

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 15 August 1984

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

### PETITION: FIREARMS

A petition signed by 83 residents of South Australia praying that the House oppose legislation that further restricts the ownership and use of firearms but support the use of funds derived from gun licence and registration fees for the promotion of sporting activities was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

### PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by 64 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intentions to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by Mr Becker.

Petition received.

### PETITION: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

A petition signed by 22 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 was presented by the Hon. Michael Wilson.

Petition received.

### PETITIONS: PORNOGRAPHY

Petitions signed by 146 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to withdraw pornographic material from prisons were presented by Messrs Becker, Lewis, and Meier.

Petitions received.

### MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT (Chief Secretary)**: I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.D. WRIGHT**: Yesterday afternoon during Question Time, the issue of the manning of country police stations during the Roxby Downs blockade was raised by the Opposition. In particular, the station at Narrung was mentioned as one which would be closed. I would like to share with the House some additional information which has now been provided to me by the Commissioner of Police. First, may I take this opportunity to repeat the assurance which I gave this House yesterday on behalf of the Commissioner of Police that no police stations will be closed during the blockade. The Commissioner is taking a number of measures to ensure that the normal high standard of service to the public is maintained.

Where the officer in charge of a one man police station is rostered for duty at Roxby Downs (and this is the case at Narrung), a police officer from a neighbouring area will

be rostered to man that police station at appropriate times during the day. A notice will be placed outside the station indicating the times of the day when the station will be manned. Honourable members will appreciate that one man stations are not manned on a full-time basis in any event as the officer concerned is required to undertake patrols and respond to requests for assistance from the public. In addition, at those times when the station is not manned, if there are any telephone calls for assistance from the public to the neighbouring manned station, an officer from that station will then respond as appropriate.

Accordingly, the situation will not be significantly different from that which would ordinarily apply on a day-to-day basis with respect to one man stations. In view of the unfounded rumours which have been raised in the community by the Opposition over this matter, I believe it is essential that I place these facts on the record so that this House and the general public are aware of the true position. In the light of this information, I am sure that the Commissioner will be able to maintain the high standard of service to which the public of South Australia has grown accustomed from our Police Force, notwithstanding the difficulties under which they will be required to work during the blockade of the Roxby Downs site.

### QUESTION TIME

The **SPEAKER**: I am advised that the Minister for Environment and Planning will take questions concerning education.

### MOTOR REGISTRATION FEES

Mr **OLSEN**: In view of the statement by the Premier reported in the *Advertiser* of 22 June that State taxation will not rise further in the 1984-85 Budget, will the Minister of Transport give the South Australian motoring public an absolute assurance that there will be no increase in motor registration fees and driver licence fees this financial year?

The **Hon. R.K. ABBOTT**: The matters raised by the Leader will be dealt with in the Budget. He will just have to be patient and wait until the Budget is handed down. Those matters will be addressed in the Budget.

### TRADE FAIR

Ms **LENEHAN**: Will the Minister of Tourism comment on statements made yesterday alleging that there was minimal South Australian content in the current World Fair being held in New Orleans? In respect to the comments made, I believe that the Minister of Tourism actually was present at the World Fair and therefore should be able to provide the House with informed comments about these allegations.

The **Hon. H. Allison**: He said he agreed with the reporters.

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Before calling on the Minister, there is some confusion which is probably my fault as I was trying to attend to something else when a matter was drawn to my attention. I think that the question is probably totally out of order under Standing Orders in that the Minister is being asked to comment on something that was said yesterday. Is that in fact what the honourable member for Mawson asked the Minister to do?

Ms **LENEHAN**: I would be very happy if the Minister could elaborate for the House on what statements were made yesterday in respect to the allegations.

*Members interjecting:*

The **SPEAKER**: Order! Would honourable members all resume their seat? The simplest way to deal with this is for me to rule the question out of order and to invite the

honourable member to bring the question to the desk, as I am sure that her intention can somehow be brought within Standing Orders.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### HIGHWAYS FUND

**The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY:** Does the Premier agree with the Minister of Transport that the Highways Fund should not be abolished to ensure that taxes paid by the motoring public in the form of motor vehicle registration and driver licence fees will remain fully available for road construction and maintenance?

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Obviously, there would have to be a fairly heavy onus to discharge if the Highways Fund as such was to be abolished. I have not had a chance to examine the report of the Public Accounts Committee; in fact, the Minister himself is now considering the report, and no doubt in the not too distant future Cabinet will be looking at it.

I would remind the House that the report is the subject of an investigation by the Public Accounts Committee, a bipartisan committee, and I would have thought that the member for Davenport, for instance, might have had some consultation with his colleagues after the report was released to discuss their reasons for subscribing to some of the things that were said in it.

The debate should not centre around whether the Highways Fund exists or does not exist. The crucial point that seems to have been brought out by the report—and I say this only from my cursory knowledge of what has been said about it, because as I said, I have not had a chance to study it yet—seems to be the accountability, both Ministerial and Parliamentary, of the Highways Fund and highways and road planning. That is something all honourable members should be concerned about. The investigation into this—

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Exactly. The committee's investigation into this has been a very useful exercise. I do not think that it is a situation for political point scoring. Of course, the Government remains totally committed to adequate funding of roads. It is one of the central responsibilities of any State Government, and that will continue. But, I think also that we must take very seriously what the Public Accounts Committee has said about the question of accountability.

### ALFREDA CLINIC

**Mr HAMILTON:** Has the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Health in another place, received a response to my representation to the Minister of Health concerning the statement made in this House by the member for Mallee on 9 August? The member for Mallee said:

... that the only existing workers rehabilitation clinic where a multi-disciplinary team of medical and para-medical staff presently operate in South Australia is to be closed down, if it is not closed down now—that is what I understand will happen to it. It will at least be phased down and will probably end up being closed down in the long run, anyway. I am referring to the Alfreda Clinic started by Commonwealth funding during the Whitlam years and which has subsequently been taken over by the State Government and found a niche in the Health Commission.

This allegation by the member for Mallee has caused considerable alarm amongst a number of staff employed at this very worthwhile centre and, I am informed, amongst the administrative section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Therefore, can the Minister give an assurance that the Gov-

ernment has no intention of closing down the Alfreda Rehabilitation Centre so as to allay the fears held by the staff and many of those persons who visit this centre seeking assistance and rehabilitation?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Yes, I can give the honourable member the assurance that he seeks. I have been provided with information by the Minister of Health, which is in direct contrast to the comments made by the member for Mallee in this House. I point out that the member for Albert Park has every reason to be concerned about this because I think that this is one of the projects that he has nurtured, in a sense, or certainly pursued in the time that he has been a member of Parliament, in order to improve the facilities available at the Alfreda Clinic.

A number of points have been made to me by the Minister of Health. First, there is no plan to close the Alfreda Clinic. Secondly, there is no plan to change Alfreda's approach to short-term fast rehabilitation. In fact, an orthopaedic exercise pool is being provided this financial year so that the Alfreda Clinic can offer intensive rehabilitation programmes incorporating the hydrotherapy component. This is for the member for Mallee's benefit. The unit does not have a niche in the South Australian Health Commission. It is part of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's Community Service Department, which is directly responsible to Dr John Durkin, Senior Director of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital is extremely proud, with very good reason, of these facilities. Quite naturally, the suggestion that the Clinic will be phased out has met with some concern and apprehension, not only by Queen Elizabeth Hospital authorities but also by the people who operate the Clinic, the patients and others who have need to use this facility.

The Minister has approved plans for a \$300 000 orthopaedic exercise pool. The pool itself will be specifically designed for use by handicapped people and those recovering from some forms of severe injury which have resulted in loss of mobility. The South Australian Health Commission intends to include the new pool in its 1984-85 capital works programme. Medical specialists in rehabilitation and allied health professionals strongly advocate the use of hydrotherapy. The new pool, which is 25 metres long by 10 metres wide, and which varies in depth from 700 mm to 1 500 mm, will be deep enough to allow swimming for rehabilitation of back and leg injuries. Facilities will be provided for exercise for disabled persons, general physical mobilisation of persons inactive for long periods because of industrial injury or other reasons, and recreation and encouragement of confidence for disabled persons.

The Minister has approved the preparation of contract documents by the Western Rehabilitation Service's architects. I think it is important that this matter should be raised here in this House where the allegations of phasing out were made. I hope that the member for Mallee at least is now convinced that the allegations he made were incorrect. There is no reason for him to be smiling and taking some credit for this because the work had already been done, the decisions had been made and the programme had been set in place.

All the honourable member for Mallee has achieved is to cause much unnecessary concern to many people who are doing their best for the well-being of groups in our society that are not as well off as we are. If he thinks that that is a matter for self-congratulation, I do not share that feeling. The matter is inappropriate to be raised in this House and I hope that that gives the lie to statements already made.

### TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

**Mr INGERSON:** Did the Minister of Recreation and Sport follow the requirements of section 44 (c) of the Racing

Act when appointing Mr Harry Krantz to the Trotting Control Board?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** Yes. That refers to the consultation with the Board concerning the appointment. I am sorry that the matter has been raised in this place because certain disappointments were associated with the appointment of Mr Krantz as Chairman of the Trotting Control Board, as some of the other people involved in trotting were anxious to become Chairman of the Board. I believe that section 44 of the Racing Act was complied with in this instance. Indeed, consultation took place. This was an appointment about which certain persons in trotting circles were not happy, but I and the Government believe that we have appointed the appropriate person as Chairman.

### TRADE FAIR

**Ms LENEHAN:** Mr Speaker, I thank you for your patience and guidance. Did the Minister of Tourism visit the current World Trade Fair at New Orleans and, if he did, will he say what is the South Australian content at the fair?

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I attended the World Trade Fair currently being staged at New Orleans and I am not pleased with the South Australian content in the Australian pavilion. This matter was raised, appropriately, by the Hon. Mr Davis in another place. I am pleased that he visited the fair and that he is concerned about the lack of South Australian content there. When I visited the fair, there was only one snapshot of Adelaide and some shots of the Australian outback that might have come from any part of Australia because they were not identified. Certainly, there was a comprehensive display of opal that we all acknowledge would have come from South Australia, but there was no display that was specifically South Australian.

I took up the matter with the Australian Government trade official who was responsible for the display in that pavilion. I must say that the pavilion is a first-class effort on the part of the people responsible for presenting an image of Australia. Indeed, the pavilion is excellent in building up an awareness of Australia. When I took up with the officer in charge the lack of South Australian content, he said that our concern as South Australians was shared by the people of New South Wales because many Sydney visitors had also complained about the lack of Sydney content. The visitors from Sydney had said that Sydney was Australia's prize city, but that is incorrect because Adelaide is. However, I could understand Sydneysiders' concern that no prominence was given to another of the world's beautiful cities. The rationale behind the exhibit, as it was explained to me, was that the Australian pavilion concentrated on three Australian cities and snapshots of many smaller cities, regional centres and the outback.

It included a lot of the interior—it could have been the Northern Territory, South Australia, or the Western Plains of Queensland and New South Wales. Anyway, it was the Australian outback. The rationale was that as Brisbane will host the next World Trade Fair they gave prominence to Brisbane; as Perth is the host city of the America's Cup challenge and as the America's Cup is still a matter of great topical discussion within North America, they featured Perth. Arguing that as Melbourne is a cosmopolitan city, more similar to New Orleans than is any other Australian city, they also concentrated on Melbourne, to the exclusion of Sydney, Adelaide, Hobart and Darwin. So the rest of the cities, and certainly regional cities, had very little content. But they also pointed out—and it is true to say this—that there were no verbals; there was only video, with no explanation.

The average American who visited the Australian pavilion would not have been aware that there was not a great amount of South Australian content. The South Australians who visited the Fair are painfully aware that we did not feature highly. Whereas it makes a tremendous impression on us, to the Americans, who are not really concerned about State borders—as we are not concerned about their State borders; if we go to America we go to visit cities or places, not the States—by and large the State boundaries in Australia are irrelevant, but the cities, attractions and locations are relevant. They would not understand that there was no South Australian content. In fact, South Australia to them is the bottom half of Australia: Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** Sure; I agree with the honourable member: a lot of South Australia's features ought to have been included, but they were not. The South Australian point of view has been expressed clearly on that, and I am absolutely confident that it will not occur again. The authorities who put together the display contacted the Department of Tourism in South Australia. We gave them a video of South Australia—of the prime features of Adelaide and of our regional features; so there is no excuse for them not to have included more of South Australia.

I agree with the matters raised by the Hon. Mr Davis; the South Australian content of the display was sadly lacking. Strong representations have been made to the Department of Trade about that; I am sure that it will not happen in the future. I am sure, too, that in Queensland, at least, South Australia will be very prominent, and also, one would hope, from there on. I have just pointed out to the House and to South Australians who may be interested in this the rationale behind the decision to concentrate on three major cities of Australia more or less to the exclusion of much of what is very good about our continent.

### TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** I ask the Minister of Recreation and Sport: was a meeting of the Trotting Control Board held between 12 July, the day on which Mr Harry Krantz was appointed as its Chairman, and 19 July, the day on which Mr Krantz was appointed to the TAB?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** My understanding is that there was. I have an idea that two special meetings were held, but that is only second-hand information. I do not know when the Trotting Control Board meets. I wrote to the Board on 10 July, advising it of two things: first, that Mr Harry Krantz had been appointed as Chairman of the Trotting Control Board and, secondly, seeking urgent comments from the Board in relation to his appointment as the representative of trotting on the TAB. I do not know when the meetings were held; as I said, it is only hearsay, but I believe that they were. I advised the Board that the appropriate thing was for the Chairman to be the TAB representative. The Government acted in that way, and accordingly Mr Krantz was appointed also as the representative to the TAB.

### STATE TAXATION

**Mr GREGORY:** Is the Premier aware of the results contained in the Australian Chamber of Commerce/National Australia Bank June Quarter Survey and did the published survey contain any details on the situation in South Australian industry? An article in today's *Advertiser*, which points to the taxes being charged in South Australia, makes the following comments which should be of interest. It states

that South Australia raised State and local taxes less than any other State of Australia. The article also stated:

... South Australia saw a rise of only 52 per cent. In that same five-year period, male average weekly earnings nation-wide have risen by 69 per cent, so there has been a small but real gain in living standards of around 7 per cent ... a lot of emotion is generated by debate of unfair, imbalanced or regressive taxation, especially State taxes and charges. But the position in South Australia is remarkably good, especially following the recent introduction of the financial institutions duty which is undeniably a more progressive form of taxation.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** Yes, I think this whole issue should be seen in some sort of perspective, and I have been encouraged by the fact that the debate over recent months in the press and other considerations have in fact homed in on some of the issues which we have attempted to raise in this House. I thought one of the most interesting features of this morning's article was the chart showing the distribution of taxation and the very heavy reliance of our system of—

*Mr Olsen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! When the honourable the Leader has finished his speech and oration, we will hear the Premier.

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON:** The way in which the debate has homed in on some factual points has been pretty painful. The point I am making is that the distribution of taxation shows how heavy a burden is borne by the personal income tax component of taxation, and we ought to remember that and get our own revenue raising attributes into some kind of perspective when we talk about it.

As to the question of the future of our economy, raised in that context by the honourable member, it was certainly encouraging to see the findings of the Chamber of Commerce/National Australia Bank June Quarter Survey which covers industry in retailing, wholesaling, merchants, transport, building and services, and it showed a very significant lift in sales and profits in the tertiary sector. It showed expected strengthening in the September quarter, a continual improvement in capital spending (and that is certainly a welcome development because private fixed capital expenditure was one of the lagging indicators over the past 12 months or so and that is now beginning to strengthen), and a rise in overall costs pressures which is expected to moderate in the September quarter.

