. That seems to be the philosophical view of some of those people who suggest idiotically that it is possible to do whatever you want to do, regardless of the cost implications to those people and those industries producing the real wealth.

Paragraph 6 of His Excellency's Speech, relating to the development of this Government's economic development strategy, states:

The main thrust of my Government's economic development strategy will continue to be directed towards encouraging South Australian industry to become more competitive both interstate and internationally; in . . . assisting the development of new industries of benefit to the State.

The member for Price has acknowledged one of those industries that will come into his area if the Premier is successful in dealing with the Federal Government (although the Premier does not have a good track record in that regard) in his efforts to attract to this State the submarine construction industry to build submarines not only for our defence forces but also for those of New Zealand and for anyone else wishing to buy those submarines. Earlier, I made a comment which may to some listeners have sounded inane, that our submarines should be powered not by seahorses but by the most reliable modern technology available to us, which is safe and efficient. Clearly, that is nuclear power.

Anyone who thinks that submarines built anywhere will be functional and useful as an integrated part of our defence forces if they are not nuclear-powered is kidding himself. We may just as well not spend one cent building submarines if they are not nuclear-powered, because such submarines would not have the range, speed, or versatility if they were powered by the old technology of fossil fuels. That was why I drew the comparison between horse-drawn submarines and motorised submarines. The comparison between the old technology (motorised submarines using fossil fuels) compared to nuclear power has about as wide a gap has for the sake of comparison in illustrating my point. While considering this point, we can also look at the implications for new industries not yet existing here, such as aquaculture, which could act as an import substitute industry.

The technologies for aquaculture are well documented, scientifically valid and well known in other countries of the world, though we in Australia do not know much about them and have tended to ignore their usefulness as part of the spectrum of industries which we could have here. Moreover, they would also enhance the appeal of Australia in general and South Australia in particular as a tourist destination. We do not grow many oysters anywhere in South Australia at present, but we could grow substantial quantities. All of us know and have known for some time that the New South Wales oyster industry in the sunken river valleys of the Hawkesbury and elsewhere is at risk. From time to time those oyster farms produce oysters which are polluted during periods of flood.

We in South Australia have been sitting on a goldmine and have been doing nothing about it for all these years. There are a few notable exceptions—the Coffin Bay and Stansbury oyster farms, in particular, have struggled along, serving only customers incidental to their immediate regions

without being able to make any substantial contribution to the overall level of national demand for oysters. I simply cite that as an instance.

We could also farm crustaceans. By that I mean not vertebrates but invertebrates such as yabbies and related species. *Cherax* is the scientific name given to them. Whilst I was in Western Australia on a study tour earlier this year I visited the south-west of that State, in the electorate of Vasse, in the area where the hardwood forests are established. Also it is the area where a species of *Cherax* known as *Cherax tenuimanus*, (which is the cousin to the yabby, *Cherax destructor*), is indigenous. It grows to a much larger size than yabbies and will grow to the same size as yabbies much more quickly than will the yabby itself. From the work that has been done there it is quite obvious that we in South Australia can develop such an industry by double pumping the water we use for irrigation, by first putting it into fish ponds, which would enable it to produce an animal protein crop for which would be paid a premium price on export markets and which would bring in export income as well as generating additional jobs in those districts where irrigation is undertaken. This species would reach market size and be hard to differentiate from yabbies, once prepared for market, in a much faster time than yabbies.

For that reason, I refer to it as yet another instance in which aquaculture could indeed fit into the context of the sixth point made by the Premier, but neither his Government to date nor any previous Government has done anything more than pay tokenism or lip service at best to this prospective industry. In some cases, they have simply ignored it.

Yet another industry in the category of those which could be developed to broaden the base of South Australia's economy is the tourist industry. The very eloquent dissertation given by the member for Coles in her speech only last night detailed many of the ways in which we can improve and enhance our reputation as a tourist destination here in South Australia. I would like to put a novel idea to the Australian tourist industry which might help sell Australia overseas by providing visitors to this country with something of a gimmick to take home and show their friends—that is, we simply turn the whole proposition of the world on its head.

There is no good reason at all why we could not invert the globe as we see it on office desks, in school libraries and other places—an orb with a map of the world on it, a facsimile or replica in miniature of the earth on which we all live to have—we do not have to have the south pole at the top and all the names written so that they are read with the letters pointing to the top, with the map of Australia drawn the way it is with Cape York at the topmost point. I am not suggesting for a moment that north is not where it is. I am merely saying: let us put north at the bottom of the globe, let us put south at the top of the globe, redraw the map of Australia with Wilson's Promontory as the uppermost point and the continents of North America, Asia and Europe at the bottom of the globe.

I think that small orbs (small globes) produced in this way *en masse* in Australia would make novel souvenirs and would tend to be therefore a point of interest and conversation among their friends whenever tourists returned to their Northern Hemisphere homes with such a souvenir conversation piece. The slogan on the base could be, 'Going south is going up.' I reckon that that would do a fair bit to promote awareness of Australia, the fact that we exist; that we are an interesting and unique part of the world with lots of interesting things to see, and thereby attract a greater number of tourists to our country and our State.

While I am speaking about tourism I would like to make the point that, for so long as we have such archaic shopping

hours laws and for so long as we have such archaic industrial relations laws which affect the cost, comfort and enjoyment of the visitor to our shores the way they do at the present time, we will fail to attract as many visitors as we could. Therefore, we will fail to develop the number of jobs in that industry that we otherwise could.

If any of us, as Australians, go overseas and arrive at our destination for a holiday of relaxation (with some sightseeing to be taken in) at a time after 11.30 a.m. on Saturday and before 9 a.m. on Monday, we expect to be able to buy the things we feel we need there and then so that we can look after our creature comforts. However, when it comes to enabling our overseas guests to enjoy the same convenience in Australia, we either completely prohibit the possibility of ever providing those services or make them so damned expensive that our guests' initial impression of our hospitality and interest in their welfare is that we don't care. To have a first impression of this country which is so damaging to our image is to my mind ridiculous. We must seriously examine the implications of those kinds of laws and regulations which do quite seriously and adversely affect the comfort and convenience of our visitors our reputation and therefore the prospects of development of our tourist industry.

There are thousands of young people, and even not so young people, who would welcome a job where they could get work for 37.5 hours or 40 hours a week (whatever a full-time job is these days), regardless of what time that they work those hours between midnight on Sunday and midnight the next Sunday. They would be glad of the opportunity to get that job, and without having to receive penalty payments.

I know that it is so because, whenever I have discussed it with people who have an interest in that kind of work, they have been quite adamant that they do not really want, nor have they sought to have, such high penalty rates imposed on their employers and their employer's customers. There are some distinct advantages in a lifestyle that enables us to work for 12 hours on, say, each of Friday, Saturday and Sunday, and perhaps another four hours on Monday morning or maybe Thursday evening—any combination of times could apply to make up to a full week's work. The advantages are that one could go fishing while no-one else is at one's favourite fishing spot, or play golf when the course is not literally packed and when sometimes to avoid that one has to play at some ungodly hour in the morning before the sun is even up or risk finishing in the dark. Not everyone is a football freak, even if I am.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Which team do you barrack for?

Mr LEWIS: Norwood.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: We all have our problems!

Mr LEWIS: Yes; I understand that North Adelaide has some very serious problems.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We are now engaged in the Address in Reply debate and are not discussing football teams.

Mr LEWIS: Yes, but tourists will be able to see more of this unique and interesting sport if we can encourage more of them to come to Australia, and in particular to South Australia. Those people who have to work, and those who want to work, on weekends do not necessarily want to participate in the same kinds of activities during their leisure time as perhaps others do who spend their leisure time at weekends. Therefore, no law ought to discriminate against any individual's taste in regard to leisure time activity or work preference. We seem to be long on rhetoric in that regard and short on action. We preclude this diversity of lifestyle, especially where it relates to choice of working hours on any of the seven days of the week in the fashion

to which I have already alluded. At paragraph 8 of his Speech the Governor states:

In recent years there has been increasing concern at the poor cost-effectiveness, the lack of proper benefits and the insufficient emphasis placed on rehabilitation within the existing workers compensation arrangements in this State.

If ever there was an understatement, that is it. In the past whenever members presently on this side of the Chamber have raised their voices about this aspect of existing industrial law, regardless of which side of the Chamber they have been sitting on at the time, they have always been howled down by members of the Labor Party. (I note that there was a brief dimming of the House lights then, and I know for a fact that the remarks I am making are being blessed by some phenomenon quite outside my control!) In any case, all of us must now accept that the way in which workers compensation legislation and associated arrangements have affected employment prospects and the injured individual in the past has been much less than satisfactory. The total focus has been on providing money as a pay-off for the consequence of injury and discomfort instead of there being a focus (of sufficient emphasis at least) on rehabilitation. The sentence in the Governor's Speech to which I referred summarises that point admirably. There needs to be rehabilitation.

I understand that the only existing workers rehabilitation clinic where a multi-disciplinary team of medical and paramedical staff presently operates in South Australia is to be closed down; that is what I understand will happen to it. It will at least be phased down and will probably end up being closed down in the long run, anyway. I am referring to the Alfreda Clinic, which was started by Commonwealth funding during the Whitlam years and which has subsequently been taken over by the State Government and found a niche in the Health Commission. However, it has been completely ignored by the present Government in the legislation which it introduced into this House and which passed through the Parliament during the last session.

As far as I am aware there was no consultation whatever with that clinic and its experience in determining how best to go about establishing such worker rehabilitation clinics. They are to become the playthings of the trade unions, and I do not see that as in any way related to the general health and welfare, in a scientific fashion, of people who have the misfortune to be injured whilst at work. It may be politically convenient for the Labor Party to do it but it is certainly not necessarily administratively expedient or professionally competent.

It might have been a good idea to have compared the performance of people who were treated in that clinic, the rate at which they were able to return to a meaningful life and meaningful employment after being treated there, to the rate of recovery and return to normality from 'the system'. As I understand it, the Alfreda Clinic's patients or clients have a much better record of rehabilitation than have the alternative forms of treatment which are otherwise available throughout the system. Paragraph 9 of the Governor's Speech states:

Legislation will be placed before you in the coming session to amend the Constitution Act to provide for simultaneous elections and for a minimum Parliamentary term of three years with a maximum term of four years, and to remove the right of the Legislative Council to block Supply. Legislation will also be introduced to replace the present Electoral Act with an Act more in keeping with modern conditions and administration.

It sounds like a rerun of the Mick Young mess that we have in the Federal arena at the present time in relation to the Electoral Act, notwithstanding the mess that he has made of other things, including his own life.

I want to take each of those points one at a time. The minimum Parliamentary term of three years with a maxi-

mum term of four years seems to be a complete cop-out for the present Government, because during the period of time that it was in office under the predominant administration of Premier Dunstan it never once went full term. In fact, the Tonkin Government—

Mr Groom: 1970-73.

Mr LEWIS: Wrong again! It went to the people earlier than it needed to.

Mr Groom: 1970-73.

Mr LEWIS: How many months?

Mr Groom: Three years.

Mr LEWIS: Certainly not 36 months. The record will show that the Tonkin Government was the third Government in the history of democratic government in this State—only the third Government—that went three years or more. Yet, whilst the Labor Party in South Australia was in office it did not go full term once. In this part of the Speech the Government says that it wants to require the Parliament to have a minimum term of three years and a maximum of four years. If the Labor Party had been sincere about that it would never have called an election earlier than three years, because there was never a necessity at any time during the Dunstan years to do so.

