

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 14 August 1984

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

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make provision by Bill for defraying the salaries and other expenses of the several departments and public services of the Government of South Australia during the year ending 30 June 1985.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

PETITIONS: FIREARMS

Petitions signed by 264 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence and registration fees for the promotion of sporting activities were presented by the Hon. J.C. Bannon and Messrs Lewis and Meier.

Petitions received.

PETITION: PRICE WATER TANK

A petition signed by 42 residents of Price praying that the House investigate the provision of a high pressure water tank at Price, with a view to its construction before December 1984, was presented by Mr Meier.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 94 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form were presented by the Hon. Jennifer Adamson and Mr Gunn.

Petitions received.

PETITION: STRATHALBYN DISTRICT WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 129 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Water Resources to upgrade the quality and supply of water to the Strathalbyn district and, until this occurs, reduce the water rates charged was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: PORNOGRAPHY

A petition signed by 380 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw

pornographic material from prisons was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: KINDERGARTEN UNION

Petitions signed by 31 residents of Kangaroo Island and 114 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education were presented by the Hons Ted Chapman and B.C. Eastick and Messrs Gunn and Mathwin.

Petitions received.

PETITION: MENINGIE TOILET FACILITIES

A petition signed by 59 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to provide the District Council of Meningie with assistance in establishing toilet facilities adjacent to the Australian National Institute Tailem Bend rowing club rooms was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: HENS

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

Petition received.

PETITION: X-RATED VIDEO FILMS

A petition signed by 237 residents of South Australia praying that the House ban X-rated video films in South Australia was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PETITION: CALLINGTON AND STRATHALBYN WATER SUPPLY

A petition signed by 108 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Minister of Water Resources to establish a reticulated water supply for residents between Callington and Strathalbyn and, until this occurs, reduce the water rates charged was presented by Mr Lewis.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Clean Air Act, 1984—Regulations—Fire Exemptions. Planning Act, 1982—Crown Development Reports by South Australian Planning Commission on proposed—
- ii. Additions at the Strathalbyn High School.
- iii. Division of Land on Part Section 5629, Hundred of Yatala, Tea Tree Gully.
- iv. Erection of Wudinna Depot Office.
- v. Additions at the Victor Harbor High School.

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

Pursuant to Statute—

- i. Harbours Act, 1936—Regulations—Wharfage, Tonnage Rates and Conservancy Dues (Amendment).

By the Minister of Local Government (Hon. G.F. Keneally)—

Pursuant to Statute—

Corporation of Hindmarsh—By-laws—

- i. No. 21—Penalties and Repeal of Redundant By-laws.
- ii. No. 23—Traffic.
- iii. District Council of Crystal Brook—By-law No. 28—Rubbish and Refuse Tips.
- iv. District Council of Wakefield Plains—By-law No. 6—Garbage Bins.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MINING EXPLORATION

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE (Minister of Mines and Energy): I seek leave to make a statement:

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: In May 1983, I announced to the House that Cabinet had approved a limited exploration programme by the Department of Mines and Energy along the western face of the Heysen Range, just inside the boundary of the Flinders Ranges National Park. I said at the time that this action demanded the fullest public disclosure because of the environmental sensitivity of the area and periodically I have provided progress reports as the exploration programme has proceeded. As the two-stage programme is now moving into its final stages, it seems appropriate to provide a further update.

Stage 1 exploration involved geological mapping and the collection of soil, rock chip and stream sediment samples. Altogether, 1 062 samples were gathered for assay and petrological identification. Compilation of the geological mapping has been completed, but the geochemical results are still being plotted and assessed. Stage 2 involved a preliminary geophysical survey using induced polarisation at Tea-Cosy Reef north of the national park boundary in July last year. On November 21, a survey was begun within the park using both induced polarisation and SIROTEM transient electromagnetics techniques.

To minimise environmental damage, all equipment and water for the induced polarisation electrodes were backpacked in from existing tracks. This phase was plagued by electronic failures in the induced polarisation equipment and, after heavy rain, the project was suspended on 3 December last year. Field work resumed on 28 May this year and the geophysical party is currently in the field. The induced polarisation work has been completed over the two initial target areas and all electrode holes have been backfilled. The SIROTEM surveys which do not involve ground disturbance are expected to be completed on Friday. Further detailed geological investigations began yesterday and are scheduled for completion on 24 August. When that is over, a report will be prepared on the exploration programme as a whole and its results.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos. 3, 14, and 17; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SEALING OF ROADS

3. **Mr GUNN** (on notice) asked the Minister of Transport: Does the Highways Department have plans to seal the streets of Marree, Oodnadatta and Andamooka and, if so, when and how many kilometres of sealing will be carried out in each town?

The Hon. R.K. ABBOTT: The Highways Department intends to seal 1.5 km of streets in Marree during the current financial year. It is proposed to seal 1.2 km of streets in Oodnadatta and 4.2 km of streets in Andamooka within the next five years, subject to funds being available for this purpose.

CROSS CANADA CYCLE TOUR SOCIETY

14. **Mr BECKER** (on notice) asked the Premier:

1. Has the Premier received an invitation from the Cross Canada Cycle Tour Society to meet and welcome 94 cyclists whose ages range between 55 and 74 when they arrive in Adelaide about the second week in October and, if so, has he accepted and, if he is unable to accept, who will be his representative?

2. What arrangement has the Government made for the visitors during their stay?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The replies are as follows:

1. I am unable to accept the invitation received from the Cross Canada Cycle Tour Society. However, my colleague the Minister of Recreation and Sport will meet the team of cyclists when they arrive in Adelaide.

2. At present no arrangements have been made.

BOY GEORGE'S VISIT

17. **The Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (on notice) asked the Premier: Did the Government pay any of the costs associated with Boy George's visit to South Australia earlier this year and, if so, how much was involved and for what reason?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: No.

REMISSION FOR PRISONERS

In reply to **Mr OLSEN** (8 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The six prisoners who escaped from Yatala Labour Prison on 28 June did not lose remission because section 42ra (3) of the Prisons Act provides that, in considering a prisoner's behaviour for the purposes of remission, no account shall be taken of behaviour which is likely to be dealt with through alternative Acts. In this case all six prisoners have had their cases properly referred to a court and therefore remission has not been withdrawn.

All prisoners at Yatala Labour Prison received 15 days remission for June. However 13 displayed unsatisfactory behaviour and were charged under relevant sections of the Prisons Act, and referred to the visiting justice tribunal for determination. A total of 147 days remission was lost. At Adelaide Gaol, unsatisfactory behaviour was dealt with by withholding remission rather than referring the matter to a visiting justice.

SUPREME COURT INSPECTION

In reply to the **Hon. D.C. WOTTON** (8 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I refer the honourable member to the answer given to the Hon. R.I. Lucas by my colleague

the Attorney-General in another place on 8 August 1984 concerning this matter.

PAROLE

In reply to the **Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY** (8 August).

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The parole legislation passed through this Parliament and the Minister of Correctional Services administers that legislation. The basis of the parole system is a very proper one in that the length of time that a prisoner remains in prison is now determined by the courts and not by the Parole Board. The Government does not intend to take from the courts that power as it believes that the court is an appropriate place to determine how long a prisoner remains in prison. With regard to the particular cases outlined by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, it is not proper to discuss here matters that are currently before the courts.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr KLUNDER brought up the 33rd report of the Public Accounts Committee which related to the accountability of the Commissioner of Highways.

Ordered that report be printed.

QUESTION TIME

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr OLSEN: In view of the statement in the Royal Commission Report into the 1970 Vietnam moratorium demonstration that the Commissioner of Police and his force should not be placed in a situation where they have to take sole responsibility for making what many reputable citizens regard as a political type of decision, and the Royal Commissioner's recommendation that the Minister responsible for the police should initiate discussion with the Police Commissioner in such cases, has the Deputy Premier initiated discussions with the Commissioner on the police strategy for handling the Roxby Downs blockade and, if he has, what has been the outcome of those discussions and have they resulted in agreement between the Government and the police that protesters who trespass in the special buffer zone around the mine site should not be arrested?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Commissioner has had discussions with the Premier and me on this matter. I am not sure who initiated them—it may have been he who initiated them, as discussions have taken place on at least two occasions. It is normal, of course, to see all heads of departments at least once a week, sometimes more, depending on problems they have. Whether or not the discussions that took place with the Commissioner were part of the normal weekly meeting that I have with him or whether it was an extraordinary one, I am not in a position to say. I get up and do my work every day as every Minister does, so I am not prepared to say who initiated the discussions or whether it was in the normal process of our meetings.

The police have laid down their policy in this regard, and have informed me, CANE, and other organisations that may have been leading some groups to go to Roxby Downs. Also they have asked the Human Rights Commission to place someone at the Roxby Downs site. I have been informed of this by CANE and the Commissioner. CANE has taken the opportunity of asking the Human Rights Commission to have someone at the site where the protest will take place. The Human Rights Commission at this

stage has declined to intervene in these circumstances and has refused both requests. The basis for that decision is that it is not Commonwealth property and, therefore, the Human Rights Commission will not intervene.

The police have seven or eight major points worth relating to the House for which they wish to see guidelines established for this protest. The first involves communication. The police have asked leaders of the groups to establish a liaison committee to discuss on-site tactics and other problems.

I do not think anyone would condemn that sort of attitude, and I commend the police for it. They are also attempting to establish a liaison group, and that will have a similar effect in regard to communications. They want to set up negotiations with the leaders of the groups involved, and are attempting to do things by persuasion rather than by aggravation. There will be a strategic coverage of the area and the police have a tactical response in their programme. Hopefully, this strategy will keep to a minimum the necessity to make arrests. I do not know how the statement that was in the *Advertiser* yesterday morning got there. Journalist Ball is very well informed.

The Commissioner made no public statement in relation to arresting procedures at Roxby Downs, nor did I. Therefore, one can only conclude from that press release that there was a leak from somewhere within the Department. The Commissioner has given me an assurance that he has made no statement, and, of course, neither have I. I think the police have handled this matter in a democratic way, trying to establish the process of getting to Roxby Downs without having unnecessary confrontation. The Commissioner and I believe that it will be only in the most dramatic of circumstances that arrests will have to be made.

LIVING STANDARDS

Mrs APPLEBY: Has the Premier seen the article in today's *Advertiser* on the living standards of the Jones family, and will he explain the apparent contradiction in regard to that and a recent statement from the Leader of the Opposition about the declining living standards of South Australians? According to the article on the Jones family, a profile of the typical Australian family, their living standards have increased, and yet the Leader claimed on 2 August that living standards had deteriorated enormously under the Bannon Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We hear calls of 'Hear, hear' from members opposite. I have read with some interest the article on the Jones family, an article which is published quarterly in the *Advertiser* and which represents a snapshot of the circumstances of a fairly typical family living in our community.

Mr Ashenden: Did you read the one six months ago?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes. Contrasting that, of course, with the 'Living standards hit by tax grab' statement by the Leader of the Opposition and his comment that 'living standards have deteriorated enormously under the Bannon Government', it seems to me that an enormous deterioration should not see the take-home pay of someone in a typical family rise by something like \$18 a week with the family having an extra \$31 a week available with which to do what it likes. That is a very odd definition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is a very odd definition of a deterioration of living standards. The assessment shows that what has occurred has produced a broad grin on Fred's face and placed his wife Barbara in a benevolent mood. I guess that is true, because they are a typical family: it seems

that they have not read the strictures of the Leader of the Opposition or taken notice of the nonsense that he has been peddling and that, like the majority of those in the South Australian community, they are sharing in a mood of optimism and determination to try to make this recovery into something substantial which will see the improved living standards for all South Australians. They know that those living standards cannot improve if our public sector services deteriorate or decay, or if the Government itself is in financial trouble.

If the Government is in financial trouble, then the rest of the community is in trouble, too. It is by taking action on that, with very difficult decisions and difficult action, that we have placed Government and public sector finances in a position to play our share in the overall recovery in the community. It is very gratifying that this is the sort of experience that one could apply to a typical family. The food and cigarettes bill certainly has increased, but it is about 5 per cent in annual terms—comparatively low and certainly much lower than the experience over previous years. It has placed this family in a position where they feel that they can outlay money on a holiday.

When one compares that to the experience of that family at different times of the Tonkin Administration, when they were experiencing a net loss in income which forced Mrs Jones to look for part-time work in order to keep the family afloat and in order to hang on to their home, because of interest rates and other associated problems, it is extraordinary that anyone is trying to peddle the fact that living standards have deteriorated. I am not sure how typical Mrs Jones was in being able to pick up that part-time employment, because certainly at that time it would have been very difficult indeed. In the first quarter of 1984, Mr Fred Jones's circumstances have improved by \$21, even after updating his family vehicle and increasing his term life insurance. So, it gives the lie to the extraordinary statement of the Leader of the Opposition.

What was the contribution in that overall equation to the cost of getting our public finances into order, saving this State from bankruptcy, and preserving the services that the Jones family no doubt are using? It was estimated in August 1983, in the context of the Jones family, as being of the order of about \$1.60 a week extra. If any family in this State can begrudge that sort of contribution, with the massive benefits that have flowed from that in terms of the stability of Government finances, I would be very surprised indeed. That is being done against a background of stable interest rates and rising home values. Our level of State taxation, as I have said on many occasions in the House, is the third lowest in Australia. It is about at the level—

An honourable member: It was the lowest.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: Yes, and when it was the lowest we were suffering the greatest depression that South Australia had ever experienced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: We are talking about a period of a few months, and in that brief period we were at our nadir as a State and, indeed, living standards had not just deteriorated, they had collapsed for the majority of people.

I suggest that the Leader look at the evidence and bear in mind that \$1.60 per week, the contribution made to get our finances into a stable order, still sees South Australia with the third lowest tax per capita in Australia and at a level well below the next closest. South Australia's tax is \$449 and Western Australia's is \$540. That is the difference in figures that we are talking about, and we intend to keep it that way.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Deputy Premier inform the House whether the need to send police officers to the Roxby Downs blockade will result in the closure of any police stations in South Australia and, if so, how many?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The answer that I have received from the Commissioner with regard to that is simply this: there was no cancellation of annual leave; the police contingent has been drawn from all sections of the force, and this may cause some accumulation of work; the patrol strength is not seriously weakened but some of the specific policing objectives have been suspended, as have other low priority jobs. This caused the withdrawal of the police units from display at the show and band members are being distributed throughout the service, that is, show duty, office duties, etc. Going on that response from the Commissioner, I would say that no police stations would be closed.

SCHOOLS COMMISSION

Mr TRAINER: Can the Minister of Education inform the House of the Commonwealth Schools Commission guidelines which Senator Susan Ryan is announcing in Canberra today and the implications for schooling in South Australia?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I have had over recent months meetings with the Federal Minister for Education (Senator Susan Ryan) to discuss matters raised by the Commonwealth Schools Commission. Members will also know that there have been some rather amazing allegations made in the press in recent weeks about funding, particularly to the non-government school sector, that can be expected from the Federal Government. About an hour ago, the Federal Minister announced in Canberra the details of the Schools Commission funding that were being adopted by the Federal Government.

That was not only for the coming budgetary period, but gave an indication of what will happen in the four-year period from now. There are a number of points we have good cause to be very excited and pleased about. There will be, in real terms, an increase in funding for both Government and non-government school sectors. The Federal Government has acknowledged, as has Susan Ryan on other occasions, that education is provided by both systems in this country and that those systems—Government and non-government—both provide for the desires and needs of parents in having a system that provides choice and diversity.

The allegations made in very recent days about a hit list are not accurate at all, nor are they sustained by the announcement made by Susan Ryan today. She has indicated that while there will, in fact, be an increase in real terms of funding for both sectors (including the non-government school sector), and funding for all levels of schools will be, at the very least, maintained in real terms. So that, for the period of the agreement announced today, it will be maintained by the c.p.i.

As to the Government sector, the Federal Government has indicated that the Government's primary obligation is to the public education system but that it is a partner with State Governments in the education of all children. Indeed, there has been talk over recent months about the need to examine together how the State and Federal Governments can look at the betterments being attempted in both Government and non-government school sectors. As State Minister of Education, I am very keen to see those discussions continue further along the track. The approach by the Federal Government to reach resource agreements with States is

something that is being met with approval by State Governments right around Australia, of various political persuasions.

In coming to what level of standard should be achieved by Government or non-government schools in terms of available funding, the Commonwealth has set standards that it believes should be achieved after a four-year period. In setting those standard figures quoted for primary and secondary education, which are available for members to look at, there will be a 10 per cent supplement for Government schools as opposed to the 5 per cent supplement recommended in the initial Interim Report of the Schools Commission in April this year. The reason for that is that Government schools cater for a much wider range of educational services than does the non-government schools system.

It is felt that that 10 per cent more accurately represents the extra costs involved in providing that wider range of services. However, two other points could usefully be made. The first is that the Federal Government has announced that there will be established a Quality of Education Review Committee under the Chairmanship of Professor Peter Karmel. This committee will seek ways to direct Commonwealth funds to ensure that all students attain satisfactory standards in basic skills and will examine what changes are needed to equip students better for entry into higher education and into the work force. That will be a very educational and exciting committee. We all look forward with great interest to the work that it will do.

Furthermore, the Government has announced that there will be a new triennial programme to improve basic learning in primary schools. It will make an immediate start on the problem of basic skills that cause difficulty to some students once they begin secondary schooling. That programme is targeted at both the Government and non-government school systems. In terms of the funding that will be made available, total funding for Government schools in this period will increase for all of Australia by \$18.2 million in real terms, or 5.7 per cent in real terms over the amount granted in 1984. Non-government schools will receive an extra \$10.6 million, or an increase of 1.8 per cent in real terms.

So, all the fuss and fury that grew last week about a hit list of schools that would be attacked by the Federal Government has not lived up to the announcement made today. We can be very pleased and excited by that announcement of the Federal Government. We in South Australia look forward to working with the Federal Government in terms of the development, or betterment, of education in both Government and non-government school sectors in this State.

POLICE STATIONS CLOSURE

Mr LEWIS: Will the Deputy Premier, following his grossly inaccurate answer given earlier, immediately obtain a report from the Police Commissioner and make a Ministerial statement in the House today on the number of police stations to close? His answer is grossly inaccurate in that the Narrung Police Station, for one, will close, and that is confirmed by a public statement made by Superintendent Sampson in the *Murray Valley Standard* of 9 August.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: To be completely honest, I did not hear the first part of the question, but I think it had something to do with an inaccurate answer. That is an allegation and not a question. What I said was that, on the report before me from the Commissioner, I was not aware of any police stations that were being closed. I said that the Commissioner had not informed me about this. The state-

ment I made was not inaccurate; it was based on information placed before me.

In order to clear up this matter I will seek an opinion from the Police Commissioner about the allegations that have been made and whether he intends to close any police stations. What I said in my reply was based on information I had at my disposal from which it did not appear as though police stations were to be closed. It is quite wrong for the member for Mallee to accuse me of giving an inaccurate answer. I was relying on information provided by the Commissioner, and I said as much. In order to satisfy the House I will ask the Commissioner for a full report, and I will bring it down tomorrow.

PROPERTY TRUSTS

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare ask the Minister of Corporate Affairs whether the Department of Corporate Affairs has investigated the question of the information provided by promoters of property trusts in their prospectus? In the August issue of the *Business Review Weekly* (p.33) it is alleged that two of Australia's most conservative bodies, the Institute of Valuers and the Institute of Actuaries of Australia, have demanded that action be taken to clean up the property trust industry.

It is alleged that these two bodies have asked the National Companies and Securities Commission to look at the fundamental basis of the property trust industry, mainly relating to the valuations put on the properties of units in the various trusts. The Australian Institute of Valuers is concerned that values and yield rates in the prospectus of some property trusts are unrealistic and unrelated to open market property sales. To guard against the possible overstatement of assets the AIU has recommended that the valuer should be instructed to include evidence of comparable sales on which the valuation of each property trust is based.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I will certainly refer the question to the responsible Minister and obtain a report from him.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Can the Deputy Premier say what he meant when he said arrests would be made only in the most dramatic circumstances during the Roxby Downs blockade, and whether this means that participants who break the law openly and collectively, as the coalition for a Nuclear Free Australia threatens, will not be arrested?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The decision on arrests is entirely up to the police, and they will act accordingly.

POWER LINES

Mr WHITTEN: Will the Minister of Mines respond to a letter which was published in the *Advertiser* on 7 August 1984 and which strongly criticised the installation of overhead power lines in a new subdivision between Piccadilly and Crafers? In his letter, Mr T.S. Calver pointed out that underground power lines was quite feasible in this area. The letter states, in part:

It is appreciated that ETSA is involved in a study to evaluate the conversion of existing overhead lines to underground installation.

However, at this new subdivision, where soil conditions appear quite suitable and the subdivider should be meeting the installation cost anyway, it just seems an amazing policy to be installing overhead lines.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I saw the letter and had the matters raised in the letter checked. The situation is not as simple as it first appeared. The Nara Estate was first subdivided in 1957 and consisted of blocks of approximately four acres. I am glad to see that the member for Fisher agrees with that statement. All services in the area were supplied by overhead mains. However, about a year ago, part of the estate was resubdivided into smaller housing blocks.

Contrary to Mr Calver's belief, the Planning Act does not empower the local council to require the developer of a resubdivision to put electricity cables underground. The overhead extension currently being built (this was referred to in the letter) in Miels Road, Crafers, follows applications from four landowners for an electricity supply to their new homes on the Nara Estate.

The applicants will, however, have to pay a substantial standing charge for 10 years to cover the cost of the 1 km overhead extensions, they having indicated that they were not willing to pay for placing the line underground.

The extension is being located beneath an existing 33 KV line, but requires a few smaller poles to be erected in between the larger existing poles. No tree clearance is involved in this work. I can understand Mr Calver's concern, but the general issues he raises are being addressed in the independent Scott consultants' study, and in due course information on new guidelines in this area will become available.

POLICE ACTION

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Deputy Premier not agree that the Roxby blockade is a *quasi*-political situation requiring the Government to give advice to the Police Commissioner as recommended by the Bright Royal Commission?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I have said and I repeat that, as far as the Government is concerned, this is a police matter.

An honourable member: It's abdication of responsibility.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: There is no abdication of responsibility.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: The Opposition is taking a peculiar stand. Really, it hoped that we would give instructions, and then there would have been an outcry and God knows that would have been said. The fact that we can work with the police on this matter worries the Opposition. That is the whole crux of the matter. I am working closely with the police. In a few minutes we will find out about whether a police station is being closed, but the simple fact is that this is a police matter and I have every confidence in the police to judge the situation at the appropriate time.

CREDIT

Mr MAX BROWN: Will the Minister of Community Welfare discuss with the Attorney-General whether an easing is possible in the current guarantor provision required by such organisations as co-operatives and credit unions when they lend money to clients who may have a doubtful credit rating or no credit rating at all with the organisation involved?