Some results were shown for South Australia specifically, and it was encouraging to see that they showed that the business conditions in this State conform to the experience in other States but in a somewhat better performance in terms of trading results and profitability experienced in the June quarter, as well as in the outlook for September. In South Australia trading and profit results improved significantly, with 74 per cent of respondents reporting satisfactory or good trading results in that quarter, and this compared with an average of 65 per cent in other States. That is certainly very encouraging indeed for a State which on all the indicators in previous years has been lagging very badly.

The September quarter outlook for business trading and profitability in South Australia also seems promising, with 75 per cent of respondents anticipating either good or satisfactory trading results, compared to an average of 71 per cent in other States. Also, 63 per cent expected good or satisfactory profitability compared to an average of 55 per cent in other States. Again, we are well above the national average both in performance and in expectation, and expectation is important because the psychology of business is very important in terms of recovery.

However, I would like to make this point and ensure that it is on the record, because I do not think that South Australia can afford a repeat of the sort of governmental posturings that we had to put up with under the previous Government: the coverage of the survey is limited to the

tertiary sector. It is not necessarily indicative of overall economic conditions in the State. Some sectors of our economy are showing stabilisation rather than an upturn. I point particularly to manufacturing industry. There has been encouraging growth in employment in manufacturing industry and performance, but there are sectors of it (heavy engineering, for instance) that are experiencing very depressed conditions. That is an area to which particular attention must be drawn, because there are major problems in our heavy engineering sector. It is being experienced Australia wide, but it has a definite impact in South Australia.

On the employment front our performance over the past year has improved greatly on the previous couple of years, but it remains insufficient to make any large or immediate inroads into unemployment. Again, I highlight that, while the employment performance is strong and encouraging, unemployment is not improving at a rate and pace which the Government would find satisfactory. We have to concentrate on that over the next year or 18 months. The point I am making is that, while our State economy is improving, it is doing so at a steady pace. In many areas it is doing much better than other parts of Australia, but the situation remains fragile. Certainly, there is a situation where undue pressure from any source would have a potential to jeopardise the gains that have been made so far. It is important that, while we retain that confidence and development which is certainly present in our community, we bear in mind that we are by no means out of the recession yet.

#### TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

**The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON:** Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport table his letter to the Trotting Control Board of 10 July, where he appointed Mr Krantz as Chairman of the Trotting Control Board and to the board of the TAB? Has Mr Harry Krantz been called upon to resign from the TAB because of the alleged failure of the Minister to fulfil the requirements of section 44 (c) of the Racing Act?

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I am happy to table the letter. There is no problem with that letter, which was issued by the Director of the Department of Recreation and Sport on 10 July. The other matter concerning Mr Krantz's being requested to resign as representative on the TAB is something I am not aware of. That is a decision to be made by the Board and Mr Krantz himself. Let me make the picture clear. I do not know the basis of the question. The Government appointed the best appointee possible in the interests of the trotting industry. Two people were interested in becoming both Chairman of the Board and representative on the TAB. That decision was made by the Government in the best interests of the trotting industry. As a consequence, Mr Harry Krantz was appointed both Chairman of the Trotting Control Board and TAB representative. The question really relates to the lack of consultation. I held discussions with both those people over a period. These appointments have always been appropriate. In fact, Mr Ray Rees, the former Chairman, was also the TAB representative. The Government believes that that is the appropriate thing to do. I am not in a position to know what has happened at board meetings in the past two or three weeks, but I believe that I acted properly in the whole matter and that the Government appointed the right person who did not have a sectional interest in regard to trotting in South Australia.

#### HOUSING BOOM

**Mr GROOM:** Can the Minister of Housing and Construction say whether the housing industry in South Australia is

coping with the upsurge in home building that has occurred in South Australia over the past 12 months? Although it is well known that South Australia has enjoyed a tremendous revival of fortunes in its housing industry under the guidance of the present Minister, questions have been raised as to the ability of the housing industry to manage the dramatic increase in demand for new houses. There has been speculation of overheating of the industry, and I ask the Minister to comment on the current situation.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** I thank the member for Hartley for that question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The honourable Minister will resume his seat. For the second time this morning I have failed to pick up an invitation by an honourable member to a Minister to comment on something. Therefore, will the honourable member for Hartley please revise the way in which he asked his question?

**Mr GROOM:** Yes. Will the Minister advise on the current situation?

**Mr Gunn:** He is turning Question Time into a farce with his silly questions.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not need the assistance of the member for Eyre. The honourable Minister.

**The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Hartley for his important question and am only too pleased to provide an answer. South Australia's housing industry has indeed experienced an upsurge in building activity over the past 12 months. The home building industry and the State's general economy have benefited enormously from this rise in activity. The question of overheating of the industry has been around since the Labor Party made stimulation of the housing sector a State and Federal election promise. The State Government has been quite aware of the potential for overheating from the beginning and has constantly sought to ensure that it does not occur. The year 1983-84 is expected to show an increase in housing commencements of about 3 500, from 8 000 in 1982-83 to an estimated 11 500.

This increase was dramatic but necessary, not only to stimulate the industry out of the doldrums of the previous few years, but also to meet the unmet housing needs of thousands of families in our community. It has resulted in many building trades being fully employed, and that is a welcome return to good business for builders. The bottom line in this whole business is that the industry in South Australia is in very good shape and has now adjusted to the increase in demand for homes. The State Government is continuing to work with policies that will help maintain South Australia's home building activity at a little less than that which occurred in 1983-84. I believe that such a level of about 10 500 commencements is not only within the capacity of the industry but will also keep the industry fully employed.

#### ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

**The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON:** Will the Deputy Premier say whether the decision that arrests during the Roxby Downs blockade should be made only in the most dramatic of circumstances, as stated by him yesterday, was made by Cabinet, the Deputy Premier or the Police Commissioner?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I think that I have made this position quite clear from the beginning of questioning about this matter. The Government has had nothing to do with this policy—I repeat: nothing! All of the information I read out yesterday is the policy of the police. The police will

make the judgment about when and if it is necessary for people to be arrested at the Roxby Downs demonstration.

#### MAIL ORDER CREDIT CARDS

**Mr MAYES:** Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs, investigate and report on whether the current practice undertaken by certain retail organisations which offer mail order credit card facilities for purchase of consumer goods provides adequate protection for consumers using those facilities? It has been brought to my attention by a constituent who has used a mail order credit card facility provided by a company supplying goods and services to that person that a purchase of goods based on filling out a credit charge form and sending of that form to the company to supply the goods resulted, upon completion of the credit charge form, in additional goods being charged against their credit card account.

I am informed by the constituent that an error had occurred in the accounting practice. However, I ask the Minister representing the Minister of Consumer Affairs to report on this incident and look at the methods by which a safeguard could be provided for protection of consumers. I understand that this matter has been brought to the attention of the public through the media.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for his question which raises an interesting point of practice in that area of sales. Obviously, it is becoming more apparent these days that mail order catalogues include a provision for payment by Bankcard. I am unsure whether this matter is caught within the consumer credit and consumer transactions legislation of this State, but I will be pleased to refer the matter to the Attorney-General for his consideration and report to the honourable member.

#### CLEAN AIR REGULATIONS

**Mr BAKER:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning advise what special arrangements will be made by him to overcome potential fire hazards which could arise in the Hills and rural areas as a result of the clean air regulations? I have received a copy of a letter from the Mitcham City Council addressed to the Local Government Association in which it raises two matters regarding fire hazard control. The first is that, under the clean air regulations, it may well be impractical at certain times of the year, prior to the major hazard season, for residents to burn off those areas within their own backyard precincts under the time frame that has been allowed, namely, 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. The second question raised by the council is in regard to the C.F.S. being employed to burn off within properties. What is the situation where the C.F.S. is normally operating after hours in those pre-summer months? What would be its position in regard to the regulations?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** The question touches on a matter raised in the House yesterday where it was indicated that certain local government authorities would be approaching me in relation to the regulations. It is up to a local government authority to come up with a scheme of what it sees as being a reasonable modification to what has been laid down and we will look at it on the merits. I am not prepared at this stage to canvass blanket exemptions from the regulations or anything like that. If a specific problem exists in an area, the regulatory mechanism is sufficiently flexible for that to occur. I fail to see how the honourable member can argue that a policy which will have

the effect of less ignition occurring anywhere can lead to a greater fire hazard.

### WATER SAVINGS

**Mr TRAINER:** Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide the House with some information on the validity of claims made by a number of manufacturers and distributors of the water and energy savings achievable through the use of a range of low-flow shower roses now on the market? Literature I have received from one Adelaide distributor (and which I communicated to the Minister) suggests that their particular low-flow shower rose saves approximately 50 litres of water for each five minutes of shower use, plus the energy used to heat approximately half of that water. If such savings can be verified, the potential for reducing household energy and water costs would seem to be substantial.

**The Hon. R.G. PAYNE:** I can provide some information and thank the honourable member for raising this question. The information I can give tends to suggest that considerable savings in both water and energy can take place with the use of at least some of these devices. The Energy Division of the Department of Mines and Energy has advised me that it is familiar with the range of devices to which the honourable member refers in his question.

The Department says that these devices can make an important contribution to water and energy conservation in both residential and non-residential applications. However, the savings that can be achieved depend on such factors as water pressure, usage pattern, type of fuel and the device being replaced, as well as the energy tariff which applies. For example, a reduction in water consumption of 10 litres per minute applied to a mains pressure system for a domestic shower used for 30 minutes a day (four people each at 7½ minutes) would produce a saving of 300 litres a day. Assuming that half of this reduction is heated water, a calculation indicates that the reduced hot water consumption would correspond to a reduction of about six kWh per day for an electric water heater. Based on the ETSA J (off-peak) tariff, this would produce annual savings of about \$75 per annum, assuming 300 days full showering per year.

The potential savings achievable in homes with existing low pressure hot water systems—a very common type in South Australia—is less clear, but it would be less than for a mains pressure system. Reducing the shower flow by five litres per minute would still result in electricity savings of about three kWh per day and annual savings of about \$40 a year on the J tariff. Staff of the Government's Energy Management Programme have been in contact with the distributor to which the honourable member referred. As a result of this contact, several of this brand of low-flow shower roses will soon be installed in the Adelaide Festival Centre on a trial basis, to determine energy and water consumption savings, shower quality and user reaction.

In the near future, the Energy Information Centre will mount a display concerned with the linkage between conservation of energy and water resources. Amongst other things, this display will refer to the contribution that flow-restricting devices can make. This display is being supported by the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

### ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

**Mr OSWALD:** Will the Deputy Premier confirm that estimates provided by the Costing Division of the Public Buildings Department have resulted in a revised estimate

of the cost to the Government of the Roxby Downs blockade and that that cost estimate is now \$1.8 million.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** In answer to the honourable member's question, I have said in reply to a similar question asked by his Leader or Deputy Leader that at the end of this exercise I will bring down a report about the costs, and I intend to do so.

### ELECTORAL ROLL

**Mr FERGUSON:** Can the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House whether his Department is prepared to give approval for the names of certain electors under risk to be omitted from the State electoral roll? The Queensland Government has accepted the request from the Registrar of the Family Court of Australia to have the addresses of judges left off the electoral roll for reasons of security. The amendments to the Queensland Electoral Act followed the assassination of Mr Justice Opas of the New South Wales Family Court and several bombing attacks on judges' homes and the Parramatta Family Court buildings. It has been stated in the Queensland Parliament that the amendments to the Act would allow voters' addresses to be omitted from the roll in certain circumstances.

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for raising this question. I point out to the House that I suspect that the removal of certain person's names from electoral rolls would not entirely remove the risks to the lives of those people, whether they be members of the Judiciary, persons who may have received political asylum in this country or other persons suffering some threat to their lives or the lives of their families. However, this may well be one further step that can be taken to provide additional security for those persons. I will certainly refer it to my colleague for his early consideration.

### PAPUA NEW GUINEA NATIONAL PARLIAMENT BUILDING

**Mr EVANS:** Mr Speaker, I direct my question to you. I ask, Sir, whether you could give a report to the House of the success of the trip that was forced on you and the Presiding Officer of this House to represent the House in Papua New Guinea, as a result of which you were not in the House last week and were missed for many differing reasons by members of the House.

**The SPEAKER:** It is pleasant to be missed for whatever reason, I suppose. It is true that the Clerk and I did proceed to Papua New Guinea. Neither of us was forced to go there—in fact we were happy to go there for the occasion of the opening of the national Parliament building of Papua New Guinea by Prince Charles, and it was also the 100th anniversary of the expedition of the Australian Squadron to New Guinea. I am not allowed to exhibit or table things here, but I point out that there is a magnificent presentation in the Library of the limited edition of the narrative of that Australian expedition in New Guinea at which honourable members may care to look. Also, I have available some photographs and other documentary records of the Papua New Guinea building, which made the Clerk and I green with envy, I might say. \$30 million of Australian taxpayers' funds have been very well spent together with funds that have been very well spent around the country in providing facilities for members. One could only feel that if we could not eat at the table at least we could receive some of the crumbs.

On a more serious note, the Clerk and I did note that Port Moresby and other regions have grown considerably, and that augurs well for the future. The new Parliament House is of magnificent design, its inspiration being a Sepik hut and meeting house. It will hold 300 members. In fact, there are 109 members servicing about 3 million people. These people are our next-door neighbours. They are split into 700 tribes and they speak hundreds of different languages. It is a marvel that democracy has survived or, rather should I say, it is a credit to people like Sir John Guise, Sir Julius Chan, Mr John Okuk and Mr Somare, whose hard work and tolerance have kept the flame for freedom alight in New Guinea. We in Australia often forget the debt that we owe to the people of Papua New Guinea for the sacrifices they made for us during the Second World War. I am sure that I speak for all honourable members in wishing Papua New Guinea a stable and harmonious future as our next-door neighbour.

### TOURISM INDUSTRY

**Ms LENEHAN:** Does the Minister of Tourism intend to initiate discussions with the travel and tourism industry in respect to the introduction of an equal opportunities plan for the industry? As the tourism and travel industry employs an extremely large number of women in non-managerial positions, it has been suggested to me that the implementation of an equal opportunities programme within the industry would not only be highly desirable but also would be equitable in addressing the imbalance in employment that exists.

**The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY:** I am aware of the view expressed about the requirement for an equal opportunities programme for the travel and tourism industry. Whilst I have not made any decision to investigate the situation, I will certainly do so as a result of the honourable member's question. As we do not have any profile of employment within the travel and tourism industry, I think that that employment base needs to be discerned.

It is probably fair to say that the majority of people who work within the tourism industry in part-time positions would be female and that females in decision-making or management positions would be lacking. This does not apply only to the tourism industry but it is a fact that is becoming better known and more widely accepted. I will certainly investigate this matter.

There is not the capacity within the Department to adequately research this subject. This matter could be taken up with the Premier's Department and certain skills within that Department utilised, but I would need to speak to the Premier about that. The community employment programme, which place an emphasis on the employment of women, could also perhaps research this matter.

My initial reaction to the honourable member's question is to say 'Yes', but what I should do is to examine the Government's capacity and the CEP's capacity to see what resources can be directed to this very important subject, and I will advise the honourable member in the House in due course.