Mr Groom: Will you support four-year terms?

Mr LEWIS: I am not fussed about that. I am annoyed that now we are going to find this present Government going to the people in an attempt to create the impression that it is opposed to short-term Parliaments and yet it is the worst sinner and the worst offender against that principle by virtue of its own practice in office.

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: I am talking about South Australia and therefore the province of responsibility of this Parliament. As for simultaneous elections, frankly the best interest long term of democracy in this State will be served if elections are never simultaneous. I do not believe that Parties or Ministers have a role and a place in the Upper House. Indeed, I believe they should make a declaration (when they are nominated for and accepted by the Electoral Commissioner as candidates for an election) to resign from any political Party.

The last point in the Speech in relation to elections referred to the removal of the right of the Legislative Council to block Supply. I cannot accept that that is a legitimate position. The very fact that the Legislative Council has not blocked Supply indicates that it is not only a democratically elected Chamber but a responsible Chamber and, what is more, a realistic House of Review. To give a Government an untrammelled power to obtain Supply—

The Hon. Michael Wilson: The member for Hartley asked whether you think the Legislative Council is a waste of taxpayers' money. That is what he said.

Mr LEWIS: The member for Hartley ought to rethink the principles upon which he bases his understanding of democracy. If he wants an illustration of the idiocy of single House Legislatures he can look at the record of Queensland since it abolished its Upper House 30 years ago. Every session and every Parliament in that State since the abolition of the Upper House has resulted in a stack of legislation passing through that single Chamber and never being proclaimed because it arrived in the Minister's hands in the Chamber with mistakes, errors and omissions in it which were discovered during the course of debate and which the Minister responsible for it and the Government of the day did not have the guts to admit existed so they toughed it out, used the numbers, pushed it through, and then did not proclaim it, leaving the legislation to be re-enacted with the amendments that were necessary three or so years later in the next Parliament, and by that means saving face.

If justice in democracy is to be served, then it is best that it be served when it is first identified as needing legislative attention, not, for the sake of Governments saving face and Ministers' egos, to be left three years down the track. Cannot the member for Hartley and other members opposite understand that it is a principle that they ought to embrace and support?

The Hon. Michael Wilson: He wants to abolish the Upper House.

Mr LEWIS: I can understand that he will want to abolish it, and ultimately he will advocate the abolition of this Chamber as well. If the Legislative Council has the power to block Supply then no Government established in the House of Assembly will ever dare try an unconstitutional act or for that matter behave in any unconstitutional way knowing that, if nothing else, the Legislative Council can refuse it Supply and force it to go to the people. I believe that within the framework of the present system it should not be necessary for the Legislative Council in those circumstances to also have to face the people at the same time. Paragraph 15 of the Speech states:

... A task force has been established to develop employment and training opportunities within Aboriginal communities, and wide-ranging consultation is currently taking place with those communities concerning long-term plans for Aboriginal people to manage their own welfare services.

I want to lay the lie to at least one situation in what the Government in this Speech is claiming is happening but which is not happening. I am referring to what is happening at Port McLeay, which is in my district. It is a matter of interest and concern to me and I have a number of friends who live there. That community, in spite of attempts being made by forces alien to it to divide it and destroy it, is still determined to retain its identity and go on to take up a challenge for the people who live there to make their future a better experience than has been their past. They have applied for a Community Employment Programme grant to develop a number of employment opportunities (and industries then) on their council lands which has as yet not been approved, even though a recommendation was made by the reviewing officers in South Australia to the authorities in Canberra that it be approved, and even though the time frame within which approval was necessary for it to be possible for them to integrate those Community Employment Programme funds if they were available into the rest of their council's budgeted expenditure was spelt out; they have still been ignored. What a pity that is, because it leaves the council in the uncertain position of not knowing what it can do, and it is already more than a month into this financial year.

Of course, against the experience of the Point McLeay Community Council we can contrast the action of the Government in the way it approved a private interest group (PIG), the application made by the Storemen and Packers Union for their development plans for the Coorong Caravan Park, to which my colleague the member for Coles has also referred. The Coorong Caravan Park, as members will know, is also in my district. I was disgusted by that decision, because it is quite obvious that public funds are being used to improve the assets of private citizens where they were never intended for that purpose whatever and, what is more, it was supported by this Government, and by that support this Government completely ignored an undertaking given by the Minister of Tourism that those funds would be used to augment the grant funds available from the South Australian Department of Tourism in developing tourist facilities for public use where they are in public ownership around the State.

Paragraph 19 of the Governor's statement of the Government's policies for the next session refers to the provision

of a source of energy for the production of sufficient electricity to meet South Australia's future needs. I want to pay a tribute to the professional excellence of the man who has been appointed to the position as Chairman of the FEAC Committee, Mr Doug Stewart, who was also Chairman of a committee which assessed all the energy options right across the board, whether they be hot rocks, tidal power, ocean thermal, wind energy, coal or nuclear as the prime source for generation of electricity to meet South Australia's needs. He also made a realistic appraisal of the continuing role of natural gas as part of the total spectrum of prime sources that can be used.

Paragraph 19 of His Excellency's Speech, relating to the mining and processing of natural resources, states that detailed work on both interconnection and coalfield selection is continuing. I hope that the information provided for the use of the committee is more accurate than that given to Mr Stewart as Chairman of the previous committee. The information that he received was inaccurate and, therefore, some of the conclusions to which his committee was compelled to come were not realistic. A correct conclusion cannot be arrived at if a committee is given incorrect information. It is regrettable that greater trouble was not taken by Bechtel Pacific or the Electricity Trust to obtain factual information about the extent of the reserves, the strip mining ratios, and similar matters as they relate to deposits of coal at Wintinna, Lochiel and Sedan, especially Wintinna and Sedan.

My discussions with the principals of the exploration companies that discovered those deposits have convinced me that the information given to the Stewart Committee was not accurate because it was not obtained in consultation with those proponents. This House well knows of instances where other inaccuracies relating to the Kingston deposit have been uncovered and referred to by me during the past session. They will be referred to by me again when the House debates the motion that I have placed on the Notice Paper. I hope that the Labor Party can come to a more realistic appraisal of that motion, if and when the House votes on it later this session, than it was possible for it to do in relation to this matter last session.

I commend the Government for the reference in paragraph 21 of His Excellency's Speech, the latter part of which states:

My Government has also been negotiating with the Government of Victoria on the equitable sharing of the ground water resources in the area of the South Australian and Victorian border. It is expected that a Bill for an Act to ratify the agreement reached will be put before you this session.

I certainly hope that that is so and that it is sensible legislation. I further hope that a better job is made this time than has been made in the past on such matters. The first part of paragraph 21 refers to the continuing expenditure on water filtration at Morgan. I regret very much that, whereas the Government continues to spend money on filtering water for Adelaide and the Iron Triangle, it completely ignores the pleas of people in rural areas who have absolutely no reticulated water supply. Further, even if it is considered moral and reasonable to leave some people without a reticulated supply of potable water that is so essential to basic hygiene in any community, the Government should nonetheless consider providing filtration plants for communities served by the Tailem Bend to Keith pipeline and for those people living around Murray Bridge. The Government has ignored requests for filtered water made by those Engineering and Water Supply Department ratepayers. That is deplorable, simply because water coming into Adelaide through the Murray River pipeline systems has already had considerable time to settle in tanks and reservoirs before it reaches the mains and the taps of metropolitan householders,

whereas water coming into the households in places such as Murray Bridge, Tailem Bend and Coonalpyn has not come from a metropolitan reservoir and therefore has not had the opportunity for settling to occur. It is therefore even filthier than the filthiest water of the householders of any district referred to by any other member in this place in the past.

This water comes straight from the river into the household, and for months housewives have complained to me that not only is it impossible for them to launder the clothes of their families and to clean their homes; but also that the water ruins their cooking. It cannot be drunk because the high levels of chlorine needed to make it safe to drink also make it impossible to drink. It is so heavily chlorinated and so recently chlorinated that by the time it reaches the taps of householders just a few hundred metres from the chlorination plant and just a few minutes or a few short hours after it has been chlorinated the chlorine makes one weep.

I cannot understand the morality of a decision which in the first instance indicates that water filtration is legitimate and then ignores the needs of those most seriously affected by the filth in the water. It is just not fair. These people pay their rates and taxes. The systems from which they get their water are as economic as, or even more economic than, any other water reticulation system in South Australia. It is just not good enough for people in this place and for Governments of this State to ignore my people just because a seat will not change hands if they do and just because no fuss will be made by the Adelaide media about their problem. It is annoying, and I expect the Government will hear much more about this matter not only from me but more especially from the communities I represent. These people are fed up with being ignored and left out, not only in this but in many other matters as well.

Paragraph 27 of His Excellency's Speech, relating to the development of the arts, states:

The Government will increase its emphasis on arts activities within the community, both in metropolitan and country areas, and will also embark on a programme of works of art in public places throughout the State.

I hope that that is being done in consultation with communities in country areas, so that those people who, like me, appreciate the fine arts will be able to contribute to the decisions that are taken in order, ostensibly, to serve the interest and need where it will be fulfilled in the communities in which they live. The record of the present Government on that score is abysmal. It had to be dragged, screaming, to the conference table to make a realistic appraisal of the performing arts needs of people in the communities of Lameroo and Pinnaroo, for instance, where the Government argued speciously that, by providing a regional cultural centre theatre at Renmark, it was catering for the needs of the people in those communities.

It is ridiculous to consider that people living in Lameroo, Pinnaroo or Geranium can be served by any such facility in Renmark when the standard of the roads between those communities and Renmark is appalling. They find their performing arts experiences and entertainment within their own communities. If they do travel it is naturally along the safest road to Adelaide, to the Festival Centre and other such venues as provide that kind of entertainment for leisure time.

In consequence of the representations made to the Government by the people in those communities through their local government and other interested groups, supported by remarks made by me as their representative, the Government happily agreed finally to provide them with some subsidy funds for the improvement of the facilities for the performing arts in their institutes. To the extent that it has happened, I am grateful. On behalf of my constituents, I express that

gratitude to the Government. I want to place on record quite clearly and unequivocally my sincere gratitude for at least that much consideration, notwithstanding that it was \$200 000 compared to the \$4 million-plus that has been spent and will be spent subsidising the continued loss operation of the Renmark Regional Theatre. They are the things I wished to say about the Governor's Speech.

I want now to refer in the time left to two or three other problems, one of which I explained in some detail, though not completely, during the grievance debate recently. I referred to the way in which off-road vehicles are advertised through the electronic and print media at present. I made the point that those advertisements are stupid, irresponsible and immoral. I illustrated that by pointing out the damage which they do or cause to be done that need not be encouraged or inspired if the people who produce those advertisements were to take a more realistic look at their effect.

First, we need to recognise that those advertisements do not sell one more vehicle. All they do is rearrange the percentages within the market. If someone is in the market for a vehicle they will buy a vehicle. Their choice of vehicle is influenced by all the factors that they perceive in their environment to be relevant. No insignificant part of that then is the advertisement to which I refer. These advertisements are not really expanding jobs for people making or repairing motor vehicles; all they do is rearrange the composition of the market. By putting these advertisements to air we encourage aggressive driver behaviour in general and the development of even worse driving manners in some people than they already have. That contributes to the road toll and in turn to the risk of being injured or having property damaged when one goes out on to a country road or into rural areas generally, off-road included.