Over the past few months, I have been involved in two cases where a credit union has loaned a substantial amount of money to a client only after a friend or relative of the borrower has been prepared to go guarantor. When the borrower has failed to meet the obligation, the credit union or co-operative has immediately, without any examination,

demanding the whole of the existing loan be paid by the guarantor forthwith.

In one case a one-parent mother has been placed in distressing circumstances, whilst in another case a businessman is being forced to seek bankruptcy, as that is the only way in which he can solve the problem. As I believe that this practice is not justified, I suggest that it be examined by the Attorney-General.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, which brings this problem in his community to the attention of the House. I will refer it to my colleague for his investigation. It is common knowledge that the Government intends to amend certain consumer legislation in the current session with respect to truth and lending provisions in that legislation. It may be appropriate to consider whether that amendment satisfies the problems to which the honourable member refers.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Education tell the House of the outcome of his recent discussions with the Acting Principal of the South Australian College of Advanced Education about the proposal to split the present early childhood education course at the Magill campus of the college? Is the Minister aware that the academic committee of the college, in a decision at odds with Government policy of integration and rationalisation of early childhood services, at a meeting yesterday voted in favour of a resolution not only to split the present zero to eight years course at the Magill campus but also to establish an additional early childhood course at the Underdale campus?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. By way of interjection last week (for which I apologise), I indicated the concern that the Government had for proposals being put forward within the South Australian college. As I indicated then, those proposals were being put forward coincidental to moves being made within the Government with regard to the early childhood area. I say that because some people (and I acknowledge that the shadow Minister said last week that he was not one of them) have been attempting to build up a Machiavellian plot that is all part of one grand scheme, apparently designed to get somebody.

I have already sought advice from the Tertiary Education Authority of South Australia and the Early Childhood Authority Committee, set up by my predecessor, with regard to the proposals being mooted within the South Australian college. I have done so because I was quite concerned about the proposals. I doubted whether they would meet the real needs of the pre-school sector in this State. As a result of that, I had also previously arranged a meeting with the new Acting Principal of the South Australian college, Dr Jill Maling, and it was agreed subsequently that we would also discuss the issue of the early childhood arrangements for the college. That meeting took place last Thursday morning, and Dr Geoffrey Mildred, the Acting Deputy Principal of the college, was also present. At that time I indicated my concern, and reasons for such concern, to them. In response, Drs Maling and Mildred advised me that on Monday—yesterday—a modified proposal was to be put before the Academic Advisory Committee of the college. They asked that I await that event before determining what action I would take.

I also advised that, if the proposal that came before Monday's meeting was still a cause of disquiet amongst those in the education community, that I would convene a working party under the chairpersonship of TEASA, with

other representation on that committee, to advise me as to the appropriateness of that course to meet the needs of the pre-school sector in this State.

They understood that to be the situation last Thursday. As I have said, the proposal went before Monday's meeting, and we are now sounding out people in the education community in regard to the proposals that were accepted by the council's committee yesterday. I am considering the propositions that were put to that council meeting yesterday, and I will determine whether it is necessary to proceed with the working party's proposal or whether some other form of action might be necessary. The college knows that the Government is very concerned about this matter and that the Government is prepared to establish a working party to advise me, following which I will advise the college about this matter, as I am entitled to do under the Act.

Quite clearly the Government is concerned about protecting the interests of preschool teachers training in this State and about the recognition of the special needs of preschool teachers and their training. This is not part of a grand Machiavellian plot linked in a most obscure way with other things, as suggested by the Opposition, apparently to achieve some fiendish end. The purpose of the Government is to deliver the best services possible in the early childhood arena, and that is why the Government is taking an interest in this area and why it believes that it is important to achieve what we aim to achieve. I point out that the Act gives this power: we recognise that, and support the power that I have in regard to giving my opinion to the South Australian college.

ELECTRICITY INTERCONNECTION

Mr HAMILTON: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy indicate whether the decision to proceed with the Alcoa aluminium smelter to be developed at Portland, recently announced by the Victorian Premier, Mr Cain, is likely to have any detrimental effect upon the proposed electricity interconnection between Victoria and South Australia? As there has been some media speculation both here and in Victoria that the decision to proceed with the Alcoa development will interfere with the interconnection, it would be useful if the Minister could clarify this situation.

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: I am aware of the speculation in this regard in the press and elsewhere, and also a constituent has approached me personally in regard to this matter. I am happy to inform the House that these fears are completely unfounded. We are not in an either/or situation in relation to this matter: that is, that either Victoria develops the Alcoa project or the electricity interconnection occurs between Victoria and South Australia. The existing transmission line to Portland has a capacity of 1 800 megawatts. The Alcoa demand will be from 500 to a maximum of 800 megawatts. Therefore, additional capacity is available, and the development should not affect the interconnection arrangements. Further, I remind members that only a few days ago the Premiers of Victoria and South Australia announced that the electricity authorities involved (SEC and ETSA), together with planning and community authorities, would be asked to investigate feasible routes for an interconnecting transmission line. That indicates that matters in relation to the interconnection proposal and the Alcoa project have already been taken into account. The quantities of electricity involved are such that the project will not affect the interconnection proposal.

SIMS FARM

Mr BLACKER: Can the Minister of Education explain to the House the latest position in respect of the Sims farm

at Cleve? Members would be aware that the future of Sims farm has been raised many times in this House. My constituents advise me that it is the wish of the general community on Eyre Peninsula that Sims farm remain in Government ownership for the original intent of the late Mr Sims' bequest, that is, for the purpose of research and education. I am also advised that there has been a general committee of inquiry investigating the future of the farm and it was expected that the findings of that committee would have been available by early August.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The report of the working party has not been made available to me on the Sims farm issue. I am awaiting it, and I understand that it will be made available shortly to me recommending whether or not the proposal that would see Sims farm being used for education purposes should proceed, or whether it is not a feasible proposition to meet the agricultural education needs of the Eyre Peninsula.

Notwithstanding that, however, the decision has been made by the Government that if the Education Department decides to take up an option to develop Sims farm for educational purposes—in other words, if the Government decides that is what should happen to it—it will require the transfer of funds from the education capital budget to the Minister of Agriculture capital budget. It will not in fact be funds that are being subsidised by agriculture for educational purposes; that decision has been made.

I am not saying that that will pre-empt any decision made on an educational basis, but it has been decided that if we proceed that is the financial arrangement that will take place. The Department of Agriculture, which has been seeking to rationalise certain of its resources, will see funds returned to that area for agricultural extension work, among other things. However, I have not yet had the report of the working party: I expect to receive it soon, and I will live up to the undertakings that I gave to consider seriously any recommendations made.

I know that pertinent arguments are being made on various sides of this issue about the value of Sims farm for agriculture/education purposes. In any event, the Government is conscious of the needs to develop agricultural education as best it can, whatever model is actually chosen to do it in any particular area.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr PLUNKETT: Can the Minister of Housing confirm the truth or otherwise of a statement made in the House last week by the Leader of the Opposition regarding the increases of Housing Trust design and construction building costs?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I do not know what goes on in the Leader's mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: He certainly places great importance on grade 3 arithmetic, and on a \$8.99 calculator that he brought back from Hong Kong. I believe the statement by the Leader is misleading and inaccurate. He has apparently picked up three different home designs from a contact in the building industry that may or may not be accurate.

The House needs to be aware that building costs vary by location, for example, metropolitan or country; by construction, cost of land, labour, materials, etc. The Trust's May 1983 design and construct call differed markedly from the July 1984 call, in that builders in July 1984 are building on Trust land. This changes greatly the economics of a building proposition in that the builder will not have capital appre-

ciation on land in the contract to offset lower margins on the building component. Further to this, the three separate design and construct propositions mentioned by the Leader are only three out of 530 submitted in July for consideration for 138 allotments. Clearly, these three may or may not be a true reflection of costs.

I, therefore, am unable to place any credibility on the Leader's comments. They are not statistically relevant, and unless he can nominate the specific contracts and allow some public review of actual costs, I believe his comments will be relegated to the rubbish bin.

I now refer briefly to building costs. Indices prepared by the S.A. Construction Industry Cost Adjustment Committee and the ABS indicate rises of award wages and materials costs relevant to the Trust's building operations during the period in question of about 8 per cent. The Trust indicated to me that the actual increases in this period for design and construct tenders are around 17 per cent, or 14.5 per cent a year. Clearly, if award and material increases are at 8 per cent, then margins or profits and land prices are causing additional movements in costs. It is a concern of this Government to keep building costs down, but we believe there are two important factors here: first, the introduction of stability in the level of building activity and, secondly, market place forces.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: I have repeatedly said that this Government, in conjunction with the building industry, is seeking stability through the Trust's building programme and through Federal and State financial initiatives. These are the appropriate methods to keep costs down, not by inappropriate payments for labour, or cheating on tax and workers compensation payments, and other unfortunate and, I hope, now past malpractices. Let us have no more misinformation from the Leader. This Government wants a viable and stable building industry. I will do what I can to achieve this and I hope that, in conjunction with the building industry, we can achieve this goal.

UPPER STURT AND COFFIN BAY WATER

The Hon. D.C. BROWN: Can the Premier say whether the proposed schemes to provide reticulated water to Upper Sturt and Coffin Bay (partly funded under the Community Employment Programme) are now in jeopardy due to interference from within the Premier's Department? Both the Upper Sturt and Coffin Bay reticulated water schemes are so-called uneconomic schemes and will not proceed without funds from the CEP. Water is a basic commodity (as I am sure the Premier would agree), and the Premier will now have to wear full responsibility if either of those projects is now stopped due to interference by his Department.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have no direct knowledge of this matter. The CEP projects are handled through an inter-departmental committee which involves the Federal Government. It is administered through the Department of my colleague, the Deputy Premier, and I will get a report for the honourable member.

WASTE DISPOSAL

Mr MAYES: Can the Minister of Local Government say what is the current position regarding disposal of liquid and hazardous waste in South Australia? What are the plans of the South Australian Waste Management Commission to deal with those wastes? For some time a number of concerns have been expressed within the community regarding dis-

posal of waste products within South Australia. More than a year ago I raised this matter with the Minister and was assured that it would be carefully investigated. I seek an answer to my question.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I thank the honourable member for his question, because this is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House has granted leave at least four times, maybe five. I would be pleased if the answer could be heard.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: Last week I was asked a question by the member for Hartley in relation to solid waste. This question relates to hazardous liquid waste, which is a completely different subject and one that I believe is of equal concern. Here again, I do not believe that we in South Australia provide adequate disposal of hazardous liquid waste. I was interested to see that such waste is disposed of in Sydney by the cellular method: they dig the cells, put in solid waste, then tip in hazardous liquid waste amongst the solid waste and compact it in a geologically solid area where there is no possibility of its getting into the water table. When I was in Santa Maria, California, I looked at the operation of Casmalia Industries, a private enterprise company that has the responsibility for disposing of highly toxic hazardous liquid waste from all of Los Angeles. I was very interested to see that that company uses two methods of disposal.

One is the open area where the wastes are kept in liquid form in small lakes and then the oxidation evaporation takes place, and the second process is to store them in 44-gallon drums and cover the drums (in a geologically stable area). I was looking for something much more sophisticated than that, but they have two trial projects under way to burn these liquid wastes.

As the honourable member advised me that he was going to ask the question, I did get a report, which states:

Most of the industrial wastes generated in South Australia are not hazardous to health or the environment. Subject to appropriate controls, solid wastes can be safely disposed of at landfill depots and liquid wastes discharged to sewers. Some industrial wastes, however, should not be disposed of so simply. Due to their physical, chemical or microbiological properties, they cannot be disposed of acceptably to normal landfills or sewers. Of primary concern are chlorinated hydrocarbons.

In Florida the authorities ship toxic liquid wastes to Georgia for disposal in that State; because of the high water tables in Florida they do not want to take the risk of disposing of them in Florida. The report continues:

There are about 30 tonnes of these materials being stored in a number of locations around Adelaide and awaiting disposal. Whilst the quantity is not large, their disposal presents considerable difficulty as high temperature incineration is the only proven safe disposal method. A suitable facility is currently not available in Australia.

Due to the nature of its industrial base, a major portion of the hazardous waste generated in Adelaide originates from the metal treatment and finishing industries. These wastes are in the form of acids, alkalis and cyanides which may be associated with heavy metals. All the evidence available through the E&WS and the Waste Management Commission indicates that this material is being received at the E&WS Toxic Liquid Waste Facility at Bolivar. Disposal of industrial solvents presents a significant hazardous waste management problem. Rising energy costs and greater control over their disposal have led to a significant decrease in quantities being disposed of in recent years. There has been a greater tendency to re-distill these materials for re-use. However, it must be acknowledged that a significant quantity is still being evaporated from liquid waste ponds. This practice is recognised as being highly undesirable and requires further action to develop a more environmentally acceptable solution. It is the long term aim of the Commission to ensure that all industrial waste which cannot be reclaimed or re-used will be converted to a form which can be safely disposed of to landfill or discharged to the sewerage system.

There is a wide range of hazardous waste treatment and disposal options available. However, the number of options which could

be practicable in South Australia is restricted by the relatively low quantities of wastes and their chemical composition. The Waste Management Commission is developing a broad strategy for the management of liquid and prescribed waste. It is proposed to prepare a management plan for the treatment and disposal of prescribed waste which will be released for public scrutiny and comment. The identification and quantification of hazardous waste is an essential first step in developing the plan. A comprehensive survey of industries and institutions is currently being undertaken by the Commission and should be finalised by December 1984.

As Minister, I regard this as a most important matter that needs to be addressed at the earliest possible time. I thank the honourable member for his question. I believe that by the end of this year we will be in a position to develop plans to accommodate this waste which needs to be, for the benefit of all South Australians, disposed of adequately and safely.

CLEAN AIR REGULATIONS

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister for Environment and Planning state how many rural councils have applied for variations in the regulations as they now apply to restricted backyard burning and whether appropriate provisions are in hand for rural councils to be granted exemptions? In June, I contacted a senior officer in the Pollution Management Division of the Department for the Environment and Planning, seeking further information on the regulations as they apply to the clean Air Act. The officer told me that the regulations would not be prepared in time for them to come into operation on 1 July but that they would commence on 2 August (subsequently, this was 6 August). I was also told that country councils could seek to have modified regulations for their areas. However, he was under the impression that, because of the rush to implement the new provision by early August, there might be some delay before the councils actually could be granted exemptions or modifications.

I was contacted last week by a school about an apparent impasse with respect to burning in the school's incinerator. Apparently the school cleaner commences work after 3.30 p.m., after the students have been dismissed, and is not available at the school after 9 a.m. Thus, unless some persons other than the cleaner is prepared to burn the rubbish it will be left unburnt. Another school principal has told me that he believed the provisions did not apply to country towns so it was of no concern to his school. Yet another school principal has drafted a letter seeking his school council's support to have the school exempted.

Subsequently I again contacted the Department, when I was told that schools are exempt from the regulations because they are not domestic premises. From the above examples it is clear that people in rural areas are unsure of the situation concerning burning and many people in the towns believe that the new burning regulations should not apply to them.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I think I want to take issue with the final point made by the honourable member. I would have thought that country people would share the general outlook of city people that wherever possible the atmosphere should not be used as a sewer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: That is precisely what we are talking about. I have been amazed by the attitude of the Opposition on this matter. As the Government is miles ahead of the Opposition on this whole issue and completely in line with public opinion, the more noise they make the better, because the more it will draw to the attention of people that the controls exist and the more credit will accrue

to this Government for having been prepared to go ahead and do something which the Liberals ducked when in office. As to the specific matter which—

The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy: You did a great job—

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: If the honourable member wants at any stage to compare the Liberal Party's policy and record on the Grange vineyard with the Labor Party's policy, I will be only too happy to come here and show the documents and debate the matter thoroughly. If I hear from the member for Torrens that the Liberal Party will also be prepared to debate it (as I think I heard by way of interjection), he is a brave man indeed. As to the basic question, which was a straightforward and sensible question, I have not been made aware of any approaches at this stage from country councils for exemption. I will confer with my officers and bring back a report.

AMUSEMENT RIDE INSURANCE

MR PETERSON: Will the Minister of Labour investigate the third party personal insurance responsibilities of amusement ride operators and avenues open to such operators to obtain this insurance? The Minister's Department has a requirement that the equipment of such operators is approved by it. I have had discussions recently with an amusement ride operator with an investment of \$350 000 in equipment who until this year had been able to obtain such insurance. However, his usual insurance company has said that it would not insure his equipment any more. He made inquiries with every insurance company listed in the telephone directory, including SGIC, and all refused to insure his equipment.

I then contacted the Small Business Advisory Bureau on behalf of this person. It was helpful and suggested a number of approaches but was unable to provide him with insurance cover. I am informed that five amusement ride operators have gone out of business this year because they could not get insurance cover. It has been put to me that certain options are open to these people. One is that they operate without such insurance, which means if anyone is injured they would probably go bankrupt or the person injured would not be paid compensation. Secondly, they could close down, which would mean no rides for the kids in this State and jobs in the industry would go. This leaves operators with an industry and with equipment that cannot be disposed of if they cannot get insurance cover.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter to my attention and I will have it investigated. I have not received any complaint personally. It seems strange, if there are five operators no doubt each employing four or five people, resulting in a total of perhaps 30 jobs, that a complaint has not been made to the Government somewhere. Although it may not be my direct responsibility to see whether these people should be covered for third party insurance (workers compensation insurance is rather within my portfolio), I should be delighted to help the honourable member in this matter. In the first instance, it may be best if he gives me written details on the matter, including the names of the people involved, and I will do all that I can. If I cannot help personally in this matter, I will refer it to the Attorney-General.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before calling on the business of the day, there is a slight tangle regarding notices of motion and personal explanations. I will call on members with

notices of motion and then those who wish to make personal explanations, Ministerial statements, and the like.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: POLICE OPERATION

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: Following allegations made in this House earlier today by the Opposition that certain police stations would close as a result of the Roxby Downs police operation, I took it on myself to reply by way of Ministerial statement tomorrow. However, I have been able to get in touch with the Police Commissioner, who informs me that there is no intention to close Narrung or any other police station as a consequence of the Roxby Downs police operation.

Mr Lewis: Who mans it?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: That is the answer. Did you hear it? I will give it again if you did not. A review of country stations is proceeding, and whether or not that has been the confusing point I do not know. However, there is no indication that any of those stations are to close, so the very wrongful misrepresentation voiced in this House today has been proved within five minutes to be totally incorrect.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: UNION OFFICIAL

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr HAMILTON: At page 19 of yesterday's *News* there appears an article, under the heading 'New Rail Terminal Outcry', the second paragraph of which states:

Former railways union boss, Mr Hamilton, Labor member for Albert Park—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave of the House has been granted and it cannot be taken away so quickly. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: First, I find the word 'boss' offensive, and the use of an emotive phrase an attempt to denigrate the union of which I was an honorary official. Secondly, the definition of the word 'boss' in the *Oxford Dictionary* connotes 'dictator' and 'dictatorial', and it is therefore an insult to past executives and officials of the Australian Railways Union and a reflection on the rank and file of that union that elected me to office over a period of 11 years with a voluntary vote of 60 per cent, under the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Court electoral system. I was an unpaid official. At no time did I consider that I was a boss—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is impossible for me to hear, and I cannot give rulings unless I can hear. The honourable member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON: At no time did I consider that I was a boss of the South Australian branch of the Australian Railways Union, nor would that attitude have been tolerated by other past executive members of that branch, the past State Council of that union, and indeed the rank and file of that union. Finally, the journalist who wrote that article is either ignorant or displays ignorance of his own union (the Australian Journalists Association). I do not believe that he would call Bill Rust (secretary of that union) his boss.

The SPEAKER: Order! I withdraw leave at that point. Call on the business of the day.

SUPPLY BILL (No. 2)

The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to apply out of Consolidated Account the sum of \$390 million for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 1985. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides \$390 million to enable the Public Service to carry out its normal functions until assent is received to the Appropriation Bill. It is usual for the Government to introduce two Supply Bills each year. The earlier Bill was for \$360 million and was designed to cover expenditure for about the first two months of the year. The Bill now before the House is for \$390 million, which is expected to be sufficient to cover expenditure until early November, by which time debate on the Appropriation Bill is expected to be complete and assent received. I commend the Bill to the House.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the issue and application of up to \$390 million. Clause 3 imposes limitations on the issue and application of this amount.

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

DOG FENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Dog Fence Act, 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is the culmination of lengthy negotiations, negotiations between a group of dog fence owners and their immediate cattle lessee neighbours regarding the maintenance of that part of the dog fence that is their common boundary. The problem has been that for several years the cattle lessees on the northern side of the fence have not contributed to the maintenance of the fence. This has been the case even where the fence forms a common boundary with the sheep lessees, who have traditionally undertaken responsibility for the fence. However, in recent times pressure has been brought to bear for a change in circumstances. This has probably occurred because the Dog Fence Board has been placing increased pressure on dog fence owners to upgrade their sections of the fence and because cattle lessees have increased the erection of subdivision fences using the dog fence as a base.

In response to a letter from the Hon. A.M. Whyte in 1982, the then Minister of Lands initiated an inquiry by the Dog Fence Board into the matter. Correspondence was entered into with the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated and a discussion paper prepared. As part of the consultation process, three meetings were convened by the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated between the interested parties. The result was an agreement that is now reflected by this legislation. In particular, it was agreed that the cattle lessees would contribute to the maintenance of the fence at the rate of \$37.50 per kilometre of dog fence per annum.

The commencement date would be November 1984, for the 1984-85 financial year. The funds would be paid into the Dog Fence Fund for distribution to the dog fence owners who are the immediate neighbours of the cattle lessees. The rate of payment would be reviewed every five years. It is pleasing to note that the agreement was reached at an open meeting by a unanimous decision, and all parties are to be commended for their fairmindedness and willingness to

assist to resolve the matter. It may also be noted that the arrangement will affect seven cattle lessees who occupy land abutting the dog fence for an approximate distance of 900 kilometres. It is therefore expected that the contributions will total approximately \$33 750 per year during the first five years.

Clause 1 of the Bill is formal. Clause 2 makes consequential amendments to the interpretative section of the principal Act. Clause 3 amends section 24a of the Dog Fence Act to clarify the application of Part III of the Act so that it will accord with accepted practice, being that the owners of land inside the fence are, for the purpose of this Part, to be regarded as the owners of the fence.