### OLYMPIC MOTORCADE

**The Hon. D.C. WOTTON:** Is the Deputy Premier aware that the police have indicated that they do not want school-children to attend the Olympic Motorcade on Friday? Children were told last week that approval had been given by the Minister of Education for them to attend. Can the Deputy Premier give the reasons for this change in policy?

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** I was with the Commissioner of Police yesterday, as I reported to the House, and he did not raise this matter with me; nor has anyone else raised it. The best that I can do—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** I am raising it now.

**The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT:** The honourable member is making it a statement of fact, by the way in which he has phrased the question. I am not sure of those facts. I will make inquiries of the Commissioner to see whether there has been a change in policy; it is as simple as that. I am not sure whether the decision has been made. I will let the honourable member know. This honourable member seems to find out a lot of things.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If honourable members—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If honourable members want Question Time to continue, I will call on the next member on my list.

### FAR NORTH ABORIGINES

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Has the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs received a report relating to the article in today's *Advertiser*—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Both the honourable Deputy Premier and the honourable member for Murray are completely out of order. So is—

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** So is the honourable Deputy Leader. If the honourable Deputy Leader does not cease his remarks I will name him.

**Mrs APPLEBY:** Has the Minister received a report relating to the article in today's *Advertiser* concerning Aborigines from the Far North charged with criminal offences in Port Augusta and found not guilty? Under a racist headline 'Blacks stranded in north', the article states:

Some Aborigines charged with criminal offences were being stranded in Port Augusta if they were found not guilty, an Aboriginal Legal Rights lawyer said yesterday . . .

Many were subsequently charged with stealing a car in an attempt to get home. 'If legal aid does a good job and they are found not guilty, many are stuck in Port Augusta with no money and nowhere to go,' Mr Swan said. If they are imprisoned for more than two weeks, at least they get a bus ticket home. He said 15 to 20 people had been stranded since January.

Would the Minister care to comment?

**The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER:** I thank the honourable member for raising this issue. However, it is not a matter that touches directly on State responsibilities. I notice at the bottom of the reference in this morning's paper that the Commonwealth Department of Aboriginal Affairs in Adelaide has made a comment. The general issue that the honourable member raises is one of concern, and I will seek further information from the respective authorities about the factual position of persons who are acquitted of criminal offences when trials are conducted in Port Augusta, or, indeed, in other remote areas of the State.

But, I also take the other point that the honourable member raised, namely, the headline and the reference to the word 'blacks'. I find that particularly offensive in its content. I notice that the *Advertiser* on the occasion, I think, of the passing of the Maralinga land rights legislation, referred in a heading in an early edition of its newspaper to the word 'blacks' but that in a later edition it removed that reference. It is not for the Government but for those persons aggrieved, particularly Aboriginal communities, to pursue this matter. There are, of course, opportunities for that to occur, whether it be through the Press Council, or by talking directly to newspaper editors and management.

In my experience, the *Advertiser* normally takes a very responsible attitude with respect to ethnic and Aboriginal matters generally, and indeed has provided some very worthwhile reporting of events which has been picked up by newspapers throughout the world, particularly with respect to Maralinga. So, I hope that a policy can be formed that does not refer in a racist way to sections of the community, whether they are appearing before the courts or in some other situation in community life. But, I assure the honourable member that I will look at the substance of the article to see whether in some way the State Government cannot assist as well.

### LAKE ALBERT SALINITY

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD:** Can the Minister of Water Resources say what effect the option adopted by the Government on the Lake Albert salinity study has had on improving the quality of the water in the lake and how that option has been implemented? During the past 12 months a vast quantity of water has flowed down the Murray, through Lake Alexandrina to the sea. If the option adopted by the Government was to have been effective, quite obviously the past 12 months would have afforded an opportunity for it to be extremely successful. It has been indicated to me that the reduction in the salinity level in Lake Albert has not occurred to the extent expected and that it cannot be anticipated that the flow conditions that have existed in the Murray River in the past 12 months will be experienced again for perhaps another eight or 10 years. So, I would be pleased if the Minister could indicate how the option was put into effect and to what extent it reduced the salinity level in Lake Albert.

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER:** I am pleased to advise the member for Chaffey that the Lake Albert salinity study option, to which he refers, was an empty-fill situation. The problem was that a number of options were proposed. We believed that this was the most cost effective, particularly at times of high flow. I inform the honourable member and the House that it has been moderately successful, but that we have not achieved the reduction in salinity for which we had hoped. The situation will be continually monitored. As I said, it depends greatly on the flow down the river for the option to be successful. I cannot recall the absolute figures relating to reduction in e.c. units in Lake Albert. However, there has been a reduction, although it has not been as significant as we had hoped. I will obtain the figures for the honourable member and advise him accordingly.

### JUNK MAIL

**Mr HAMILTON:** Will the Minister for Environment and Planning say whether the Government will consider recommending to persons letter boxing large leaflets and/or brochures that they honour requests by residents not to place junk mail in their letter boxes? On Monday last, I was approached by a married couple resident at West Lakes who complained strongly that their requests to persons letter boxing such material not to place it in their letter box had been ignored and met with the retort that the letter boxer had been told by the distributor to ignore such requests and that she must place a leaflet in each letter box.

These constituents told me that they had placed another container alongside their letter box for bulk advertising material but that this had been ignored. In addition, these constituents said that important authorised postal mail had been lost, resulting in great anxiety and concern to them regarding their own financial matters and, indeed, regarding

matters concerning the secretary of the strata title units to which they belong. Will the Minister consider advising these distributors to tell the people letter boxing to honour such requests from residents?

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I am willing to take the matter up. I do not think that anyone would want to go further than that. This is a fairly complex issue. Some people want to exercise a fairly severe censorship over the material that is put into their letter boxes, while others welcome any sort of reading material they can get. It is the sheer volume of material delivered that is the problem rather than necessarily the content of that material. It is important to the people who are distributing this material that they honour any reasonable request made by householders. It seems that the honourable member's constituents have taken one of the two courses of action that are available, as they have provided a separate box for the bulk material. Some people have also put signs on their letter boxes saying 'no junk mail'.

**Mr Evans:** Post them back unstamped.

**The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD:** I do not know that I want to underline that suggestion because it would create problems for Australia Post that I do not want to create. The suggestion about marking the letter box 'no junk mail' or something like that can be advisory only: there is no force of law operating. However, where people who are distributing material ignore such requests by householders that only develops momentum for stronger controls. I do not favour stronger controls being instituted, but people who have a vested interest in the continuance of this delivery industry would not want to create objective conditions for somebody else in a position of authority to institute such controls.

*[Sitting suspended from 12.55 to 2 p.m.]*

*At 2 p.m., the bells having been rung:*

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

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN COLONISATION ACT

**The Hon. J.C. BANNON (Premier and Treasurer):** I move:

That this House takes note of the historical significance of this day, Wednesday 15 August, which marks the 150th anniversary of the proclamation of the Act which enabled the establishment of the colony of South Australia.

Two years from now the people of this State will be celebrating 150 years of European settlement in South Australia. Most of us associate this event with a ceremony that was held beneath an oddly shaped gum tree at Glenelg in December 1836. But 150 years ago today another ceremony took place, now almost forgotten, without which there would be no celebration in 1986. Indeed, without it our history would have been vastly different. On this day in 1834 King William IV gave his assent to an Act:

... to erect South Australia into a British province and to provide for the colonisation and government thereof.

The proclamation of this Act marked the culmination of the agitation by a dedicated group which included Gouger, Wakefield, and Torrens, to establish a system of immigration from England free from the taint of transportation of convicts and soundly based on humanitarian principles. It signalled clearly that South Australia was to be no ordinary colonial appendage of Britain. No other colony had ever been founded by an Act of Parliament, and no other Act of Parliament was intended by its makers to be a blueprint for an ideal



society based on a perfect balance between free labour and capital.

In a strict legal sense the Act did not have a long history and was of no lasting significance to the legal framework of South Australia. It was repealed *in toto* in July 1842 and replaced by an Act for the better government of South Australia, that made South Australia a Crown colony and gave it a Government similar to that of its neighbours.

While the Act of 1834 had a very brief life-span, it was the expression of that idealism which gave South Australia a reputation for being in the forefront of social experiment. Those early planners established a tradition that gave this State universal suffrage, the secret ballot, and pioneering social and planning legislation well before other places in the world that would have claimed to be more civilised.

The seeds of failure for the Act lay in the fact that it represented a compromise between those who wanted to found the colony on these novel principles and the officials of the colonial office who feared that the schemes that were being proposed would lead inevitably to a republic. As the early history of South Australia showed, the compromise did not really work, as some of the provisions of the legislation were unclear, and others, particularly those concerning financial control, proved almost disastrous. Yet without the compromise, and without the legislation, the experiment in colonial settlement that became South Australia may never have taken place.

The novelty of the scheme to settle South Australia ensured that it drew plenty of criticism, both from inside and outside the British Houses of Commons and Lords. Perhaps it is not surprising that it had its detractors, given that its genesis came from the theoretical writings of Edward Gibbon Wakefield when he was serving three years imprisonment in England's Newgate Gaol for the abduction of an heiress. Wakefield's works had been taken up and published by Robert Gouger, who was to become one of the most energetic propagandists for the new system of colonisation.

When the Bill finally came before the Commons it was introduced to a sparsely attended House at 2 a.m., jammed in between an amendment to the poor laws and a Bill to resolve unrest in Ireland. The suspicions aroused by such a rushed introduction ensured that it received a difficult passage. During the debate, one member asked:

Was any individual to be found so great a fool as to set himself down upon 200 acres of land in a community of kangaroos?

In the House of Lords the question:

Pray, where is this South Australia?

was answered by the Lord Chancellor as:

Somewhere near Botany Bay.

The press was even more harsh and even more vague about the location of this experiment in a new society. The *Times* editorial of 2 July 1834, identified the new colony as:

Somewhere, we believe, about the south-western extremity of New South Wales a country known to the learned by the denomination of Australia.

The promoters of the scheme were condemned as charlatans by most of the London press, and the *Times* again was particularly harsh:

But our duty to the public requires that we should declare broadly, however briefly, our entire distrust of the whole character and tendencies of such a project, and our hope that it may rather be strangled in the birth than live just long enough to spread disappointment and ruin through a far wider portion of society than that now subjected to its influence.

In retrospect, it is fortunate for all of us that these criticisms came to nothing, and that the planners of the new colony were able to ignore the suggestion of one MP that they 'practise their theories on some moderate sized cabbage garden'.

Interestingly, one final hitch after the passage of the Bill concerned the question of the rights of the Aboriginal inhabitants of the proposed colony. In December 1835, one year before the colony was founded, the Colonial Secretary, Lord Glenelg, wrote to the South Australian Commissioners instructing them that they were to only sell such land in South Australia as was not occupied by the natives. While Torrens assured Glenelg that the Commissioners planned to protect the land rights of Aborigines and that they would not be dispossessed without compensation, it is clear from any reading of our history that there was no real attempt to do other than impose European settlement. It is significant that, as we are moving towards our sesquicentenary, the question of land rights for our Aboriginal people is only now finally being addressed and dealt with.

The beginning of that sesquicentenary year is indeed very close, and the planning that began almost five years ago is now coming together to ensure one of the biggest and spectacular years in our history. It is worth stressing that the Jubilee is in every way an exercise in bipartisanship, and, of course, the celebrations will not be confined to the actual anniversary of the proclamation at Glenelg, but will fill the whole year. More than 2 000 activities have been planned, ranging from multi-million dollar projects through to sporting championships, publication of books, historical re-enactments, festivals, conventions, and reunions. The Jubilee will be a truly community event, and there are already more than 100 community committees throughout the State working on planning for 1986.

Today marks the first significant date in the lead-up to these celebrations, and provides Parliament with the opportunity to take note of the proclamation of the Act which laid the basis for the founding of our State. We should also recall the men who pushed and lobbied the Act through the British Parliament, gave their names to so many of our streets, parks, and geographical features, and who were not simply vague idealists, self-seeking adventurers, or super patriots attempting to make the world more radical and progressive. They were complex enough to have all those things in their make-up, and 150 years later we can judge their achievements. They created in this Act a manifesto that transcended their individual weaknesses.

However, no Act of Parliament, regardless of how imaginative it is, can guarantee the success of its stated aims. It was one thing to create a new society on paper, quite another to make it a reality. This required the efforts of hundreds of thousands of people who came to South Australia in pursuit of a better life, over those intervening years, including and beginning with the ordinary people who stood under that gum tree in Glenelg listening to Governor Hindmarsh's proclamation. It was their faith, their enthusiasm, and their confidence in the future that makes that Act, passed in 1834, worth remembering. They are qualities that have never gone out of fashion, and they are still with us.

**Mr OLSEN (Leader of the Opposition):** I am pleased to support and second this motion. It is appropriate that this House recognises the 150th anniversary of the passing of legislation that was the first formal step in the orderly settlement of South Australia. This brief motion also serves as a preliminary event in the lead up to the 1986 sesquicentenary year celebrations. It is my hope, and certainly that of all members of the Liberal Party, that those celebrations will encourage widespread public participation and enjoyment at all levels and, secondly, demonstrate the diverse segments of the South Australian community. It is perhaps appropriate that already the initial planning for the celebrations have involved Governments from both sides of the political coin. I refer, of course, to the establishment of the Board by the former Administration and that the planning

process established by the former Administration has been carried on by the present Administration, as have other events to which the Premier has already referred.

I believe that it is particularly important that the celebrations cut across all political, economic, and cultural barriers and that, in the planning of the sesqui-centenary celebrations, it is incumbent on us all to ensure that that takes place. I looked back with interest at some of the former Cabinet material in relation to the sesqui-centenary celebrations when Cabinet was trying to determine a name for them. The names put forward were interesting: there was sesqui-centenary, birthday, anniversary, celebration, and jubilee. The last mentioned was the name selected because, 'first, it is a pleasant sounding word; secondly, it has style and distinction and sounds prestigious; and thirdly, "jubilee" denotes any period of 50 years or multiple of 50 years'. Appropriately, that was the reason for the selection of the name 'South Australia Jubilee 150 Celebration'.

It is important that these celebrations cut across all political, economic, and cultural barriers. I stress the fact that all South Australians should be encouraged to participate in the celebrations. After all, that is the broad intention of the legislation we are recalling today, namely, 'An Act to empower His Majesty to erect South Australia into a British province or provinces, and to provide colonisation and Government thereof.' The thrust of the legislation, which faced strong opposition even though it was first debated in the House of Commons at 2 a.m. on 23 July 1834, was free settlement of South Australia. It is interesting to note that, despite 150 years having elapsed, debate in Parliament at 2 a.m. still seems to be a feature of the Parliamentary system in Australia. The debate in the House of Commons was for free settlement of South Australia.

While the design of the colonisation scheme was to encourage settlement of South Australia, the marketing techniques used in the legislation were, at best, suspect. South Australia was said to consist of 'waste and unoccupied lands which are supposed to be fit for the purposes of colonisation'. The scheme to colonise South Australia as set out in that original Bill was based on the sale of land at a cost of 12/- per acre. The proceeds were then to be used to bring labourers to the new colony to help in its development. The original British Parliamentary debate makes fascinating reading. A Mr Baring, who opposed the measure, said that plans to colonise South Australia were drafted by 'experimental philosophers'. He further stated:

These philosophers were about to form a colony upon a principle which would throw all others in the shade. They were persons possessing great and varied powers of mind, and most enlarged understandings but, as it too frequently happened, the schemes of these theoretical individuals were seldom so contrived as to meet the ordinary purposes of life.