The next point to which I referred in the context of damage was the way in which rural roads are mercilessly torn to pieces by trail bikes and four-wheel drive vehicles whose drivers are emulating the kind of behaviour they see in those advertisements. Already we have insufficient funds to properly maintain our rural arterial and rural local roads, and this kind of behaviour further exacerbates the problem we have in rural communities.

The other kind of damage resulting from this sort of behaviour promoting advertisement is damage to private property. The few drivers there are who respond to it and try to emulate it drive out into the country, simply drop down someone's panel gate or open a gate if it is a swing gate, drive into the paddock, up and down the hill or around the creek lines, not giving a fig whether there are milking cows or lambing ewes in the paddock. They damage not only the pasture and, therefore, the property of the landholder, but also the death of a number of lambs, for instance, in the darkness on a rainy night when this has been known to happen, the lambs will be mis-mothered and died by morning.

They do not give a second thought about them, and in fact get very abusive towards landholders who ask them, first, why they are there and whether they have sought permission to be there and, secondly, whether they would mind being more considerate. They abuse such reasonable approaches, and consequently divisions develop between country and city people because the rural dweller thinks most of those people as irresponsible townies. That is a pity. We do not need that kind of division being promoted. The other thing it does, of course, is to exacerbate the problem which many of us have when we try to talk up the benefits of tourism because the people who come to visit the countryside are seen as 'townies' and as such, people who simply tear up the roads and leave their rubbish. That is not the kind of response we need in rural communities, where in fact we could expand the number of jobs for our

children and other unemployed folk living there if we were able to encourage an expansion of tourism in those localities.

Worse still, the effects of this driving on paddocks and/or other off-road situations in which it is undertaken is to exacerbate erosion. I believe the real solution to this problem is not only simply to stop advertising vehicles in this fashion, but also, and more importantly, to tell those people who want the thrill of cross-country off-road driving to get together like those of us who play golf, for instance, form themselves a club, buy some suitable piece of land and use it as 'an off-road vehicle farm' if you like. Then they can root up their own land without risking lives, causing damage, or disturbing the peace and property of others, leaving our natural environment intact for posterity. The damage they do is not only on farms and rural roads; it is also in our parks system.

In the short time left I want to refer to what I regard as a nefarious practice of some groups in the community in the way they get up petitions to be presented to the Parliament. Recently, I received an unmarked envelope without an accompanying letter containing two petition forms, each being different. One was to be presented by a member of the House of Representatives in Canberra. I do not know why it came to me. I am not a member of the House of Representatives; it should have gone to James Porter. However, none of the people signing it actually live in Mallee or Barker. I must make the point that I sent letters to everyone who signed both these petitions and asked them if they had signed such a petition.

So far I have had several replies from those people stating that the signature on the petition was not theirs and that they had never seen the petition. This just goes to show that there are some people around the place who will stoop to anything to make their political points. In this case, the petition for the House of Representatives was about prohibiting kangaroos from being commercially exploited. It says permissible cropping rates are unknown and the means of enforcing controls or protective laws are completely ineffective in this land, thus allowing this unique animal to follow the path to rarity or extinction along which all wild animals have gone when subjected to exploitation in similar circumstances. All that is simply a lie; there is no evidence to support any of it. The petition further states:

We Australians have the right to see kangaroos in reasonable numbers on the landscape: we find the commercial slaughter of the kangaroo to be abhorrent and unjustified.

So, they want us to ban the export of products from kangaroos and take action to ensure that the State Government prohibits commercial activity. How stupid!

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

Mr MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. First, I add my condolences to the families of those former members of Parliament who have passed on. I refer particularly to Mr Kelly Chaffey, whom I did not know, but I certainly did know Howard O'Neill, who was a member for Florey. I knew the late Charlie Wells (a former member for Florey) fairly well. In fact, he often from across the Chamber named me with special terms of endearment. I also refer to Claude Allen (a former member for Frome), whom I knew very well and who was a very good friend of mine. Indeed, when I first came into this Chamber he was an adviser to me and assisted me on many occasions.

Before I deal thoroughly with the Governor's Speech, I would like to deal with some matters mentioned in it, particularly with the emphasis on beach protection. We have had a big review, namely, the Adelaide Coast Protection Statistics Review. It was a technical report that many people would have found difficult to understand, but fortunately

the Coast Protection Board has put out a resume (if one likes) of the main points of that report, to which I would like to address most of my attention. There is no doubt at all in my mind that we must have more action in relation to the problem of the disappearance of our beaches. Of course, that would mean that we must have more money directed into that area and there must be more concentration on investigation. That is imperative and it has to be done now, not some time in the long distant future.

I agree with the terms of the report. In short, it states that in the next few years we will deal only with the replenishment programme. The replenishment programme is working, but I suggest that that is band-aid treatment for the problems that we are about to face and are already facing. We will face more serious problems before long unless something further is done than merely replenishing sand. I would like to know how many models have been made of the metropolitan coastline for the purpose of experimentation. In the beginning, before the Coast Protection Board was set up, we had a committee of seaside councils representing the councils along the coast of the metropolitan area.

I was a member of that committee originally. In fact, at one stage I did a term as the Chairman when I was Mayor of Brighton. At that stage funds were made available to us and a model was funded, which was set up in the Adelaide University under the directorship of Professor Culver, a well known authority on beach protection. He wrote a report that some members may have read, if not in full certainly in part. If we are not to follow the shocking mistakes that have been made by so many other countries, such as Italy, Spain, Portugal, and ourselves in regard to allowing people to build houses on the waterline, build railway lines and roads on the waterline, we have to set up some laboratories similar to those that have been set up in other countries that have made these mistakes.

They are now beginning to realise that it is important indeed for the economy of their countries to maintain their beaches because, after all, they are a big tourist attraction. Certainly, in places like the Adriatic coast of Italy, Spain, Portugal, Germany, and other places, people are attracted by the availability of some of their beaches. As I have said, laboratories are being set up in most countries, and these are not like the little laboratory and model that was set up many years ago at Adelaide University. It was quite good and gave some indication of what was needed in the future. We now need large models to give us some direction, if we wish to take it, as indicated by models and experimentation taking place certainly in Madrid, Lisbon and Northern Germany. The harbor in Lisbon is probably one of the greatest harbors in the world. When one considers the history of Portugal, it is no wonder that it had such a powerful navy for so long because of its very great harbor. They spent a lot of money on research and are now at the stage where they are advisers to a number of other countries and indeed have been commissioned by Brazil to advise, control and supervise the upgrading of the Copacabana beach in Brazil. I refer to a book that was given to me (fortunately not written in Spanish or Portuguese) about some of the matters in relation to the Copacabana beach. The book states:

Copacabana Beach is located very near Rio de Janeiro (Brazil) and faces the South Atlantic Ocean. With a crescent shape in plan, it is around 4.2 km long. The mean width of the original beach was about 55 m at HWL. It has been necessary to widen the bordering avenue—

what we know as the esplanade—

from 20 m to 72.5 m, to widen the beach from the original mean width of 55 m to about 145 m. As about 52.5 m of the widened beach should be used for the construction of the avenue, the mean width of the new recreational area would approach 90 m.

First, they did this with models and experimentation in their laboratories to prove that it could be done. I am giving this information because I wish to emphasise the fact that we should be following this example in relation to experimentation in laboratories with this type of work. The book further states:

Site conditions were observed and collected data were analysed in order to characterise the beach regime and to explain its width fluctuations. Based on the conclusion of that analysis, a small-scale model was calibrated and run.

The model was built to a horizontal scale of 1/300 and a vertical scale of 1/75. The sand was represented by crushed bakelite. The model project was based on Valembois criterion.

It goes on to give a general description of the field operation which was done after the experimentation exercise, the forming of the model and the consideration of the facts obtained. It states:

The stockpiled sand came from a protected bay, pumped by two cutter suction dredges with 24 inch delivery pipes. The total length of pipes was around 5 km. The estimated monthly production of sand was 315 000 m³. The sand dumped on the offshore was carried by a hopper which dredged in the open sea at depths about 10 to 15 m, about 4.5 km away from the centre of the beach.

So, it was not done at close range as has been the case here. When looking for sand we have been staying fairly close to the foreshore but in this example this was undertaken in areas of open ocean, 4.5 kilometres and even further away from the shore. It goes on to say:

The actual evolution of the beach during and after nourishment very satisfactorily confirmed the predictions based on the model.

Therefore, what had been predicted and confirmed by the model was also confirmed when put into actual operation. It further states:

The actual volume of the sand used to reach the desired widening was exactly the one predicted by the model tests. The efficiency of the dumping method seems to be supported by three evidences.

It goes on to explain those matters. The conclusion states:

The good results obtained in the widening of the Copacabana beach by artificial nourishment of sand stockpiled on the foreshore and dumped offshore have confirmed the predictions based on the results of the hydraulic model study specifically run for that purpose. Such a practical success of the offshore dumping method will open new possibilities for its use in similar works in the future. The use of offshore dumping is bound to previous analysis—

in other words, one must get one's facts right first—

of specific conditions in each case, knowledge of the coastal history and its correlation with natural agents is of prime importance.

It is important that in such operations some extra finance be provided for investigation first, and I am not referring to an investigation involving simply sending a couple of divers down just off the foreshore of Brighton, Glenelg or Semaphore, but to do a proper analysis involving the building of a model using actual waves and beach contents so that the matter can be investigated properly using the model to ascertain the exact position.

This type of investigation and the use of such models I believe must be worked in close conjunction with the universities. I turn now to matters raised in the May issue of *Coastline* which was released while I was away shortly before I returned. In an article in the *Advertiser* of 30 June under the heading 'South Australian beaches will disappear unless protected', a strategy review on this matter was explained. I think most members would have received a copy of this most recent issue of *Coastline*: it is one of the best I have seen since it has been produced. It explains in layman's terms what is happening in relation to the Adelaide Coast Protection Strategy Review. The actual review itself is pretty technical for the layman and in this publication an explanation of it has been simplified so that everyone can understand it. In part, it states:

The Adelaide Coast Protection Strategy Review was prepared for the Coast Protection Board by the Coastal Management Branch with the assistance of two major consultant studies. . . Beach replenishment by trucking each year, with some rock sea walls, is the only viable strategy at present.

To some extent I would agree with that. Only a meagre amount of money is being spent at present. I am not blaming only the present Government for this, because previous Governments have neglected this matter also. More money must be spent if we are to save the beaches and attract tourists to South Australia, because, after all, we have some of the best beaches in Australia and the world. The publication continues:

Major beach replenishment with a once-off dredging would be feasible and would quickly improve the worst features, if a suitable off-shore sand source can be found.

I wonder how much investigation has been done in that regard. I understand that some investigations have been made in the past 12 months and that some divers have been sent out to look at the situation, but I wonder how many kilometres off shore they went and how deep they have gone, because having regard to what is happening in Europe, investigating only a few kilometres off shore really does not mean very much. Having regard to the cost of losing a beach, on the calculations of this review, I believe the Government has got out of it very lightly. It further states:

Groynes or breakwaters would not provide effective protection in Adelaide.

I agree with that. It further states:

Improved rock seawalls would protect property without replenishment, but some beaches would be lost.

That is quite correct. It further states:

Adelaide's beach and sand dune supply is finite.