Clause 4 proposes the insertion of a new section 28. This proposed new section allows the board, in respect of any financial year, to charge an occupier of land immediately outside the dog fence to pay an amount towards the costs of maintaining the fence. The charge is to be assessed according to a prescribed rate per kilometre of dog fence that is adjacent to the land being occupied. It will be due and payable within 28 days and recoverable as a debt. Amounts received by the board are to be paid to the owners of land inside the dog fence in proportion to the length of fence that they own that is contiguous to land occupied by the persons who have been charged under the section. It is proposed that the rate per kilometre of dog fence that may be charged initially be \$37.50, and that the board then be required to review that rate on a five-yearly basis after consulting the United Farmers and Stockowners of S.A. Incorporated. The section will apply to the 1984-85 financial year, and every financial year thereafter.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIBRARIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Local Government) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Libraries Act, 1982. Read a first time.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a minor amendment to the Libraries Act, 1982. During the two years since the enactment of the Libraries Act, the Libraries Board has been able to provide the public with more effective library services. The board has also monitored the operation of the Act. This Bill makes a single amendment which is desirable to ensure the availability of a wide cross-section of expertise for board membership.

At present there is an undue restriction placed on local government representatives on the board. The Act envisages that these members be members or officers of councils, and accordingly, provides that membership of the board ceases upon the expiry of that membership or office. This can lead to frequent changes in membership of the board. It also prevents the appointment of persons who, having retired from local government, have had wide experience in the field which would be of great benefit to the board. Accordingly, the Bill removes from the principal Act the requirement of membership of or employment in local government, and substitutes a requirement of experience in local government.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 9 of the principal Act. A new subsection (2) is substituted, pursuant to which three members of the board must be persons with experience in local government and, of these, two shall be nominated by the Local Government Association. Clause 3 makes a consequential amendment to section 10 of the principal Act.

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

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 9 August. Page 188.)

Mr EVANS (Fisher): Last week I was talking about a problem that existed at the Blackwood roundabout. That junction involves five roads and is very dangerous because of the amount of traffic that builds up and the natural tendency of motorists to get frustrated, particularly in the mornings. Each year people find they have to leave earlier to achieve the same goal in travelling from home to work. When the authorities built the roundabout they believed they were solving a problem, but they must have realised at that time that it was only a short-term solution to the problem.

One must have great sympathy with bus drivers and heavy vehicle operators because to manipulate a vehicle around that roundabout is a traumatic experience for the driver and it does not really enhance the feelings of other motorists who are waiting to get across or trying to be across before the heavy vehicle completes its manoeuvring. I hope the Minister notes my comments and immediately instigates an inquiry through the Highways Department to install traffic lights at that junction. I believe that no other junction in the metropolitan area would have a roundabout with such narrow carriageways between the corners of the pavements and buildings and with such a high traffic count as does the junction at Blackwood.

In a grievance debate last week, I mentioned briefly the concerns the community and I have about the most dangerous piece of road left in metropolitan Adelaide. I refer to the southern end of Coromandel Parade which crosses Horners Bridge to join Murrays Hill Road. That part of Coromandel Parade is very narrow. There was no room for the Electricity Trust to place its stobie poles other than right on the south-eastern edge of the road. On the western or south-western side of the road, in many places there are large gum trees that the community wishes to preserve.

If two heavy vehicles, say, buses or trucks, meet on that road at certain points, it is impossible for them to pass. In some places there is not sufficient room for two cars and a pedestrian or a cyclist to pass each other with safety. In this day and age those situations cannot be condoned. I do not think it would be practical in either financial or construction terms to move stobie poles out of the way and widen the road. The alternative would be to provide a road from Murrays Hill Road, over Horners Bridge, and to then take the route (which now passes through part of Craighburn Road) over the top of the hill coming out on to the better section of Coromandel Parade. It may be argued that another route would be better instead of using Horners Bridge, which because of its unique construction and design should be preserved—it is an old stone bridge that has been there for about 100 years. It would be possible to construct another bridge slightly further downstream to provide a better approach to a new road over the hill.

Governments may argue that such a road would serve only a few people living at Aberfoyle Park, Coromandel Valley and Blackwood. However, that is not the case. Moves are under way to upgrade Black Road, Manning Road, Hub Drive and Reservoir Drive, and there is an increasing build-up of traffic on South Road during peak periods, in particular in the Flagstaff Hotel area where Seacombe, Marion and Flagstaff Roads join South Road, which causes congestion and delays. Many motorists now take the Old Belair Road

which at present is being upgraded, the Main Road at Blackwood, Coromandel Parade and on to Black Road, Manning Road, etc.

The only bad section of road, apart from the Old Belair Road, is the section of Coromandel Parade to which I have referred. No matter how long it is left in the present sad state of repair, increasing numbers of people will continue to use it because it is a shorter and quicker route than is the Main South Road. Some of the people who live on this section of Coromandel Parade find it nearly impossible to get out of their driveways during peak periods of traffic. Further, children walking and riding bikes to school are in serious danger as are people who may be walking a dog or whatever. There is no way out for people who live there. I make this request not only on behalf of the people who live on the road but also of motorists who use it to get to various destinations. I hope that the Government notes my concern.

Another matter that I have raised in the local press in recent times concerns the South-Eastern Freeway. There is no doubt that the freeway is a great asset to South Australia, although it may as well have been constructed over the highest part of the Ranges at Mount Lofty, because, in effect, that is what occurred in regard to its present route, and traffic has to contend with fog and wet weather. Because the first bullock waggons used that route, it was considered that it should be maintained. The oldtimers laughed in the 1950s when the authorities, I admit under a Liberal Government, set out to develop the freeway to serve transport travelling south-east and the Hills urban developments. If a better route had been provided for heavy traffic travelling south-east and interstate, the Hills communities would not have been involved with such a massive expenditure to serve their needs.

However, in regard to the freeway I refer again to the matter of the increasing number of accidents on the freeway involving major damage to vehicles and people often caused by vehicles slipping on the surface of the road after there has been heavy, or even light, rain following a dry spell. From the beginning I argued with the authorities that resurfacing a road with hot mix would provide a finer texture and that any oil leaks would be less likely to penetrate grooves or indentations in the surface making it more dangerous. At the time I raised this matter I was told that I was wrong. I ask the Minister (and I will raise this matter again in a letter) why more accidents are occurring on the freeway because of oil or other material spilt on the surface.

The problem is not only caused by diesel oil from buses or semi-trailers or trucks or cars that use diesel; we all know that most cars leak a small quantity of oil. With thousands of vehicles travelling on the road each day, if each vehicle drops only a few drops of oil this causes a build-up. I am convinced that part of the problem involves the type of surface of the road. That surface may be cheaper, easier and quicker to provide, but we should realise that the Hills section of the freeway is a dangerous road in inclement weather.

Another problem associated with the freeway concerns the approach to it, that is, the section of road between the junction of Portrush, Glen Osmond and Cross Roads and the Eagle on the Hill. There is a massive build-up of traffic on that road during peak times and a large bank-up of traffic at the traffic lights. This causes a lot of frustration. Yesterday a heavy vehicle lost its braking power. If such an incident occurred when there was a large queue of vehicles on the approach section it could result in a major accident involving many vehicles and people. That section should be upgraded to the same standard as the freeway. This would provide a massive boost for the travelling public

using the road and in the long term would prove a cost saving to the State. It would also ensure a safer trip for the thousands of people who have to use the road to get to the city.

Tied up in the same argument is the fact that there is now more development occurring in the southern suburbs. Moreover, some of our major tertiary institutions, such as the CAE campus, Flinders University and the Medical Centre—a teaching hospital—are sited there. Many people thus use the Upper Sturt Road, and many others come from the southern areas along Upper Sturt Road to join the freeway at Crafers. In many places, the Upper Sturt Road is nothing more than a bullock track covered by a sealed surface. In its day it was a good bullock track because it was more level in certain sections than part of the Mount Barker Road, as it used to be, with its bridle path and winding sections.

It would be a simple process to widen some sections of the Upper Sturt Road to allow STA buses a greater degree of safety and heavier vehicles room to pull aside and provide a free flow through of lighter and faster traffic. It would also improve the fire break between the Belair recreation park and neighbouring property holders.

So, there is an urgent need, not to make the Upper Sturt Road into a freeway or four-lane road for all its length, but to provide at least some areas where heavy vehicles can pull aside to enable a free flow through of lighter traffic. If the Minister cannot see his way clear to make the section between the Glen Osmond Road junction and Eagle on the Hill a complete freeway, he could create sections on that road, too, where heavy vehicles could pull over to allow faster traffic to flow through. That alternative is better than the suggestion some people are making, namely, to ban heavy transport vehicles from the roads in peak hours.

That suggestion is unfair to the heavy haulage operators, whether STA buses or other heavy vehicles, because the private sector pays for registering vehicles, sales tax on equipment, fuel tax to operate vehicles and so on, and it is the business of these people to use the roads. If carriers cannot get out of or into the State at the right time they do not get unloaded in time, because of the hours worked in the community, and they would miss out on a load the next day. Therefore, I am suggesting that passing lanes at least be made available on those two roads if the money is not available to upgrade the roads to a freeway standard.

Many years ago the argument was won to have the Mitcham Hills connected to sewerage. I am grateful that the major part of the work has been carried out. At the time there was a lot of sweat and tears in fighting the argument, but it was acknowledged that the people of Stirling, Bridgewater and Aldgate had as much need to have their properties on sewer as did the residents of Springfield, Walkerville, or wherever. The treatment works were established at Brickhill Road, Heathfield, and I appreciate that because the effluent passes through a property of mine and helps my flowers to grow better.

Pumping stations were also installed, but the actual installation of the deep drainage to properties has been very slow recently. Initially there was a big surge to have the schools, the hospital, and the buildings in the main streets connected to it and rightly so. This occurred at Crafers, Stirling, Aldgate, Bridgewater, and so on. However, householders, who spend the major part of their lives sniffing the putrid stench from the effluent flowing out of septic tanks, are being ignored, and I ask the Minister in charge of the Engineering and Water Supply Department why the process is not being speeded up.

It is said that there is a shortage of work and that there are still unemployed people, yet I know that there is equipment lying idle in the E & WS yards; there are acres of it.

It could keep auctioneers going for half a year trying to quit the machinery, or else a lot of people could be kept in jobs handling the tenders to dispose of it. However, if there is the machinery available, if the survey work has been carried out in the Bridgewater, Stirling and Aldgate areas, if there is a demand and a desire to create jobs, why is the work not given the priority that it deserves? Why does the Government ignore the opportunity to give the community what it is entitled to, instead of slowing the programme down and doing nothing more than a token amount of work to try to give the community the impression that something is happening?

I know that the argument will come forward that, because of the wet month we have just had, it has been too wet to do anything, and I know that is so because I have lived in the Hills all of my life. I accept that, but when the weather was fine in summer and autumn in one of the best environments in the State no greater amount of work was done. Not very often do I make the claim that one electorate has been prejudiced against another but I am becoming concerned about why the needs of the people in those areas are being ignored.

The same Minister's portfolio concerns water quality. The type of water that the Adelaide Hills residents have been receiving over the past six or seven months is an absolute disgrace to any society. I would go so far as to say that when it was at its worst, if the water had been tested by Government departments without their being told where it came from, and being asked if it was fit for human consumption, the officers in those departments would have said that it was not fit for human consumption. One could not tell if it was rusty water, orange flavoured water or orange coloured water with a horrible flavour to it—one could not tell. It was a disgrace. After that came water that looked as if someone had mixed slack lime in it. It was milky white in colour and if allowed to stand in a glass for some time a large amount of sediment went to the bottom of the glass.

If the Government and Minister thought that we were doing some pottery work and wanted to sell us clay through the water supply, why were they not honest about it—and why didn't they tell us? That is what they delivered. I complained about it. I happen to be connected close to the Heathfield tank, which can be supplemented through the Happy Valley area. Lo and behold, within a few days of my complaining about the water, I got a shock when I was supplied with beautifully clear water. However, in Bridgewater, Aldgate and the other Hills areas, people were still getting the muck. I do not know whether that was a coincidence or whether they thought that if the member for the area received a better quality supply it might shut him up. However, it was not a personal complaint, because I knew that I would not be staying long term in the house that I was in. I am going where I will not have to put up with the Minister's filthy water; I will have an independent supply. The complaint was on behalf of people in my area, and I have handed in to this House petitions containing over 1 800 signatures.

Many people joined in this issue: there was no organised campaign, and people did not go from house to house to collect signatures. I hope that the Government realises that, if it is to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to filter the Adelaide water supply, it should tell the public that it will cost nearly double the cost of unfiltered water. Also, it should tell the Hills community that those people are unlikely ever to have filtered water, yet they will be charged full tote odds. That is totally dishonest, because filtered water will virtually cost twice the cost of unfiltered water. If private enterprise did that, people would be brought before a Government agency and told that they could not charge the

same for unfiltered water as they charge for filtered water. That is common sense: it is fair and just.

There is no reason why the Government cannot say that after 1988, when most of Adelaide will have a filtered water supply (because the Happy Valley plant will come into operation, another 40 per cent of the population will have filtered water), people should not have to pay a high price for a second rate commodity. We will see what water is like in the coming summer months, but water coming through Hills pipelines to residents there will not be fit for human consumption. I hope that the Government does something about the matter before then.

I have in my district the Eden Hills Primary School, a small school with only about 100 or so students. For six years I have known of problems associated with the school, but for those six years members of that excellent council have said, 'Stan, we do not want you to stir the possum. We will do things through the normal channels.' Different principals and members of that council have stuck by that philosophy. They do not want to play politics: they want to go through normal channels, because they believe that is the way they should work.

I am pleased to see that the Minister of Education is in the House. I received a letter from him in the past couple of days saying, 'Sorry; we do not think we can do anything for you in relation to any major upgrading of the Eden Hills school.' To the Minister's credit, he said in the letter that simply because the school has just over 100 students that should not disadvantage it. He said that the school was entitled to the same considerations as are other schools. I ask the Minister to put that philosophy into practice, because the Eden Hills Primary School has very poor playing fields compared to those of any other primary school in the State. It is built in some of the steepest country in South Australia.

When the Hon. Hugh Hudson was Minister of Education there was some land next to the school with a house on it. I saw the Minister and told him that the school needed more land. I asked him if he would buy it, but he said 'No'. I said that if he would not buy it, I would put a deposit on it and the matter would be followed through from there. I phoned the agent who told me it had been sold. So, I found who had signed to buy the property and asked if that person would forgo the contract for the sake of the school. He agreed. I then saw the Minister again and told him that I would buy the property on behalf of the school community. It was only \$8 000-odd for the house and a large block of land next door. However, the Minister agreed to buy it, which was how the school got that extra piece of land. I appreciate the concern expressed in the Minister's letter. We should give opportunities to school councils who do not push a political barrow.

The school council, as I said, wants to go through normal channels. They have done all the right things, yet they have ended up getting no consideration. There is an old saying, 'The waggon wheel that squeaks loudest and longest gets the most oil.' This school, and its changing committees, believe that that is not the case. They believe that, if they have a just cause, that should be considered. I am not talking about the present Government only: this also happened when the previous Government was in office.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I believe that we need to ensure that the system of priorities is fair.

Mr EVANS: As long as the Minister puts that into practice, I am quite happy.

The Hon. Lynn Arnold: I am.

Mr EVANS: The Eden Hills school has taken the kicks. While the Minister is here I will also mention Stirling East school. Its committee said that it did not need as many buildings as were planned for, and that it was prepared to take something less. Both Governments agreed that building

should proceed, but suddenly the Stirling East school was told it would be proceeding as a two-stage construction, whereas if the school had not said anything and used the necessary funds it would have been completed by now. I repeat that two schools in my district have been very responsible, but they have got the bad end of what one might call a bad deal.

Recently, a report has been made about the Belair Recreation Park. Although the park at present is mainly in the district of my colleague the member for Davenport, he has the land but not the people, as most of the people around that park live in my district. In the report suggestions are made for accommodation for tourism, and so on, but cyclists have been virtually ignored. That is in an area in which young people in particular should be able to ride a pushbike if suitable facilities are made available for them. There does not necessarily need to be cycle tracks or separate paths, just an area alongside the road, but no comment has been made in that report about such a provision. The cyclists group in that area is disturbed, and I do not blame those people.

One would think that in this day and age when we are trying to find healthy methods of relaxation, especially for young people, to develop their bodies and get out into the fresh air of the Hills instead of staying in the city hustle and bustle, those who worked on that plan should have given greater consideration to cyclists. I know that the plan is not very far advanced as yet, and that there are enough complaints and comments about it for corrections to be made to it and for consideration to be given to cyclists, but I am concerned that people who claim to have a knowledge of recreational needs of the community have overlooked this matter.

I turn now to the matter of natural gas. When Monarto was first planned provision was made for natural gas to be taken to that area. If the plan had proceeded, natural gas would have been piped to Murray Bridge as well. In the Mitcham Hills area people would appreciate a natural gas supply. We are trying to encourage the use of natural gas because of an uncertain future power supply, and the massive community of Stirling, Aldgate, and Bridgewater would welcome a natural gas supply. Why is the Government not encouraging the South Australian Gas Company to reticulate a gas supply to parts of the Stirling District Council area that is densely populated?

If one looks further ahead, Hahndorf and Mount Barker could be supplied also as both of those communities are growing rapidly, as one can see from published figures. If we are all taxed on the same basis in one community, natural gas should be available to everyone. I know that the gas company is not a Government agency, but surely the Government could influence that authority to supply gas to more communities. I will later be speaking about the benefits and savings to individuals using natural gas as opposed to electricity. I hope the Government will start looking at this subject so that it will have some answers when I pursue this matter further at a later date.

People living in the Hills accept that it is a difficult terrain in which to work when putting in roads, sewerage, and other facilities. However, some savings could accrue to the Government because communities like those in the Hills are usually very ready to do volunteer work, whether it be in the CFS, local community clubs, service clubs, the scouts or guides. A large percentage of the people living in the Hills are prepared to work voluntarily for the benefit of their communities and that is a saving to the Government. I would hope that the Government is looking at its priorities, and will realise that the Hills people are prepared to work to do things for themselves but also need some assistance

from the Government. I hope the present Government recognises their needs.

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN (Alexandra): A little over a week ago, on 2 August, His Excellency the Governor delivered a 6½ page speech to mark the opening of this Third Session of the Forty-Fifth Parliament. Before addressing this House in reply to his Speech, there is an important personal message that I wish to record. It is my last respects to the four Parliamentary colleagues who passed away between this and the last session: first, on 24 August 1983 Mr Harold Welbourn King, who was member for Chaffey from 1956 to 1962; second, on 30 October 1983 Mr Harold Howard O'Neill, who was member for Florey from 1979 to 1982; third, on 8 June 1984 Ernest Claude Allen, who was the member for Burra from 1968 to 1970 and member for Frome from 1970 to 1977; and the fourth, on 5 July 1984 Charles John Wells, who was the member for Florey from 1970 to 1979. To the families of those late colleagues I join with other members of the House in expressing my sympathy and condolences to them.

Parliamentary members from both Houses, senior members of the State Judiciary, and many invited guests crowded the benches of the Council and the corridors of that place to hear the opening Speech by His Excellency. We have learned to recognise that it is tradition for the Government of the day to prepare those speeches for such occasions. I have noted since coming into this place in the early 1970s that those speeches have become progressively padded with Party political propaganda and, indeed, as I have indicated under both political persuasions that tendency has occurred and persisted.

It is my view that the basic traditional practice should be returned to these important non-Party political ceremonies wherein the Governor is provided with a speech that identifies the legislative programme for the forthcoming period and incorporates the intentions or the directions the Government of the day proposes to take on important issues of public interest, but beyond that criterion there should be no further padding of the speech for the purposes that I have outlined. I am aware that it is inappropriate to refer to the Governor and/or the manner in which his speech is delivered, but clearly, when the preparation is the responsibility of the Government, the Government should heed the original intentions for which that occasion was designed and planned to achieve.

I wish to refer to several subjects during this address: the first was briefly mentioned by His Excellency when he indicated to the gathering on opening day that action had been taken to close the Port Lincoln abattoir. We are all aware of the problems that have surrounded the operation of that premise for many years. Some of us are well aware of the responsibilities that the Government has had in providing service facilities for isolated regions of the State but, be that as it may, my most recent concern for meat processing facilities in South Australia occurred the other day when I learned that \$2 million had been lost during the 1983-84 financial year by Samcor at Gepps Cross.

I asked the Premier in this House last week whether he would 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 that alleged \$2 million trading loss at these works during the 1983-84 financial year just ended. I went on to explain to the Premier that a strict policy of employee throughput ratio was introduced by the previous Government, indeed while I was Minister of Agriculture in South Australia, to avoid financial losses during periods of low and fluctuating livestock movement through our abattoir premises.

I went on further to explain that, following consolidation of Samcor's capital debt into the general revenue account by the Liberal Party when in Government in 1981, simultaneous instructions were given to the Samcor management board to employ and retrench and/or redeploy, whatever was applicable, the shop floor and proportional staff levels in accord with fluctuating livestock throughput. During the two years of that policy, 1981 and 1982, and again during the financial year 1982-83, with the support of the Samcor Board, and with supporting management, and also those employed at that premise during the period mentioned, a substantial profit was made in both years. More than \$500 000 trading profit was enjoyed, despite the fact that in the former year we were in the throes of a drought and in the latter year we were the first year out of the drought.

My concern surrounded the loss in the next year, which was in fact last financial year. I explained to the Premier that it was our understanding that my successor in Government (the Hon. Mr Chatterton) pursue vigorously the policy adopted by the Liberal Government immediately following the consolidation of the Samcor Gepps Cross account. I explained to him that it was imperative in all abattoir premises across the country during drought or fluctuating throughput periods that the number of employees was subject to a like fluctuation. The Premier did not understand the subject or, at least from the answer he gave to the House, he did not understand it. He apologised during the process of his reply for failing to identify appropriately certain employees at the works. He floundered through the rest of the reply. He neither denied the alleged \$2 million loss over the period outlined in my question nor did he explain why the Government had not vigorously pursued the proven policy.

The simple fact of the matter, whether in relation to the Samcor abattoirs or in any other abattoirs, is that the margins for processing red meat are so fine that one cannot afford, at management level, to employ staff unless there is work to be done. It should be understood that, when in Government, we entered into an arrangement with the AMIEU representative (Mr Arthur Tonkin) was that no shop floor men would be retrenched unless a proportionate number of white collar or PSA employees was redeployed or retrenched also. We adhered to that arrangement, while we were in Government, until November 1982. During our period of office we did not have a strike or an industrial hiccup and we enjoyed tremendous co-operation from the work force at the Samcor site. In accordance with our no-retrenchment policy, under the Tonkin Government we redeployed the white collar workers proportionately with the retrenchment of the shop floor workers, during seasonal fluctuation of livestock throughput and a trading profit was enjoyed.