The fact that the original scheme was withdrawn less than a decade later suggests that Mr Baring was right. Another member, Mr Hughes, saw the scheme as a way to rid Britain of the Irish. He was pleased to support the spending of public money to facilitate the voluntary emigration of Irish workers. He said:

The Irish labourer was better adapted for the purpose of emigration than the English labourer: he could live on harder fare, and was accustomed to a more primitive state of existence.

It is probably true to say that the original Bill was approved when it eventually won the support of the Duke of Wellington, whose influence on British politics in 1834 was somewhat considerable. South Australia has made enormous advances in the past 150 years since 15 August 1834, advances of which every South Australian can be justly proud. The South Australian Government administers the affairs of a State which is older than Germany, Italy, 26 of the 50 States of the United States of America, and older than 115 of the 151 members of the United Nations.

Adelaide was established before Hong Kong. The University of Adelaide is older than are 36 of the 45 universities in Britain. The two Houses of the South Australian Parliament have met in regular session for 123 years, a record of continuity which can be matched by the elected Legislatures of only four nations.

South Australia pioneered many things such as secret ballots, voting for women, safety inspections in factories, free secular and compulsory education, and agricultural innovations, including drought resistant wheat and the stump jump plough—a wide, diverse, innovative South Australia—this by a State less than 150 years old, by a region described in the original legislation as 'waste and unoccupied lands which are supposed to be fit for the purposes of colonisation'. South Australia and all South Australians have a record of which we can be justly proud, and I support the motion.

**Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach):** It gives me great pleasure to support the motion. In the limited time available to me I wish to say something about the person I believe was the most responsible for the passing of the Act of Parliament in the House of Commons that started this colony on its way. I believe that Captain Sturt was probably the most influential person connected with the choice of South Australia as a point of settlement. In 1833, when the results of his expedition down the Murray River were published, he reported (and I quote from his journal):

It would appear that a spot has at length been found upon the coast of New Holland to which the colonist might venture with every prospect of success and in whose valleys the exile might hope to build for himself and his family a peaceful and prosperous home. All who have ever landed upon the eastern shores of St Vincent's Gulf agree as to the richness of its soil and the abundance of its pasture.

It was Captain Sturt's reports that convinced Edward Gibbon Wakefield and Robert Gouger to continue their efforts to commence a new colony, and it was Captain Sturt's journals that convinced the House of Commons to pass an Act in 1834 to allow the new colony of South Australia to be established.

South Australia owes a lot to Captain Sturt, and we can proudly say that South Australia was the only colony of Australia that was founded on the basis that the colony would be settled by free, hard working settlers who should be given an opportunity to leave their homeland, where the chances of success were limited, and go to a place that would give the opportunity for people to succeed. Captain Sturt's explorations have made him the most famous Australian explorer. His feats have superseded any effort that has been made by any sports hero or folk hero in Australia. I can only quote your words, Mr Speaker, when addressing a recent celebration in this House:

When Captain Sturt set out from Sydney in September 1828, the interior of the continent was still a mysterious region. By the time the explorer returned from his second expedition in 1831, though much of the mystery still remained, the Murray River had been discovered, its course navigated to the sea and a vast tract of country charted. Captain Sturt's journals recapture the excitement and the hardships of exploration, making them absorbing reading even today. South Australia's first colonists hailed Sturt as the discoverer of their province and his reports of the region did much to encourage its settlement. Few men have left a better memory. From his own journals and from the writing of others, Captain Sturt emerges as a courageous, conscientious, intelligent and humane man, caring for his subordinates and capable of inspiring lasting affection and respect.

It would be no surprise to anyone to hear me talk about Captain Sturt. The Captain Sturt Trust, in my district, is one of the priceless heritages that we have—a museum which every South Australian should visit. I issue a cordial invitation to all members of the House to take the time to visit that museum.

Finally, in tribute to Captain Sturt, I quote the last paragraph of chapter 5 from the book, *Australian Explorers*, by Colin and Margaret Kerr:

Sturt was probably the most beloved of all Australian explorers and he had a passionate love of Australia. But, for financial reasons, he returned to England. He died before receiving his well-earned knighthood from Queen Victoria.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** I support the motion ably proposed by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. It is fit and proper that we should remember particular dates in the manner that we have here today. Part of our future is dependent upon remembering our traditions. However, it is also important that we never dwell so much on the past that we cannot meet the challenges and the needs of the future.

I believe that the examples that have been shown by our forebears, many instances of which have been related by previous speakers to this motion, indicate that the people of South Australia certainly recognise the importance of the future. It is interesting to note the point made by the Premier about South Australia's being something of a social experiment. Indeed, that has been chronicled over a period of years. It has been recognised that a number of very vital social experiments took place in South Australia as a result of the form of settlement different from that which occurred in other parts of Australia.

Not the least of those social experiments which has passed on has been that directly associated with the traditions brought to this State by the German dissidents, or those who were unable to remain within their own homeland. They came out as part of the South Australia Company development of this State and made a tremendous impact upon many aspects of our agricultural and winery endeavours. The opportunity for this existed in the provision which was made by the passage of the appropriate Bill 150 years ago today.

We have benefited by their presence as we have benefited by the number of people who came here from areas of Cornwall and elsewhere to commence our copper mines, which played a significant part in the early export development of this State. We have benefited most certainly by the inclusion of the large number of Irish migrants—whether they were deported here in some sense by the decisions of others in England, or by the very fact that they came here, in many instances, to populate the offices of the church, which is dependent upon the Irish background. There have been many examples of benefit to this State and the social fabric of this State today which have arisen out of the sequence of events that followed on the decision made 150 years ago today.

Sir, it is fit and proper that the member for Henley Beach should pick up the point about Captain Sturt. Indeed, the House is thankful to him for having stimulated the suggestion that Sturt's memory should have been commemorated in the exhibition conducted here last year. It was also pointed out that Sturt was an explorer. Many other explorers in the history of South Australia played a vital part in developments far beyond the bounds of South Australia itself. Having been resident for a long period in the town of Gawler, which commemorates one of our early forebears, one's mind immediately comes to McKinlay and the tremendous work done by him and others.

There is a rich experience of South Australian development which I believe the activities of 1986 will bring to the fore, resulting in a worthwhile spectacle hopefully to be well recorded for posterity. However, although we recognise today the importance of the occasion 150 years ago, we will most certainly recognise the importance of our sesqui-centenary in two years time. It is important that we welcome and

strive towards a total future for the State which recognises all these important dates of the past.

Perhaps we are such a small part of a large continent, albeit an important part, that, apart from the special occasions we should give due thought and due accord to a portrayal that relates to the whole of Australia. Indeed, the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the development of Australia which will occur just two years after South Australia's sesqui-centenary celebrations, will highlight that point. The work of the Australia Day Council over the years, since it has developed from a small group to become today a beneficial group of people who are giving something by way of national pride, is important. I hope that, apart from the importance of today, the importance of this State's sesqui-centenary in two years' time, and the importance of the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Australia, the totality of what we in Australia stand for will be something which we stand up for on all occasions, not only on special ones. Truly, the old adage 'Hats off to the past and coats off to the future' will become a by-word by which we can go forward to a better Australia and a better role for South Australia in the Australia of the future.

**Mr EVANS (Fisher):** I support the remarks already made and wish to pick up where the member for Light finished. In celebrating and recognising this occasion, it would also pay us to think of some of those areas in which we have failed. I refer to a specific area in which I have taken an interest, a historical area whether it be concerned with local cemeteries or other historical sites. Such places indicate the effort that our forefathers and foremothers made to develop this country, especially our State of South Australia. If we consider the way in which some of our cemeteries have been allowed to deteriorate over the years, we realise that this deterioration reflects just how much respect we have for our forebears and for their efforts.

I am proud to belong to a group that has had a working bee once a year since 1903 to look after a local cemetery and keep it in excellent order, and I know that throughout the State many other small communities have bodies that do the same thing. Indeed, in our larger centres trusts and local councils perform this task. As a result of new methods of funding and the new attitudes in communities that have developed, we see community interest being replaced by self interest. Consequently, in some country towns buildings have reached a state of disrepair and, with the aid of CEP funding, we should try to restore these buildings to a condition of which we as a community can be proud.

As chairman of a committee of the Jubilee 150 celebrations, I know that the Premier, and his colleagues, and all other members of Parliament are aware of the need to which I refer, but I do not think that the community at large has accepted the real challenge to make the 1986 celebrations as successful as they should be.

I do not really believe service clubs and community organisations have been able to grasp the nettle to do all the planning that needs to be done even at this stage. I recognise that over 2 000 events have been registered. Many of them are regular events which will be updated to be a greater occasion during that year. We need to get the message over to the community that there will be an opportunity for whole families to go to our twin State of Texas that year to share in the family life and different lifestyle in that part of America. Air lines will be offering some concessions in air fares during that year, and there will be an interchange of people such as teachers and other professionals. I believe this occasion should be taken up by the media to ensure that the community is made even more aware of the effort needed and the potential there to have a great time during

1986. It will also be a great opportunity to boost our economy at the same time.

As the member for Light said, I hope we never forget the effort that men and women put into the development of this State. They came out on vessels for a six or eight week trip not knowing exactly where they were going, heading out to what might be suburbia now but what to them must have seemed like a wilderness. They took up a challenge that many of us today would not be prepared to take up if we were given the opportunity to do so. I take my hat off to the pioneers for making the effort they did. Like the member for Henley Beach, I was fortunate enough to live in the valley through which Charles Sturt travelled and I will go back there to build my home and spend the rest of my life. I congratulate those pioneers who gave so much to the development of this State.

Motion carried.

### COMMISSIONER FOR THE AGEING BILL

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

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

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

The purpose of this Bill is to establish the position of Commissioner for the Ageing and to define the objectives and functions of that office. In short, it is the Government's intention to create a focal point for information and advice about the ageing in South Australia, and for the co-ordination and support of services for this important section of our community. This measure was introduced in the House in the last session and was laid on the table for comment. The Bill is introduced in the same form as it was previously introduced, and I seek leave to incorporate in *Hansard* the remainder of the second reading speech and the explanation of the clauses without my reading them.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Bill

Over recent years, South Australia has seen a marked increase in both the numbers and the proportion of the older members in its population. The number of people of 65 years of age is increasing by more than 4 000 every year. In 1983 there were more than 147 000 people over 65 years in this State, or about 11 per cent of the population. By the turn of the century it is likely that there will be nearly 200 000 people over 65 years, comprising 13 per cent of the State's population. It is predicted that this trend will continue beyond that time producing even more significant changes to this State's population structure.

Within the older population, there are many other important social and demographic characteristics which warrant the interest of Governments and the wider community. For example, it is estimated that between 1981 and 1986 the number of Italian-born aged people will increase by one-third, and those from Greece and Germany by one-half. Women comprise 65 per cent of people over 65 years of age and 72 per cent of people over 80 years. Also, 70 per cent of women over 65 years do not have the support of a husband, and many lack other family ties. For many people there are good things to be enjoyed in their older years— independence from family and employment responsibilities; increased time in which to expand one's knowledge, skills and experience; new opportunities for community service;

more time to spend with one's friends or to relax after a busy period of life. For many it is also a time of loneliness, boredom, impaired physical and mental health, increased dependency, fears, anxiety and poverty.

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

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

In addition, as a part of the process of developing the proposal that there be a Commissioner, the Government was confronted with the question of whether to establish the office of the Commissioner by the enactment of special legislation, whether to provide for a statutory office by amendment to the Community Welfare Act, or whether to establish an office by administrative act. Obviously, it would have been possible simply to appoint a person within the Public Service to perform the functions that are to be prescribed by legislation. However, the Government has perceived that many people in the community think that it would be appropriate that the functions of a Commissioner be contained in legislation, and it is certainly the case that an office prescribed by Statute will acquire a status that is, in the opinion of Government, desirable because of the special needs and position of the ageing within our community.

Accordingly, the decision has been made to provide for the office by legislation, and that decision will culminate in the passage of this Bill. It will be immediately apparent that the Commissioner's title has been changed from 'Commissioner for Aged Care and Services' as originally proposed, to 'Commissioner for the Ageing'. The new title more clearly represents the Government's intention that the Commissioner will have responsibilities to all the ageing with their skills, experience, enterprise and resourcefulness, whilst giving special attention to their need for 'care and services' when required.

The objectives for the Commissioner also reflect this broader mandate. They have a three-fold focus—the ageing

themselves; the programmes and services for the ageing; and the community of which the ageing are a part. The term 'the ageing' has been given lengthy consideration and whilst it will not appeal to all, seems more acceptable than other terms including 'the aged' and 'the elderly'. It is also receiving more widespread usage (*viz.* Councils on the Ageing; studies on 'The Family and the Ageing' etc.) and is in common use in the United States. It has been decided not to limit the term to a particular age group but to follow customary usage as referring to the older members of the population. The primary responsibility of the Commissioner will be to provide informed advice and commentary to State Government Ministers, departments and instrumentalities and programmes and services affecting the ageing. Such advice will also be available to other levels of government, service agencies, non-government organisations and the general public.

Many policies and services separate old people from others in our society. This is not the philosophy of this Government, nor the intention of this legislation—nobody should be subject to society's intended or unintended rejection. The Commissioner will try to identify and promulgate inclusionist rather than exclusionist practices at all times. The Commissioner will have access to all Government Ministers and heads of departments and instrumentalities on matters concerning the ageing. For the Commissioner's advice to be fully informed, it will be necessary for the Commissioner to study and consult widely. Information about the ageing needs to be brought together, analysed and applied to the South Australian situation. Local research on the ageing and the services provided for them needs to be encouraged. The Commissioner will promote such research, compile data and ensure its dissemination throughout the community.

The Commissioner will consult widely with individuals and organisations about issues and needs of the ageing. These will include policy makers, service administrators, professional workers, academics, and organisations for the ageing. In particular, the Commissioner will consult with the ageing themselves, and will seek to ensure that society adjusts to the needs and aspirations of older people. Obviously, the process cannot be all one way and one of the tasks of the Commissioner will be to pursue that balance, taking into account other considerations and expectations. Conceptions about older people being unproductive and dependent. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Commissioner will seek to ensure that the skills and experience of elderly people are recognised and used for the benefit of both the community and individual elderly people. Wherever possible, the Commissioner will seek their wider participation on Government committees, boards of management and in other community structures—particularly where decisions and actions are being taken which affect them.

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

and represent the State on influential advisory and co-ordinating committees.

While there is a considerable amount of information for and about the ageing, it is not always in a form accessible to the elderly. The Commissioner will seek to ensure that information for the elderly is comprehensive and well presented and available through those channels with which they have regular contact. In time it is expected that the Commissioner will provide a clearing house of information for service providers and policy makers so that they have the latest research data as well as information on such matters as funding sources and priorities, departmental responsibilities and procedures, program ideas and practices. It is not the Government's intention that the Commissioner should be responsible for the administration of services for the ageing. As far as possible, this Government will provide policies and services which are inclusive—for all the people—and it will be the task of the Commissioner to seek to ensure that they are sensitive to the needs and aspirations of older people. Whilst inclusive policies and services run the risk of fragmentation, the Government will look to the Commissioner to identify gaps and assist with co-ordination on behalf of the ageing.