It is limited, and this is happening throughout the world because the sand is not being produced as it used to be. As we all know, sand is produced by the weathering of mountains and rocks and is brought down by rivers and tributaries eventually to the sea. However, now it is being blocked by dams and blockages of rivers and it is not getting through. Therefore, sand is not being replenished as occurred previously, and this is happening throughout the world. The publication states in this regard:

The sand arrived from the seaward side between 12 000 and 6 500 years ago, and is now no longer arriving. The same process occurred in many other parts of the world . . . the net annual movement is always to the north, and is estimated to average 30 000 cubic metres per year.

That is very interesting, because up on the Adriatic Coast it goes to the south. It then deals with the various strategies as follows:

Strategy 1—No action: If the current and recommended annual beach replenishment programme is not undertaken most beaches south of West Beach would be likely to disappear within the fifty year period. Property losses from storm damage on the more vulnerable coastline were estimated at \$28 million (\$10 million present day values). Loss of the beach amenity was estimated at \$3.8 million per year.

I would say that in regard to that figure tourism has not been accounted for and that it has probably been missed out completely. Italy places a lot of emphasis on tourism and many people are attracted to that country, especially to the Adriatic region, because of the beaches. That is why Italy is spending hundreds of millions of lire in trying to do something about the big problems that have occurred in the past and are still occurring. Strategy 2 deals with continuing the present measures being undertaken. It states, in part:

The review concluded that for beaches to be retained, continuing the annual beach replenishment with some seawall construction, has the lowest cost in present day values. It is also the only viable strategy if off-shore sand cannot be found, and if beaches are to be retained. The cost of implementing this strategy was estimated

at \$13.4 million (present day values at 5 per cent discount rate). This is approximately \$6 million less than the estimate for a major beach replenishment strategy.

I have some problems with the way in which the costs have been estimated in the report. The report states:

Continuing the present measures would have little impact on the physical or biological environment, but it would involve nearly three times as much truck travel as the other strategies and would have the greatest impact on coastal residents.

I have had some complaint as I am sure other members living along the coast area would have had from residents complaining about the trucking of sand. It continues:

Few opportunities exist for reducing those impacts, except for replenishing when beach use is lowest.

Perhaps pumping the sand or bringing it in by barge into the area could be of benefit. I refer particularly to the areas of Brighton, Seacliff, Glenelg and Somerton where replenishment is needed at least every 12 months. Strategy 2a deals with the *status quo* and states:

The objective of this strategy is to reduce the present level of annual beach replenishment by trucking to the point where beaches are maintained at approximately their present level. This option would not remove the cause of local erosion problems . . .

The cause of local erosion is that people have been allowed to build far too close to the beach and the foreshore. The dunes have disappeared completely, except for the area in front of Minda, and this has caused difficulties.

One area with which I have some argument concerns strategy 4 dealing with major beach replenishment, which states:

This strategy is based on finding 3 million cubic metres of sand . . .

Costs for the strategy were based on dredging the sand from offshore if it can be found.

It will have to be found somewhere. The amount of \$19.1 million to \$21.6 million has been estimated on present day values. It continues:

Although the cost would be slightly higher than for continuing present measures, a major beach replenishment would enable trucking to be avoided for the next ten to twenty years, and to be at a much reduced level after that.

This is where I have some difficulty with the report. Under the same heading it states:

Three sand sources were initially considered, but narrowed down to two when sand off North Haven was found to be too fine.

This of course can be mixed with other sand. It continues:

It may be that the two remaining sources of Outer Harbor and near the Onkaparinga River are also unsuitable . . .

While on my recent study tour, I visited an area in north Germany along the North Sea where pumping and dredging have been used successfully. From the contract prices for the work done and completed in north Germany the estimate of \$19.1 million to \$21 million is about \$15 to \$16 million out. I visited three islands but on one in particular a replenishment programme had been completed by pumping, by dredge and barge. On the island of Norderney 400 000 cubic metres was pumped over a kilometre at a cost of 1.2 million Deutschmarks. The rate of the Deutschmark is 2.419 to the dollar which works out at \$496 072. Therefore, based on the experience in Germany, using the calculations presented in this report, it would cost \$4.2 million which means that the calculations are incorrect. I could understand them being different but for there to be a variation between \$19 million and \$21 million and \$15 to \$16 million, it is far more than a slight mistake.

On the island of Langeoog the cost of pumping 300 000 cubic metres was 1.1 million Deutschmarks, which is well below the calculated estimation contained in this report. I understand that the report was prepared by the Department along with consultants and the costing in that report is about 7.5 times the cost in Germany. One could argue that

in Germany, off the Frisian Islands, there are sand bars close by and that pumping the sand could be achieved simply by hacking into the sandbars and pumping it back to the island. Nevertheless, it was pumped over one kilometre and, based on the calculations in this report, it cannot be correct. Strategy 5 relates to groynes, and it states:

Groynes could be technically feasible if used with a major beach replenishment, but not on their own. This is mainly because there is insufficient sand moving into the area and the structures would merely redistribute the scarce amount of available sand. Unless combined with replenishment—

that is pretty obvious—

the structures would cause more problems than they would solve. Groynes would reduce the alongshore sand movement and subsequently the need for top-up replenishment with its associated cost and trucking nuisance.

It continues:

The cost of using groynes with replenishment is approximately \$1 m to \$2.8 m more than for replenishment alone...

I presume that is trucking the sand. That argument is fairly flexible because one could argue that it all depends on the length and width of the groynes, on the depth of the water, how many there are to be and how far back they will be. So, it is a very generalised statement and I accept it for what it is—an estimate. One would hope that the use of groynes on our beaches would be as little as possible because they do present problems. Aesthetically they are not very good, particularly if one has had the opportunity to see some, especially in one area near Lisbon where there is a mess with the number of groynes that have been established. Strategy 6 deals with offshore breakwaters, and states:

... offshore breakwaters would change the beach alignment in much the same way as groynes... Offshore breakwaters would cost more, and their performance is even less certain than groynes, although the effects may not be as harsh.

Along the Adriatic Coast, 8 kilometres of groynes and 8 to 9 kilometres of offshore breakwaters run parallel with the beach, and that has created problems.

One of the problems is that the offshore breakwaters are parallel to the beach and they cause the distraction of the waves which means that when the sea comes in it does not get behind the breakwaters and the sea water between the breakwater and the shore becomes stale and smells, and people refuse to swim in it; it even becomes dangerous. That type of breakwater is erected along the Italian coastline. I say sincerely to the people who will make decisions on this matter that the last thing we should have along our coast would be offshore breakwaters. The review found that other coast protection strategies were either unsuitable for local conditions or not sufficiently developed. These included floating breakwaters, artificial seaweed, and so on.

On the Continent, at beautiful places such as Monaco and other resorts along the French coast, they are using concrete cubes, which weigh about 150 tonnes each, are ugly and rubbish gets between them; they look terrible. I hope we never have this system in Australia. These cement cubes are placed along some of the beaches of what has been called the most beautiful coastal scenery in the world. The beaches are not as good as Australian beaches. We have a valuable asset which must be protected at all costs. We do not have the pebble beaches that exist at Cannes and Nice and other Mediterranean and Italian resorts. Other recommendations of this review are:

Continuing the present coast protection measures remains the only viable strategy until an offshore sand source is found. It is also the least costly way to improve the beaches and the level of protection.

I would like to know what has been done and how much has been spent on beating the offshore source. The review refers to 100 000 cubic metres of unbulked sand (approximately 135 000 cubic metres in trucks). That is what they are using and what they need. The report continues:

Information which might lead to review of this strategy is unlikely to become available in less than two years.

I agree with that, because they have to get down to it and get an investigation going. They have to get some working models, so that they know exactly what is happening along our beaches. When I was on a seaside council about 15 years ago Bob Culver had some models, but we should have new models and new information before we decide exactly what to do about the problem. The review continues:

The search for an offshore sand source should continue, and the strategy should be reconsidered if suitable sand is found, even though a major replenishment from offshore would be more costly than continuing the present measures.

I could not agree more. I have not been to America but I believe that the American Navy uses its knowledge, ships and personnel to help in the search for offshore sand in an attempt to solve the problems of beach erosion. This is a good time for the Minister for Environment and Planning, if he has not already done so (which I doubt) to contact the Federal Government to see whether some help could be given to the South Australian Government by our armed services to enable investigations to be made.

The review also states that the sand on Torrens Island should be reserved for beach replenishment. I understand that there is a lot of sand there and I agree that it will have to be used at some time in a beach replenishment programme. Many thousands of cubic metres of sand are available on Torrens Island, and perhaps the time is near when we will have to use that resource. The review also recommends:

... reconsideration of a larger groyne at The Broadway/South Glenelg, if a major replenishment were to proceed and if a channel were to be dredged at the Patawalonga.

I have doubt about that until investigations have been made into the efficiency of groynes. From what I saw during my study tour I doubt whether groynes are the answer to that problem. The review also recommends:

... reconsideration of strategies if a rapid increase in the rate of sea level rise is confirmed.

I would think a rapid increase in the rate of sea level rise would be impossible here. We all know that the sea is rising around the world, and there are difficulties at Venice, but we should have more information on this. The recommendations continues:

... that the proclaimed management plan for the metropolitan coast protection district be amended to take account of the strategy recommendations.

We must get some model experience, as they are doing in other countries. The recommendations also refer to the search for offshore deposits of sand for beach replenishment. We must seek further assistance from the Australian Navy if it has the knowledge and ability to contribute in this area.

I refer now to a report given to me when I was in Spain about groynes in coastal engineering. It is by Mr J. Tomlinson, who is from Wallingford, England. Summarising matters in relation to beach protection, particularly groynes, he said:

There are then nearly as many different groyne designs as there are papers that have been written on the subject. Despite this there is, as Kemp (42) indicates, general agreement on a number of points:

1. Groynes inclined downdrift give more even accumulations on either side.

2. Groynes inclined updrift have increased accumulations on the updrift side and lee-side scour.

We all know the general effect of groynes is that sand on one side is replenished and on the other is scoured. In our case, the northern side of the groynes is scoured and we have a replenishment on the southern side, so we have to build another groyne to counteract that problem; we would end up with groynes along the whole coastline. Mr Tomlinson continued:

3. Groyne height should be increased gradually in response to increasing beach level.

4. The seaward ends of groynes should be low, especially on sand beaches.

He was referring there to the use of groynes along the pebble beaches in England. The report further states:

Straight groynes are usually preferred although, with extra cost, a groyne may be advantageous in certain instances. For example, to reduce erosion on the downdrift face of the groyne.

Most of the groynes built in Japan are T-shaped. They are expensive, because much of the groyne is built in deep water. The groyne at Glenelg, which was built between 15 and 20 years ago, cost \$160 000, and one wonders how much it would cost to build today. The report states:

Groynes have been used extensively in the United Kingdom for many years particularly on the south and south-east coasts.

I have seen groynes in Europe that were constructed up to 130 years ago. Once a groyne is built, the local community is saddled with it for ever, and that is a big problem. The report continues:

At first sight their function, and hence design, might appear to be straightforward in that they are intended to provide some form of obstruction to the passage of material along the beach thereby raising beach levels. This is not the case, however, and the design difficulties and intricacies should not be underestimated since groynes are placed in a very complex and sensitive physical regime. If the coastal processes are not understood then it may be that the groyne system will be badly designed and cause a deterioration in the beach conditions rather than an improvement.

That is another emphasis on the need today for investigation and for working models before proceeding with the construction of the groyne. At page 16, the report states:

Most groynes extended to the low water mark or thereabouts and were sufficiently long to impede a high proportion of the littoral drift. (In some model tests drift was completely eliminated but in prototype this would be too costly to attain.) Some of the model tests used high groynes which again eliminated most of the drift. It was found that this was not necessarily the best way of improving beach levels. Particularly on sand beaches a relatively small height (of 1 m or less) is preferred as this reduces scour caused by wave reflections.