It is disappointing to learn that the present Government, or particularly in this instance the Minister of Agriculture, has allowed the policy to relax so far as to incur this enormous 1983-84 trading debt. As a State we cannot afford this sort of public loss. As an administrative responsibility, I do not believe that the Minister of Agriculture either can afford that sort of failure, and it is extremely disappointing to me personally, because I am sure that members on both sides recognise the degree of interest and effort that was directed to straightening out the problems associated with Samcor abattoir operations in South Australia while we were in Government. I was pleased indeed to see the Hon. Mr Chatterton apply the vigour and attention to the subject that it deserved during his short stay in the Bannon Cabinet. Accordingly, it is extremely disappointing and disturbing to see a works of that calibre go down hill as it has under Minister Blevins in more recent times.

I do not wish to spend too much time going back over the situation that occurred at Port Lincoln a few months ago, but the same degree of insensitivity was applied by the

current Minister of Agriculture during the closing down of that works. I understand that he has not answered the questions asked of him by me, by other members of this House generally, and by the district council and the community of Port Lincoln in particular. The questions raised with the Minister were that he explain what he meant precisely by the Government's offer to help private enterprise occupy the Samcor site at Port Lincoln. He talked about this in his Ministerial statement to the House when announcing the pending closure of the works, but he has said nothing about it publicly since, and I understand that there are at least two submissions with the Government proposing to establish premises on the site, but neither of the investors making those submissions knows what is applicable by way of entry cost and what they may qualify for by way of regional industry development incentives. In fact, at this stage no-one knows whether those persons would have access to the existing land, the infra-structure or the other facilities currently on site. The latest I have heard is that the Government has issued instructions for the demolition of the premises at Port Lincoln to proceed. So much for the Port Lincoln works.

I now come to another abattoir that is located in that north-west region. The Stirling North abattoir closed on Friday last week. I have spoken with the management who have been involved in that business at Port Augusta as a family for 31 years. The Kingham family has put all that time into developing the business. More latterly, and especially since the enactment of the Meat Hygiene Act in 1982, the family has spent \$150 000 in upgrading the premises so as to continue to qualify for licence. Indeed, as a result of not yet completing compliance with the requirements demanded by the department in recent months, the family has run out of time, money and co-operation from the Minister of Agriculture, and has now even been run out of business. Together with the family's departure from that activity, about 15 employees are out of a job also. The business is closed and I understand that there is no likelihood in the foreseeable future of its re-opening. In the meantime, up to 10 butchers in Port Augusta and another in Whyalla, all of them erstwhile customers of the Stirling abattoir, have been required to obtain their beef from elsewhere. At a significant additional freight cost, they are obtaining meat from the Strathalbyn abattoir, on the butt of Fleurieu Peninsula.

It is about time that the Government got its act together and recognised that South Australia deserves a spread of meat processing facilities throughout its vast geographical area: not too many, not too few, but certainly enough to cater necessarily for the local trade and to avoid the extreme transport incurred over long distances. Altogether, it is clear that the present Minister of Agriculture has little or no interest in this subject. Members of the Port Augusta council and of the meat industry who were present at a deputation to a Minister last week were clearly unimpressed with his attitude, which is reported to have been one of 'couldn't care less'.

Indeed, he is quoted as saying that it is part of the hard cold business of the free enterprise system, that it is bad luck, that it is not his problem, and words to that effect. I think that, whilst I have been quiet in my criticism of the Minister of Agriculture since his recent appointment to that level, it is high time he lifted his game, applied himself in the field of agricultural servicing within this State, and shared his administrative time fairly between that portfolio and the others he has been given and not neglect the agricultural portfolio as clearly as has been demonstrated in recent times.

So much for the reports on recent closures and disturbing situations in which the proprietors and employees have been

placed on the West Coast. Added to that saga is yet another closure in the South-East. The MacPhersons have closed their business in that region and, again, whilst throughput, other business pressures, and the fine margins situation applies, undoubtedly in all of those late premises there is an element of intervention, unreasonable insensitive intervention, by the Government via its Meat Hygiene Authority. I will not quote names of officers of that Department given to me when their attitude towards the respective management has been cited, but clearly this is a problem with which the Minister must grapple, otherwise we will find more well-meaning essential meat processing premises in South Australia collapsing.

It may be the Government's objective for that to occur. Clearly, when we came into office in 1979 there was an ALP objective to centralise meat slaughtering to a relatively few premises in South Australia, have the product distributed throughout the rest of the community after processing and, in the interim, demolish the country slaughterhouse concept altogether. It has gone further than that, and we are now seeing what has been described as a vicious attack on certain abattoir proprietors.

So much for the subject of abattoirs for the time being, although members will hear more as time goes on because, clearly, others are in trouble and others will need assistance, co-operation and some patience from the Government in the coming months. Without it they will go down the shute in the same way as the unfortunate few that I have mentioned.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: Are you going to mention the unfortunate increase in tariffs on the *Troubridge*?

The Hon. TED CHAPMAN: I had in mind to use some of my time for that purpose. As I am prompted by the former Minister of Transport to do so, it might be an idea if I proceed in that direction forthwith. Members will recall my placing on notice a motion strongly opposing the space rate increase and operational cost recovery policy applicable to the m.v. *Troubridge* and its proposed replacement, as announced by the Minister of Transport on 18 April this year. In that motion, I call on the House to recognise that the 25 per cent increase in rates this financial year (1984-85) and the c.p.i. plus 10 per cent increase to apply each year thereafter until full cost recovery is achieved will cause considerable hardship and place an unfair and unprecedented burden on the residents of Kangaroo Island. I further canvass in the motion that this House call on the Government to rescind that charging policy and replace it with a schedule of space rates similar to those applying to other forms of mainland public transport over comparable distance.

I have raised that latter point several times in this House with the Minister in requesting him personally to recognise the sort of devastation that will occur within the Kangaroo Island community if he proceeds in the direction in which he has now proceeded. In response, he has challenged me to identify to the House the sort of undertakings about which I am talking. When was it, he said, that his predecessors in Government had made commitments along these lines? I have taken the trouble today to bring into the Chamber the information that the Minister has challenged me to provide. In fact, I go back to 5 April 1977, when Mr Keal, from the Department of Transport, and Mr Wildy, from the Department of Highways, attended a Kangaroo Island Transport Committee meeting in the absence of their Minister but committed the Minister in his absence. I quote from the minutes of that meeting the following paragraph:

The committee was advised that the Minister had already indicated that fares and freight rates would be aligned with other State Transport Authority rates and therefore the question of recovery of the capital costs of the new ship in this manner would not arise. The committee was further advised that it was not possible to indicate when fares and charges would be reviewed

but *Troubridge* (or replacement ship) charges would be considered at the same time as other rail and transport charges.

The officers went so far as to commit their Minister to that extent. At a subsequent meeting which the Minister attended the commitments made by his officers were raised with him and he confirmed to the Kangaroo Island Transport Committee that his Government of the day recognised that it was unfair to isolate the Kangaroo Island community from the rest of the highway linking system within South Australia. He went on to give a guarantee that the sea-linking service would be retained by his Government and the space rates charged would be aligned with other public transport charges applicable over comparable distances.

Following that commitment by the Minister and his officers to the Kangaroo Island community, the local transport committee, in conjunction with the two councils of the Island, took the initiative to write to the then Leader of the Opposition (David Tonkin), citing in their correspondence to him the commitment that had been given by the ALP Government and made a request for a similar commitment from the Opposition. As Leader of the Opposition, David Tonkin wrote back on 20 March 1978 and stated, amongst other things:

I can assure your council that in Government we will maintain a public sea link between Kangaroo Island and the mainland. This link would be a vehicular ferry service plying between Kingscote and Outer Harbor, with timetable and space adequate to cater for the movement of stock, machinery, merchandise, vehicles and passengers. Space rates would be comparable with other forms of mainland public transport over similar distances.

In fact, a year or so later when David Tonkin became Premier appointed Michael Wilson as his Minister of Transport, during the Liberal Government's term of office, upheld the undertaking previously given. That former Minister of Transport was also asked by the Kangaroo Island community to provide a re-affirmation in writing of the commitment, which he did. The important thing is that the bipartisan undertaking was honoured. On the Liberal Government's losing office in 1982, the councils, again pursuing this initiative, sought a similar undertaking from the current shadow Minister of Transport (Hon. Dean Brown), and it was given. His press release was couched in identical terms to those given previously by his colleagues. That was forwarded to the Kingscote council and was reported in the local newspaper, *The Islander*. Both Labor and Liberal Parties have upheld the undertaking given to provide a vehicular link with the island and the mainland and to provide a service to the community at space rates that are tied and similar to other forms of public transport over comparable distances on the mainland.

However, on 18 April this year the current Minister of Transport abdicated his inherited responsibilities. He threw those undertakings out of the window and adopted a policy of operational cost recovery from the users of the *Troubridge*. In regard to Australian transport systems that is unprecedented. However, undoubtedly, in due course the Minister will recognise the damage to the community which he has caused, and which will continue to occur.

Accompanying the Ministerial statement made to the Parliament in April was a report which was produced in January 1984 and which emerged from a committee set up in March 1983. The report identifies certain recommendations for Government consideration in regard to future transport services to Kangaroo Island. It identifies issues such as cargo, passengers and other matters that must be taken into account concerning catering for the future needs of the Kangaroo Island community. It identifies alternative services, Port Lincoln services, trailer ownership, a summary of future considerations and potential growth of the Island, using those as a basis for determining the recommended style and design of a replacement ship for the *Troubridge*.

The report goes on to refer to the condition of the *Troubridge*, its manning personnel, operational cost, possible savings, and existing revenue, and it provides a summary of these considerations as well as further detail associated with the summary of recommendations on page 3 of the report. The report also refers to the location of berthing facilities at Cape Jervis and Penneshaw where the new vessel *Philanderer III* will berth when providing its short link service with the island. The report further refers to the replacement vessel, its design, economic evaluation, the pricing policy, which I have raised, and one or two other padding matters.

I place on record my concern in regard to the contents of the tables provided on page 15 of the report. A committee preparing a report for Government needs to do its homework carefully and must base its calculations and predictions on well researched data. Matters relating to the potential growth of the Kangaroo Island community, production growth, and so on, are of major importance when endeavouring to ascertain future servicing requirements. However, it would appear that in this instance there has been a gross lack of attention to detail. The island is 430 000 hectares in area. About 66 per cent of the total area, that is, about 284 000 hectares, is privately owned broad-acre land. The remaining 34 per cent is occupied by Government authorities, including the National Parks and Wildlife reserves, town sites, road reserves, coastal reserves, and water and stone reserves and the reserves of the Department of Marine and Harbours.

Of the 284 000 hectares, which the report confirms is occupied by primary producers or which is broad-acre holdings, the report states that in 1983 the actual pasture area was 182 000 hectares, with the cropping area being about 22 000 hectares and that the area yet to be developed was some 80 000 hectares. However, it was predicted that within the next 17 years, to the year 2000, the area under pasture will increase to 250 000 hectares, that the cropped area will increase from 22 000 hectares to 34 000 hectares, and that after the year 2000 every single hectare of currently undeveloped land privately owned on the Island will be developed.

That is outrageous. The report then suggests that the 80 000 hectare additional area to be developed within that 17-year period will progressively need additional services provided in relation to it and recommendations are made accordingly in the new design, plans, etc. for the future shipping services. But the point here is that the compilers of the report have had no regard at all for the areas of broad-acre holdings that will never be productive, areas that will never be cleared on the volition of the landowners themselves, quite apart from those areas that landholders are unable to clear as a result of the native vegetation clearance regulations which came into force after the committee which compiled this report was set up. Somewhere along the line there has been a lack of inter-departmental communication and a lack of attention to the real scene as it exists on the island.

Again, it appears that this report has been undertaken in isolation of the real position in the field. I have not been able to check whether the determinations and recommendations of the committee rely substantially on the basic data referred to. However, in my view the credibility of the document is very much in question as a result of the apparent absence of homework apropos the groundwork material cited at page 15 of the report.

I now want to put on the record some details relating to the actual costs incurred by that community resulting from the vehicular ferry freighting service operating at the moment. One needs to bear in mind that with a vehicular ferry a cost is associated with the space occupied on the ship, as well as a cost associated with the vehicles occupying that space on which the goods are carted. As a result, the overall freight cost incorporates two components. It is fair when talking about freight costs from the mainland to Kangaroo

Island that those two factors are fairly cited and considered. However, the result is that, prior to the new operational cost recovery policy adoption from 1 July this year, it costs, for example, \$70 a tonne to transport groceries in bulk on the *Troubridge* from mainland South Australia to Kingscote. The same bulk load of groceries can be and is being transported between Adelaide and Melbourne for \$27 a tonne, and from Adelaide to Brisbane for \$68 a tonne. Indeed, those examples alone of that one essential commodity demonstrate that nowhere can one find a tonne-mile cost of transport as high, by sea, road or rail in this country, as the cost of transporting those items from Adelaide to Kingscote.

If one goes north to Darwin, as a further example, and looks at the sea transport system there, which may be said to be a fairer comparison with the freight system applicable to *Troubridge* carted goods from the mainland to Kangaroo Island, then over the distance of 600 miles from Darwin to Gove, the average cost of transporting bulk groceries is \$70 a tonne, and that is eight or nine times the distance from Adelaide to Kingscote.

In the case of Groote Island where there is a sea transport business between Darwin and that settlement, the average sea transport cost per tonne over the 700 mile distance is only \$80 per tonne. If one looks at some of the closer islands, such as Melville and Bathurst Islands, which are approximately the same distance from Darwin as Kingscote is from Port Adelaide, then one is looking at less than half the Island cost—about \$30 per tonne.

I turn now to one or two other commodities. I do not think anyone would deny that milk is an essential diet item in any community. Within the boundaries of South Australia, the metropolitan consumer price for milk is 64c a litre; Port Pirie, 66c; Port Augusta, 67c; Loxton, Berri and Waikerie, 67c; Woomera, 69c; Streaky Bay, 69c; Cleve, 68c; Cowell, 68c; Ceduna, 71c; Leigh Creek, 70c; Renmark, 66c; Mount Gambier, 66c; and Port Lincoln, 66c. However, only 70 sea miles away from Adelaide at Kingscote is 73c per litre.

Incorporated in that 73c a litre for milk at Kingscote is a component covering freight. Whilst some of the actual freight cost is picked up through the dairy levy rebate system (that is, a rationalised subsidy system covered by the dairy producers themselves), one finds that milk is 10c a litre dearer at Kingscote than it is at the vendor dispatch point here in Adelaide, and therefore dearer at Island consumer level than it is at any other consumer level within the boundaries of the State—indeed, even dearer than S.A. produced milk is at Broken Hill, New South Wales.

According to the supplier of that milk only last week the actual costs of freight per litre on milk to Kingscote is 15.125c per litre. Other than the Broken Hill case, I do not have any examples of how much it costs to send milk from one State to another because, other than from South Australia to the very competitive city of Broken Hill, very little milk is moved from one State to another. However, I did take the trouble to talk to people in Tasmania and I found that the maximum charge for milk at Flinders Island that is supplied from mainland Tasmania is 70c per litre. The actual cost of freighting the milk from Launceston to Tasmania—about 93 miles—is in fact 9c, and that is by air freight, not by boat freight.

Whilst talking about air freight, let us look at yet another example which demonstrates the extreme costs that are applicable to commodity freight between mainland South Australia and Kangaroo Island. Let us take the item of icecream. Icecream might be said to be not an essential product but it is a highly desirable product that is enjoyed by most people in Australia. The Kangaroo Island community can enjoy mainland produced icecream if they are prepared to pay for it. It in fact costs, via the *Troubridge*, 15.1c a litre to freight icecream 70 miles from Adelaide to

Kingscote, and now it costs more again if that icecream is subject to distribution to other outlets and centres beyond Kingscote on Kangaroo Island.

By 1988, Minister Abbott's new policy will increase the present space rate by 2.39 times which, if reflected on the icecream commodity freight, will cost more than 32c per litre to transport that product to Kingscote. The last container of ice cream despatched from South Australia to Saudi Arabia, by British Airways, cost less than 31c a litre to air freight.

I do not know how many of those examples one has to cite to demonstrate that a community, virtually at our back door, is being victimised by this Government as a result of its isolation and total dependence upon a sea-linking service in order to obtain essential goods and to despatch production items. Overall, we import about 60 000 tonnes of goods and we export about 60 000 tonnes of produce per annum. The basic reason why the costs have escalated is that the manning levels negotiated on that ship are completely out of hand. When the Government took over the m.v. *Troubridge* from the Adelaide Steamship Company a few years ago it inherited a manning level of 18 on board. Within a relatively short period, through negotiations with the various unions, the Labor Government had increased that manning level from 18 to 29.

Bearing in mind that that 29 on ship is duplicated by a further 29 on shore as a standby crew, that effectively means that there are 58 people on the pay-roll, for God's sake, to run a vehicular ferry over a 70-mile distance, quite apart from all the other supplementary employees who are engaged. And there are two agencies to run the one ship. Have honourable members ever heard of such a thing! When the Adelaide Steamship Company owned the ship, there was no duplicating of management. Now we have the Highways Department as the so-called caretaker administrative manager of the m.v. *Troubridge*. It is the only trading vessel that the South Australian Government owns, but the Highways Department indeed commands that important title. It is duplicated. Another agency, R.W. Miller and Company, at a cost of course, provides the operational management for that one ship. Collectively, those costs are going on.

When one looks at income and expenditure from this operation, one finds that there is approximately \$2 million annual income from the ship's space rate charges, but that \$2 million is absorbed in wages so that all the rest of the operational costs associated with the ship are identified as losses. On top of that, to rub salt into the wound, the Government repeatedly in its weak defence says, 'Oh, but we service Port Lincoln as well.' Indeed, that is a paying arm of the set-up.

Effectively, the Government is saying that the South Australian public is subsidising the Kangaroo Island community to the tune of \$1 million, \$2 million or \$3 million, or whatever is the accrued loss to at this point. Never at any stage does the Government look at pruning the cost. Now we find in this duck egg blue covered report to which I referred earlier that there is a recommendation to reproduce another vessel not unlike the *Troubridge* concept, preserving the vehicular ferry style (which is tremendous as a service facility), but it is a matter of who will pay if the ship is loaded with personnel and facilities we do not need, but also we cannot afford.

My view is that if the Government proceeds in this line with the new vessel it will fall into exactly the same trap as it is now in. Unless it adopts a policy of providing an adequate no frills freight service to Kangaroo Island and reduces the manning levels to the bare minimum, the community will be blessed with a Rolls Royce service it cannot afford to use. As far as I am concerned, the quicker the Government realises that, first, it is unprecedented and

unreasonable to insist upon a full operational cost recovery policy for the only such community in Australia (the Kangaroo Island community) and, secondly, that it should hasten to revise its attitude towards the required facilities to cope with the freighting of essential services in and out of that community, the better.

I hope that in doing that the Government has due regard, of course, to the movement of passengers: that it is totally satisfied with the movement of local and tourist passengers either via the new Peter March services, the four or five airline services that currently cater for the area and/or, if considered necessary, via a sea servicing link also. But, to try to continue to mix the two parcels—that is passengers with freight—on a ship of the design with which the Government is currently proceeding, as I said, will only result in a Rolls Royce service that no-one can afford to use.

A report went to the Minister the other day from the Kangaroo Island councils (the current Island Transport Committee) identifying the depth of concern that prevails in the community about the present Government's cost recovery policy. The report included details of the absence of sales of broad-acre properties in that community since Minister Abbott's announcement, and details of persons seeking to resettle in other areas of mainland Australia. I think that collectively it demonstrates clearly that this is not just a matter of temporary emotion; it is a matter of very deep concern and I make no apologies whatsoever for raising it in this place.

So, on that note, I urge the Minister who is present in the Chamber this afternoon to convey to his colleague (the Minister of Transport) that we are not joking about this issue. We are not just whinging about a problem without merit or justification; we are raising a matter through the most effective avenue that I can find to demonstrate to all members of Parliament that we are fair dinkum about our concern. Indeed, we want that cost recovery policy removed. Do not get me wrong, Mr Speaker. The Island community has never requested a service for nothing. It has never requested special treatment with respect to its freight requirements.

They have consistently asked for a continuity of service connection with the mainland on scheduled occasions which are appropriate to meet the markets and to ensure maximum loadings for the vessel that is plying over those waters and at rates similar to those applying to other forms of public transport covering comparable distances between centres on the mainland. It is not a matter of asking for unwarranted handouts or subsidies or services for nothing, but just a link with the rest of the community of which at this stage we are a part. We are prepared to pay a fair price for a fair service in return, but we are being absolutely ripped off at the moment with a potential for being driven out of business not only in the rural sector but at all other community levels.

The tourist industry is grossly disadvantaged as a result of the levels of charges that are being levied and potentially will be levied under this formula on the *Troubridge* operation, and if the Government itself sets a schedule of fees in accordance with those which currently prevail and those which are looming along the track, then obviously human nature dictates that the private sector providing passenger services will follow at or about those levels of charges, and we will find that with the die cast through the Government system, the private sector will seek to enjoy it—and that is understandable. The users, the consumers, my constituents, will suffer and I do not propose to let that occur if it can possibly be avoided.

That concludes my remarks on the two major subjects of the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech. I look

forward to the opportunity during the Appropriation debate to discuss several other issues also of importance.

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

Ms LENEHAN (Mawson): I support the motion, and in so doing will discuss several issues both specific to my district and general to the people of South Australia.

The first issue that I would like to talk about is a group which was formed within my district, called the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed group. I think it is significant that I talk about this group because I think that this is possibly one of the best success stories that I can discuss in respect of my own area. The first public meeting was held on 22 November last year, and I was fortunate enough to be asked to chair it. At that meeting the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed group came into being and it started with a small group of 11 people. It moved into the Job Seekers site, which was situated at this stage behind the Noarlunga CYSS. At that time it organised a street market which comprised 30 stalls and which has been operating on every second Sunday in each month.

The Noarlunga Mature Unemployed group recently applied for an extension to 50 stalls, and I believe that application will be heard by the local council in the coming week. In March this year the group moved into the Southern Area Behaviour Unit known as Karuna, which is situated on the corner of Beach Road and South Road at Morphet Vale, and at that stage the food co-operative was commenced.

This food co-operative began with four families and this is the ninth week in which it has operated; 126 families are now registered with the co-operative. I think it is significant to look at a breakdown of the people involved in using the services of a locally organised food co-operative. The figures that have been presented to me by the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed state that 31 per cent of the users are unemployed, 36 per cent are sole supporting parents, 27 per cent are invalid and widowed pensioners, 4 per cent are age pensioners and 2 per cent are on low incomes. I think that the figures speak for themselves. Quite obviously this is an area in which something like a food co-operative is not only desirable but absolutely necessary for people who live there. The Noarlunga Mature Unemployed is presently undertaking the formalities of incorporating with Job Seekers, at Noarlunga, and I believe this will take place from 1 September this year. There will then be 180 families involved in the joint Noarlunga Mature Unemployed and Job Seekers project in the area.