Finally, it is not intended that the Commissioner should have a regulatory function. Almost certainly the Commissioner will receive personal complaints about treatment received or not received from service givers. Such complaints will provide important information to the Commissioner for advising about services. However, if the Commissioner becomes an investigatory and enforcement agency for personal complaints, there are dangers of duplicating the existing avenues of investigation as well as providing a conflict of roles *vis-a-vis* those of advising, liaising, support and co-ordinating. Where existing standards of care and enforcement mechanisms are found to be ineffective or insufficient, the Commissioner may be asked to advise the Government on more adequate measures. As members would be aware, this Bill was introduced into the Parliament during the last session so that interested individuals, organisations and other bodies could comment before the Bill was fully debated. This period of consultation has been a worthwhile time for people to explore the contents of the Bill and comment accordingly. It may be noted that the consultation did not, however, necessitate any alteration to the Bill as it was initially drafted.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 provides for the commencement of the measure. Clause 3 contains the definition of 'the Commissioner' for the purposes of the proposed new Act. Clause 4 provides for the office of Commissioner for the Ageing. It is proposed that the Commissioner be appointed for a term not exceeding five years. He is not to be appointed under the Public Service Act, but the conditions of his appointment will be determined upon the recommendation of the Public Service Board in order to ensure some consistency with comparable appointments in other areas of government. In the event that a Commissioner is appointed from the Public Service, his existing and accruing rights to leave are to be preserved.

Clause 5 provides for immunity from liability for the Commissioner in the performance of his functions under the Act. Any liability shall attach instead to the Crown. Clause 6 sets out the objectives of the Commissioner. It is proposed that the Commissioner should work to achieve a proper integration of the ageing within the community, to create social structures within which the ageing may realise their full potential, to advance a desirable social ethos in relation to the ageing, and to achieve a proper understanding of the problems of the ageing within the community. Clause 7 relates to the functions of the ageing. The Commissioner is to advise upon programmes and services designed to

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

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

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

#### PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.  
(Continued from 14 August. Page 251.)

**Mr PLUNKETT (Peake):** I support the motion. I would like to place on record my sympathy to the families of former colleagues: Howard O'Neill who entered Parliament at the same time as I did in 1979 and passed away on 30 October 1983 after a long illness; Charlie Wells, who passed away on 5 July 1984; and Harold Welbourn King and Ernest Claude Allen.

I wish to take up some of the negative points made on the other side of the House in relation to the State housing industry. It is plain to me why the member for Mitcham is not in the shadow Cabinet. If ever there was a prophet of doom and gloom, he is it. Heaven help South Australia if he ever rises above his current political station. He could only be a Minister of Misery or Minister of Depression. If he ever becomes Minister of Housing I am sure we would be lucky to see a single house built for fear of not finding a buyer.

In fact, the member for Mitcham's pessimistic attitude summarises the key difference between the State Government and the Opposition, namely, courage. In relation to the housing industry, it requires courage to implement policies to raise the industry from its knees and put it to work for the benefit of the whole community, even though some risks are attached to that resurrection. A few days ago in this House we witnessed the incredible sight of the member for Mitcham pouring cold water on the upturn in the housing industry and predicting a big bust—hardly a word of optimism, not one word of praise, just pathetic snivelling criticism.

How out of touch is the honourable member with the new wave of hope and optimism in South Australia. How

out of touch is the whole Opposition with the lift in the State's economic fortunes and positive community spirit that is developing with it. The isolation of the Opposition has been confirmed in poll after poll, which show its standing consistently below 39 per cent. The speech by the member for Mitcham typifies the reason for the Opposition's low standing. They are a group of negative thinking, depressing people. They cannot even recognise positive developments as obvious as the State's massive housing recovery. All they can do is moan about some of the inevitable consequences of the lift in housing activity. The Opposition tries to ignore what is clear to every other South Australian, namely, that the State's new housing buoyancy has given a tremendous boost to our economy.

The arguments put by the member for Mitcham on the housing industry were not only negative but also ambiguous. First, he denied that the State Government could claim any credit for the housing revival. He then said that we were silly to say that we had helped rejuvenate the industry because, sooner or later, it would go bust. What a pitiful position in which the Opposition finds itself. It does not know what tack to take. It has been washed overboard in the wake of South Australia's economic revival. The honourable member actually said, 'Let me not hear the Premier of this State say, "Look how well we have done; we have got the housing industry to a state where its activity has increased 50 per cent and that is something to be proud of"'. It is nothing to be proud of. The honourable member is obviously in need of a lesson on the housing needs of South Australia. He is also in need of some economic instruction, but most of all he needs to read some books on positive thinking.

The high level of activity in the building industry today is the result of several factors, but the State Government does indeed claim credit for some of these factors. Furthermore, the Government believes that the increase in building levels is doing far more good for the community than it has undesirable effects. The generous economic spill-over for the general state of the economy is something that the State desperately needed and it is beginning to show its effect in employment figures and its other economic statistics.

The Government would have preferred the rise in home prices that has occurred over the past few months to have been more modest. However, because South Australian real estate prices were depressed in comparison with the rest of the country it was inevitable that sometime a natural catch-up would occur. Nevertheless, overall during the past one or two years more people who previously would have been excluded from the home buying market have been able to buy a home.

From the beginning of its current term of office the Government has been aware of the necessity to stimulate the housing industry not only to revive the economy but also to meet the needs of South Australian families. Contrary to beliefs held by the member for Mitcham, the Government is aware of the history of booms and busts in the housing industry. The Government has consulted with the Federal Government and has laid down a housing strategy that aims to increase building activity to a certain level and then maintain that level. The first part of that objective has been achieved. Much to the member for Mitcham's relief, the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement and the First Home Ownership Scheme will continue, and will help to achieve the second objective. I notice that the Opposition is very quiet. Unfortunately, this objective cannot be met by Government action alone and the private sector, through the real estate industry, must play its part by not talking up price levels. The member for Mitcham is obsessed with the idea of a big bust in the housing industry either this year or next. He expounded on this proposition at great length

and talked negatively about the future. He predicts doom and gloom because he cannot face the positive state of affairs that exists nowadays in relation to the housing industry.

The State Government is well aware of the boom/bust cycle and is working with policies to limit the extent of a bust, while helping many families to purchase homes of their own. The Government is working hard with positive policies. The private market must also play its part or the result will be the same old story of killing the goose that laid the golden egg. I took particular offence at the member for Mitcham's claim that the Government has had nothing to do with the revival of the housing industry's fortunes in this State. While the Government does not claim total credit for it, the State Government's lobbying of the Federal Government to provide a significant boost in funds for public housing was a most instrumental factor in the recovery process. The resultant increase of funds enabled the public sector to provide the initial stimulus to the very depressed housing industry. I might say that this reflects the Labor Party's traditional concerns for the needs of low-income families.

The member for Mitcham implied that the State Government had ignored the needs of low income groups. This was an odd claim to make not only because of the history of the honourable member's Party in providing unnecessary assistance to the wealthy in our society but also because of its woeful ignorance in regard to these matters. The public housing sector has a great deal to offer low income families, and the Government has concentrated much of its efforts in providing decent housing for people who cannot afford, or who do not want to buy, their own house. The Government has gone much further in providing homes for low income families, and I refer to the Home Ownership Made Easier Programme, established specifically by the Government to help low income families buy their own homes. This programme is an innovative package of assistance measures and is unprecedented in Australia.

It is based on a redistribution of the interest subsidy offered through the State Bank more towards the lowest income groups. It provides financial assistance through low income loans or rental purchase to all low income people whether they are family, single parents, a single person or even a parent with custody of his or her children.

**Mr Whitten:** They're the people who need assistance.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** My colleague, the member for Price, is quite correct in what he said. HOME has been attractive to those whom it was designed to help, and there are more than 6 600 householders waiting to take advantage of the programme. This refutes the baseless assertions that the State Government has done nothing to help low income households. The Government is continuing to monitor the HOME price situation, and will adjust the provisions of the HOME programme to ensure that real and effective help is maintained for low income households.

While the member for Mitcham continues to dwell on the dark future as he sees it, the State Government will continue to provide real help to South Australians in their housing needs, be it public or private housing, and it will continue to implement policies that will maintain that help while keeping building activities at a level that can be managed by the housing industry. The only dark future that I see is for the member for Mitcham and his colleagues opposite who continue to thrash about in despair at their poor ratings, and who try to tear down what is obviously a real achievement by the State Government, the housing industry, and the community. I pay a tribute to the Minister of Housing and Construction, Terry Hemmings, who has put the runs on the board.

**Mr Whitten:** He's doing a great job too, isn't he?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Yes, he most certainly is. Nothing has deterred him in his goal of providing housing and jobs for thousands of working class people. Under his Ministry, the Housing Trust is building hundreds more homes a year than the Liberal Government ever considered, and literally thousands of jobs have been created as a direct result of those policies.

**Mr Whitten:** Liberals have never been interested in helping ordinary people, have they?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** They do not know how to. The State Government is proud of the housing portfolio, as I am sure all South Australians are. I now refer to an incident that occurred on 1 June at the Adelaide Airport concerning an accident involving a light aircraft. Unfortunately, I was away from Adelaide at the time, but it concerned me greatly, because some of my district is under the flight path of both large and small planes and I have advocated, since being the member for Peake, that the airport should not be located in its present position. That is not to say that South Australia should not have a high class airport, but it should be situated out of the city and away from built-up areas. A report in the *Advertiser* of 1 June states:

A Strathalbyn pilot reckons he's lucky to be alive after crash-landing his light aircraft last night . . . a single-engine Piper Comanche crash-landed just inside Adelaide Airport.

The plane narrowly missed an occupied house, flattened a stobie pole and brought down power lines, hit a tree, smashed through the airport's perimeter iron fence and came to rest upside down in a crumpled heap about 25 metres from the house.

It ended up in a horse paddock leased by the airport. One wing, which sheared off in the crash, lay on Trennery Street, about 15 metres from the house. The report continues:

At the accident scene, Department of Transport investigator Mr G. Bailey said it was lucky the wrecked aircraft had not exploded as it still had about 80 litres of fuel on board. The pilot and three other men survived the crash.

**Mr Hamilton:** They were lucky.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** They were lucky, but so were many people who live in houses near the airport. The article further reports the comments of Mrs Trudy Rannu who owns a house on Trennery Street at the edge of Adelaide Airport, as follows:

Mrs Trudy Rannu was last night describing the crash minutes after the Piper Comanche, its engine dead, had almost cannoned into her home. The house is almost directly under the flight path of incoming planes. 'I was so scared,' Mrs Rannu said as she stood in her front garden, surveying a litter of plane fragments, a stobie pole, powerlines and a carpet of white foam sprayed by firefighters. 'I rushed to the front door with Irene, my daughter, and saw them scrambling from the wreck, their noses bleeding,' she said. 'One was lying on the ground, something was wrong with his back.'

Mrs Rannu was further reported as having said:

The first thing I saw was the powerlines on the ground, I was scared of a fire.

I am reading only parts of the report, but I am very disturbed to hear about such events. I would certainly have spoken about the matter at the time, but unfortunately I was not in Adelaide and could not do so. The article further states:

The aircraft had reported difficulties up to 40 minutes earlier and had been diverted from its intended landing strip at Strathalbyn.

I suggest that if an aircraft was in danger of crashing (which this plane certainly was) it should not have been diverted to Adelaide Airport where we have such a vast population near the airfield. That aircraft could have dropped out of the sky at any time. It was definitely not advisable to direct it across the city of Adelaide. It would have been more appropriate to have sent it to Parafield aerodrome, where all small planes should land and should be based. This is one of the things that has always concerned me, and I have raised the problem several times. I believe that the airport should be moved, but I will not bang my head against the

wall knowing that this will not happen for at least 10 or 15 years, from all reports. However, we should not encourage light aircraft to operate from Adelaide Airport.

I know that some of my colleagues think that I am incorrect in saying such a thing. Also, I have received letters as a result of my speaking about the matter previously and my comments having been reported in the newspaper, from people in the country in Coober Pedy and other places pointing out that they were members of the Labor Party and that they did not want me to advocate that light planes should be moved from Adelaide Airport, because they found it convenient to fly to Adelaide Airport and be easily transported to the city. I answered all the letters, but when I replied to those letters written by Labor Party members, I pointed out that I represented people, not aeroplanes. Some of my constituents unfortunately live under the flight path of the aircraft. It is all very well for the member for Light to laugh, because he would probably not see an aeroplane in his district.

If he were here, the member for Hanson would not laugh because his district is involved in this problem. Although he has received criticism, probably from members of his own Party, for defending the interests of the people in the flight path, he has done a good job.

I am concerned not only for the people who live near the airport but also for the teachers and students at the five schools in the area. An inquiry that was held at Thebarton was told that a teacher at Cowandilla Primary School had to stop teaching the children in her class every time an aircraft flew over the school because the noise disrupted and disturbed the class. Other schools under the direct flight path are Thebarton Primary School and Thebarton High School, while Lockleys Primary School, Kilmara Secondary School, at Thebarton, and the Salesian College, at Brooklyn Park, are just off the flight path. I am amazed when I hear people say that, because the airport has such a safe record, an accident could not occur. Thank God that the airport has a good safety record, otherwise many people would have been killed. There could always be an accident, and if there was one, many people would lose their lives or be injured.

As the member for Hanson has just come into the Chamber, I must tell him that he has my support for the statements he has made about the removal of small light aircraft to another location and the transfer of the airport from its present site. I seldom support the honourable member, but in this case I do so without wishing to have any favours from him in return.

On 23 November 1983, together with other members of this place, I attended an inquiry conducted in the Thebarton Municipal Chambers by Mr Peter Milton (Chairman of the National Aircraft Noise Inquiry). A newspaper account of the proceedings that day states:

The chairman of the National Aircraft Noise inquiry, Mr Peter Milton, says he was horrified when he flew into Adelaide yesterday. 'The houses were just a few hundred feet below me, and the plane flew so low as it came in,' he said. 'It must be very frightening to be in the path of one of those aircraft just 300 to 400 feet towards the end of the runway. Lights for the airport are located in people's backyards—I've never seen that before.'

Mr Milton, head of the Federal Government inquiry into aircraft noise, opened the two-day hearing in Adelaide yesterday.

As the inquiry proceeded it was interrupted by the roar of several planes, which is understandable because the council chambers are in the Adelaide Airport flight path. The report continues:

Outside the hearing, he said Adelaide had the worst noise problem of airports so far investigated by the inquiry—Perth, Launceston and Melbourne.

For those who laugh and carry on about the airport, it is a sad thing that the people who live under the flight path do

not have a big voice because if people are not annoyed by the planes they do not want to see the airport shifted.

A poll was conducted through the *Advertiser* as to whether the airport should be shifted. The results of the poll appear in a statement made by Alderman J.V.S. Bowen, a former Lord Mayor of Adelaide, which pointed out that a total of 51.4 per cent was against and 48.6 per cent was in favour of moving the airport away from the metropolitan area. I am amazed that it was as high as 48.6 per cent, because the majority of people questioned would have lived away from the flight path, and I thought the majority would have been higher. That is the attitude of people who live outside the flight path, such as the member for Light who grinned when I started to speak about airport noise, because he is not bothered by the noise or by constituents who have crockery breaking when planes fly over their houses, and I have been in such houses. The walls of some houses are cracking through the vibration of aeroplanes flying over them.