That shows that a groyne should not be of a high construction. The big groyne at Glenelg is a high one. Concerning the shape of a groyne, the document continues:

Straight groynes are used most frequently. An offshore breakwater, parallel to the shore, at the end of the groyne is sometimes used, particularly in Japan, but this would increase considerably the cost of construction. Impermeable groynes are generally preferred to permeable groynes. The lack of information on prototype groynes suggests that any data in the form of beach surveys could be very useful. There may be many councils and coast protection authorities who have unpublished data and contact should be made to establish if this is the case. Such an approach would save both on the expense of making surveys and also on the time taken for results to be obtained.

Before constructing a groyne it is therefore advisable to get the advice of the local council and the local people, because they usually know more about local matters than do the academics who are called in to advise. The report continues:

In order to assess the effectiveness of groynes on a beach a comparison must be made with the beach without groynes. If a groyne system is monitored and found to be maintaining a stable beach then, without knowledge of the previous condition, it is not possible to say whether the beach would be stable or not if the groynes were removed. The ideal case then, would be to monitor an ungroyned, deteriorating beach for a number of years and to continue this examination during and after groyne construction.

It is too late when it has been constructed. The report continues:

There are likely to be many groyne systems which do not achieve the desired result and it would be just as useful, if not more so, to study these to determine the reasons for their failure. In this way certain critical areas of groyne design may be established.

Parliament should have more information on the subject of groyne construction, and I ask members to consider seriously the information I have put before them today.

The cost of replacing sand on a beach is high indeed, but people are willing to pay that cost in an effort to solve the problem of beach erosion because a beach is a tourist attraction and a source of income to a country or to a State. In Italy, the beach at Misano became eroded and it was necessary to cart sand of a comparable nature from a quarry 40 km away. In the event, 150 000 cubic metres of sand was quarried and transported to fill 1 600 metres of beach. Imagine that quantity of sand and the cost. Yet the Italian authorities were willing to quarry and transport that quantity of sand at a high cost to replenish the beach. Maybe (but heaven forbid) we have to go to that extent to get the sand to replenish our beaches.

Paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech referring to economic conditions states:

My Government also believes that the financial resources of the public sector must be fully utilised, in partnership with private enterprise, for the development of the State's economy.

At last the message seems to be getting through to the Government that private enterprise is useful and that 'profit' is not a dirty word. After all, profit provides the incentive for people to work and to do some good for the State. Paragraph 13 states:

The welfare of aged people and their ability to play a greater role in all community and social activities is of particular concern to my Government.

Many senior citizens work hard in voluntary organisations. For instance, in the Brighton Meals on Wheels, of which I have the honour to be President, one of the cooks is 92 years of age. She has been cooking in the Brighton kitchen for over 20 years, indeed ever since it opened. That lady likes the job and gives great satisfaction as a cook. Many other people are doing this type of work. Paragraph 13 continues:

In the past session legislation to establish a Commissioner for the Ageing was tabled to encourage community discussion and debate. This legislation will be introduced in this session.

I remind members, however, that the suggestion of such an appointment was first made by the former Liberal Government. Indeed, such an appointment is Liberal policy. My Party planned to make such an appointment, and this is a case of Liberal policy being grabbed by the present Labor Government. The Governor's Speech further reads:

To provide further supply of urban development land, major developments in the Tea Tree Gully-Golden Grove area and at Morphet Vale East are being undertaken. My Government wishes to see these new developments proceed through integrated social and physical planning to ensure that those who live in these areas will have proper and equitable access to all services.

I hope that this means provision of transport services. The Government must have had this on its mind for some time, especially with respect to increased building, housing, and the numbers of people (commuters who have to go to the city or Port Adelaide) in the southern areas. People in that area cannot all travel via Brighton Road. Ocean Boulevard has been upgraded but we are still faced with the bottleneck at Anzac Highway, which is also affected by traffic coming from the airport.

At another time I will bring these matters before the Government. It is a ridiculous situation. The Government has left closed Morphet Road which could take some of the traffic in the southern area and which would take pressure off Brighton Road. I do not believe that it is too difficult or too steep to put a road south of Seacombe Road. It is not impossible to construct such a road, nor is it dangerous. No engineer could say that it would be too difficult to develop a road from Seacombe Road up, because it would not be. If one looks at road building done 20, 40 or 60

years ago in places such as Sydney or Launceston one sees very steep roads. When engineers and roadmakers say that they cannot develop that road because it is too steep and dangerous, that is balderdash. They are passing the buck. The Government is politicking. The desire is to have all the extra traffic coming down into Brighton, Somerton and Glenelg, and the District of Morphett. It is time that the Government was honest and reassessed the situation. The Governor also said:

My Government also intends to place greater emphasis on reducing the State's accident road toll. Death and injury resulting from road accidents continue to cause unacceptable emotional, social and economic costs to individuals and to the whole State.

I agree with that statement, as would everyone here. It is a big problem. Of course, the biggest problem in relation to accidents boils down to alcohol and driving. If one looks at accident figures one finds that the great majority of people involved in alcohol related accidents are aged 25 years and under. I believe that we now need driving licences showing photographs which would indicate that a person driving the vehicle is the licence holder. Also, that driver's licence could be produced in a hotel to prove a person's age. Presently, people can produce any licence, but photographs would identify them. The licence could also be used for cinema entry, which would give people the opportunity to protect themselves. However, some people do object to that idea for one reason or another.

Yet, how many people who come to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, as a member of Parliament, to have passports signed and photographs on those passports witnessed say that they do not want to go on their overseas trip because they must have a photograph in their passport. None! They want to travel and they know that the law states they must show a photograph in their passports. Although we would not eliminate accidents on the road by affixing photographs to drivers licences, we would go a long way towards that aim. The Governor also said:

My Government will continue its policy of supporting and developing the arts. Several major Capital Works programmes are envisaged, including the Museum Redevelopment Project on North Terrace.

Of course, that is happening now. The Tonkin Government began that project. The Public Works Standing Committee, of which I am a member, considered that matter some years ago. The project has been under way for about 18 months or more. Why is it mentioned in the Governor's Speech now? If the Governor had said, 'We have this museum redevelopment and we invite you to the opening in a couple of months time,' that would have been better. However, it has been put in there in such a way that people will believe the present Government was responsible for redeveloping the new museum.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Don't you realise that Ministers have some input in the preparation of that speech, and that it is well padded up, this time in particular?

Mr MATHWIN: Yes, I do. It gets padded up from time to time and I have no doubt that the chief padder was the Minister in charge of the arts, the arty Minister, and that, of course, is our long distance harrier, the Premier. The construction of the Adelaide Remand Centre is proceeding. It is about time! It has had rather a chequered life. At one stage it was to be built at Regency Park; then it was to be built in Hindmarsh. We had long meetings about that. Finally, we have settled on a place in the metropolitan area. We presume now that everyone is happy, including the prisoners, who can look outside to see what is going on, yet people outside will not be able to see inside to see what is going on. It will be interesting to see how long it takes to complete. The sooner it is finished the better. Then Adelaide Gaol can become a museum as it should be used. People

might then refrain from saying that we should protect and preserve every gaol in South Australia, because we cannot preserve them all.

I refer to amendments to the prisons and correctional services legislation dealing with management of offenders. I see no reference in the Speech to overhauling the bail system. I introduced a private member's Bill on this subject last year. The Government asked what I was worrying about and said that it would fix the situation. A survey was conducted but there is nothing in the Speech about it. If anything is needed in our society it is a way in which the Government of the day can appeal against people being released on bail. If ever it was needed it is needed now. They are releasing people left, right and centre and the only criterion is: they have never skipped bail before so we will let them out. We adopted that policy when we were in Government and indeed nothing has happened. Considering the promises made by this Government to me last year, I would have thought that it would at least be mentioned in the Governor's Speech.

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

Mrs APPLEBY (Brighton): I am very pleased to take part in this Address in Reply, and I support the Governor's Speech made last Thursday. My contribution is made on behalf of the District of Brighton and some special interests I have pursued to ensure that the individuals and groups I represent may benefit. In setting my agenda, I would like to make special mention of two people who work tirelessly and uncomplainingly as my personal assistants. Lorraine and Chris fulfil their role with personal initiative, care, concern and great patience in carrying out the work for which I set the pace and also in dealing sympathetically and caringly with the constituents. I thank them on my behalf and on behalf of my constituents, as it has been said many times that the person up front can be only as effective as those who support in the background.

Yet again, I wish to raise what has become an ongoing awareness campaign, which I have had no hesitation in supporting strongly. It is with much more optimism that I address the situation of the mature unemployed at this time than I could at the same time last session. Many mature age people grew up with a strong reliance on the 'work ethic', and 'charity' is seen by them to be the dole and something they should not quite take. There are still mature unemployed men and women who do not register as being unemployed and seeking employment.

Many who are unemployed in this age group register only after their financial situation has become critical in order to avoid the shame, loss of status, and so on which they associate with being unemployed. This may be especially true of those who have employed spouses. The mature unemployed have not been a matter for media concern; consequently, the public has remained largely unaware of the special problems that this group in our community faces. There are few organisations or schemes designed to aid this particular group of people. I again express the fact that in South Australia some funding has been provided for self-help groups, particularly through the Department for Community Welfare.

Although this type of funding is never enough, at least when we look around Australia it seems that South Australia has fulfilled an important role in providing some recognition for the mature unemployed. On 17 July this year the Premier launched Australia's first in-depth research project for mature unemployed—Health and Social Implications. This project has been sponsored by the South Australian Health Commission and involves a community employment programme grant and has State Government job creation funding total-

ing \$155 000. I am delighted to say that this project has employed six women on a full-time basis for one year. The work will be headed by Dr Ross Harris and Dr Tony Radford, who are both top people in the field of primary care and community medicine at the Flinders Medical Centre.

One of the six women, who will be the senior project officer in the research, is Dr Susan Merritt and I wish her well in her endeavours to ensure that this research is effective. The aims, objectives and benefits of the project are as follows. This project intends to carry out, in the first instance, a descriptive survey, with the aim of identifying the size of the problem in a finite population and to provide a basic descriptive profile of the mature age unemployed person. It will also compare their physical and psychosocial health with employed people of otherwise similar circumstances. The objectives are:

1. To collect basic demographic data concerning the study population.
2. To determine the number of mature age unemployed men, both registered and unregistered, within this population.
3. To discover the number of mature age unemployed men who are not registered as unemployed and to ascertain their reasons for non-registration.
4. To discover the number of unemployed women within this population both registered and unregistered with the CES.
5. To discover the number of people within the study area who consider themselves as 'underemployed'.
6. To investigate any differences in psychosocial health of those unemployed compared with those who are employed in this community.
7. To investigate any difference in physical health of those unemployed compared with those who are employed in this community.
8. To determine and compare the lifestyle of the mature age unemployed compared with their employed mature age counterparts.
9. To use the information obtained as a basis for comparison between mature age unemployed who have become involved with self-help groups and those who have not.