When it became apparent that the premises at the corner of South and Beach Roads were not adequate, as a result of the support and the prompt action of the Minister of Housing and Construction a disused depot of the Housing Trust in Honeypot Road, Christie Downs was made available. This is extremely significant because this site has enabled the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed project not only to continue its operation but also to expand. Through the Community Response Team in the local area, a further project was introduced: namely, to establish a garage and workshop facility on the complex. At present this is working successfully with about four cars a day being serviced.

Regarding the food co-operative, it is important to mention the role played by the Community Response Team officer. As there are two Community Response Team people involved with the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed, I wish to pay tribute to the Minister of Community Welfare, whose foresight was the driving force behind the establishment of Community Response Teams. As a satisfied local member, I can only say that the Community Response Teams are working extremely well in the southern community. It seems that the food co-operative has the potential not of just

remaining in the hands of the Community Response Team co-ordinator: but the co-operative itself is looking to become self-sufficient and self-supporting and to be able to fund through the generation of its own funds a co-ordinator, a driver and clerical workers who at present are drawn from volunteers in the community.

It would seem that a mature unemployed group that could establish itself in November 1983 and is now running an extremely successful support organisation involving a food co-operative, which is a worker co-operative, and a garage co-operative is something that could be used as a model for other groups in South Australia. I was delighted to hear the Deputy Premier, as Minister of Labour, talk about the introduction of worker co-operatives in South Australia. I wholeheartedly support such a move and will give the Deputy Premier information about what has happened in my district and the success with which the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed group has introduced its own worker co-operative.

I now turn to another issue that concerns not only my constituents, although it concerns many of them, I must say with great sadness. The subject of rape law reform concerns South Australians right across the spectrum. I pay a public tribute to Dr Ngairé Naffin who, through the office of the Women's Adviser, has produced a report entitled *An Inquiry into the Substantive Law of Rape*. This report is a detailed and thorough report that examines the substantive law of rape and makes a series of recommendations to the Government on reform in the area of rape and associated crimes.

I do not intend this afternoon to deal in great detail with the report, because it has now been around in the community for two months. In fact, on 28 July the final submissions were to be called for by the Attorney-General's Department and I eagerly await the summary of the community response to the Naffin Report. I would, however, take the opportunity to refer to literature that has been circulated by the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre in respect of the issues raised in the report and, indeed, issues raised generally in the community.

The Rape Crisis Centre, in its covering letter, clearly outlines the situation that exists currently and also particularly supports one of the recommendations of the Naffin Report. I quote from this letter from the Rape Crisis Centre:

... the Crown is required to prove, in the first instance, that intercourse took place without the consent of the victim. It is a defence for the accused to argue that he honestly and reasonably believed that the victim was consenting. He must persuade the jury, on the balance of probabilities, of his honest and reasonable belief.

The Rape Crisis Centre has strongly supported this option, which has been put forward as one of a series of options by Ngairé Naffin in her report. This, if it were to be adopted by the Government and introduced or translated into legislation, would be a radical and extremely reforming implementation into the legal system in South Australia. The information from the Rape Crisis Centre goes on to talk about the Naffin Report. I totally agree with the comments that I am about to read. It states:

The Naffin Report deals with the substantive law of rape, not evidentiary or procedural law. Major changes are needed in these other areas of rape law in, for example, the corroboration warning and the use of the unsworn statement by rapists.

The report deals with what rape is, what we as a society define rape to be. Its single most important proposal is for changes to the role of consent in defining 'rape', and this is where the major thrust of discussion will revolve, both in the community and subsequently within this Parliament. It is important in looking at the redefinition of 'rape' to look at some of the figures that the Rape Crisis Centre has provided. The Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre dealt with 541 reports of rape of women and children during the 1983 calendar year. It found that women who had been raped

were often uncertain whether they had been raped in terms of the legal process because they had not actively resisted. In the experience of the Rape Crisis Centre this was one of the major factors that prevents women from reporting to the police the incidence of rape and pre-empts justice from being done for them.

I will read something that summarises some of the community attitudes towards rape, but before I do so it is important that we look at one of the proposals that have been put forward. The report recommends that 'rape' be defined by whether or not the woman consents and not by whether the rapist believes or cares that she has not consented. It says:

It recommends that the intention to rape no longer be included in the definition of rape. Penetration without consent, largely irrespective of the intentions of the rapist, is what 'rape' is.

This change will bring rape into line with other sexual offences such as incest, gross indecency and unlawful sexual intercourse, in which the intentions of the accused are not the only defining factor. This change will bring the advances in women's status in society into the legal definition of 'rape'.

The system of graded sexual offences, which was recently introduced into New South Wales, is believed to have led to a marked increase in convictions, with guilty pleas significantly increasing at the committal stage. The proportion of complaints accepted by police has also increased, and there has been a corresponding increase in the number of women reporting rape to the police. The Rape Crisis Centre states in its letter that these results alone are sufficient grounds for introducing graded offences for rape into South Australia.

I conclude my quotation of what has been put out to the community by the Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre by citing the last paragraph.

The Adelaide Rape Crisis Centre calls on the Attorney-General to translate the recommendations of the Naffin Report into legislation and to enact the new rape laws as a matter of priority when the Parliament resumes.

I would like to take this a little further: while I support the call of the Rape Crisis Centre, I also think that it is important that we as a Parliament and as a community do not see that the reforming of our legislation is the only way in which we will obtain justice for victims of rape, both adults and children, and also for people who are victims—and, of course, it is mostly women—of domestic violence. We must see a mass education programme in the community to dispel myths that surround rape and to re-educate the community to the feelings of the victim in respect to this heinous crime. Attitudes and prejudices cannot be eliminated by the legislative pen and this is something that we as a Parliament must bear in mind. To change the laws is only the first step in bringing about justice for those many people in our community who believe very sincerely that they have been denied justice under the present law by the way in which it has been implemented and by its outcomes.

I conclude this section by saying, first, that I eagerly await and look forward to the report that the Attorney-General will bring down about community response to the Naffin Report. I quote from a document that is circulating in Adelaide at the moment. It is interesting because it really highlights the biases and prejudices that many members of the community have about rape. Entitled, 'Was he asking for it?', it reads:

Q. 'Mr Smith, you were held up at gun point on the corner of Hindley and King William Street?'
'Yes'.

Q. 'Did you struggle with the robber?'
'No.'

Q. 'Why not?'
'He was armed.'

Q. 'Then you made a conscious decision to comply with his demands rather than resist?'
'Yes'.

Q. 'Did you scream? Did you cry out?'
'No. I was afraid.'

Q. 'I see. Have you ever been held up before?'
'No.'

Q. 'Have you ever given money away?'
'Yes, of course.'

Q. 'And you did so willingly?'
'What are you getting at?'

Q. 'Well, let's put it like this, Mr Smith. You've given money away in the past. In fact you have quite a reputation for philanthropy. How can you be sure you weren't contriving to have your money taken by force?'
'Listen, if I wanted—'

Q. 'Never mind. What time did this hold-up take place?'
'About 11 p.m.'

Q. 'You were out on the street at 11 p.m.? Doing what?'
'Just walking.'

Q. 'Just walking? You know that it's dangerous being out on the street that late at night. Weren't you aware that you could have been held up?'
'I hadn't thought about it.'

Q. 'What were you wearing?'
'Let's see—a suit. Yes, I was wearing a suit.'

Q. 'An expensive suit?'
'Well—yes. I'm a successful lawyer, you know.'

Q. 'In other words, Mr Smith, you were walking around the streets of Adelaide late at night in a suit that practically advertised the fact that you might be a good target for some easy money; isn't that so? I mean, if we didn't know better, Mr Smith, we might even think that you were asking for this to happen, mightn't we?'

Although there is a little bit of humour in what I have just done to try to add some balance and perspective to what is an extremely emotional issue, what I have just read out highlights some of the myths that are prevalent in our community with respect to women and rape.

Turning to another issue which is not quite as emotional but which probably in some other ways could be considered to be a fairly emotive issue—that is, the area of tourism—I refer specifically to the ways in which South Australia can increase its share of the Japanese tourism market. I recently visited Japan, and I refer to a report that I have just presented to the Government in respect to that recent visit.

My report is entitled 'Increasing the Japanese tourism market to South Australia—observations and recommendations'. It is important that we seriously consider the potential of the Japanese tourism market because, in the time I was there (and I spoke to a wide range of people while I was in Japan), I found that one consistent thought kept coming through, namely, that there was wide acknowledgement by the Australian representatives in Japan that a definite tourism market existed from Japan to South Australia, in particular to Adelaide. Specific identification of that market has been done with respect to women in the age group of 20 to 35 years and also to the ever-increasing number of honeymoon couples. This has been thoroughly and conclusively documented in the report on the Japanese tourism market to Australia produced by our Travel Centre.

However, several obstacles presently prevent this unique and large potential from being directly translated into an appreciable increase in Japanese tourists visiting South Australia. First, there is a lack of awareness by Japanese people of Adelaide and the wide range of tourist attractions and facilities in South Australia. Part of this lack of awareness of Adelaide as a tourist destination can be attributed to the fact that Adelaide has not been widely included in tourist packages to Australia because of its relative inaccessibility when compared to other capital cities, particularly on the east coast of Australia. There is no direct flight from Tokyo to Adelaide, and the cost of domestic fare and the distance from Sydney and Melbourne are obvious reasons for this

inaccessibility. The question of easy access is particularly relevant as the average tour package from Japan is between seven and nine days.

I have made some recommendations about how we could increase the awareness and the accessibility of South Australia as a tourist destination for Japanese tourists. The obvious correlation between increasing the awareness of Adelaide and South Australia as a tourist destination and the provision of easy and affordable access cannot be overstressed. However, in my discussions with Qantas, both domestic airlines and the Australian Tourism Commission, it became apparent that, whilst the airlines are happy to promote travel to Adelaide, they are obviously looking for sufficient numbers of visitors to make any new initiatives economically viable. It is a 'chicken and egg' situation. They are not prepared to introduce direct flights or look at special packages domestically unless they can be assured that it will be economically viable. From the perspective of Japanese wholesalers and travel agents, the inclusion of Adelaide and other places in South Australia must, among other factors, depend on accessibility, given the short period of tours to Australia. Ideally, achieving an increasing awareness in the Japanese market of Adelaide as a desirable place to visit should coincide with the provision of flexible tourism packages, including direct access from Tokyo.

I have then gone on to list several strategies on the way in which we can implement these suggestions. The first strategy in achieving the objective of increasing South Australia's share of the Japanese tourism market would be to set a realistic target of the number of visitors to South Australia from Japan. I have suggested that, as 1986 is South Australia's 150th Jubilee year, it would seem an appropriate target year, particularly in view of the proposed completion date of the Adelaide Railway Station development project, with its convention centre facilities. Obviously, in establishing such a target figure, close consultation between the Government, the Department of Tourism, the Australian Tourism Commission and, most importantly, the tourism industry in South Australia would need to occur. I have gone on to make specific recommendations, and I will elaborate on a couple of them.

One of the things which has already taken place and which I believe is a great step forward in the right direction is the production by Japanese nationals of a high quality travel brochure in Japanese being released very soon, if not already released. I had the privilege of seeing a draft copy of the brochure whilst in Tokyo. It was of extremely high quality and was very explicit, and it will do much to promote South Australia in the Japanese market. This must be followed by the holding of seminars and workshops for the Japanese travel industry. I have suggested to the Travel Centre that the audio visual presentations we now have entitled 'Enjoy South Australia', and the campaign material surrounding those presentations, could easily be adapted by a talk-over in Japanese. I would thus not see this as a major source of expense to the Government.

I also believe that the Government should continue to subsidise selective groups of travel agents, travel journalists and convention and specific interest group organisers from Japan. It must be noted that 95 per cent of Japanese tourists book through an agent. I have made several other specific recommendations, one being promotional targeting to single women in the 20 to 35 year age group, to honeymoon couples and to special interest groups. We must also continue to promote Adelaide as a desirable convention centre for international conventions. This has already been undertaken through the Convention Bureau.

So far I have concentrated on only one half of the story. If South Australia is going to compete effectively with many other tourist destinations throughout the world for the Jap-

anese market, it is essential that we must do certain things, which I will now explain. First, the interests and needs of the Japanese tourist must be clearly identified and the quality of our tourism product at all levels must be of a significantly high standard. Some examples would include the provision of, first, a reception welcoming group with proper interpreting facilities; secondly, easily contactable and available Japanese speaking guides; and, finally, the use of multi-language tapes, which would include Japanese, on organised tours. Tapes and small portable tape recorders could be hired for a reasonable charge. Such a facility operates effectively in other major tourist cities, such as Paris and London.

Another idea that warrants some discussion, if we are seriously going to cater for the needs and interests of the Japanese tourist market, is that it is both desirable and necessary for South Australian tourist operators to visit Japan and meet with a wide cross-section of the Japanese travel industry. To this end, the South Australian Government could take a lead in facilitating this visit by tourism promoters in South Australia. I refer specifically to tourism promoters from the Flinders Ranges, Kangaroo Island, Port Lincoln and the South-East.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Coober Pedy.

Ms LENEHAN: Yes, indeed; Coober Pedy opal tours are gaining in popularity. It is also essential that the tourism industry in South Australia respond quickly and creatively to specific Japanese interests and fads. To illustrate this point, in my report I have talked about the craze (which I found in Japan and which I believe is still there) for the Australian frilled-neck lizard. I phoned the Cleland Conservation Park to ascertain whether it would be possible to ensure that there was some frilled-neck lizards in the park so that we could promote it as a home not only for the lizard but also for other popular Australian native animals, such as the koala, the wombat and the kangaroo.

I believe we should also look at providing for specific Japanese zoos some of our animals which perhaps are not very well known now but which may become more well known and result in 'fads' developing in relation to them. We have seen what has occurred in relation to the koala and now in relation to the frilled-neck lizard. Already there is a degree of interest in the wombat. This is an idea that we must pick up and use creatively both in Japan and here in Adelaide.

I will not canvass my discussion in my report about our future presence in Japan, because I think that that has been fairly widely done in the community. I believe the Minister will make a statement in the near future about what is the best form of representation for South Australia in Japan. However, I undertook a range of discussions about this issue with numerous people. It is not a simple issue, but one that we will have to look at very carefully in relation to the sort of presence that we seek in Japan.

I have called a section of my report 'New Directions', and I think it is worth pursuing. I think we should look very seriously at establishing a sister State relationship with one of the Japanese prefectures. I discussed this matter in some detail with people whom I met in Japan. I believe that the benefits for South Australia in establishing such a relationship are apparent both from our own experience of the sister city relationship with Himeji City and from the Western Australian experience of its sister State relationship with the Hyogo prefecture. Apart from the obvious benefits of generally raising awareness within each State or city, there is also the benefit of establishing direct Government, commerce and tourism links.

I believe that these negotiations should proceed in line with Japanese protocol (whereby one cannot hurry), which takes time. Perhaps the culmination of those discussions could be a joint announcement and visit to South Australia

by a delegation from the chosen sister State during our celebrations in 1986. In my conclusion and recommendations I have recommended that we must press (and I believe this should be done right across South Australia on a bipartisan basis) for the introduction by 1986 of a direct Qantas/Japan Air Lines flight between Adelaide and Tokyo.

The Hon. Jennifer Adamson: Hear, hear!

Ms LENEHAN: I will be harangued by—

Mr Mayes interjecting:

Ms LENEHAN: The member for Hanson will not, but the shadow Minister of Tourism will support it. I believe that we should also be looking at providing promotional funding for the continuing subsidy of Japanese travel agents and other special interest groups to South Australia. Another innovation could be the joint sponsoring, together with perhaps the international airlines and local tourism promoters, of the establishment of a prize to be offered at peak viewing time in Japan on one of the television quiz programmes. I believe that the Western Australian Government already does this and that it has done an enormous amount to increase the awareness of the Japanese in relation to Western Australia.

I also recommend that we should use our 'Enjoy South Australia' campaign material to highlight the prize in respect of getting information about what one can win. In regard to the millions of people who, of course, do not win the prize, we would still be getting to that audience, involving very little cost, particularly if Qantas and/or the domestic airlines, together with some of the South Australian tourism operators and the Government, were prepared to be involved. I believe that there is a wide appreciation throughout the political spectrum and the community of the need to increase our share of the Japanese tourism market. I look forward very confidently to seeing this take place. I believe that we must work together on both sides of the House, with the tourism operators and the Travel Centre to ensure that we achieve a realistic target by 1986.

I now turn to the final matter about which I will speak this evening. I cannot let this opportunity pass without referring to a matter that I believe to be of incredible importance. I began my speech by talking about the problems of mature age unemployed people in my area and about some of the various positive solutions which the Noarlunga Mature Unemployed have devised and implemented. I now refer to the other end of the spectrum, to children and young people. I feel that I must set the record straight in respect of some of the misinformation that somehow has found its way into the community in relation to the proposals made about Early Childhood Services.

I am not simply getting involved with this issue at the last minute: I have been involved with it for 18 years. It is an issue that is very dear to my heart and one in which I have been involved as a parent and a teacher, and now as a member of Parliament. I had the opportunity of meeting with Marie Coleman, who produced the Coleman Report, on several occasions when she was in Adelaide. Indeed, I made a personal submission to her while she was here. I think her report is excellent. I believe that she has gone to the absolute heart of the problem, clearly identifying the strengths of the provision of children's services in this State while very clearly articulating and highlighting the weaknesses involved. I want to congratulate the Government on being prepared by and large to pick up and implement the recommendations made by Marie Coleman, which I believe are extremely valid and good recommendations.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: No-one said they weren't.

Ms LENEHAN: The Government has picked them up and is going to implement them in the form of establishing a Children's Service Office. When considering some of the

background of the discussion taking place at the moment it is important that we realise that the public submissions made to Marie Coleman, as evidenced in her report, indicated widespread agreement with her assessment of the problems in this field, and widespread support for effective co-ordination between the various services.

I will not take up the rest of my time with elaborating on all the recommendations in the report or with pursuing all of the arguments that have now become quite prevalent in the community. Suffice to say that the Government has never had any intention of in any way downgrading the excellent educational facilities provided for pre-school education in South Australia through the office of the Kindergarten Union. Rather, it is my understanding from discussion with the Minister and other members of the Government that it is the Government's intention to increase child care facilities and services to a level commensurate with services presently being delivered in the pre-school education area.

I think it is absolutely mischievous (and I am being charitable and contained when I say that) to suggest that somehow the kindergartens will be turned into *de facto* child-minding centres and that we will see everyone within the age group 0-5 running around in the same area. That has never been the intention of Marie Coleman or of anyone to whom I have spoken who is intimately involved in this issue. Indeed, I believe that the establishment of the new Children's Service Office will enable a greater rationalisation of resources to occur and will not result in a diminution of resources. I do not believe for a moment that we will see resources being taken away from the kindergartens. Parents have written to me asking what will happen to their parent funds next year, as if someone is going to do an amazing raid and remove all the funds presently held in parent body funds. This is absolute rubbish; this is not happening.

The Hon. Michael Wilson: What is going to happen?

Ms LENEHAN: What I understand will happen is what the Premier, the Minister of Education and everyone else have outlined: with the establishment of this office they will be carefully examining, in consultation with all the service providers presently in the area of children's services, the establishment of a model which will do all of the things that Marie Coleman recommended in her report, that is, to redress the problems in child care, to redress the problems of lack of co-ordination, of services not knowing what each other is doing, of people in areas not knowing what is available. Where do they get the information? They do not know what is available, and co-ordinating these services seems to me a perfectly reasonable and rational approach.

Members of the Opposition have pre-empted the findings of this group that is being set up to look into the establishment of an Office of Children's Services and have put out misinformation into the community, which is most regrettable. Many parents have been made to fear something which will be of great benefit to this community in the future. Once again, I congratulate the Government on the initiatives it has taken. It is not rushing into it and setting it up in five minutes. If it did that, it would be criticised. The fact that the Government is not doing that is being criticised, because it is being said it has not dotted every 'i' and crossed every 't'. It seems to me to be a no win situation. If one goes about a thing in a logical and responsible matter, one is criticised; if one rushes into something to get the thing into place to redress problems that exist, one is criticised for being too hasty. What is happening is the correct procedure, and we will see in the future that this is the way to go. There is widespread community support for these initiatives. I conclude my reply to the Governor's Speech at this point.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): It is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to join in and support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. However, I regret that in so doing I must record my condolences to the families of Harry King, Howard O'Neill, Claude Allen, and Charlie Wells. Members would be well aware that Harry King was a former member for Chaffey who entered this Parliament in 1956 and contributed a great deal for that community, not only here as the member for Chaffey but also in his involvement in the community before entering this place and after his retirement from Parliament. His great contribution to the citrus industry will be remembered for a long time to come.

I had the privilege of serving with Howard O'Neill, Claude Allen and Charlie Wells in this Parliament through their time in this place. I also had the privilege of sharing a room with Claude Allen for two years from 1968 to 1970, and during that time I certainly got to know him extremely well. The comments that were made a fortnight ago in relation to Claude were well founded and totally supported by the whole of the House. I also had the privilege of knowing Howard O'Neill and Charlie Wells quite well and of working with them for a considerable period of time in this place. These deaths were a sad loss to the community.

I turn now to the contents of His Excellency's opening Speech as presented by the Government. The Speech is notable for what it does not say in that I can find no new initiatives, no significant new capital works programmes for the State, and, certainly in the areas that I am vitally concerned about (that is, in relation to water resources and the fishing industry), there is virtually no mention whatsoever. However, a small mention in His Excellency's Speech at paragraph 21 states:

Construction is continuing on the Morgan water filtration plant—the first plant in a programme to provide filtered water to the northern parts of the State. It is expected that it will be completed in 1987.

That is fine as far as it goes, because the Government and the Minister would be well aware that the Morgan filtration plant is only part of a filtration system, an integrated water distribution system, for the northern part of the State, and it is essential that, for the system to work effectively and provide filtered water, a further filtration plant be built on the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline. Otherwise it cannot be guaranteed that totally filtered water will be delivered to all parts of the north. If this is so, one still runs the risk of the dreaded *naegleria fowleri* and amoebic meningitis being present in the system.

One can well recall the comments and statements by the present Government in early 1980, when we were cursed with a further case of amoebic meningitis at Whyalla. Unless the Government proceeds with all haste not only to complete the Morgan filtration plant but to get on with the job of building the Swan Reach to Stockwell pipeline filtration plant, no guarantee can be given to the people of the northern areas of South Australia that they will be safe from amoebic meningitis, apart from the fact that it will still have the problem of contributing a certain amount of turbid water to the distribution system of the North.

Unfortunately, the Government has not seen fit to even mention the second half of that programme. The preliminary stages of design were under way in the E & WS Department in 1982, and the lack of comment or mention of that important project indicates to me that the Government regards it as not having a very high priority. It is a sad day for the people of northern South Australia, because it is essential that the State Government is in a position to guarantee to those people that they will be free of any threat of amoebic meningitis; otherwise they will continue to live

under that threat until the Swan Reach to Stockwell water filtration plant is operational.