That might sound ridiculous to anyone who does not understand this. I know the member for Hanson has had the same experiences, as I have had, of visiting some of the houses under the flight path. The owners of these houses cannot get compensation. Don't let members not carry on as the honourable member opposite does; he is in a safe rural seat of Alexandra and would not see a plane from one day to the next. I must admit that he might see one of the little planes that goes over to Kangaroo Island but that would not bother anyone very much. That is the type of attitude Mr Bowen, the former Lord Mayor, had when he was quoted in the *Advertiser* on 2 June, after this close accident:

Alderman Bowen said that he lived at North Adelaide—

In case there is someone here who does not know it, North Adelaide is the exclusive area up there. I think the member for Torrens covers that district. The houses up there are very well protected. They make sure they build their houses with plenty of money, some of them cost \$200 000 or \$300 000, and possibly they would not hear much noise. The former Lord Mayor was quoted as follows:

Mr Bowen said that he lived at North Adelaide and he experienced aircraft coming down the glide path to the Adelaide Airport—

they call it the glide path up there—

'Only yesterday afternoon a jumbo flew overhead and it was far quieter than earlier model domestic airliners', he said. 'There are times that only their shadow alerts you to their being overhead and they are getting quieter every year.'

I would like to see Mr Bowen go down to Trennery Street, at West Richmond, or to the corner of Henley Beach and South Roads, where my office and the Thebarton Town Council are situated and hear the noise the planes make when they fly overhead. He will not have to be worried about the shadow; the shadow comes after the noise. I have to stop telephone conversations because I cannot hear the people on the phone. I have been told that I speak clearly and I am easy to understand, so one can imagine how some other people who speak quietly get on when they are talking on the telephone and a plane flies overhead.

I have visited many of these houses to see the damage that has been caused by the vibration. I have been told that the price of their houses would be reduced by at least \$10 000 and the problem is worsened because there is no way they can get any compensation. The more the houses deteriorate, the lower their value. I have been told that insurance companies will not insure for cracks that occur through vibration from aeroplane noise. I honestly believe that if we cannot shift the airport to Two Wells we should at least discourage light aircraft from using West Beach airport, because they are making the matter worse. Every Jack and Jim seems to have an aeroplane parked next to



the International Airport. Parafield is the place for them. I have told people who have written to me about this that Parafield is only 12 kilometres from Adelaide and surely that is close enough for them. If they have a fast car they could get to the city in about 25 minutes. So do not let them direct their problems to me. Not only is the noise causing damage to people's property and houses, it is upsetting people's nerves and their health, and I am talking about people's lives.

*Mr Ingerson interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** The member for Bragg need not smile. He ought to get down to the district of the member for Hanson, who will no doubt give him a conducted tour. I do not like the Opposition members smiling and being smart because that is one thing they cannot be. Not one member on the other side has a bit of smartness, apart from the member for Mitcham, because he did not come into the Chamber when I was criticising what he said about housing. The member for Mitcham is embarrassed. He has been up in his room listening, and sneaked back to the Chamber only when he knew I had finished. I am pleased to stand here and say that no-one was injured when the plane crashed on 1 June. I believe that, if light aircraft continue to use West Beach, there is a possibility of a serious accident occurring. We should be doing something to get those light planes away from the airport and then shift the airport later.

**An honourable member:** That's rubbish.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Members opposite can laugh: half of their constituents own planes and they are worried about the owners of these planes losing five minutes coming to the city from their cattle stations to cash their cheques.

*Mr Ashenden interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** There he is, the General Manager of Holdens! They have gone broke since the member for Todd left them. You can always tell when we hit a Liberal, because they start yapping. This will cool them off a bit. I am pleased to see the member for Eyre coming in. I have something to say that might interest him. I have been doorknocking in his district. They say they never see him up there. He missed the airport bit, he should have been here with his comrades—

**Mr Ashenden:** We are not comrades.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I would agree with the member for Todd, there is no comradeship over there. They will stab each other in the back, no worries. Look what they did to the member for Fisher.

**Mr Gunn:** Talk a bit of sense. You've talked a lot of nonsense—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten):** Order! The honourable member for Peake does not require the member for Eyre to provoke him.

**Mr PLUNKETT:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. In June I was fortunate to take a study tour.

**Mr Baker:** Where did you go?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** I did not go overseas, but at least I reported properly when I came back. I have read some of the reports of overseas study tours, and it is a pity that members do not write them up correctly. I drove to Wilpena Pound, and stayed there a couple of days. No wonder it is a great attraction for tourists, artists and painters. It is also a great attraction to people who like to get out and take walks. I thoroughly enjoyed the two days I was at the Pound. While I was there (I made sure I did not say too much around fire places), I had an opportunity to use a solar powered telephone. Only two people had used it prior to my using it. With the development of viable solar powered techniques and new technology electronics, the outlook for the coin operated telephone service in rural locations is brighter.

The public telephone can be powered by solar panels and connected to the telephone network by line or radio link. The latest design is a unit which has the ability to function without direct sunlight for at least 10 days and is well protected against faulty conditions and vandalism. I have quite a bit of information on that telephone and it is great to see this sort of thing becoming available in the country. Anyone who likes to read the information later will find it in the library along with other details that I will not go into.

From Wilpena Pound I travelled to Leigh Creek, where I had arranged with the Manager, Ron Morgan, to have an inspection of the coal mine. I found it extremely interesting, because I had visited Leigh Creek back in the late 1950s when the old town was there. Of course, the new South Leigh Creek town has been built, but I had never had an opportunity to look over the coalfields. Ron was very good. He took me everywhere, explained the increase in the tonnage and the millions of tonnes that would have to be supplied to the new power station in Port Augusta. He also took me to within a hand's reach of the Terex diesel electric trucks which are of 155 tonnes and are used to remove the overburden. The reason for these large trucks is that the amount of overburden at Leigh Creek is much more than in any other coal mine in Australia.

He also showed me where the coal is loaded by electric shovels into 80 tonne trucks which transport it to the crushing plant. The crushed coal is then stored in loading bins until being railed 225 km to Port Augusta. Improvements in mining methods and the rising cost of alternative fuel for power generators have led to the planned production of much more coal from Leigh Creek than previously had been envisaged. Leigh Creek South is a new town 13 kms south of the original township, which had to be relocated to make way for future operations. Leigh Creek has all the modern conveniences in education, including schooling for 500 students from primary to adult education levels. Facilities for sport and recreation include a large swimming pool, ovals, playing fields, golf courses, cinema, and live theatre. I also noticed that at one time Leigh Creek's management did not encourage tourists in any way, but with the new town they have encouraged tourists with a new caravan park. Apparently the Trust has had a change in attitude towards tourists.

*Mr Peterson interjecting:*

**Mr PLUNKETT:** As the member for Semaphore just mentioned, it could be developed as quite a good tourist centre: I agree with him. Leigh Creek is very close to some very scenic country and many people sell South Australia down tourist-wise. They ask what we have and say that we have to go to the Grampians and other places to see anything interesting. That means that those people have never been to some of the places in Northern South Australia. We have some of the best scenery and tourist areas. It cannot be seen anywhere in the world like it is in the Outback. We have not got a corner on the market as far as the Outback is concerned, but we have a big portion of it. I do not know whether people realise the potential. That is where people want to go. They have gone off the glitter of Surfers Paradise and places where one has to pay through the nose to be entertained, and they are looking at holidays where they can travel, be themselves, do not have to dress up every day, and where they can wear the same pair of pants, shirt and coat for a week and no-one will complain.

I am pleased that the previous Minister of Tourism is present, because she would probably agree that the old hotels at Blinman and such places have something that cannot be obtained anywhere else in the world. One cannot get it in the English hotels or anywhere else. People go there and put their card up on the wall to show that they have

been there, and some people leave money, but I noticed that the member for Eyre had not left any there.

I wish to thank Ron Morgan for the great opportunity of looking over the coalfields and the town. While I was at the Leigh Creek coalfield he showed me an area that was going to be blasted the following day, the blast to be witnessed by a delegation from China. They were blasting 243 tonnes of explosives and 1 390 blast holes were drilled over 8.5 hectares. That was blown the day after I left. Ron Morgan told me it was a complete success and that there are 2 million tonnes of overburden currently being removed as a result of that blast. He also explained to me the high cost of mining and the equipment used, such as the Terex which is an enormous truck carrying 155 tonnes. To change a tyre or a wheel it is necessary to use a front-end loader, because it is too heavy for any person to carry, unless he is a weightlifter like Dean Lukin, who might be able to handle some of those tyres.

He also explained that a replacement motor for a Terex truck costs \$70 000, that a tyre costs \$8 000, and a radiator costs \$20 000. These sorts of things involve tremendous expense. Following the inspection on the following day we travelled to Lyndhurst, from where one can travel farther to Marree or the Strzelecki track. I did not travel up the Strzelecki Track on this occasion because I did not have time and because I had previously travelled up the track as far as the corner of the three States (that is, South Australia, Queensland and New South Wales). As a matter of fact, in the 1960s when I was shearing at Fort Gray I was invited to attend a ceremony involving Ministers of those three States of the laying of the corner post. The original corner post had been there for many years and so the new concrete post was not the original post at all. Actually I have a piece of wood from the original corner post. Also on the track is Burke's Dig Tree as well as many other historical items.

On this occasion I travelled from Lyndhurst to Marree. Because the Ghan train no longer travels through Marree, the population has decreased from 300 to about 100 people. Therefore, not a great deal of activity is occurring in Marree. I was told that the only activity there involves tourism. I think there is a great opportunity there for tourist ventures. I notice the man from Bragg over there smiling again—I guess he has never been on any of these sorts of trips. Marree is the gateway to the Birdsville track on which many people travel during good weather and it is also the gateway to Oodnadatta track. I would not be surprised if in a few years some live wire grabs the opportunity to establish a restaurant, information, tourist centre at Marree, as I believe that there is some potential there to do that.

Whilst at Marree I decided to take the opportunity to travel up part of the way of the Birdsville track, a track I had not travelled before. I drove up as far as Etadunna Station which at that time was owned by Brian Oldfield. That is where I started to do some door knocking of the member for Eyre's constituents. I called in and spoke with Brian, who is a very nice person.

**Mr Hamilton:** Did he know the member for Eyre?

**Mr PLUNKETT:** He said that he did, that he had met him somewhere. I shall not be too unkind to the member for Eyre: I found that everyone up there knows the member for Eyre. I mentioned 'the member for hot air' but they said they did not know him under that name! However, I do not want to be nasty; he can be a very nice bloke at times. Whilst I was at Brian Oldfield's property he informed me that they are presently undertaking the job of restocking. The destocking that had been necessary had already taken place. For the benefit of members who do not know anything about it, I point out that, in relation to destocking, since 1980 the programmers have been through the properties

and have destocked them because of tuberculosis. As can be imagined, that was a very large programme.

Brian Oldfield told me that I should visit the old ruins of the Killapaninna Mission, a few kilometres off the road. That was built in 1867 and once cared for 22 000 Aborigines. Although that seems a lot, I have checked on that figure and have found that it is quite correct. The severe drought of 1915 forced the closure of the mission. In this regard, I would advise travellers on the Birdsville track not to stick solely to travelling on the track itself. Most people simply get on the track and head towards Birdsville and consequently do not see the other great attractions of the area off the track, such as the artesian bores. I went to see three artesian bores which were so hot that one could not touch the water. Before taking these trips, I checked first with the people at Marree who recommended some of these places. Had I not inquired I would not have known about them.

A few kilometres from Brian Oldfield's station a large highway construction gang was working on the road. I was informed by them that they are replacing a fair bit of the road because in March of this year 18 to 19 inches of rain fell over two days and that parts of the road were washed away. People travelling on these tracks would be well advised to first inquire about the condition of them. I would suggest that in most cases a four-wheel drive or a high wheel base vehicle is required to negotiate some of the creek beds, and so on. Also, it is a good idea to travel during daylight hours, because it can be quite treacherous at night time.

I then travelled from Marree to Williams Creek which is situated about 45 kilometres from Lake Eyre. There I enjoyed the company of host Harry Coleman, who is the licensee of the hotel. I enjoyed his hospitality over a few beers and we were entertained by Jack, a two-year-old donkey and his blue heeler cross, Fred. They put on a good turn. Jack would breast the bar and have four or five beers, after which he would get quite niggly, I might add. He is quite a character. Every person who travels through Williams Creek most certainly calls in to see Harry and his two pets.

I stayed at Williams Creek for three days and then took the opportunity of travelling to Lake Eyre North. That is where Sir Donald Campbell broke the land speed record; that would be a bit difficult this year because the lake is full of water. The track to this location is very rough because it is traversed by many drains and creeks. This is the end of the channel country from which normally water flows to fill the lake. However, the locals told me that to their knowledge this is the first time that the lake has been filled by local waters.

Normally it would be filled from the Cooper or Diamantina channel country originating in Queensland. For the first time ever it filled up in March this year from local rains. That seems incredible because it is an enormous salt lake. Anyone who went out fishing would be very disappointed because, although the fresh water brings fish into the lake, the salt eventually takes over and millions of fish die. Presently the bird life is thick but within a few months it will diminish because the lake will be too salty for the birds to exist.

It is certainly a worthwhile trip but it is disappointing not to be able to see much of the lake because from land you are unable to get close to the lake; you go up to your knees in silt. One cannot get to the water's edge. The only area that I have seen which resembles the scenery around the lake is probably the first pictures of the landing on the moon. I have never seen any other country like it.

I travelled from Williams Creek to Anna Creek Station which is reputed to be the biggest cattle station in the world. It covers an area of 30 027 square kilometres, almost half the size of Tasmania, and it is owned by the Kidman Company. I met the manager and some of the workers

there. Whilst there, restocking had commenced after the station had been destocked. An enormous amount of money was needed to restock the station. However, the Kidman Company has bought a property in Western Australia and is using the cattle from that property to restock this station. I was informed that the Taxation Department had agreed to spread its tax over a few years so that it would not impose too much hardship on the station. From there I travelled to Coober Pedy, but lack of time prevents my dealing with that part of my trip.

I would like to place on record the names of my two grandchildren born in June and July of this year. My son John and his wife Heather had a son, Joshua John Plunkett, born on 18 June 1984 in Adelaide, and my fifth grandchild, to my daughter Linda and her husband Barry Ahern, named Lachlin John Ahern, was born in Clare on 15 July 1984.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK (Light):** It is a delight to be able to follow the member for Peake. He is a much better proposition to listen to when he is talking from the heart rather than from notes prepared by someone else that do not reflect the real issue.

**Mr Whitten:** That's a bit rough.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Not rough; I genuinely mean it. The honourable member's contribution when talking from the heart on matters which he had personally investigated was much better than his delivery of a case presented to him by a Minister designed to criticise another member. That was of no value at all to the debate because it missed the point in so many directions.

The member for Peake said that I was grinning at what he was saying. I was laughing because he presumed that I did not know what it was like to live under a flight path. Recently I shifted from under a flight path, having lived there for 32 years. It was not the West Beach airport; it was the Gawler airport, which has a heavy and consistent usage by the tow planes that take the gliders up from the national glider school. It is the same airport mentioned in the press only weeks ago from which the Liberator bomber took off 40 years ago, when it deposited half of its cargo over the member for Mitcham's current electorate. It deposited whisky, oranges and apples and other goods over Colonel Light Gardens because it found that it was overloaded and could not get over the Mount Lofty Ranges. I heard that particular Liberator take off from the Gawler airport. It only just cleared the spire of the main building of Roseworthy Agricultural College.

I found some interest in the honourable member's tying together these various events. I was laughing at his presumption, not at what he was saying. For a period of almost five years, I lived under the flight path of the Mascot aerodrome in Sydney before jets came into existence. Whilst I was a resident in New South Wales as a student at Sydney University I lived in three different locations under the flight path to Mascot aerodrome. So, I do know what the honourable member is talking about when it comes to this sort of noise, and he does not want to presume that other people have not had some of the experiences of life to which he was referring.