The benefits of the study will be:

1. This study will provide the most comprehensive overview of the problems of unemployment in South Australia ever attempted.
2. It will be the first attempt made to define the problems pertinent to mature age unemployed people.
3. It will provide basic descriptive data concerning the processes of adaptation or deterioration of mature age unemployed.
4. The study will assist in formulating a profile of the mature age unemployed from which we will be able to generalise to the State as a whole.
5. The study will serve as an investigation of the efficacy of existing programmes for mature age unemployed.
6. The study will provide information as to the identification of areas of need that are not currently being met, or could be met in alternative ways to those now in use.
7. The study will increase awareness amongst medical and paramedical professions of the problems of middle age unemployment.
8. The study will increase public awareness of the existence of mature age unemployment within the community, and what particular problems this group encounters as a result of being unemployed.

I look forward to the interim reports to be provided along the way and have every confidence that at last we will see constructive action taking place on behalf of the mature age unemployed, their families and dependants.

I now turn to another matter that I hope can be addressed in the near future should funding be available. Over the past few months a steering committee has been formed to prepare a submission for funds to provide a mobile youth worker at Westfield, Marion. My involvement in regional shopping centres over a number of years prior to entering Parliament gave me an insight into the continual problem of youth gathering in such places as shopping centres. I do not believe that this is a new problem and should we care to look back in history we would find that the village square probably had to address the same concerns. Therefore, I find it very pleasing that this committee has sought to tackle this problem as we lead up to 1985, which will be the International Year of Youth. This submission carries my full support and co-operation, as I believe that it is an exciting and unique approach to the influences to which youth are subjected in their participation in activities at central gathering places of a community, such as regional shopping centres.

For some 18 years we have seen the establishment of regional shopping centres in South Australia, and they are continuing to expand and develop. With this development has come the advent of a new concept in regard to a community focal point which in turn has brought about a new meeting place for people, including youths. For some time I have been concerned that the young people congregating at regional centres are being subjected to influences that affect their behaviour in regard to property of the centre and of the community generally.

Some concern has been expressed by sections of the community that such gatherings of youths cause trouble. I do not deny that some youths create disturbances and that in many instances the need of people to prove themselves can lead to antagonism, vandalism of property, the drinking of alcohol, drug taking, the sniffing of glue and other dangerous substances, shop stealing, and offensive behaviour and language. Because of their size, large centres have tended to provide a playground, and management has had to deal with any disturbances using the traditional method by means of security personnel and calling of the police. That is a right of management, which must consider its tenants, patrons and protection of its property.

Prior to the committee's being formed to work through the submission for a pilot scheme, Mobile Youth Worker, I made extensive inquiries both in South Australia and interstate to ascertain whether any of the large centres had any new solution in regard to dealing with the increasing number of youths gathering at these centres. They do so for a variety of reasons and include those who are unemployed or school drop-outs. They gather after school and on Thursday evenings and, to a lesser extent, Saturday mornings. A varied combination of youth groups gather with little to do and with limited finances. During school holidays these centres become unsupervised child minding areas, and this usually brings about an increase in the number of people in the minor age group; these children are influenced by older youths on a day-to-day basis and may tend to emulate them. Similar situations occur at gathering places in the community on weekends, holiday weekends and on other occasions.

I consider that a mobile unit would be better able to reach young people than would a permanent construction such as an office. The mobility of the Mobile Youth Worker Project, which it is envisaged will continue for a 12-month period, means that the unit can be utilised in various regions of metropolitan and country areas, which will make it a very cost effective way in which to reach youth. Also it will be a venue to which they are able to relate. As the International Year of Youth approaches, I feel that it would be most appropriate to get this project off the ground by December

this year so that the youth of this State will be able to take full advantage of the opportunity to be involved in the project and in other activities relevant to the International Year of Youth.

I want to express my appreciation to officers of the Darlington Police Station who have been assigned to a special project at Flagstaff Hill. Following an increasing number of complaints received at my office in relation to the behaviour of a number of youths in the area, I contacted Superintendent Stretton and passed on details of the complaints that I had received. These involved complaints about bricks being thrown on roofs, bottles being thrown over fences, noisy behaviour, congregations at the local delicatessen, the potential for gang warfare, the burning of a bus shelter which, I might add, was made of brick, and vandalism at the primary school.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: That sounds pretty serious. Does that usually occur down in Brighton District?

Mrs APPLEBY: It occurs everywhere. Superintendent Stretton then informed me that a pilot scheme had been set up. It commenced on Thursday 24 May. During the initial period of operation a four-man team worked in plain clothes. Their vehicle was an unmarked car with radio provisions. These officers worked in two-man teams. Their brief was to make contact with groups of youths frequenting the area and to set up dialogue with those youths in an effort to probe the causal factors behind their behaviour and to help them understand the police role in maintaining public peace, safety and security.

As I have said before, full credit must be given for this initiative, as its results so far have proven to be most effective. Reports that I have received have been very encouraging, and I hope that this type of policing can be ongoing, as I believe that the community can only benefit from initiatives such as this that address a local issue in a caring and educative manner. Resulting benefits from the operation have included the youths requesting a meeting with Superintendent Stretton and me, at which meeting the youths expressed their points of view on what they believed had led to some of the behaviour that caused the reports. They do not have a place to meet and they have no transport in the evenings or weekends. By 'transport' I mean both public and private transport. Many of these youths do not have independent means of travel to enable them to socialise at other venues and are reliant on their parents or friends to transport them; otherwise, they are isolated at their own base.

Mr Evans: Or they could take the risk and hitch-hike.

Mrs APPLEBY: I would not recommend it, would you?

Mr Evans: That is the problem.

Mrs APPLEBY: I feel that these matters should, and must, be addressed to ensure that these youths are not disadvantaged unreasonably, as there are some 850 pupils in Flagstaff Primary School—our youth of the future. As we are all aware in this House, the Electoral Commission—

Members interjecting:

Mrs APPLEBY: I hope that members are listening in their rooms. We are aware that the Electoral Commission has redrawn the boundaries for the next State election. My electorate of Brighton has been divided into three seats: part to Bright; part to Fisher; and the largest portion to the seat of Hayward. I have been endorsed for the seat of Hayward at the next election. This seat has been named after Sir Edward Hayward, who would be best remembered in this State for his idea which became John Martins Christmas pageant and which over the years has given so much pleasure to many people, not just South Australians.

In my early years in the retail business I had the pleasure of being involved in the pageant, an experience I will never forget. Sir Edward's involvement with St John saw him

largely responsible for the growth of the St John Ambulance Service in South Australia, a service for which we have all been thankful at some time in our lives. Another pleasure which we can all enjoy and which is attributed to Sir Edward Hayward is Carrick Hill, through which all South Australians and visitors to our State can wander, enjoying works of art and fine craftsmanship. It will be sad to see the name Brighton disappear because of its local identity and because of the people such as Hugh Hudson who have represented that electorate in the past. To those people I represent as the member for Brighton I reaffirm my commitment to continue to support their expectations until the next election. To those who are residentially in the new seat of Hayward, many of whom I have already contacted, I say that I look forward to representing them in the years to come.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I recognise that we are replying to the Governor's Speech which was given at the opening of Parliament. The views in the Speech are not necessarily the Governor's ideas; in this case it is the Bannon Government's plans for legislation for the forthcoming year and also some comments on the past year. It is traditional that members take the opportunity, if they so wish, to talk about any subject, whether mentioned in the Governor's Speech or not. It is an opportunity to give a reply, if one can use that term, not necessarily to the Governor but to the Government's ideas in the Speech or its programmes over the years or, more particularly, if the member so wishes to talk about the areas of concern or achievement within one's electorate.

Before moving in any of those directions, I take the opportunity of saying that I was sorry and regret the passing within recent times of two men who gave much of their time to the community and who were in entirely different roles in their earlier life before coming to Parliament. One was the late Charlie Wells, who served his district with the enthusiasm that is necessary if one is to be successful as a politician. As I mentioned in a previous speech, he was a person whom one could trust. I appreciated it when he placed trust in others, because if a person places trust in you, then you know that they can be trusted. That is true of most human beings, and Charlie Wells had great respect for the trade union movement and from his colleagues in this place, and from the vast majority of people associated with Parliament as a whole. He always had a kind word to say. He was free and easy to speak to. Again, I re-emphasise my comments in thanking his family for the times that they may not have had him available while he was serving the people, whether in the trade union or the Parliament, and for allowing him to be a friend of ours within this Parliament.

Claude Allen, the member for Frome, was from an entirely different background. He set out to be an entrepreneur as a farmer and that is what he was: he was never a big farmer, but was meticulous about what he did and how he did it, and proved that, by using his own initiative, he could be successful. This also occurred within his community where he sought to serve the community through local government and a desire to work with his fellow man. He gained respect and it gave him the opportunity of serving in this Parliament.

I made the point previously that he was one of those few politicians who carried a notebook and wrote down everything brought to his notice. He followed things through, and I do not believe that any of his constituents or those outside his constituency who asked for help would ever have been able to say that Claude Allen did not do his best. He did it in a quiet and unassuming way and if he was not successful that way, then he was prepared to stir the possum. They were the attributes that gained Claude Allen the respect of all sides of politics, within local government, the community, and in whatever sporting endeavours he participated. I wish to thank his wife and family for the sacrifices that they

made while he was prepared to give his time to serve those who may not have been as well off or as successful (and sometimes even more successful and better off) than the man giving the time. So, to the Allen family, I express that thanks on behalf of the total community.

I have always had an interest in housing, and I become concerned when we as a society think that the cost of housing can go on as it is and that when there is a boom it all sounds rosy and that we should be patting ourselves on the back, saying that there are plenty of houses being built and contracts being signed, the industry is working at full capacity (perhaps at over-capacity in some trades) and so it is great for the housing industry.

Unfortunately, when that happens there are always a few scoundrels who encourage people to over-borrow. That is wonderful while things are going well, but as members of Parliament, economists and those in the building industry know, the economy has not for 30 years flowed at a free, easy, continuous, progressive path where one can say that tomorrow will be as good as today or, that tomorrow is going to be as bad as today, as were the tough times a couple of years ago.

When high interest rates came in, some people had committed themselves to first, second and even third mortgages and many young people (sometimes middle aged people) lost all their savings and work effort in trying to establish a home. Some of those people took their own lives and some gave up and said that they would never try it again and would live off society.

To a degree, that is the fault of the politicians. Governments advertise that one should eat good food and look after one's health to save the State money in the health area; that one should not smoke so that one is not a burden on society and does not adversely affect one's health; that one should take alcohol in moderation or not at all because of the cost it places on society. The same can be said about drugs and road toll casualties. The Government spends money without blinking an eyelid in these fields as it believes them to be important. It will even advertise and spend huge amounts of money to say that it believes in the accord and that the accord is working wonderfully for the country.

The Hon. G.J. Crafter: It is.

Mr EVANS: I say to the Minister that it is just as important to advertise and point out to young people the benefits of home ownership and how much easier it is to adopt a different path in early life, save money and make a few sacrifices to acquire a home, than if one spends everything until one is 25 years old and then says that one wants the Housing Trust to supply a home at the taxpayers' expense. It is important that public funds be spent to encourage people to change their lifestyle in this regard. Some people, even on my side of politics, say that that cannot be achieved. I would never argue that the system can be changed or many people convinced overnight. But, if only 200 people a year are convinced, it means that the Housing Trust has to find 200 fewer houses a year. That is a significant number of houses. The end cost on the Government would be less if this system was adopted.

The Government sells bonds to citizens to subsidise Government ventures such as Housing Trust homes for those who cannot afford them. Surely the Government can advertise to show people an alternative way of achieving a home. I have spoken about this before, and I emphasise it again. At the moment people are borrowing money at virtually 100 per cent of the cost of the home. At some time in the future—not too many years away—there will be an increase in interest rates. When that occurs many people in that category will find that they cannot retain the home that they have worked for and it will be lost. I do not blame them totally. Let us look at the system we live in.