Also in paragraph 21, His Excellency indicated that the Government was continuing with the Happy Valley water filtration plant: that is fine. It is claimed that the programme for the construction of that plant is still on schedule but once again, no new initiative is indicated, no mention of if and when the programme will be completed, and one has to remember that beyond Happy Valley there is still Myponga which has to be built ultimately to adequately service the southern parts of the metropolitan area. The other point mentioned in that paragraph is this:

My Government has also been negotiating with the Government of Victoria in 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 agreements reached will be put before you this session.

I am pleased to see that that matter has finally reached fruition and that a Bill will soon be presented to Parliament. But, once again, it is not a new initiative: it is an area which has been worked on and in which negotiations have taken place since the early 1980s, before the present Government was elected to office.

I am also concerned that there has been no indication of any new initiative from the Government about what it intends to do in the interests of the people of this State with respect to a better quality of water. Unfortunately, a number of towns have been classified on the list of uneconomic water schemes, such as Coffin Bay, South End and American River, to name a few. If there is any truth in what we have heard about the programme funded by Community Employment Scheme moneys being deferred or abandoned, it will be an absolute disaster for people in communities such as Coffin Bay. I hope to goodness that there is no validity in that suggestion.

I was extremely pleased, knowing the background of the uneconomic water supply schemes that need to be built in South Australia, to hear that a method has been devised which will enable some of those schemes to be built. I will be very disappointed if the proposal is deferred or if the funds that were to have come from the Commonwealth Government are now to be channelled in some other direction. I can also imagine the disappointment and the attitude of people in those small communities who have been waiting for many years for a reticulated water supply.

I have looked carefully through His Excellency's Speech but I can find no mention of the fishing industry. Yet, we are all aware of the dilemma with which that industry is confronted at this moment, particularly the tuna fishing industry, which has an enormous capital investment. It has been acknowledged that there are something like 140 vessels in the tuna industry. I totally support the comments made by the Minister of Fisheries in this State in relation to the new tuna fishing rules that were announced recently. A quota has been set of 14 500 tonnes for the tuna catch for the coming year, but at the same time size limits have been completely abolished. Most of the people in the tuna industry in South Australia with whom I have spoken are appalled by that decision. They recognise the impact that it will have on their industry in the longer term. There is no doubt that, if the industry is able to continue to develop the sashimi market in Japan, it will give South Australia an added advantage over and above the other States.

It was with interest the other day that I looked at works being undertaken on a vessel on the slips at Port Lincoln. Modifications were being made to the vessel to incorporate the latest in refrigeration equipment so that the owners of the vessel can more effectively go out and catch large quantities of tuna, particularly for the sashimi market which, I

understand, is the most profitable part of the tuna industry at this stage.

But the fact is that the dilemma facing the tuna industry was not mentioned or recognised by the Government in His Excellency's opening Speech, which concerns me, because the problem will not go away. I recognise that the Minister of Fisheries in South Australia has a problem on his hands, but I certainly believe that it is up to the Government to do what it can, in association with other State Governments and the Federal Minister (Mr Kerin), in an endeavour to overcome the problem and resolve it in the long-term interests of the fishing industry in Australia, because it is a valuable and important industry, particularly to South Australia. If stocks are run down by allowing fishing of what we classify as undersized fish in this State, obviously the catch will have to drop below the quota of 14 500 tonnes allocated for this year. In the not too distant future we will see that drop even further, which will mean that more and more vessels will not be viable and those persons involved in the fishing industry will find that their catch will be far below a viable level.

As was pointed out in Port Lincoln recently, some of the vessels require something like a 500 tonne quota to make them viable, but they are being allocated quotas of around 200 tonnes. So, this is a very real problem with which the Government has to grapple, and I support the comments made by the Minister of Fisheries. However, I believe that more must be done than simply making comments. It is a matter of coming to grips with the problem to resolve it, which can only be done on a national basis by involving other State Governments and the Federal Minister.

Recently, the Government released the report of the steering committee which was set up to look into redevelopment of the Riverland. It is an interesting report and I believe it is one that should be read by all members of Parliament, because when one considers some of the comments and statements that have been made in this place by people such as the Premier and other Ministers and the manner in which the problems of the Riverland have been reported in the media, one realises that they have done nothing to help the situation in that area.

The Premier has stated that the taxpayers of South Australia are sick and tired of subsidising the people in the Riverland. When one reads this report one sees how inaccurate that type of statement is. Even though there has been a contribution of something like \$30 million by the taxpayers of this State to the Riverland Cannery, taken over a period of years and in relation to the total scene it becomes a comparatively small item when seen in the context of the contribution that that area makes to the total economy of South Australia. I will read a portion of the report to the Government:

The Riverland region is an important area of the State in terms of population, employment and its contribution to the economy. . . . The annual gross value of Riverland horticultural production is around \$100 million and after multiplier effects are considered the value of income generated in the region by fruit-growers alone is around \$250 million to \$350 million per year.

Over 2 000 fruit growers are solely or partly dependent on fruit growing for their livelihood and the Riverland community is largely dependent on horticulture and its associated processing industries and infrastructures.

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

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As I was saying before dinner, it is worth considering that the level of production in the Riverland is about \$350 million a year, generated purely from horticulture. The report continues:

The next largest income earner for the region is tourism which generates income of the order of \$30 million per year.

So one is looking at a total figure not far short of \$400 million a year generated in the Riverland. The report further states:

It is difficult to determine the total value of production derived from the Riverland region. What is known is that horticultural crops are the largest contributors, providing an estimated 'gross value' in 1981-82 of \$111.2 million. Grapes contributed \$44.45 million, citrus \$35.75 million, apricots \$12.77 million and vegetables an estimated \$11.35 million. The gross value of the State's fruit and vegetable production in 1981-82 was \$201.83 million, and the total gross value of agricultural production was \$1 288.69 million. The Riverland thus produces 55 per cent of the State's fruit and vegetable production by value, and 8.6 per cent of the value of total agricultural production.

That figure is significantly higher than the average person in South Australia would have imagined it to be. Careful note should be taken of it by all members in this Parliament because, when the Parliament is considering projects such as the redevelopment of the irrigation headworks, one has to consider that in the total context of the value that the Riverland region contributes to the economy of South Australia. I reiterate that the Riverland produces 8.6 per cent of the value of the total agricultural production in South Australia. That is a very significant item indeed.

So we are talking about a sum of close to \$400 million generated in that area. By the same token, even though the area is generating close to \$400 million, when one takes into account the difficulties under which that region is producing that vast amount of money, it is incredible that the area is performing as well as it has performed. I now refer to some of the problems with which the area has to cope. Most of the problems to which I will refer are the direct result of Government intervention in one way or another or of inaction by either the State or Federal Government. I refer to a paper presented in the Riverland in February of this year by the Chairman of the Australian Dried Fruits Association Board of Management, Mr Henry Tankard. In his paper the Chairman made the following comment:

In spite of the gains in production efficiency our production costs have raised upwards. We are compelled to pay substantially more for all product inputs—labour, fuel, chemicals, irrigation costs, etc. For most other Australians, cost increases are almost automatically adjusted for—more wages, increased fuel prices, etc. But for those involved in producing the primary product from which all other opportunity stems—the community demands that we meet the heat in our market of competing goods that flood in from countries with sweated labour, or are propped up by massive subsidies that result in selling prices unrelated to the real cost of producing and the marketing of the goods.

There is no better example than the dried vine fruit products in Greece, which is supported by the common agricultural policy of the European Economic Community. The subsidy component of the selling price exceeds \$800 a tonne. This subsidy is more than Australian growers expect to receive for their 1983 and 1984 crops when they are ultimately sold into a fiercely priced competitive market.

I am pleased to be able to say that the Federal Government has taken temporary measures in relation to this problem. It has imposed a countervailing duty on dried fruits coming in from Greece that I believe will operate from 7 August. However, that is a temporary measure that will apply for only 120 days. If the industry in Australia cannot sustain an argument for this level of support, the moneys paid by importers to the Federal Government will have to be refunded. The problem that confronts us within Australia is that the product we are producing, while recognised as the best in the world, cannot (and there is no possible way that it can do so) compete with products coming in from a country with a subsidy component of about \$800 a tonne. If we are given an opportunity to produce and compete on an equal footing with other countries, I have no doubt that we can effectively do so. However, it is grossly unfair to have imports coming into this country in competition with

a product produced here when the product being imported has a greater subsidy component than the end price received by the Australian grower for the product that he is producing.

Also, the dried vine fruit grower and the dried fruit grower generally in Australia is paying a significant amount for the promotion of his product. However, the heavily subsidised fruit coming into the country is gaining the benefit of the market promotion for which the Australian dried fruit grower is paying. Once again, that is grossly unfair, and I trust that the Federal Government will continue down the track that it has adopted with its countervailing duty and that little notice will be taken of the report which has just been released by the IAC and which virtually condemns the Australian dried fruit industry to oblivion.

I can only reiterate that I trust that the Federal Government has adopted the right approach in this instance in relation to the dried fruit industry and it will continue down that path, retaining the dried fruit industry as one of this country's viable primary producing industries.

Another example of lack of Government intervention exists in the citrus industry. At the same conference at which the dried fruit paper was presented by Mr Tankard, a paper was presented by the President of Murray Citrus Growers Co-operative Association. Mr Peter Webster, which sets out the situation. In that paper, Mr Webster states:

Citrus Growing is a young, small by world standards but stable, efficient and important Australian horticultural industry. Total production is around 500 000 tonnes, with the Riverland contributing approximately 175 000 tonnes or 35 per cent of that total. Young plantings coming into bearing will lift production to 200 000 tonnes in the Riverland in the near future.

He goes on to state:

However, since 1974-75 the significant trend has been the large quantities of frozen concentrated orange juice imported annually, particularly from low-cost highly-subsidised countries (i.e., Brazil) to make up the shortfall in local supply. In the 1970-71 season, 127 tonnes equivalent of frozen concentrate orange juice were imported into Australia and by the 1982-83 season had reached 218 648 tonnes equivalent.

That is a massive amount of citrus concentrate to come into Australia. That equates to approximately 4 000 hectares of citrus plantings in full production. Mr Webster continues:

Governments both State and Federal really do have control over our industry and the ability of citrus growers to make reasonable returns from their labour and investment. Tariffs and sales tax exemptions, both vital to the industry, are constantly queried by Treasury officials, IAC Commissioners, Economists and Government Advisers. Added to that, State and Federal charges like workers compensation, irrigation water rates, power, export inspection charges, etc., can all have devastating effects on citrus growers' livelihoods. Citrus growers themselves have only a few options for their survival:

1. Maximise production yields.
2. Grow quality fresh fruit.
- 3a. Minimise their inefficiencies with improved irrigation techniques.
- 3b. Increase property size to take advantage of any size efficiencies available.

The growers are doing that. Regarding the efficiency of our industry, one only has to look at the production of the Australian citrus industry compared to that in other parts of the world. If we go to the figures provided by the Department of Agriculture Research Advisory Committee as far back as December 1979, we find that the Riverland in South Australia has an average production rate of 25.11 tonnes per hectare of citrus. Israel produces 38.92 tonnes per hectare and is the only country in the world to produce in excess of our rate of production, mainly because the Israeli citrus industry is comparatively young and all plantings are of a young age and are therefore at the height of their production.

When one compares the Riverland with other recognised citrus producing areas around the world, one finds that California has an average production of 19.33 tonnes per hectare, Florida has 21.52 tonnes per hectare, Argentina

11.36 tonnes per hectare and Spain 15.1 tonnes per hectare. When we compare those figures with the Riverland production of 25.11 tonnes per hectare, we see that it clearly indicates that the citrus industry in the Riverland in South Australia is one of the most efficient citrus industries in the world. Once again, I refer to one other section of the industry in the Riverland and to another paper given in the Riverland in February by the Chief Executive Officer of Consolidated Co-operatives. Consolidated Co-operative Wineries in the Berri Estates winery. The paper states:

Our capacity for manufacturing brandy has not diminished but the declining demand caused by increased excise duties being levied by various Governments and exacerbated by the deluge of cheap dumped French brandy has brought our massive stills to a halt. My company in its two plants in Renmark and Berri has sufficient capacity to manufacture over 3 million litres of pure alcohol brandy during a vintage. Australia's total consumption from the latest A.B.S. figures to August 1983 was just under 3 million LALS [litres of pure alcohol brandy] of which over 25 per cent was imported from France at landed prices of less than 50 per cent of our cost of production.

As with the dried fruit industry, there is no way that the Australian brandy industry or grape growing industry can compete with heavily subsidised brandy being sent into Australia from France and delivered to wineries in Australia at 50 per cent of the cost of production in this country. One knows only too well that the cost of production in France is at least equal to the cost of production in Australia and that there is no way that that product can be delivered to Australia without a massive subsidy.

So, exactly the same thing that is happening in the dried fruit industry concerning Greece is happening with the French brandy industry. The Australian brandy industry cannot cope with that sort of subsidy. By the same token, on an equal footing Australia could more than compete with the French brandy industry and we could have a viable industry in Australia once again.

Successive Federal Governments have virtually annihilated the brandy industry in Australia. As was stated in the paper, for a number of years the massive stills in various wineries in the Riverland were virtually unused, purely because of the Federal Government brandy excise. Members have heard a lot from this Government about the inefficiencies of growers and the industries in the Riverland. I refute that and cite the examples given. In fact, the industries in the Riverland are some of the most efficient of their type in the world. There is no way that those industries can compete with subsidies provided by the European Economic Community to dispose of surplus production.

It is not a matter of inefficiencies in the Riverland; it is a matter of industries in the Riverland being given a fair go. As I said before, even with the problems that the industry has had to face up to as a result of poor and stupid decisions made by Governments, that area is still producing about \$400 million annually towards the economic viability of South Australia. So, there is no reason, if common sense prevails, why the Riverland cannot contribute even more than it is at the moment.

We have heard that the Government will not continue with the rehabilitation of Government irrigation areas. The reason given by the Premier is that more than enough handouts have been given to this region. When one takes into account the employment opportunities that are created and the contribution of about \$400 million in productivity, one realises that the Premier has a lot to learn. No Government can afford to ignore a section of the community that is contributing some \$400 million to the economy of the State.

The Hon. D.C. Brown: How can the Government leave the rehabilitation just part finished? It is almost a waste of much of the funds already invested.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD: As I have already indicated, we already have some of the most efficient horticultural industries in the world, despite the appalling condition of some parts of the Government irrigation distribution system. If the Government irrigation distribution work was completed and brought into line with the private irrigation area, with the same standard of facilities being provided to all of the Government irrigators in the Riverland, I have no doubt that the Riverland would be a most efficient horticultural producing area. Modern irrigation practices can only be fully implemented with a proper, modern irrigation distribution system. Comments and statements have been made by the Government that the area is a drag on the taxpayers of South Australia, but that is patently false. How can it be a drag on taxpayers if it contributes \$400 million annually to the economy of South Australia?

It is high time that the Premier and the Minister of Water Resources recognised the massive contribution that that area is making and the fact that the rehabilitation should be reintroduced as quickly as possible to enable the total Riverland area to contribute its full value to the economy of South Australia. We urgently need the completion of the rehabilitation of the Government irrigation areas so that the growers will be able to implement the latest technology in irrigation equipment.

Unfortunately, in His Excellency's opening address to Parliament once again no mention was made of further rehabilitation work proceeding, nor was there any mention of the lock 2, lock 3 ground water interception scheme to control salinity in the Murray River. Only last week I asked the Minister of Water Resources about the status of that project. It is a project that the Liberal Government introduced in 1982 and one that the present Labor Government inherited. Although the present Government has been in office close on two years, virtually no progress on that project has been made. That project alone would reduce salinity in the Murray River in South Australia by about 80 e.c. units, which in money terms would be equivalent to a saving to the South Australian public of about \$3 million a year. At a cost of \$16 million to implement, on a cost value basis, it represents excellent value for money.

Unfortunately, as I said, there is absolutely no reference to that project in His Excellency's Speech. So, obviously, the Swan Reach to Stockwell water filtration plant (as part of the total water filtration system for the North), and the lock 2, lock 3 ground water interception scheme appear to have about the same level of priority. I have had a great deal of difficulty finding references to any significant capital works projects initiated or announced by the present Labor Government in South Australia. We have just seen the completion of the Noora drainage scheme.

We have seen the completion of the Rufus River ground-water interception scheme at Lake Victoria, but there are no new initiatives on the books whatsoever. The initiatives that the Government inherited are virtually at a standstill. Not only are the projects that the Liberal Government introduced and announced at a standstill but the Federal Government, with its Bicentennial Water Resources Programme, has not made any funds available. In fact, it inherited that programme from the Fraser Government and, as soon as the Hawke Government came into being, it appears that all of the major salinity control programme works that are needed to combat salinity, particularly in the interests of all South Australians, virtually have been left in abeyance.

There is absolutely no indication from the Government and certainly nothing in the Speech to Parliament about when they will be picked up. It is a sorry state of affairs that exists in this State.

I refer to an area about which the Premier makes great play all the time: he is for ever stating that the Labor Government, since coming into office in 1982, has created about 20 000 jobs in South Australia. What concerns me even more than the Premier's making that claim is that the media aids and abets that statement. In fact, about 1 200 fewer people are in employment in South Australia today than in November 1982, when the Government came into office. Some 2 400 more people are registered as unemployed than in 1982.

When is the Government going to face up to that fact and tell the people the true situation? Although 20 000 jobs might have been created since November 1982 by the Bannon Government, in that time it has lost 21 000 jobs, leaving a situation where 1 200 people fewer are in employment than in November 1982. It is blatantly dishonest for the Premier to keep peddling that line to the public, and it is even worse when the press aids and abets the Government by not telling the public of the true position.

Another of the Premier's pet pastimes is to try to convince the people of South Australia that the Labor Government inherited a large deficit from the Tonkin Government. The document presented to this House in December 1982 by the Leader of the Opposition, and signed by the Under Treasurer, clearly indicates just how false is that statement. Once again, it saddens me that even with the information provided by the Under Treasurer under his signature, a false impression continues to be promoted and peddled by the Premier and his colleagues, although they well know that it is absolutely false, that the figures presented by the Under Treasurer have not been questioned, and that the figures provided are perfectly true.

I say, it is a sad day for South Australia when the facts are not presented to the public. When a false situation is peddled and portrayed to the public in this State as the true situation, it saddens me that people are prepared to go along with that and are not concerned with the truth.

The adverse publicity that has been generated in relation to the Riverland is quite false. Most problems that exist in the Riverland's horticultural industries are a direct result of the actions of State and Federal Governments over a number of years. If a little common sense is to prevail in horticultural industries, the Riverland will not only be producing and contributing about \$400 million annually (as it is at the moment) to the economy of South Australia, but it will be contributing even more.

The comparatively small amount allocated by successive Governments to the area, whether to the Riverland Cannery or in support of any other project there, is returned many times over every year. If total efficiency is to come to that area, commonsense must prevail with both State and Federal Governments. Until that gets through to a number of people, not only in Government but in high places in Treasury, and they get out of their ivory towers and learn something about the practicalities of the industries I have referred to, those industries will continue to be hammered time and time again. We are talking about a contribution of about \$400 million annually from that small region of the Riverland, which accounts for 8.6 per cent of the total agricultural production of South Australia—no mean figure.

I conclude by hoping that the Government of South Australia, in its endeavours to try to improve the situation with its proposed Riverland Council for Redevelopment, will recognise that, with all the best will in the world by the executive officer of that council and those appointed to it, they will not have a chance of achieving any worthwhile results unless both the State and Federal Governments are prepared to recognise the problems which they have created and which have been pointed out to them time and time again by industry leaders. An industry redevelopment council

will highlight once again the problems that have been highlighted by industry leaders over the years. I hope that under the name of the Riverland Development Council both State and Federal Governments for once will listen to the advice given.

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I, like other members, support the motion for the adoption of His Excellency's Speech at the opening of Parliament. I add my condolences to the families of the late Claude Allen and the late Charlie Wells. Both gentlemen were in Parliament when I first entered this House and both at various times gave me words of advice which I treasure. Claude Allen sat very close to me and I could always rely on his discretion and the advice that he gave me, and I treasure that advice. Charlie Wells was a person of a totally different character but one with whom I could talk and share Parliamentary experiences, and I extend to the families of both those fine members of Parliament my sincere condolences.

I would like to pay a tribute to His Excellency for the manner in which he opened this session of Parliament. His Excellency Sir Donald Dunstan and Lady Dunstan are to be commended for the way in which they have conducted themselves whilst holding their positions.

The Governor has travelled to most parts of the State. I understand that he enjoys these trips and that he has won many friends from all sections of the community. I honestly believe that I have never heard a word of animosity or anything degrading said about Governor. Every comment has been favourable and respectful and has indicated loyalty, which is commendable.

His Excellency's Speech reflected the views and attitude of the Government. However, little reference is ever made to rural industries in such speeches. In paragraph 5 of His Excellency's Speech, there is a brief mention about the rural uplift which marked the turning point in a cycle of recession, and it was said that it could not be expected to continue in the absence of good seasons. Although that is an obvious comment, it is extremely relevant to this State's economy. Last year was a very buoyant and good one. We would all like to think that it will happen again, but it will not. I say by way of a caution that that good year saved the financial necks of many people throughout the community. Had it not been for that well above average year, many primary producers and industries associated with primary production would have gone bankrupt. I do not believe that the general community has accepted that very serious situation as being one of life's realities.

Earlier this year we faced what looked like being yet another drought. There was an atmosphere of gloom amongst the rural community because many people had not sufficient incomes to recover from the series of droughts and previous low income years. As I said, 1982-83 was a good year, but it was not good enough. It merely reduced many farmers' overdrafts and those of many associated industries upon which primary industry relies. In relation to the necessity for a good season, I should have thought that greater support would be given by Government members to the United Farmers and Stockowners Association Conference. However, I regret to say that, even though the Federal Minister for Primary Industry was invited to open that conference, not one of his colleagues was present. I am concerned that that reflects the present Government's attitude and its lack of respect for that part of the economy, which I believe is a major factor in our State's well-being.

As I said, although the Hon. John Kerin was invited to open the conference, it did not eventuate, which was regrettable. The UF&S conference was told that that occurred because of an urgent Cabinet meeting which happened, incidentally, to coincide with the Paddington Bear affair.

Mr John Brumby (who is the member for Bendigo, although I stand to be corrected on that) opened the conference and did it well. But, he found himself to be a loner amongst a large section of the community which was obviously rural oriented and which believed in the importance of the rural economy. I think that he got the message loudly and clearly that the meeting generally expected far stronger support from his Parliamentary colleagues than they had so far received.