I support the traditional motion presented to this House in response to His Excellency's opening of Parliament. I once again record my condolences to the families of the four former members whose names appear in the Speech and who have passed on since the last opening of Parliament. In the 14½ years that I have been in this Parliament I have witnessed many openings and this is the greatest number of ex members that have ever been listed at the same time. I served with three of those members, and one of them I knew quite well because of his consistent representation on

behalf of the citrus industry, and I speak of the late Mr Harry King, a former member for Chaffey.

I had the privilege of serving in this place with Charlie Wells, Claude Allen and Howard O'Neill, and I have previously passed on my thoughts to their families. They were people worth knowing and I enjoyed the rapport which one is able to develop with people in this place, no matter where they sit. Before answering some of the member for Peake's comments—

**Mr Plunkett:** You're lucky I went first.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It helped no end. I can assure the honourable member for Peake that I was going to have a bit to say about the housing industry after the despicable display by the Minister of Housing yesterday in misleading this House by attempting to reflect against the presentation of the Leader. I will come to that later and set it out in turn. One thing I do not like, no matter which side it comes from—whether from this side or the side opposite—is the misuse of fact.

That behind us, I want to speak more particularly today on the motion passed unanimously here this afternoon, which relates to the 150th celebration of the creation of the State of South Australia. More specifically, I want to comment on the sesquicentenary celebrations and the great importance of those celebrations to the South Australian economy and to South Australian tourism. Hopefully, we will recover and record a tremendous amount of South Australian history. It is a fact that, if we do not record and retain information which is currently available, in not too many distant years from now it will either disappear or be impossible to record, and that will be to the detriment of the eventual knowledge of development of our State.

One item in the programme for the sesquicentenary, which it is hoped will bring about 10 000 overseas visitors to South Australia, is the Sixth World Three Day Event, which will be held at Gawler in 1986. It is really a vote of tremendous confidence in the people who have maintained the Gawler Three Day Event for 26 years.

I have been pleased in one way or another—initially professionally and subsequently as member for the district and, therefore, as patron for the organisation—to be directly associated with the Gawler Three Day Event since its inception. Through the Chairman of that organisation, Mr Graham Fricker, an opportunity has been taken over the past three years to present to the world equestrian body the value of Gawler as a venue for the conduct of this major world event. I said earlier that it will be the sixth world equestrian event, so obviously we have only had five before.

It is, in some measure, very similar in presentation to an Olympic Games equestrian event. A great number of people in this State and, indeed, across the face of Australia and of the world, have benefited in recent days from the television spectacle of the three day event with dressage, show jumping and various other aspects of this important sport. Suffice to say that the people initially involved in the Gawler Three Day Event made representations to the world body. Earlier this year they were successful in gaining approval of that body for the three day event to be held as part of the sesquicentenary programme.

A great deal of concern has been expressed by people in the community, particularly agriculturalists and more specifically those associated with the horse industry, that some form of relaxation of quarantine requirements would accompany the conduct of the three day event. That is not the case, nor has it ever been. It has been clearly set out from the outset of discussions on this issue that it would be necessary for the people associated with the three day event to recognise that, in the event of a major outbreak of disease at or about the time that the three day event was to be held, horses coming from the sector of the world

where the disease had broken out would not be admitted to the three day event.

It is also a fact that the horses, even when they do compete, will not be able to have free access to all of Australia. In fact, the horses which come from overseas for this event will be airfreighted out of Australia within 48 hours of the end of the event. They will be airfreighted in, and go immediately into quarantine. The primary quarantine station for this purpose will be the Torrens Island quarantine station in South Australia, which has the capacity to take horses that will be flown in by specially lengthened Jumbo jet from France, then England and Canada. Some 45 or 46 horses will be brought into Australia on this flight. They will go into residence, so to speak, along with their grooms and others at Torrens Island. They will be schooled there. Their education and training will continue on Torrens Island whilst they are serving their quarantine period. It is fortunate that the quarantine station is big enough to allow this.

There is a secondary back-up with a quarantine station in the Eastern States, which I believe will be in Melbourne. Any horses entered from Japan will come from that country and go to a quarantine set-up in exactly the same way. Only after the required time will they be released, and then they will go to Roseworthy Agricultural College.

**The Hon. G.J. Crafter:** How long is that?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** It is basically two weeks, although I believe they will come in for a month before so as to be acclimatised and so that they can settle in a much more relaxed manner. They will go immediately to Roseworthy Agricultural College and will be housed as a group there. That is almost adjacent to where the whole of the event will be held. The accommodation available at Roseworthy Agricultural College will be utilised for grooms, riders and other people. The historic property, which is now over 100 years of age, will make a very fitting backdrop to the main veterinary parade and associated parades. We will make use of the facilities that we have in this State for some excellent television background material. The income from the television promotion across the world will do a great deal of good, not only for the events and the horsing fraternity, but will also promote parts of the State across the world.

I believe that it is important that we recognise that these provisions have been made, and that the important quarantine aspects have been considered adequately. The group that will run this Sixth World Three Day Event is being formed at present. It will include members of various Government departments (Federal and State), people from the Equestrian Federation of Australia, and people from the Gawler Three Day Event because they have the expertise and knowledge of the area to put these matters together. The Department of Tourism in this State is represented through Mr Graham Thompson. The Assistant Director-General of Quarantine from the Commonwealth Department of Health (Dr K.A. Doyle) has been seconded to the committee by the Prime Minister.

I would like to read a statement of Dr Doyle because it has the authority of the Quarantine Department of which he is Deputy Director. It will hopefully be taken up and used to placate or set at rest the minds of people within the community who are concerned that doors might be opened to the entry of disastrous horse diseases. The statement is simply this:

A modification of Australian quarantine and health requirements for the importing of horses will enable the animal to be kept in competing conditions while in quarantine. This development has made the holding of a major international equestrian event in Australia possible. The organisers of the event and the Australian Quarantine Service have made arrangements for the performance of quarantine, both pre-export and post-import, in facilities in which it will be possible for the animals to be exercised and

practised. Imported horses will undergo full quarantine health testing and other requirements and will be eligible for release from quarantine after arrival in Australia. They will be able to compete on Australian soil and with Australian horses without any risk to Australian animals.

That statement comes from the top authority in Australia, and that authority does not make such a statement before clearing it with the world authority that is associated with the control and monitoring of animal disease and animal health across the world. There is the likely secondment of an officer of the State to become the executive officer of the organisation. I believe that that is well in train and that that executive officer will bring a knowledge and expertise of the South Australian scene that he will give to the authority that is running the events.

There will be a potential of 10 000 oversea visitors coming to South Australia for the three-day event and from the television coverage that will follow from the holding of this prestigious event. South Australia will benefit in many ways, not least from oversea exposure and hopefully as a result of the presentation people all over the world will want to come and see (because of what they have seen on television and what they have heard of Australia, especially South Australia, through the presentation of the event) for themselves.

Of the four gold medals won by Australia at the recent Olympic Games, three have come to South Australia, two of those being won by individual winners and one by a member of a team. There are also creditable performances by other athletes from this State. Although not a big State, South Australia has made its mark in this regard. No doubt, many people coming to the three-day event will welcome the opportunity to see the tin shed at Port Lincoln because, as the member for Flinders said yesterday, this famous tin shed has done great credit to a gentleman who used it for some time in his preliminary training.

**The Hon. G.J. Crafter:** We have had famous horses in South Australia, too.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Yes, and also winners of equestrian events who have gone overseas and even to the Olympic Games to compete, bringing credit to Australia and to South Australia as a result. All the people who have represented Australia in the Olympic Games and other oversea equestrian events over the past 20 years have won their spurs as participants in the Gawler three-day event, which has become the centre of the trials used to select the participants in such events.

Turning to housing, I am sorry that the member for Peake is not in the Chamber at present, because I am concerned about some of the statements that were given to him to make regarding the housing industry. Over the past two days we have seen a series of orchestrated questions from the other side in relation to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition. Indeed, earlier today, in relation to the remarks of the member for Mitcham in this debate, the Government was obviously concerned that its housing activities were being called into question.

As I have said publicly, and as I will continue to say, it is of tremendous value to South Australia and indeed to Australia that the housing industry has picked up and has been responsible for a major part of the general economic upturn of the Australian economy. This, however, has not happened in isolation, but has resulted from several factors. It has been able to happen because there has been relief from a drought that was causing an overall depression in the flow of funds; because there has been a marked change in the economic climate right across the world, as a result of which Australia has benefited; and because there has been an element of accord, although as to how much longer that will continue I will not conjecture at present. Possibly,

the member for Semaphore will deal with that aspect of the economy when he makes his contribution in this debate.

However, there have been difficulties and there will continue to be difficulties associated with the uplift in housing. I draw to the attention of members a statement made yesterday by the Minister of Housing and Construction when he was asked by the member for Peake to comment on statements made last week by the Leader of the Opposition. In his reply, the Minister failed to compare apples with apples: he presumed that he knew the circumstances referred to, and he suggested that those circumstances related to the seventh call of the Housing Design and Construct, a group currently building on Housing Trust land. However, nowhere in the information given by the Leader did he say that the buildings were being erected on Housing Trust land. He indicated that the differences were between the month of May 1983 and the month of July 1984.

For the Minister's information, because he got it wrong, the Leader was referring to the fourth call and the sixth call of Housing Design and Construct, where the specifications required that the tenderer supply his, her, or the company's own land. The Leader was referring to the supply of a house on company land. He referred to houses that were being built in the sixth call tender in July, as they were built in the fourth call tender in a different street but in the same area. For instance, one house cost \$43 305, the second house \$44 293, and another house and land \$44 538. That group comprised a selection of three types of home in May 1983: the same three houses in July 1984 in same order are \$58 093, \$56 618, and \$56 744.

**Mr Baker:** How can people afford houses?

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Exactly, when prices are soaring in the way they are and this is only the tip of the iceberg. In that area an increase in the value of the land for each of those buildings, was the difference between \$6 500 in May 1983 and \$9 000 in July 1984. There was an increase of \$2 500 a block associated with the price in that 15-month period, and the balance of the increase, which the Leader described as averaging about \$12 000, over \$9 000, almost \$10 000, of the total was an increase in the cost of building the property. Whether the cost of the bricks was greater, whether the cost of the roofing tiles was greater, or whether the cost of the timber was greater, I am not sure, but I am reliably informed by the industry that the vast majority of the increasing costs associated with materials to turn into a finished product, in this case a house, has not been in profit, but purely and simply in the cost of labour associated with presenting that product to the market, and indeed the vast majority of the costs associated with putting those materials together into a completed house has been in the cost of labour for the building of that house.

The profit margin has barely moved, and I am sure the Minister will find that that is correct, but the cost of the labour component has just escalated, and therefore the assertion made by the Leader in this place is correct. The Minister cannot say that he has not been warned about this situation. Indeed, the documents circulated thus far (not all the documents are yet available) in relation to the new Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement clearly show that the Federal Government recognises that the labour component is playing a major part, and the Housing Industry Association in this State as the spokesgroup for the majority of house-building groups (and I do not want to take away from the fact that a number of the larger builders who are members of the MBA that look after industrial building as well as some housing have joint membership and are members also of the housing industry group) have been pointing out to Government persistently that the course of action the Government has been undertaking is against the best interest of the end product, that is, the cost of a house unit.

Even though the Minister is not in the Chamber, I hope he will take an interest in what is being said. The Housing Industry Association of South Australia in March 1983 in the presence of the Premier (I was also present at that breakfast) clearly pointed out that there was an escalation of costs and in that March 1983 document made the following point:

The building industry is a major employer, not only directly but indirectly, through all the supporting housing-related industries. Labor's social objectives are plainly best helped by a building industry that has long-term viability providing jobs and good quality homes for Australians.

The Hon. Mr Hemmings, the Minister of Housing and Construction in this State, at that same meeting said:

The Government was extremely hopeful of expanding the public and private housing sectors to the degree necessary to meet the home ownership aspirations of the community.

No-one, whether it be a Labor Minister or a Liberal Minister, no matter where one sits in this House, would deny the aspirations of the public to home ownership. We on this side of the House will certainly continue to work towards that aim. However, the warning was there, that the industry needs to be viable. The Minister also said:

We certainly don't want confrontations with industry, especially the building industry.

That is a direct quote from a Minister of the Crown in this State, the Hon. Mr Hemmings. Since then we have had on-site confrontations, and I am reliably informed that there is at least one confrontation a day somewhere in South Australia, some of them major confrontations and some of them a little less severe.

A statement is now written into the design and construct specifications, quite apart from the fact that the Minister said earlier, that the only group to which compulsory unionism and therefore compulsory costs would apply would be those directly associated with a Housing Trust development, not the Housing Trust design and construct programme, which is private industry working with the Housing Trust but only for Housing Trust development where the Housing Trust is providing the land and has determined the design and is letting the contract. That was where compulsory unionism was to apply. However in the sixth and subsequent calls for design and construct housing, (which is clause 8 on page 6 of the seventh call document) it is stated that in engaging labour preference will be given to people who have a financially clear card, which is compulsory unionism. That is having an effect on an industry that has survived for years on the basis of the subcontract system.

It goes further: not only does it require that these people must have a financially clear card, but it is also intruding on the typical, normal subcontractual undertaking where subcontractors are now being required and forced to show a financially clear card. Nowhere in the system in the past has it been necessary for a subcontractor who is a privately employed person, who is offering his labours and his expertise on a contractual basis, to be tied in to a compulsory unionism system. In October 1983, again in the Housing Industry document the following statement was made:

During the past financial year the design and construct scheme has provided about 30 per cent of the total housing construction by the private sector. Already several major builders have informed the Housing Industry Association—

they informed the Minister and they certainly informed the Premier—

that unless these directions are withdrawn they will not tender for future Housing Trust design and construct work.

I believe that if one were to look at the successful applicants for tenders associated with the sixth, seventh, and now the eighth call for Housing Trust design and construct programmes, it will be found that many people who had been traditional builders over recent years have withdrawn their

services, because they are sick and tired of being directed as to how they will conduct their business, which has been successful, a business which has been responsible for the creation of very worthwhile housing to the end advantage of the people of this State, and more specifically the home ownership to which I have previously referred, where they have said that they will not be heavied, they will not be threatened, they will not be told what to pay for services to a contractor.

That is the normal contractual arrangement that works between a principal and a subcontractor, whether in the building industry or elsewhere—one which is traditional and which should be continually supported. So, the Government was warned in October 1983 that this sort of problem was likely to occur. Again, we find that the Housing Industry Association, which held its national conference in South Australia earlier this year and at which the Prime Minister was present (and I will refer in a moment to some of the statements that he made), was quite clearly told on the floor of that convention before the media and in the public eye that it was against the best interests of the traditional housing industry of Australia for the heavying of the industry and that the effect would be eventually disastrous or against the best interests of the Australian public because fewer houses would be built as they would be forced to cost more in production.

When the Prime Minister opened the conference, he drew attention to the tremendous part which the Housing Industry Association of Australia had played in picking up the building industry across Australia. Indeed, it was a package put together by the Housing Industry Association, presented to the accord in Canberra soon after the election of the present Federal Government and was the blueprint that the Government picked up and ran with. The Government has publicly acknowledged it and it has resulted in this very marked increase. The Prime Minister indicated that it was important and would remain important that there be consultation between the Government and the industry. He also indicated that it was important that the Government, whether it be his Government or other Governments in place in the States, heeded the advice available from this very responsible industry which had its finger on the pulse and knew precisely what was taking place in the industry and was able to foretell the sorts of problems likely to arise.