From the time a person is of kindergarten age watching television, he is subjected to all kinds of advertising encouraging people to spend money, except for Government advertisements. The advertisements are cleverly designed, and I am not attacking business for doing that, because if a business wants to sell its articles it must convince people to buy them. I believe however there has to be some other organisation which advertises the benefit of being frugal in order to get a roof over one's head. The only agency that could do that is the Government.

I know that the Fraser Government looked seriously at this suggestion. When Mr Newman was the Minister for Housing I took the suggestion to him and he agreed with it in principle. I hope that the present Government will go to the Federal Government and talk about perhaps tying it in with the accord. Unless we can find a way of cutting down the demand on Government funds (taxpayers' money) we will never get out of being what I call a high tax country.

I have been concerned for many years about the way we go about financing the purchase of a family home. In the 1950s a person who bought an allotment of land paid only minimum council rates (compared with the rates on an established house), water and sewerage rates were low, councils did not impose high standards for road construction, they had not imposed controls on the power supply being underground (which I accept is a good system but it is also costly), and they did not have to provide a certain amount of land for reserves (which I accept is necessary). These days councils charge a high minimum rate, water and sewerage rates are high, and land tax is high, particularly if a person owns more than one block of land. In the 1950s it was not uncommon for a parent to purchase a block of land which could be used by a child either as a deposit on the purchase of a house or on which to build a house when the time came. The average family cannot do that now because the costs associated with owning a vacant block of land are too high. Also, because of advertising campaigns, the average family now wants a holiday shack, a caravan, a trip around the world, and whatever, so the children have to make their own arrangements when they wish to purchase or build a house.

Many of these people are now placed in the position of having to ask the Housing Trust for a house and the burden upon that organisation is therefore becoming very great. I believe it should be possible for a parent to sign a statutory declaration to say that the block of land he owns will be used by a child at a later date, either as a deposit on a house or a house will be built on it by the child, the council would then levy a minimal rate on that land. I believe that could be done quite easily. If there is more than one child and therefore more than one block of land, the same thing could be done.

I believe that the Government could make the same arrangements in relation to the payment of land tax. Why not exempt the block of land that is clearly set aside for the first home of a child who might be a minor at the time? It could also be laid down that if the person who signed the declaration wanted to sell the land he would be liable for all retrospective council rates and land taxes that would have been paid. The land value would have escalated, so the person would be able to pay such back taxes. The benefit would apply only to those people who used the land for the stated purpose. Unless we do something to encourage people to start early to think about buying a house, they will be caught up in the trends we have now, where the prices of blocks of land have escalated in the past two years by up to 70 per cent.

Part of that is the Government's fault, and I say that clearly. The Government was not willing to make land available early for new subdivisions to create an oversupply

and, unless one has an oversupply of an article, one cannot control the price. The previous Labor Government tried to control the price of land by legislation providing that one could not increase the cost by any more than the inflationary trend prevailing in the economy overall, but that does not beat the black market system.

If a Government instrumentality attempts to put a fixed price on a piece of land or any article and someone wants that article badly enough, they will offer something on the black market behind the back. The system will not work unless one has an oversupply on the market. I accept that the Minister for Environment and Planning has realised the mistake and will make much land available for subdivision to try to correct the problem, although it will take a long time to do that. It is not likely to bring down the price very much because of the established fact that people see now what is a reasonable price for a block of land, whether it be \$20 000 or \$25 000, or whatever is the value in their suburb.

As a Parliament we have spent much time over the years debating questions involving social welfare, community welfare, health, road accidents and many other areas, yet one situation more likely to create a happy home and an environment of satisfaction where a person is interested in maintaining their home is a home of their own, and not one rented from someone else.

I acknowledge that people on the other side of politics at times argue that those who rent out accommodation are making money from the disadvantaged but, if one really looks at the rents received, often landlords do not make much at all. They may make a profit if they eventually sell, because of the inflationary trend but, if the Federal Government changes the tax system and introduces some form of capital gains tax, we will see a massive increase in rents or many people withdrawing from the rental field, and a bigger demand being placed on the Housing Trust to pick up the leeway created through that set of circumstances.

Many people say to me that one cannot change society's attitude to see the benefit of housing until people are in an older age group, rather than being in their late teens or early 20s, but I disagree with that. I believe that today's young people have as much intelligence and understanding of situations as anyone, especially if they are given the right encouragement. That is all we need to do. People who were fortunate enough to come through the Depression years or the war years did not have all the advertising and the thrust of the electronic media telling us how good it is to go for a trip around the world, buy a video or have a better motor car. I am not blaming the business houses for that. We did not have those pressures, and we need someone to counter that today. I hope that both the Federal and State Governments will take up the challenge.

I would now like to talk briefly about air pollution and the controls to which this Parliament agreed through a change in the Act to control when and what people can burn in their backyards, especially in the metropolitan area. These controls will be disastrous, and I refer especially to the Adelaide Hills. Under the regulations local government has the power to ensure that one shall not be able to burn any material other than dry paper, cardboard or dead vegetation. The House should imagine what will happen in properties of half an acre, one acre, two acres or more. People will remove the vegetation growing on their properties and stack it in a heap until it dries. If the wood is cut in the spring it will not be dry enough to burn until the summer and, if a fire occurs then, disaster will result. Many trees and shrubs in Hills gardens are deciduous and not cut until the spring.

The other problem is that the hours set for burning are often those during which Hills residents have washing on

their clothes line, and smoke will drift across to the neighbour's property and affect the clothes on the line. We know all about smoked fish, but few people want smoked clothing. The end result will be that we will achieve not the result that is sought by the new regulations but a much more serious situation. Hills councils do not know what to do in relation to this matter. The Mitcham and Stirling councils are concerned about the matter. For instance, the Stirling council wants to know what constitutes a township area. Is the interpretation of 'township area' as the local council sees it or is it to accord with the Engineering and Water Supply Department description? There is great anxiety and concern in my district about the new regulations, and I am being asked how Parliamentarians can be so stupid as to pass such legislation and limit the hours of burning to the hours that have been stipulated, because in some cases they are the worst hours possible. Scrubland will burn in the Hills in the middle of winter. Large fires have occurred in some scrub areas in June. The Government should note that there is a problem in relation to these regulations.

The Blackwood roundabout is a matter of concern for my constituents. It is at the junction of Main Road, Coromandel Parade, Shepherds Hill Road, and the road leading from the Blackwood railway station. State Transport Authority bus drivers and semi-trailer drivers need to be more than skilful to negotiate this huge roundabout, let alone negotiate it with ease. During the peak morning and evening hours, the traffic is banking up as far back as across the railway line on the main road to Coromandel Valley, and that is not taking into account vehicles that may be banked up on the other roads.

The roundabout was installed a few years ago to solve the traffic problem, but nowadays all we see there is broken glass, while cars are dented and scratched. Possibly most of these accidents are only minor, but they annoy owners of vehicles. Traffic lights are needed at this junction which, being one of the worst in the metropolitan area, needs upgrading. I hope that some Government members take the message to the Minister of Transport and tell him that there is a problem at the roundabout that needs to be solved. As I wish to refer to other matters, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr EVANS (Fisher): I will raise a couple of matters. The first relates to the Gem and Mineral Clubs Association of South Australia. The Association recently wrote to the Premier asking that he recognise four of our gems by declaring emblems for them. The request is made on the basis that the Association is going to hold a gemboree in 1986 to celebrate the State's 150th birthday. The Association's letter points out to the Premier that it is important that the emblems it has chosen as a group, following a survey of its members, are recognised.

The Association has chosen opal as its official gemstone emblem, because around the world it is virtually synonymous with South Australia. The opal fields in this State produce at least 75 per cent of the world's requirements of precious opal, with a total value of rough opal sold annually estimated at over \$40 million. The Association would also like to make native copper the emblem for minerals. The Association states that native copper was chosen as the official emblem for minerals for two reasons: first, it is virtually

synonymous with the history and development of the State, most of our early mines being worked for copper; secondly, most of these copper mines produced excellent and often spectacular specimens of this mineral.

The third emblem is for fossil. The Association has chosen *mawsonites spriggi* as its official fossil emblem. It was chosen first, because it is unique to South Australia and, secondly, because its name commemorates two of the States most eminent palaeontologists, geologists and mineralogists—Sir Douglas Mawson and Dr Reg C. Sprigg.

The fourth emblem is for rocks. The Association states that the rock emblem should be granite, which is the material used for this building. Granite was chosen as the official rock emblem of the Association because it is relatively common in the State and because it forms a number of prominent, easily recognised and characteristic geological formations. The presence of granite formations in South Australia has always been of major importance to the history and development of the State's mining, agricultural and many associated industries.

I think this is quite a reasonable request from the Association, because we have said that we would like our 150th birthday recognised by as many groups as possible. It would not cost the Government anything to recognise the emblems and give them the approval required. A petition to the Premier to legislate for these State emblems is something that I support. I hope that the Premier will take the necessary action to achieve this and inform the Association of his intention.

Earlier this week, questions were asked of the Minister for Environment and Planning about Reservoir Drive, Flagstaff Hill, concerning realignment and upgrading. On occasions, as politicians, we have to fight to achieve a goal. Sometimes we cannot do it on our own. If we have a common boundary with another member it is better to work together to achieve something rather than trying to win points off one another. Our real goal should be to improve the society in which we live and, therefore, to achieve some of the things our electors would like us to achieve within our districts.

In the case of Reservoir Drive, I was fighting that cause before Mr Dick Glazbrook became a member of Parliament and, subsequently, we worked together to achieve a result. I used that road before the council stopped me by tipping loads of rubble across it; even though it was a rough road, it did not matter because I have been driving the same vehicle for some years. It needed upgrading, so eventually the southern regional councils formed a policy to fight hard for that end and to reroute the road into the present planned area.

Prior to the last election, and even before that, Dick Glazbrook and I tried to convince our colleagues in Cabinet that it was necessary to make an announcement about that road. The ALP was in a better position to say, 'Yes, we will upgrade the road.' It was not in government. As the Liberal Government had announced the planned improvement prior to that election, everyone was happy—candidates, the community and politicians. Subsequently, after the election, when the proposed road became a matter of discussion and the former Minister of Water Resources became involved in the matter. Also, I was grateful to be able to work with the member for Brighton, even though she comes from another side of politics. We received a deputation in her office to discuss the matter and subsequently we went with another deputation to the Minister. By that time the Government and the local council were working very hard for the same goal, for which I give them credit.

The Government was to consider the matter. The shadow Minister of Transport was given a petition from people in the area. I, as the local member, did not receive a copy, but

I am not blaming anyone for that. I do not think that the member for Brighton received one either. However, it was suggested earlier this week (and I think that the shadow Minister was a little carried away) that it was only his efforts which achieved that goal. I must say that much effort went into that project for years before we reached the stage of the route being acceptable to most people.

I now draw members' attention to another matter that concerns me. In my district is the most southerly point of Coromandel Parade, and I say without fear or hesitation that it is the most dangerous stretch of road in metropolitan Adelaide which is used by STA buses. We need to make up our mind to spend money and take that road around the back of the housing development, along the old path on the western side of Coromandel Parade, through part of Craighburn, down the old road, over Horners Bridge and into Murrays Hill Road. I plead with the Government to take note of my suggestion, to take up the challenge and do something about it. Stobie poles are virtually on the edge of the bitumen and in some places there is no room for two buses to pass, let alone for people to walk on the footpath, or for two cars to pass. It is becoming overcrowded and more dangerous each day. I trust that someone in the Government will take notice of what I have said about this problem.