It has almost become traditional that in Address in Reply debates since 1975 I have mentioned sporting achievements of some of my constituents. I note that the member for Light has a sly grin because almost invariably when he was Speaker his comment to me was, 'I suppose we will get another serve of Lukin, Fitzgerald and Byles.'

On this occasion I will concentrate my remarks specifically on the gold medallist, Mr Dean Lukin. The achievements of Dean Lukin are to be applauded, not only for his outstanding physical strength and his sportmanship and the way in which he performed but more particularly for the amateur way in which he was able to develop his skills and bring himself through to world standard in what has now become well known as 'that tin shed'. That tin shed is a steel frame (I am not even sure that it is a steel frame; I think that it is a wooden frame) galvanised iron shed at the back of the Eyre Peninsula TAFE Community College. As such, it was the first gymnasium, for the want of a better name, in Port Lincoln.

I recall that when I was a member of the then Further Education Council, the Principal of that council, Mr Leon Holme, said to me, because Leon was a keen weightlifter himself, that amongst the kids of Port Lincoln there was talent of world standing. I do not mind admitting that I laughed. He said, 'Look, Peter, take me seriously. On a weight and age basis these lads without training have done remarkably well.' So I took his word for it and watched with interest the progress of the weightlifters of that area and, in particular, the Lukin brothers.

I say 'the Lukin brothers' in this instance because Dean's younger brother David, on an age basis, has outlifted Dean in almost every category. So I believe that whilst Dean has hit the limelight it is not impossible that his brother could be there with him.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Gold and silver next time.

Mr BLACKER: I made the prediction that at the next Commonwealth Games the first two would be Lukin and Lukin. That could still eventuate, but David is not quite the same personality. He is a rather shy boy and does not like crowds. If he can overcome that I firmly predict that the two Lukin brothers could well be numbers one and two.

However, Dean has put himself in the world records. I will relate to the House some of his career highlights briefly so that they are on record and add to the credibility of his standing. Dean, as you know is 24, and 135 kg in weight. His career highlights go back to 1975. I quote from an article in *Prime Time*.

The 15-year-old Lukin is encouraged to start lifting by his future coach Leon Holme, then the headmaster of Port Lincoln's Eyre Peninsula Community College.

1978: Lukin first goes overseas as an Australian representative for the world junior titles in Greece. He finishes ninth. The same year he breaks national junior records (snatching 100 kg in the 95 kg division and comes second in the Australian senior titles).

1979: Dean goes to the world juniors in Hungary where he finishes seventh. He is again runner-up in the Australian titles.

1980: The fast-improving teenager wins his third national junior title. In June, he goes to Montreal and finishes fourth in the 110 kg-plus division of the world junior weightlifting championships. He lifts a combined total of 337.5 kg clean and jerk and a snatch of 145 kg. Before returning home, he competes in the World Cup competition against the experienced communist lifters in Hungary, finishing a creditable fifth.

1982: A month before the 12th Commonwealth Games in Brisbane, Dean lifts 165 kg in the snatch, and clean and jerks 220.5 kg in the Victorian championships.

At the Brisbane games, wildy-cheering fans see him take the super heavy gold and break the Commonwealth record with a total lift of 395 kg—227.5 kg for the clean and jerk and 167.5 kg in the snatch.

1984: In April, at the Olympic selection trials in Melbourne, Dean smashes the 168.5 kg Commonwealth record for the snatch by almost-casually hoisting 173 kg. He also clean and jerks 230 kg, bettering his own Commonwealth mark of 227.5. His total lift of 403 kg at this competition is the first time any Western lifter has topped 400 kg.

In mid-May, he travels to Vancouver for a month's intensive training with Canadian champion and chief L.A. rival Sergio Bevalaqua. By this time he knows that his previous main rivals for Olympic gold, the Russians Pisarenko and Kurlovich, plus others from East Germany, Poland and Bulgaria, will not be in the 1984 competition on 8 August.

The rest is history. We know that Dean excelled on 8 August to bring home a gold to the cheering support of many Australians. I do not know whether schools had the official approval of the Minister of Education, but many schools on Eyre Peninsula were at a standstill when that part of the Olympic Games was televised. I offer my heartiest congratulations to Dean Lukin and his family for the commendable way in which he represented us.

I will now raise several issues, some of which are obviously related to my district. The first relates to the Sims farm saga. I am pleased that the Minister of Education is in the House, because I believe he is on side in relation to this particular issue. Some years ago the late Mr Gordon Sims bequeathed to the Government a property at Cleve for the purposes of research and education. It has become a point of contention that a report to the Department of Agriculture has recommended the sale of Sims farm. This has upset many people at Cleve for a number of reasons. First, many people at Cleve are related to the late Gordon Sims, knew the intent of the original bequest and are concerned that the Government is not honouring that bequest. More importantly, there is a strong feeling in the Cleve community, and throughout Eyre Peninsula generally, that an agricultural college, preferably residential, could well be established on this property, which was bequeathed for research and education purposes.

I add my full support to that idea, because I believe that this bequest presents a golden opportunity for the Minister to establish an agricultural college, either residential or otherwise, that could be supplementary to or play a part with Urrbrae College and Roseworthy Agricultural College. People associated with those institutions have given very strong support to the Cleve project. As honourable members would probably know, a good agricultural course is being conducted at an area school, but that could be further developed. The Department of Agriculture wants to capitalise on this property, and I use the word 'capitalise' advisedly, because that is how it looks to outsiders. It wants to collect money from the sale of a property that was bequeathed for a specific purpose.

It is my opinion (and I believe the opinion of many others in the area) that, if one Government department cannot comply with the bequest and another department can, that department should have the property for its care and custody. That is a fair and reasonable position. However, the Government has not quite seen it that way. From the Minister's response to a question today, I understand that Cabinet has decided that, if Sims farm is to be transferred in total to the Education Department, a transfer of funds must take place.

I am in sympathy with the Minister, because I believe that his Department is well able to comply with the bequest if it were allowed to do so. The fact the Education Department would have to pay for the property is unfair. I appre-

ciate that the Minister of Agriculture would see it an entirely different way. Be that as it may, it is a Government decision. My only hope is that the Minister will recognise the sincere request of the local community and have the matter properly analysed. I hope that the Minister will come down with a view that the property should be maintained in total in order that the bequest may be complied with: ultimately for the establishment of an agricultural education college.

Presently, petitions are circulating within the area and I know that many people have written to the Minister adding strong support. That support comes from more than individuals—it comes from organisations on Eyre Peninsula which have had either direct or indirect association. I say 'indirect association' because many students from all over Eyre Peninsula have moved to Cleve to take advantage of the agricultural studies course presently under way. If this property could be acquired in total, those agricultural studies courses could be further developed.

The petition presently circulating in the area (and it has a considerable number of signatures—some 400 and many more to come), which I hope to be able to present tomorrow, calls on the House to, first, support the retention of Sims farm intact for the purpose of fulfilling the wishes of the late Mr Gordon Sims; secondly, support the retention of the Sims bequest farm intact for the purpose of improving the existing Cleve certificate in agricultural course; and, thirdly, support the retention of the Sims bequest farm intact for the purpose of establishing residential facilities to cater for the present and future requirements of country students.

If it were possible to summarise the views of the local people and many others in regional towns in the area, those three points would sum up the wishes of those people. One of the difficulties in trying to promote an agricultural course, be it for local residents or other students anywhere in the State, is that few opportunities exist within the education field for students to be given a hands-on agricultural course. Most of the facilities presently available (and I am referring to Urrbrae) are basically plot-type studies where any experimentation is done on a small plot. It is very difficult to get a broad acre concept when one can only deal in quarter acre or one-tenth acre plots.

In a case like this where full-scale farming operations could be undertaken, it is possible for hands-on classes to be undertaken. I am in sympathy with students throughout the State who do not have direct access to farming operations. Many of the students who undertake an agricultural course possibly come from farming families. However, where are the opportunities for students in the metropolitan area who may have a natural yearning for the land and who may want to get into a farming operation?

The opportunities for those students are non-existent. I personally know of one lad, born and bred in Sydney (whose mother and two brothers came back to Adelaide two years ago), who had a strong yearning for the land and who had difficulty in finding schooling and training in rural matters. Fortunately, he was able to get a place at Urrbrae, but that would only be a stepping stone if he was ever to get into the agricultural area at all.

So, I lend my full support to this proposal. Such a college could provide that opportunity for students of this kind. At present, students who are isolated have to go to the city and from their eighth year onwards they have to go to Urrbrae if they want to get into these areas. They could enrol in specified courses at the Cleve or Cummins area schools, but those schools are scaling down the importance of agricultural studies. I can see that the prospect of a residential agricultural college could be of great importance as a stepping stone from the Urrbrae type situation and complementary to Roseworthy studies and, even though

they are not directly involved, they could be an integral part of rural studies throughout this State.

I understand that the secondary agricultural courses in our education system take up only a very minute part of the education budget. In fact, it has been put to me that only .6 per cent of the budget of the Education Department is actually channelled into these secondary agricultural courses. I cannot confirm that: maybe the Minister will confirm it at a later date. If that is the case, then it further justifies the desirability of retaining this property for the purposes I have already outlined.

I will leave this subject now but I could cite many reams of paper, correspondence, supporting letters and petitions from the local community. I am sure that the Minister has a copy of all these papers and I hope that he accepts the sincerity of the local community and the desirability of this project.

I refer now to the Road Traffic Board, particularly those people who determine the eligibility of vehicles on the road. We have the ridiculous situation where road trains are allowed a certain height of truck or stock crate but, if they drop the back trailer, they then have to reduce the height of the front trailer. The situation becomes quite ridiculous where a rig in a road train configuration is allowed a maximum permissible height for an indivisible load of 4.6 metres, but a normal semi-trailer with an indivisible load is allowed only 4.3 metres.

Difficulties arise in the transporting of stock, in particular cattle, where double decker cattle crates are used. Any person with any knowledge of stock and who has any humane sympathies for stock would know that it would be humanly impossible to confine two decks of cattle within a stock crate 4.3 metres high. The extra .3 of a metre (1 foot) makes a big difference to the comfort of the stock. It prevents the back-scraping and bruising that would occur if double decker cattle crates were used and were required to be confined to 4.3 metres in height.

The ridiculous part of the argument is that a person can operate a road train north to Port Augusta but he must then change the height of that vehicle. Further, if he drops off the back trailer, as he is required to do under the road train configurations, to bring the initial trailer down to Adelaide for example, he must reduce the height of that vehicle. So, it is an absolutely ludicrous situation. To make things even sillier, the 4.6 metre configuration is allowed almost unlimited travel in the areas to the north of Port Augusta, but once one gets south of Port Augusta then for some reason or another the height factor comes into it.

All I can say is that almost every double decker cattle crate operator could be prosecuted on this technicality, that is, for having an over-height vehicle. How does one reduce a 4.6 metre stock crate to 4.3 metres? Obviously the ability to carry two decks of cattle is in doubt. More particularly, there are literally dozens of these crates on the roads. There are at least eight double decker cattle crates that I know of operating on Eyre Peninsula. But as I said, although these road train configurations are legal and operate under a permit, singly they are illegal. I think that the Road Traffic Board should provide some answers. Double decker cattle crates have been in existence for some 15-odd years. So ridiculous is the situation that if a producer, a station owner or a carrier who normally operates north of Port Augusta wants to obtain a double-decker cattle crate to carry stock in that area, which he is legally entitled to do, he cannot legally have that crate built in Adelaide because it would be over-height.

I do not know how a court of law could ever interpret something like that. It is an anomaly that is costing many people a lot of money. In this way officers of the Road Traffic Board seem to be setting out to deliberately provoke

situations of inconvenience for transport operators. It is certainly an anomalous situation that these crates are allowed in one part of the State but not in another. More particularly, if an operator gets to Port Augusta and cuts back a road train configuration to a single trailer train, it automatically becomes illegal, because the height must be reduced by 0.3 metres.

What I have said sounds confusing, and I know that much of it is, but I think that, in regard to the practicalities of the situation, unless the Road Traffic Board can be a little more consistent in its operation (it has for 15 years allowed road trains of 4.6 metres in height to be operational on a permit basis), the anomaly will persist. It is rather strange that the officers should now start to get a little bit touchy with some of the operators who have to drop off their back trailer at Port Augusta and therefore have to reduce their height. We all know that it is totally impossible to do that. I know of one transport operator who was pulled over and chatted about this. This occurred in February or March, but I am not aware of his having received a summons for that. We all know that if that eventuates it will set a precedent for every other transport operator in South Australia.

I think it is time for some uniformity. As I have said, 4.6 metre crates have been allowed in a permit situation, and in regard to animal welfare surely it is logical that cattle should not be forced into crates; bruising and rubbing of their backs will result due to lack of height. I strongly support the transport industry in this matter, that is, that a 4.6 metre high road train be an allowable transport in which cattle can be carried.

I was interested to read today's *News* editorial which is headed 'How to lose an election' and which seemed to be having a little kick back at the National and Liberal Parties. Although I have read it two or three times to try to work out what the author is on about, I still do not know. If the author had any understanding of South Australia's electoral laws, he would know that what he had written was totally wrong. Under the preferential voting system, the comments of that editorial cannot be substantiated in this instance. I would like to draw a parallel to the comments made about the two Parties. If the same writer had made the same comments about the Labor Party and the various factions within it, perhaps one could understand some of his thinking. However, that is not the case. The writer seems to reflect directly on the voting system that applies in this State.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do they have factions?

Mr BLACKER: Over the weekend I was at a conference where someone tried to work out how many factions were in the Labor Party. They counted about eight, but certainly there are three or four main factions within that Party. Be that as it may, it comes down to individual preferences. The ability to express an individual opinion should be the right of every individual and, in this case, the *News* editorial does not seem to think so. I refer that writer to the voting system that applies within this State. If he can relate his comments to the Constitution and the electoral system, I will be interested to see how he does so.

I was pleased to see in the Governor's Speech reference to development work that the Government intends to undertake this year. I was somewhat wary about the wording of His Excellency's Speech, or how the Government worded his Speech. Paragraph 26 states:

My Government will continue to encourage the growth of the State's tourism industry as an important component of its broad economic development strategies. In addition to the Adelaide Railway Station development, major construction projects are also being undertaken at Port Lincoln. . .

When I heard that I interpreted what was meant by the term 'major construction projects'. I believe that I am right

in assuming that His Excellency was referring to the announced Port Lincoln marina project and the ancillary projects that are associated with it. Without doubt, that project has the potential to be a tremendous tourist attraction and develop a considerable number of jobs in our area, which is now suffering from a high unemployment rate. I commend the Government on this project and I trust that, when the Budget comes down in a few weeks, it will spell out clearly the amount of money to be expended in this financial year and, more particularly, when it is expected that those jobs which have been promised to the workers of the area will become available. We all know that there will be a lead time until the actual marina basin develops before any quantity of jobs will be available.

This leads me to my next point. I was concerned about the statement of the Minister of Agriculture on 1 May this year when he announced the closure of the Port Lincoln Samcor works and drew members' attention to the Government's announcement of the marina project. Although the Governor does not refer specifically to the word 'marina', I assume that his comments about major construction projects are relevant to that project. I hope that the Government intends to honour its commitment to the employees or the unemployed in the area and that that project will be under way as soon as is humanly possible so that jobs, particularly for unskilled people, will be available as soon as possible.

We all know that the work for unskilled persons will not be available for a long time on the project because the initial stages will involve basically mechanical work for which only skilled labour will be required. However, we know that the project has the potential to provide 900 permanent jobs and, if those jobs are created at the earliest possible time, South Australia will benefit, as will the unemployed people in Port Lincoln.

I mention this because it arose when the Government made the announcement concerning the closure of the Samcor works. I know that I have spoken about this matter in the House previously, but a lot more needs to be said. I was very concerned that the Government should approach this subject in the way that it did and more particularly about the way in which it endeavoured to mislead the press, the general community and everyone else about the importance of this abattoir to the State as a whole.

It concerned me no end when the Premier said in this House that the Government could not substantiate a \$1 million loss because only 15 employees were involved. That is gross misrepresentation of the most blatant kind because as I understand it—and we will not know until the figures are released—the loss is unlikely to reach \$700 000. That loss has been deliberately boosted because the Samcor Board has refused to allow boning room operators into the works since Christmas. So, for the past six months of this year, the plant has not been able to operate at anywhere near its capacity.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Who held them out?

Mr BLACKER: The Samcor Board, I believe, with the concurrence of the Government. I am very critical of members of the Samcor Board but even more critical of the way in which the Government went along with its recommendations. It is not by accident that, when the problems arose at Port Lincoln, with all the subsequent meetings that took place, the Chairman of the Board happened to be away on other business and that not once, since the announcement of the closure of the works, has he been seen publicly to be associated with any of the subsequent winding down activities.

I now return to the Premier's statement which was made in this House and with which his Ministers appeared to agree. The employment figure at the works is not 15, as the Premier would like us to believe; it is not that at all. I

would like to quote some statistics that were taken, and I might add that not one member of the Government or of the departmental staff took the trouble to ascertain what the employment position was at the works. No-one worked out the full time job equivalent or what the works meant to the area or to the general economy of the State. I find it extremely hard to comprehend that Ministers of the Crown could make such blatantly untrue statements. How does one comprehend this or have rational discussions with Ministers who adopt that sort of attitude?

On 17 May I wrote a detailed letter to the Premier setting out many of the difficulties that would accrue following the proposed closure of the works. I found out no-one had worked out any employment figures, so I asked the Chairman of Samcor whether his officers at Port Lincoln could supply me with details of the hours worked for 1981-82 and 1982-83.

Those years were quite deliberately chosen, because 1981-82 was a below average year and 1982-83 was probably the highest on record. When we analysed the total hours of employment and divided them by 48 (the number of working weeks in the year—and I have not allowed for any of the other incidental holidays) and then divided that figure by 40 (the number of working hours in a week), we found that in 1981-82 there were 112.8 full-time job equivalents. So, the Government, by closing the works, even on a below average year figure, put 112 full-time jobs on the line.

The following year which, as I said, was one of the highest years, in effect, and using the same criteria of dividing the total hours worked by 48, then dividing that figure by 40 (representing a 40-hour week), we found that the total job equivalent was 152.3. So, in reality, what the Premier said in this House about not being able to sustain 'a \$1 million loss when there are only 15 employees there' indicates that he was quoting only 10 per cent of the real situation.

How does one argue logic or even present a case to anyone when they refuse to accept what the *status quo* is? We are simply asking for recognition of the fact that that works did, in 1982-83, provide the equivalent of 152 full-time jobs. Those jobs ranged from a minimum of 72 people employed as at 31 May 1983 to a maximum of 211 as at 21 September 1982. More particularly, that was when the Government had pleaded with local producers to support the works. A good response was received to that request. Those producers mated their ewes to provide fat lambs for the works. When those fat lambs were born and just before they were ready to go to market, the Government said, 'Sorry fellows; no go.'

How would members feel if they were producers of fat lambs and they had 3 000 lambs on the ground waiting to go to market and the Government said, 'No; we will not take them. You must freight them all the way to Adelaide?' They would have been off their mothers for 16 hours. They would have lost their bloom and lost weight. They would have looked an absolute disgrace when they arrived. I predicted that the loss to those farmers would have been between \$5 and \$9 per lamb. That is what the Government did. It was hellbent on closing the works. If the Government had said right at the end of the lambing season, 'That is it,' I could have accepted it, irrespective of the other reasons given. However, the Government pleaded with producers to support the works (which the producers were supporting) and then, just prior to the lamb drop being processed, cut that away from them. That shows a lack of understanding by the Government about realities in the industry.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: What will happen to the Labor vote?

Mr BLACKER: I am not particularly worried about the Labor vote at the coming election. It will be considerably reduced. However, I give full marks to the local ALP sup-

porters in my district. They bent over backwards to help present the view of the local area to the Government. I take my hat off to Terry Krieg, who has stood as a candidate against me on a number of occasions. He and his supporters worked hard, as did just about every other organisation in the State. So, I think that that particular issue is one on which the Government stands to be condemned because it failed to give support in any basic or logical way. I wrote to all Ministers of the Crown who I believed had a direct association with the closure of the works.

I was very concerned at the Premier's response. I subsequently received a letter from him on 25 July. The letter was actually dated 5 July; so it had been floating around in his office for some time. It read:

Mr P.D. Blacker, MP.

Dear Peter.

Thank you for your letters of 17 and 25 May 1984, which were a follow up to our discussions on the announced closure of Samcor Port Lincoln. Your letters address many issues and show a deep concern for the effects of the closure of Samcor Port Lincoln on the community you represent. I cannot agree with all the points you raise, but the Government has never tried to hide the fact that the closure will adversely affect the level of employment in Port Lincoln itself and similarly the farming community and service industries of the Eyre region.

However, you would be well aware that the Government is trying to mitigate the effect upon the area; for instance, discussions with Lincoln Bacon Specialists Limited concerning the provision of a Government guarantee for a pig processing facility at Port Lincoln. Furthermore, any request for Government assistance to build a small sheep and cattle abattoir would receive serious consideration. Your letter raises a number of issues. I understand that you were present when the Minister of Agriculture visited Port Lincoln and participated in a discussion on these issues.

Many people in Port Lincoln endeavoured to put up a logical argument to the Minister of Agriculture, but they met with the same stone-walled reception.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Insensitive to their requirements?

Mr BLACKER: The Minister was totally insensitive to their requirements, and one thing that rocked me quite a deal was that the Minister claimed that it was not his decision. I said, 'How can other Ministers of the Crown make a decision if they are not properly informed, and he was not properly informed?' but he was not prepared to discuss that.

Mr Plunkett: It would not be the first meatworks in Australia that has been closed.

Mr BLACKER: I appreciate that, but if the Government attitude remains like this we will not have a meat industry. I would have thought that the honourable member would be most interested in trying to maintain the employment of his union colleagues, because the greatest single employer of workers in the lower Eyre Peninsula region was that abattoir. That is the part that we are always trying to defend. That was the action of those members who bent over backwards to try to maintain that works. Despite what the Government said, those workers were condemned by their own Cabinet colleagues because they tried to work to the maximum of their ability to keep that works going. They ran into the greatest problem because they worked over and above the award conditions.

That is the problem, and that is why they did not get Government support. That is why the Samcor management at Gepps Cross tried to play them down, because the Port Lincoln workers were prepared to work their quota plus 10 per cent plus overs. They did their bit, and I will defend those workers right to the last hilt because they really tried to do the right thing, as did the producers, because there were the highest matings ever for fat lambs, only to be left in the lurch by this Government. Everyone was trying to do their bit. Some four or five years ago a committee of inquiry said that the works had to meet certain standards. It met those standards. The only thing that it was not able

to absorb within those requirements was the increased cost of the meat inspection levels. We all know that the works in 1982-83 had a loss of \$361 000. The Government tried to tell us that it was over \$500 000, but it added the capital expenditure on to that. Instead of capitalising over four, five or 10 years it made the capital investment over one year so that it could build the annual loss up to over \$500 000.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: But that would be cooking the books.

Mr BLACKER: I have mentioned that before in the House. It is cooking the books, because if you or I were ever to become involved with any project we could not amortise the lot or wipe it out in one year. The Government seems to want to do that, so that it can build up that loss figure. With a \$361 000 loss—and bearing in mind that the additional charges to that works were over \$450 000, because of meat inspection fees—that works more than adequately complied with the requirements of the reports. I am indeed very bitter that the Manager at those works was virtually sacrificed by the Board at Samcor for the Samcor operation's own inefficiency.

They were looking for a scapegoat, and used the Port Lincoln works for it. A great deal of explaining needs to be done, because there are people at Samcor who should have been sacked long ago. We heard the member for Alexandra earlier today give a lengthy report on the Samcor operation at Gepps Cross and how they refused to put people off, people who were there when there were no jobs available for them. No wonder Samcor is down the drain for \$2 million—yet it had all its debts wiped out two years ago. These things need to be explained. I believe that the way in which the Manager (in particular) and the employees at Port Lincoln were treated almost calls for the appointment of a committee of inquiry. A great deal of answering needs to be done, and there should be an investigation into the operations of Samcor. I believe that the Government needs to reconsider its actions in this matter. I will defend to the very last the employees at those works, because they did their bit and so did management, but they became the scapegoat in this matter for the Government and the Samcor management at Gepps Cross.

We then have the situation of Samcor going a bit rough and the Minister of Agriculture went to air and said that if it did not pull up its socks he would close it down, too. That really put the heavy hand on Port Lincoln, because there was no way in the world that the Government could come to the rescue of Port Lincoln. If it had come to the rescue of the Port Lincoln abattoirs it would have had to come to the rescue at Gepps Cross (for totally different reasons, although the philosophy behind them was the same). The Government has condemned Lower Eyre Peninsula to one of the highest unemployment levels it has ever experienced. It has failed to take up with any Ministers, State or Federal, ways to alleviate this matter.

Mr Ferguson: You have an investment in the tourist industry that I envy at Henley Beach.

Mr BLACKER: I will take that up later. I return to the scurrilous way in which the Government has used and abused the position at Port Lincoln and its failure to recognise the need for a service abattoir in this State. That is the whole crux of the situation: whether or not the Government believes there is a service requirement in this State. What happens when we have a drought next? Do we let the stock die in the paddocks? We will not be able to cart them to the Port Lincoln abattoirs or to the Stirling North abattoirs and, if the freight component is more than the value of the sheep, the stock will die in the paddocks. What will happen then? Will the Government say that it cannot have rotting animals lying around in paddocks and that it will have to

pay farmers or local government bodies to bury them? These are matters that have not been thought through.

Mr Plunkett: Do you think that that is the only place in the world where they have droughts?

Mr BLACKER: The honourable member shows a complete lack of understanding of primary industry and a lack of understanding and appreciation of why the works was built in the first place, bearing in mind that it was built 54 years ago, that circumstances were vastly different then, and that stock numbers would have been considerably less than they are now. The whole circumstances have changed, but the honourable member cannot appreciate what it is all about. I will now add up the height of ignorance of the Premier's reply, which states:

Your letter raises a number of issues. I understand that you were present when the Minister of Agriculture visited Port Lincoln and participated in a discussion on these issues. The issue is really a matter of economics and how the Government should spend taxpayers money.

I do not argue with that. The letter continues:

The abattoir has incurred considerable losses—
but not the losses that they claim it has—
and there is no doubt in my mind that it will continue to lose money in the future.

I do not think that one can argue with that, because one cannot sustain a commercial abattoir unless it runs at maximum capacity for a full 12 months of the year. That is the problem with all abattoirs. The letter continues:

We cannot justify the continued payment of taxpayers money as a subsidy to offset these losses.

I would argue with that. He continues:

Governments have responsibility for spending taxpayers funds, and the Government decision in this case was that it could not afford to underwrite the continued loss at Port Lincoln.

It has not said that it pays considerably more than that to offset the losses in various schemes, unemployment benefits and so forth. The taxpayers will be paying two, three or four times as much than if it had to subsidise the abattoir: This is the crunch line:

The Government, through the Minister of Agriculture, has had many discussions with all groups who have wished to make submissions following the announcement that the works would close on 30 June 1984.

I would argue that he has had meaningful discussions. The letter concludes:

I see no point in holding a further meeting.

If anyone were to throw mud in the face of the corporation, the district council, or the Samcor Committee or those who have worked hundreds of hours in trying to reach a meaningful resolution to this, and then have the Premier say, 'I see no point in holding further meetings', that is the height of ignorance and an action for which I believe the Premier needs to be condemned.

I cannot in anyway condone the actions of the Government in this instance. It has cut off its nose to spite its face. It has condemned all taxpayers to considerable expense with higher unemployment benefits. This seems to be the issue to which the Minister of Agriculture comes back. He did not mind what happened—whether it collapsed or whether it was propped up—as long as it did not come out of his budget.

I began my contribution by talking about Sims farm and the transfer of funds from one Government department or one Ministerial portfolio to another. I believe that the manner in which the Minister of Agriculture approached the real problem at Port Lincoln and the blatant way in which he said that it did not worry him as long as it did not come out of his budget is the overall problem. What we tried to do as a committee, what I tried to do as the local member and what the corporation tried to do as a council was obtain

a Ministerial Cabinet subcommittee to sit down and look at the problem in total so that the overall effects from the Government's viewpoint could be rationalised to see whether something could come out of it. We could not get the privilege of a Cabinet subcommittee on an issue as vital as that.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: The council cannot even get an answer.

Mr BLACKER: No, the council cannot even get an answer. I got my answer on 25 July after the issue was dead and gone. That has been the general approach. If the Government approaches serious problems like that, what hope do we have for the future?

Mr PLUNKETT secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY (Minister of Tourism): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr GROOM (Hartley): I refer to the so-called immigration issue raised by supporters of honourable members opposite. In recent months in Australia we have been subjected to a new bout of racism under the guise of some so-called immigration issues. I was pleased to note in today's *Advertiser* a report released by the New South Wales Ethnic Affairs Commission which quite clearly contained statements such as this:

Any move to resurrect race as a criteria to settle in Australia would have a far reaching effect on our foreign relations.

The article quite clearly went on to put down any suggestion that immigration was a proper issue for public debate. The sad fact of the matter is that honourable members opposite have been entering into this area and using Professor Blainey as their cover, but at no time have honourable members opposite or their Federal counterparts condemned the sort of attitudes expressed by Professor Blainey—rather the reverse. The *Advertiser* of 12 July states:

The Opposition spokesman on Immigration and Ethnic Affairs (Mr Hodgman) back from a world tour of refugee camps and major European centres told a press conference the Government's policies could cost it 12 seats. He went on to say that the immigration issue had been simmering in Australia for a long while but the Opposition had not provoked the issue.

This is really quite ridiculous, because the Federal counterparts of members opposite have clearly been fuelling the immigration issue. To seek to resurrect the immigration issue after Australia has developed a multicultural society over the past 20 or so years is a very sad reflection on the Opposition in its attempts to seek to win seats from the Government at the next election. The Opposition will permit an immigration issue, albeit a racist stance, to divide the community and promote the sorts of feelings that one would have thought were long since buried. To select one group, such as the Asian section of our community, and to suggest that there is too much Asian immigration and that there should be a balancing or increase of migrants from Britain or Europe, with the suggestion that the Federal Government has currently allowed the mix between the various groups to get out of kilter, is put down by the figures released by the Federal Minister in Federal Parliament.

These figures indicate that migration from Asia in 1980-81 was 22.47 per cent; for 1981-82, it was 22.4 per cent; and for 1982-83, it was 26.3 per cent; from Europe in 1980-81 it was 18.4 per cent; for 1981-82, it was 21 per cent; and for 1982-83 it was 21.2 per cent; from the United Kingdom and Ireland in 1980-81, it was 28.4 per cent; for 1981-82,

it was 32.7 per cent; and for 1982-83, it was 29.2 per cent. The preliminary figures for 1983-84 in relation to all those categories show no significant departure. Therefore, the statistics do not support the stance that the Opposition spokesman (Mr Hodgman) took on this matter. If the real issue is not figures, what is the purpose of the Federal counterparts of members opposite raising the immigration issue and actively fuelling racist sentiments in our community? Clearly, Mr Hodgman, in his statement, indicated that the real motive was to seek somehow or other to swing seats from the Government—he predicted some 12 to 13 seats. I do not think that that will occur, even if members opposite go on their merry way and continue to fuel this issue.

The Australia community has reached a degree of sophistication that is probably not appreciated by members opposite. Certainly, Adelaide has a migrant population of over 260 000, nearly 26.9 per cent of a total population of nearly 970 000 people—a very significant proportion. To seek to return to the days of the White Australia policy, which was thankfully abandoned some years ago, is absolutely ridiculous. The nature of Australian society has changed dramatically since the Second World War. We are now a multicultural society that benefits from the diversity of languages, lifestyles and cultures introduced by the many migrant groups. The Asian group has been picked on now; what other ethnic group will follow? Once one starts promoting racist sentiments in the community, it does not end at one particular sector of the ethnic community; it is transferred to other sectors, because adverse feelings of people towards others with different cultures and origins are resurrected.

South Australia in particular has played a very important role in changing community attitudes in Australia, and it is well to remember that in 1966 we were the first State of any country in the world to pass legislation prohibiting discrimination on racial or ethnic grounds. In other words, it became part of the law of South Australia that each ethnic group has the right to the preservation of its language, lifestyle and culture. So, I have no doubt that the types of issues raised by Mr Hodgman and actively aided and abetted, of course, by Professor Blainey, whom he is using as a cover to raise this issue, will simply not wash in South Australia. That will not be accepted by the South Australian community, as I believe it will not be accepted by the Australian community at large.

I was pleased that the opposition spokesman in another place (Hon. C.M. Hill) rebuked any suggestion of any drift towards extremism. Mr Peacock sought to water down the situation. In July he said, 'It will in all probability be an issue, but it is not an issue we will promote.' That was a very weak attempt at trying to distance oneself from this type of issue. Why cannot the Federal Opposition Leader stand up and condemn these types of attitudes instead of fuelling the situation? Michael Hodgman of course is saying that the Opposition would be craven and cowardly if it ran away from immigration matters and that its Party's policy would help it win a minimum of 12 seats from the Australian Labor Party at the next Federal election. The Opposition is recklessly going along this sleazy path of promoting racism in the community, but what will its effect be? It is all for the sake of winning seats, but that simply will not occur. However, it is prepared to take the risk.

It is atrocious to pick on the Asian community in this day and age and to suggest that somehow or other they are second-class citizens. The dramatic effects that that would have on our foreign policy relations with the ASEAN countries and the potentiality of resurrecting a white Australia policy directed against Asians at this time is mind boggling. That is the effect of what honourable members opposite are doing. It is simply a tragic reversion to attitudes of the past

which have long since gone. I know that to some people there is an element of racism that lurks beneath the surface, but it certainly does the Opposition no good at all to try to resurrect and play on these feelings for the sole motive of trying to win some seats (which obviously it will not do). We are promoting Asian tourism to South Australia and we are getting a giant investment in relation to the convention centre at the railway station site. However, while on the one hand honourable members opposite want to see this type of development taking place, they then point to the Asian community and say that they are second-class citizens and not welcome in numbers in Australia. It is a tragic reflection on the State that a Party with a history that the Liberal Party has, even over the past—

Members interjecting:

Mr GROOM: The figures indicate that when honourable members opposite—

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

The Hon. D.C. BROWN (Davenport): This evening I want to refer to the transport problems that are being experienced in the southern metropolitan areas of Adelaide. It is fair to say that after some 20 months of the Labor Government's being in office absolutely nothing has been done by the Government to alleviate transport difficulties of that area. The Government has done nothing except rescind existing projects that were scheduled to start in the area and I will deal with that matter shortly. It is because of the inactivity of the Government that the southern metropolitan areas, the newly developed areas of Adelaide, will face transport chaos in the next few years, if it is not occurring already. There has been a housing explosion in the Morphett Vale, Seaford, Happy Valley, and Hackham South areas as well as in other similar areas. In the past 12 months alone, from May 1983 to April 1984, there were 3 070 private home approvals.

That does not include approvals to erect Housing Trust homes. In other words, there is a housing explosion occurring in that area which must amount to about 4 500 homes in 12 months alone. I understand that the rate of building has increased since April this year. Over 4 000 new family units have been established in the southern metropolitan area but this Government has done absolutely nothing in the past 20 months to help solve the transport problems.

What has the Government done? What is its record? First, it decided to scrap the north-south transport corridor, the one major transport project that would have given long-term relief to the transport chaos and traffic congestion in that area. Secondly, despite an election promise, the Government has scrapped or deferred indefinitely opening up the Hallett Cove to Hackham old railway line to some form of public transport. Thirdly, there was a proposal under the former Government with Federal Government approval of funds under the Australian Bicentennial Road Development programme to put in a new Reservoir Drive, which was to be a major new arterial road linking Aberfoyle Park, Morphett Vale, particularly Morphett Vale East, through to South Road via Flagstaff Road. This Government has deferred that project which was due to start in the middle of this year and which will now start next year.

Other promises have simply been deferred by the Government. Again, I stress that nothing has been done, even though the list of Government promises was extremely long. I refer to the difficulties that these people face in regard to traffic, where currently traffic of a morning builds up almost to the top of Flagstaff Road. If one looks at the more important South Road, I understand from talking to local policemen that it is not infrequent to see traffic build up to the top of O'Halloran Hill, almost to the junction of

Blacks Road, which is almost at the O'Halloran Hill Hotel. That is a substantial distance of about 2 or 2.5 kilometres from the Darlington intersection at the bottom of the hill.

The difficulties faced by these people relate not just to the traffic area but also to public transport. Residents in these areas are severely disadvantaged. For instance, in the developed areas—not the newly developed areas—of Flagstaff Hill, Sheidow Park and Aberfoyle Park and others, no bus services whatsoever run at night or during the weekends. In other words, these people are left in their residential suburban areas with no means of getting out unless they have a private vehicle.

I have been amazed by the number of parents ringing me, particularly single parents, who refer to the difficulties that they face in finding transport for their children to or from sporting or other social events, or their own problems in getting to or from shops or work on Saturday mornings. I wish to place before the House and particularly the Minister of Transport the sort of initiatives that must be taken immediately by the Government: first, upgrading the Darlington intersection of South Road, Marion Road, Flagstaff Road and Seacombe Road. That is probably the worst congested area at present. Secondly, construct a wider bridge at the bottom of Flagstaff Road adjacent to South Road. If honourable members have seen that bridge they will realise how narrow and inadequate it is, especially as there are three lanes of traffic converging on a bridge that has severe difficulty in taking two lanes of traffic. There is a real bottleneck, and constriction in the road where the bridge occurs before the intersection.

That is one of the reasons why, when the traffic lights turn green for Flagstaff Road, so few cars can get through the lights during its cycle. Thirdly, work should start immediately on the construction of Reservoir Drive. This is a project for which Federal Government funds have been allocated under the ABRD programme. The Federal Government has been complaining about the slowness of the State Government in undertaking those projects and in spending the funds. Local residents have been complaining for some time about the route of the proposed road. They saw the Minister for Environment and Planning who rejected their plea to have the road realigned. It was not until I took up the issue in June that the Minister again looked at the matter and finally, only a week ago, came down with a decision to realign the road away from houses, because as it stood, it went within 20 metres of houses and it would have caused an enormous traffic problem.

I stress that, where there are newly developed roads and residential areas, nothing but poor planning would put a major arterial road so close to a major new residential development. There was no need for that to occur because there was adequate space on the other side going towards the reservoir without any danger whatsoever to the reservoir. One only had to see the situation to understand that.

Fourthly, the Government needs to complete the detailed design of a new arterial road running south from Sturt Road to Reynella using the route of the so-called North-South Transport Corridor. Construction of that major new arterial road must start within a three-year period. It cannot be delayed any further, and I throw out that challenge to this Government. If the Government has any regard for that district whatever, it will give a commitment to build that major third arterial road over the escarpment as quickly as possible.

The fifth point, as far as roadworks is concerned, is the widening of South Road between Daws Road and Anzac Highway as a matter of top priority to relieve the congestion along Anzac Highway. Again, I stress that this Government has decided to take no action on that road widening. It has until 1986. Even then, to allocate funds at such a slow rate,

it would take three years to be completed, in fact, three years to spend a miserly \$3.5 million on that road widening programme. We all know of the congestion that exists along South Road, and this Minister will be hung (in a metaphorical sense) by the residents if he does not do something very quickly to overcome their transport problems.

As far as public transport is concerned, the provision of adequate night and week-end bus services should be a high priority. There needs to be the provision of a bus/rail interchange at Tonsley and Oaklands railway stations, and the provision of bus services to Morphett Vale East and Seaford must be improved. There needs to be improved bus services from Hackham and Hackham West to the Noarlunga regional centre and the extension of certain bus services to Aberfoyle Park. Finally, the Minister must ensure more adequate bus services to near rural areas including Clarendon, Kangarilla, Willunga, McLaren Vale and Aldinga Beach.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During the adjournment debate I will refer to some of the problems my constituents have had concerning travel insurance. One of my constituents, a Ms Margaret Bowling, had a claim against the Australian American Insurance Company Limited for travel insurance. I am sure that travel insurance is very dear to the hearts of all Parliamentarians because I am sure that they all take precautions in this area. However, I found that I had to rely very heavily on advice from other people in relation to travel insurance.

I did not have the time to look at the full provisions of the travel insurance programmes, because they were given to me very late. I am sure that other people have been in a similar position. Ms Margaret Bowling made a claim upon Australian American Assurance Company, which is refusing to pay her. So that honourable members are aware of the details of her case, I will read from a letter she wrote to me:

Dear Sir,

I undertook a trekking trip to Nepal on 26 December to 23 January, inclusive, Adelaide to Adelaide, with Australian Himalayan Expeditions with travel insurance with Australian American Assurance Company Limited. After our trek we arrived at Lukla on Wednesday, 18 January to confirm our air tickets for the following day, 19 January. The airport was closed to all air traffic because of adverse weather conditions and remained closed until 23 January.

If our plans were to have run their planned course we would have flown on 19 January from Lukla to Kathmandu. On 21 January we were booked on a Thai flight from Kathmandu to Bangkok. These extra days in Kathmandu were to allow for any problems we may have experienced in Lukla—Kathmandu connections. On 22 January we were to fly with Thai Airways to Sydney and stay at the Airport Hilton overnight and complete our journey with TAA the next day, 23 January, to Sydney-Melbourne-Adelaide.

As it was we caught the plane from Lukla to Kathmandu on 23 January and a connecting flight with Thai to Bangkok the same day. When we reached Bangkok our group leader negotiated with Thai Airways but could not obtain any seats until 3 or 4 February which was unsatisfactory because of work and financial commitments. We contacted the insurance agent in Bangkok and we were told to contact Garuda Airways; we did this but they too were booked until mid-February. Qantas had a flight from Singapore to Adelaide with a Cathay Pacific connection from Bangkok to Singapore on 25 January for \$770. I booked a flight as did 33 other members of the AHE party and arrived home on Thursday, 26 January.

On 27 January I contacted the travel agent, Thor, and the assurance company and put in a claim for costs, reimbursement and discussion on liability and communication problems that we had experienced with our trip. Sue Brooks was the contact at the assurance company and Quentin Chester and Ann Brain the contacts at Thor Travel. I waited several weeks, being reassured by Sue Brooks of AAA that my cheque would soon arrive. Barbara Caudle of Burra who was on my trek and put her claim in with mine had received her cheque for \$707 some weeks before. I then received the enclosed letter to my amazement and once again contacted Sue Brooks who said she would investigate it and my cheque would shortly arrive. I could not understand their claim

as I considered that I had made reasonable effort to make my international connections by allowing three days for any hitches.

I contacted Thor at the same time who expressed surprise and told me to contact Insutavel but they were AAA, so it was a pointless phone call. On 23 March I called in personally to AAA to investigate the matter again and was told that I would not be receiving any payment and they had contacted Barb Caudle to reimburse them with the cheque they had issued to her in error. Sue Brooks then told me that the manager from Melbourne would be in Adelaide on Tuesday, 27 March to investigate some of the difficult claims—one of which was mine. I requested an interview but was refused on the grounds that he would be too busy and could not help me. Having achieved nothing but frustration with AAA I revisited Thor and saw Ann Brain who was of little assistance except to agree she would contact Thor in Sydney plus one interesting fact.

A gentleman in Adelaide is planning the same trek in May and became concerned with our plight; so Thor contacted AAA and was given a verbal agreement that he would be covered in the event of being stranded in Lukla and having to rebook his trip to Adelaide. Four years ago also when the last group was stranded in Lukla it was also covered under the same insurance policy so why not us?

I would appreciate it if you could use your expertise to follow up this matter as I consider I took all the precautions to ensure a smooth running trek that a normal person could cover. I enclose a copy of the policy, the letter from AAA and a letter from Sue Webb, our group leader.

I referred this matter to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, who in turn wrote to me. He stated that the claim could not be met because:

Inquiries have revealed that a booklet issued to prospective trekkers by the Australian Himalayan Expedition contains the following references to delays in the area visited by Ms Bowling:

Note 1. Because flights only operate to Lukla in ideal weather, we recommend you leave at least three days after your option before flying out of Nepal. If you are delayed on the return more than one day, you shall be charged \$20 per day for food and accommodation at Lukla.

Note 2. If we are delayed flying in for more than two days the trek shall be re-routed to the Helambu area. You can anticipate this happening 40 per cent of the time.

On receiving this correspondence I once again contacted Ms Bowling, who explained to me that she had received the booklet and, as a result of receiving the booklet, she had contacted the travel agency. The travel agency had told her that, in order to overcome any problems that might occur with delay, she should insure.

So we have a circular argument. The travel agency had provided her with the information in the first instance that she might be delayed. In order to overcome the problem (that is, that she might be delayed) she took out insurance. The insurance company is now not prepared to pay on the basis that she had already been warned. I find this situation quite ludicrous. I have looked at the insurance policy: it is quite clear. It states that if any unforeseen delay occurs the policy will be met in full and my constituent will be paid in full.

In the past I have received great satisfaction from the Department of Consumer Affairs. My only problem is in relation to insurance claims. My inquiries to that Department concerning insurance claims have been fruitless. This is a situation in which my constituent took out all precautions that were necessary. She had received the information, which was acted upon. When the contingency of delay had occurred and an insurance policy was taken out, it was not paid.

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

Motion carried.

At 9.33 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 15 August at 11.45 a.m.