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I will use this opportunity of a grievance debate to congratulate the Australian competitors taking part in the 23rd Olympiad at Los Angeles. Tremendous feats have been accomplished. Many of our competitors have bettered their personal best without gaining medals for recognition. In congratulating our State's competitors, initial congratulations must go to Mike Nunan and the staff of the South Australian Sports Institute for the excellent job that they have done in 1983-84.

The Institute, which commenced operating in 1982, has in a very short period grown to provide a first-rate service to over 130 South Australian athletes. Thirty-one of the 33 South Australians selected for Los Angeles are scholarship holders of the South Australian Sports Institute. The SASI has competitors in 12 different sports in Los Angeles: archery, basketball, canoeing, cycling, fencing, gymnastics, hockey, rowing, shooting, swimming, track and field, and yachting.

In cycling Mike Turtur took a gold medal in the 400 metres pursuit. In hockey the men's team is still in line for a gold medal. In rowing a silver medal went to Robin Grey-Gardner in the coxed four and a bronze to Gavin Thredgold and Tim Willoughby in the men's coxed eight. In swimming a silver medal went to Glen Beringer in the 200 best and Anna McVann reached the finals of all events entered.

A gold medal went to Glynis Nunn in the track and field heptathlon, and Bruce Frayne reached the semi-finals of the 400 metres. In yachting we have Chris Pratt currently fourth in the Finn class. Special consideration and congratulations must go to the coaches and trainers for their dedication to the individuals in obtaining the best for the best.

The South Australian Sports Institute has now become a model for all Australian States. It was set up by the previous Liberal Government, and the current State Labor Government funded it to the tune of \$429 000 this year, more than double the initial grant received by the Institute.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Don't be nasty; tell us who got it set up first.

Mr PLUNKETT: I am not being nasty. I congratulate the previous Liberal Government for setting up the Institute, but since the Labor Government came back into power it has most certainly funded it to a great extent, and I point that out.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: And we have congratulated you on doing that.

Mr PLUNKETT: Yes, I certainly agree that members on the other side have done that. In Canberra the Australian Institute of Sport has a \$6 million budget, but to date no medals. It supports only nine sports; so there is a big difference in the comparison of sports that are being catered for by the Institute in Canberra.

Congratulations must also go to Dean Lukin for his magnificent 240 kg lift to take out a gold medal in the heavy-weight lifting. Our sympathy must go to the two New South Wales boxers who had decisions taken against them by the boxing jury. Everyone would recognise that that sort of jury should most certainly be done away with in the Olympics, as those two fighters were awarded the fights by the judging panel but then the jury reversed the decision. I hope that in future that jury will be done away with and a much fairer system accepted.

Congratulations must also go to the South Australians who competed in the Eighth Paralympics in Stokes Mandeville, England. South Australian shooter Libby Kosmala clinched four gold medals and made a world record. Barbara Caspers from Strathalbyn took three gold medals. South Australia's Julie Russell won a silver medal in the first official paraplegic marathon and a bronze medal in her pentathlon event. Robert Russell was a member of the four-man team which won a bronze medal in the 4 x 400 metre relay. Members on both sides of the House must agree with me and join in congratulating our South Australian sports men and women for their wonderful achievements.

I noticed an article in today's *News* which reported that there will be a parade through the streets of Adelaide to welcome back our sports men and women. All members of this House will probably make sure that they are at that parade and at the presentation later at the Adelaide Town Hall. I most certainly will be. This is one of the greatest successes that South Australia has ever had in any Olympic Games. I congratulate the South Australian Sports Institute for what it has done. I am sure that it has assisted the sports people in improving their personal bests, although the sports people themselves have to make that extra effort, as we saw on television today when our heavyweight Dean Lukin not only achieved his personal best but also broke the record for that event.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Spare a thought for Leon Holmes of the Weightlifting Association.

Mr PLUNKETT: There have been interjections from members opposite, and there are possibly people whom I have not mentioned during my congratulatory remarks. However, I think that it is understood that we are all very proud of all our sports people who have represented us in Los Angeles, whether they be from South Australia or any other State. We are most certainly moving in the right direction by putting money into institutes so that these people are able to compete with overseas sports people, although perhaps on not quite the same footing, because I think we are far behind the Americans as regards the money they spend to ensure that their athletes are trained to their peak for the Games. However, considering the results that we have achieved, I think that in the future there will not be any reluctance to supply finance to assist our sports men and women in future Olympic Games.

Mr LEWIS (Mallee): Some time ago, earlier this year, several representations were made to me by people from the electorate I represent about the desirability of establishing a Medicare office in Murray Bridge. Accordingly, I wrote a letter to the Hon. Neal Blewett (Commonwealth Minister for Health), Parliament House, Canberra, which in part stated:

Are Medicare offices established in provincial towns and other major population centres throughout the South Australian and

broader Australian community? If so, what is the function of these provincial/regional offices? What do they cost and what benefit do they provide?

Is it less expensive to the Medicare system and, therefore, the Australian taxpayer, to use such offices instead of using Australia Post? If so, how many transactions per annum is it expected would be transacted by such an office?

I have been asked by the Murray Bridge District Council to support their request for a Medicare office to be established in Murray Bridge. The obvious benefits of convenience to the people in Murray Bridge compel me to support their proposal as a matter of sentiment. I have asked the foregoing questions in the preceding paragraphs in order to determine whether or not the establishment of such an office in Murray Bridge or any other centre of its type elsewhere in Australia is economically justified in terms of the costs to the taxpayer compared to the benefits it brings in cost saving by providing its service in the community.

If the economic costs are greater than the cost saving benefits, then a value judgment has to be made about the additional benefits there may be to the community by locating these Medicare officers in any such town or city. I would like to think that such an analysis has already been done, and that the location of Medicare officers are being determined on these criteria, and if regional centres of the size of the city of Murray Bridge are having Medicare officers established within them, then Murray Bridge would be high on the list of priorities for such an office. I look forward to some frank and factual information.

That letter was written on 19 March. On 30 March I received an acknowledgement from the Ministerial Liaison Officer, informing me that he had received my letter. I also received a letter about this matter from James Porter, the member for Barker. In due course, on 19 July the Minister replied to my letter. In the interim a number of other letters were forwarded and received. In his letter the Minister stated:

Thank you for your personal representations on behalf of the Murray Bridge District Council concerning the establishment of a Medicare branch office in Murray Bridge, South Australia. I am sure you will appreciate that many proposals to set up Medicare offices are received. Compelling cases for establishment of Medicare offices are being received almost daily and, while each proposal receives careful consideration, the cost of the total would be prohibitive.

That is understandable. I remind the House that the member for Price favoured us this afternoon with the information that in the metropolitan area not far from the electorate which he represents there is a Medicare office at both Westfield and the West Lakes shopping centres. The honourable member said that he would like a Medicare office established at Port Adelaide. However, there are a substantial number of public transport facilities available for people living in those localities and in terms of kilometres they would not have very far to walk to an office.

Mr Ferguson: There is no office at Henley Beach.

Mr LEWIS: Whilst that may be so, it is not far to West Lakes from Henley Beach. The letter continues:

In the planning for Medicare, the Health Insurance Commission initially thought that they would need to establish a branch office at Murray Bridge. However, further inquiries revealed that the doctors in the area would be direct billing and they did not wish to affect this possibility by opening a branch office.

I presume that the Minister thinks it is a good idea to have direct billing and by that means control doctors' incomes. The letter continues:

There is only one practice in Murray Bridge, The Bridge Clinic, involving seven doctors. It appears that each doctor in the practice is direct billing.

Mr Ferguson: That is good.

Mr LEWIS: I am glad that the honourable member has said that he thinks that it is a good idea. The letter continues:

The marketing branch of the Commission recently had an information stand at the Murray Bridge Health Fair. Attendance at the fair was between 3 000 and 5 000 people and, because of the location of their stand, each person who attended had to pass the display when entering and leaving the fair.

Over the duration of the fair, 119 people approached the Commission's representatives with various questions re Medicare. Of this number, 30 made mention of the need for a Medicare office

in the town (approximately 1 per cent of the total attendance). Murray Bridge is one of the larger country towns in South Australia. I agree. The letter continues:

However, with the elderly and 'disadvantaged' being catered for by the willingness of doctors to direct bill, the speedy turnaround of cheque claims and the relative proximity of the town to Adelaide it would not be cost effective to open a new branch office; in fact, it may be counter-productive in influencing doctors to reduce rather than increase their direct billing habits.

That shocked me. I understand the reasons why it is necessary to limit branch offices for Medicare. The questions I asked the Minister at the outset in my letter of 9 March were not answered. In his response to me he did not say how many offices there were in Australia, on what criteria they were established or the locations in which they are placed. Furthermore, he made out what appeared to be a compelling case in his letter to me for not establishing such an office in Murray Bridge. However, I had to point out, and need to point out to the House now, that the information upon which the Minister based that judgment is grossly inadequate and naively interpreted by him or by the officer he instructed to write that letter to me.

I would like to know the location of the Medicare offices in South Australia; the reasons why those locations were chosen; the location of three or four Medicare offices in the western districts of Victoria nearest to the South Australian border; and the reasons why those offices were so located. There is only one practice in Murray Bridge—a fact I am telling members for the sake of this debate. While it is an outstanding practice about which I have never heard any complaint, I think that the Minister should be aware that there are a number of other practices in the demographic region serviced by Murray Bridge including the Murraylands, the Lower Murray, the Mallee, the Upper South-East—not just the narrow focus on the town of Murray Bridge alone.

I know that the Murray Bridge health fair was an outstanding, innovative, quite unique service club event initiated by the local Lions Club, which received overwhelming support from the immediate Murray Bridge community. I would like to know from the Minister what effort his officers made at the stand there to determine the addresses of the people

who attended the fair and what information those officers collected about the addresses of people who spoke to them on the stand.

In his letter to me he pointed out that 30 people made mention of the need for a Medicare office in the town and that that was only 1 per cent of the people in attendance. Nonetheless, we need to remember that only 119 people approached and spoke to representatives on the stand. Any of us would know that there were more than 119 people at the health fair who would have had feelings of uncertainty about their total awareness of the Medicare programme and how it would work but who for various reasons such as 'What does it matter,' or 'What can I do about it anyway?', or 'The system's in, and I guess we will have to wear it whether it works or not because we cannot change anything, really,' or 'It will only make trouble for us because I am not sure what I am talking about,' would have been reluctant to approach those officers and ask questions. After all, 30 people represents approximately 1 per cent of the total, sure; but 119 people only represent 4 per cent. I believe that the Minister should have said quite fairly that, of the people who were self-confident, gregarious and bold enough to approach those officers and discuss Medicare, 25 per cent mentioned that they believed a Medicare office was justified and needed at Murray Bridge.

In his ultimate paragraph he points out that the elderly and disadvantaged are being catered for by the willingness of doctors to direct bill. I challenge his assertion that there is a speedy turnaround of cheque claims for people in the community that I represent. I do not know what he means by 'speedy'. If it is as fast as the speed with which he replies to his letters, that is not very satisfactory. How soon after a citizen mails a claim should he be able to obtain a cheque? In conclusion I would like to point out that—

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

Motion carried.

At 5.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 14 August at 2 p.m.