In talking to this same convention, indeed, in the presence of the Prime Minister, the National President of the Housing Industry Association, Mr John Graham, stated:

Authoritative research over a long period of time by the CSIRO, shows our independent subcontractors have made Australia's housing industry the most efficient of any in the industrialised world. We have become alarmed at moves by some State Governments to convert subcontractors to employees, and to remove from businesses their present access to the common law courts to seek redress for economic damage caused by black bans, coercive tactics and the like. We do not underestimate the delicate sensitivities involved, but are committed to preserving the fundamental rights and freedoms of self-employed people.

The Prime Minister responded and said that he wanted to continue having consultations and discussions and that his Government was committed to the continuation of a sound building policy.

What has happened in South Australia? The Minister of Housing and Construction, along with the Deputy Premier (the Minister of Labour), set up behind the back of the industry in the first instance the Pryke Inquiry, and did not even bother to inform the industry that the Pryke Inquiry had been set up, that Commissioner Pryke had been withdrawn from his normal services within the Industrial Commission and had been given what amounted to a private Government commission to inquire into certain aspects of

the housing industry to determine what was a value per hour for workers in the building industry.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** I understood this Government was elected on the basis that it was going to consult.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** There was no consultation in that issue, and it was only by chance that the industry learnt afterwards that such an inquiry was going on. It was after the industry was advised that there was such an inquiry that it started to appear before it, and an inquiry which may well have been expected to conclude in a matter of weeks is still going today.

The industry is not now appearing before it but has withdrawn for a variety of reasons which I will not describe today. The Commissioner has indicated clearly that there were a number of important issues and that it is important that he seek to comply with the terms of reference that he was initially given by the Deputy Premier and the Minister of Housing and Construction, again white-anting the very heart of the building industry which is such an important element in this recovery. I have indicated some of the background. Let us get up to the present moment.

One has only to look at yesterday's *Advertiser*, the main feature on page 7, where an article is headed 'South Australia's union fighting battle of the building sites'. There is an excellent example by Simon Wilkinson where he brings out into the open the clear conflict taking place between the BWIU and the BLF. One can pick up some excellent comments, such as this:

Workers in the BWIU and the plasterers have been harassed by BLF officials and told that they had to change unions or the job would be black.

That is not somebody's wild imagination but a statement of fact, happening on almost a daily basis here on the South Australian scene. Although the documentation in yesterday's *Advertiser* is directed mainly at industrial sites and the building thereon, the self same kind of activity is taking place on home building sites. It is happening not only in the industrial building area but in house building, and the ultimate result is standover tactics and bullying.

The real problem involves the little people in the building industry who have not had experience or who, as subcontractors, are not big enough and have never had an industrial officer who might be able to put them in touch with how they can react against actions and threats of this nature. They are being bluffed, coerced and intimidated into complying with what has been put to them. If they do not, not only do they leave the industry or that site, but nobody else is allowed back onto the site because it has been blackened. In this day and age when the cost of building is high, as is the cost of materials, it is extremely important that there be a quick turnover of the use of resources and that the value for the work performed and the cost of resources is returned to the banker or other financial institution to pay the debts in the building of that home.

One has only to hang up for two or three weeks or a month, and someone else is sent to the wall. There is evidence of subcontractors having been sent to the wall due to these types of activities. Currently a time and motion study is being undertaken to try to determine what is a fair value for various work being undertaken on site. Quite recently, two union organisers answered a call for tenders for subcontractors, and they were taken on because inquiries indicated that they did have expertise.

They arrived on the site and began to disrupt the other subcontractors working there, having time off to discuss matters with the employer, the builder, and with other subcontractors on site. Eventually, when they were eased off the site following some industrial disruptions, the end result was that they were paid for the work that they had performed. In one instance an organiser had performed

\$100 worth of work in eight days. He received that amount but then used that instance of having received \$100 for eight days work as the basis of a claim before the time and motion study that one is unable to make a buck, that one cannot make an honest wage, in the building industry. To what lengths will these people go to get their way and in doing so bring down the housing industry of which we should be proud now and in the future? To what lengths will the Ministers of this State go in allowing actions of that nature to continue?

**Mr Ashenden:** They probably encourage it.

**The Hon. B.C. EASTICK:** Well, I did not go that far, but I certainly know about it, as does the industry, and I would be surprised to find that members of the Government did not know about it, and yet in other ways they condone this ongoing inquiry and the writing into the calls of the Housing Trust for design and construct tenders these oppressive words which completely destroy the basis on which a well-founded industry has existed for many years. One could pick up a number of other similar examples. In the Housing Industry Association journal of June 1984 the following reference is made to the inquiry before Mr Commissioner Pryke:

It should be noted that the Commissioner has defined clearly that he is only dealing with South Australian Housing Trust tender contracts and not 'design and construct' or private sector housing.

The Commissioner's terms of reference relate to Housing Trust tender contracts. I have referred to this previously. However, notwithstanding the clear direction that was given by the Ministry to the Commissioner in regard to the inquiry, pressures are being put on people in the design and construct and private sector housing areas.

That is happening by way of heavies turning up on site intimidating those who are there into submission. In many cases they do not know any better or are placed in the very worrying situation of having to consider the question of maintaining financial equilibrium and of being able to maintain commitments in regard to their families, such as their houses, and so on. I could refer to a number of other examples, but I believe that I have demonstrated the sorts of problem that exist. They will not go away unless a clear lead comes from the State Government that these heavy-handed activities will not be tolerated. The final objective is to provide houses for the many people who are waiting for accommodation.

I am very pleased that the housing industry is providing a large number of houses to people who are taking advantage of the benefits under the first home ownership scheme, which came into existence with the new Federal Government and which is really an extension of the original home scheme in place under the Fraser Government. Since the introduction of that scheme the number of applications for first home loans has almost doubled. The opportunities applying under this scheme were referred to in a Federal economic document which was made available to members only yesterday, and which clearly indicates the tremendous increase in the amount of money laid out for housing. At page 4 of the publication *Government in Focus* volume 1, No. 6, July 1984, an overview in regard to the Budget deficit being \$400 million less than expected is given. A report under the heading of 'Housing' states:

Housing (up \$122 million or + 13.4%). Largely the result of outlays under the assistance schemes for first home owners being almost double the budget estimates (\$242 million compared to \$122 million—an increase of \$199 million), associated with the very strong recovery experienced in the housing industry in 1983-84. This increase reflects significantly larger than expected numbers taking advantage of the First Home Owners Scheme . . . In addition, the decision by the States after the Budget was brought down, to nominate \$227 million of Loan Council advances for welfare housing, increased expenditure under this function by \$27 million . . .

That was a commendable decision by the various Governments and is one that we applauded when it was introduced in the Budget last year. It picks up the fact that it is right that large numbers of people looking for accommodation should be given access to it. If people miss out in the public welfare area we have a responsibility to make sure that accommodation is available elsewhere. However, the opportunity to provide sufficient units decreases every time there is an abnormal or artificial increase in the cost of producing that accommodation, often due to the types of activities to which I referred earlier. I have been informed within the past 10 days that currently there are 32 000 applicants on the South Australian Housing Trust waiting list, an increase of about 4 000 in the past 12 months. Further, some 64 per cent of people in Housing Trust rental accommodation are in receipt of some form of rental assistance.

We also supported that. It is unfortunate that it has to be that way. The money expended from the revenue of this State to provide those subsidies in 1983-84 is of the order of \$30 million. We would like to have seen that \$30 million put into new homes, but that was not possible, and this follows on from the problem of unemployment and so on.

I now refer to the manner in which the Minister answered a Dorothy Dixer asked by the member for Hartley this afternoon. The question, associated with housing, referred to the hot spots and pressures which are developing. If the Minister believes that he fooled anyone with his answer, let him think again because his own Prime Minister, leaders of the industry and anyone with their feet on the ground know full well that the sort of activity that the Minister would promote will result in a bust, not a boost.

We are committed to a boost in the housing industry. We laud it, but one has to be very careful when creating that boost that one does not go to a bust situation and frighten people whose services are wanted out of the industry. Certainly, they will be frightened out of the industry if they are intimidated. We must not have a situation where people are given wrong or unrealistic answers. Before the House rose in May of this year I asked the Deputy Premier what the Government was doing to make sure that there was an increase in the number of skilled workers in the housing industry to meet the demands of today. The Deputy Premier simply replied that he would make arrangements for the question to be answered. The question was answered by urgent letter on Tuesday of last week in which the Deputy Premier informed me that there had been an increase in the number of apprentices and that the Government did not think that the situation was as bad as I had painted.

Why is it that Jennings, Hickinbotham and other people in the housing industry, people who have played a very significant part in the housing industry of this State, have had to move outside South Australia to entice people here, for example, from Queensland? These firms have done that, and they are on public record as having said that they have had to go outside the State to find skilled artisans. What happens if a person is forced off of a site because of some of the heavying that takes place or because a builder stands up and says, 'No, I will not be forced into a position of coercing a person to join a union.' Quite apart from the fear of a black ban, he knows full well that he will not be able to get a replacement artisan in under five to seven weeks, if indeed he can get one at all.

There is a dearth of people in the industry, and that is reflected in the question that you, Mr Acting Speaker, have posed to this Parliament. Why is it taking longer to build homes now than it did in the past? Why is it that some people are being disadvantaged in having to rent for longer periods or by being placed in the awkward position of having sold one home and being unable to get into a new home. Quite apart from the Government's services, which

are under pressure, this has occurred because there is an inadequate number of workers.

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

**Mr ASHENDEN (Todd):** In this Address in Reply debate I will address a number of issues which are of vital importance to my district. I will also dwell on some issues that are important for the community of South Australia as a whole. Members would well know that since my election to Parliament in 1979, and prior to my election, I have been a supporter of the development of a guided busway system from the city of Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza. I have long held that that was the best form of public transport that could be provided at a reasonable cost to service my constituency. Those members present here today and who were present during the days of the Tonkin Government would well know that the then Bannon Opposition lambasted that project from the time that it was first mooted. Members of the present Government were very loud in their condemnation of the development of that project for South Australia. The foresight of the then Minister of Transport, the now member for Torrens—

**The Hon. Peter Duncan:** As he was then.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I take the point made by the member for Elizabeth. He was the Minister of Transport at the time. His foresight is at long last receiving just recognition. The present Government has accepted that that project should proceed. It took the Government an awfully long time to announce that the project would be completed to Tea Tree Plaza, even though it had the grace to admit, virtually immediately following its election in 1982, that the project was viable and ideal as a service for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. That was in marked contrast, one might say, to the outpourings of abuse that Labor members were giving to the project prior to their attaining the Government benches.

*Mr Hamilton interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I suggest that the member for Albert Park should look at some of the comments he made whilst in Opposition. Labor members opposite were loud in their condemnation of the project. They stated that it was second best, no good, it would not work, and that it was not viable. However, the system is viable, and the present Government acknowledges that. The only galling part about it is that the present Minister of Transport is trying to turn it around as though it were his and his Government's proposal in the first place. Of course, that is totally untrue.

The present Minister of Transport has inherited a decision which was far sighted in its original intention, and he is in the fortunate position of having the hard work of the member for Torrens as something on which he can build. The present Minister of Transport has attempted to play politics in relation to the development of the O-Bahn, and his outburst in both the *Advertiser* of Tuesday 7 August and as reported in the *Australian* of the past weekend is seen by the residents of the north-eastern suburbs for exactly what it is. In fact, had not the Opposition persisted and placed pressure on the present Government, I am extremely doubtful that any announcement would have been made.

The Minister and the Government have had almost two years in office. It has taken two years to come out and relieve the concern of the residents of the north-eastern suburbs by saying, 'Yes, we will complete the guided busway through to Tea Tree Plaza.' That two year delay will cost the South Australian taxpayers millions of dollars as well as resulting in an additional two years of chaos on the North-East and Lower North-East Roads which could and will be relieved when this project is finally completed. However, it could be relieved even earlier. I have been given

advice that there is absolutely no technical reason as to why the guided busway could not be completed through to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986 which, I point out to the House, was the promise given by the present Government prior to its election in 1982.

The present Government gave a categorical assurance to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs that a form of rapid public transport would be completed to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986. It said that it would match the promise of the then Liberal Government to complete the guided busway through to Tea Tree Plaza. The only proviso that the then Bannon Opposition placed on the project was that it would review the busway's viability; if it found that it was not viable, it would replace it with another system; but that there would definitely be a form of rapid public transport from Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986.

That was this Government's word. Of course, we have seen what that word is worth—absolutely nothing! That must remind us of the promises that the present Premier gave in relation to no new taxation and no increased taxation. The Government's promises are worthless, and I therefore wonder about the worth of the Government's promise to complete the guided busway to Tea Tree Plaza by 1988, when I recall that two years ago it said that it would be completed by 1986. These questions are also being asked by the residents of the north-eastern suburbs.

As I said, I can see no technical reason for it not going ahead. Purely and simply, the Government does not regard the O-Bahn guided busway as a sufficiently important project. In other words, once again it is saying to the residents of the north-eastern suburbs, 'Look, you are not important to us. We gave you a promise, but you are not too worried about it. We will give you a busway, but you can wait another two years. We hope that it will only be another two years'. That is not good enough. The residents of the north-eastern suburbs have waited for many years for a rapid public transport system. It was first promised by the Dunstan Government ten years ago when the residents of the north-eastern suburbs were told that a light rail system would be built. That promise was made a number of times.

Prior to the 1979 election, a test drill hole was finally put down in King William Street. That was all that the then Labor Government did. Purely and simply, that was yet another attempt to try to lull the residents of the north-eastern suburbs into believing that the Government would do something. It was not until a Liberal Government was elected that any real move was made to implement a rapid public transport system to the north-eastern suburbs. It was only because of the commitments and agreements entered into by the Liberal Government that the work was even continued by the present Government although, as I have said, it did review it and say, 'Yes, it is viable, and it is an excellent system. We support it.' That is a total turnaround to what Labor members said prior to their election to Government in 1982.

Following the 1982 election, the new Labor Government admitted that it had been wrong and that the previous Government had been dead right. It also admitted that it was an ideal system and it should proceed. However, two months later the Government turned around and said that it would have to review whether the busway would continue from Darley Road through to Tea Tree Plaza. It took the Government almost two years to decide whether or not that would be the case. That two-year delay means that it will be another two years before my constituents are able to reap the full benefit of this new system. It will mean that South Australian taxpayers will have to pay many millions of dollars in increased costs. Once again, the Bannon Government has shown quite clearly that it treats the residents of the north-eastern suburbs in a cavalier manner. That is



resented by those residents, and it is shown quite clearly in the feedback that I am receiving within my district.

**The Hon. P.B. Arnold:** This Government hasn't announced one new capital project on its own initiative.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I take that point. The guided busway system was a Tonkin Government initiative, as was the Adelaide Railway Station project. One could go on and on about the projects that this Government is picking up and calling its own. I will mention a little later how the present Government has now picked up and is running with Roxby Downs as if it was its own little baby.

This Government has shown quite clearly that it has absolutely no concern whatsoever for the residents of the north-eastern suburbs. It has delayed a vital project by two years, a project that a Liberal Government would have completed by 1986, and a project which the present Labor Government could complete by 1986 if it wanted to. However, it just does not want to; it does not regard it as important enough. As I have said, technical experts (including engineers) have pointed out to me that there is absolutely no reason why the project could not be completed by 1986, as was originally promised by the present Government. A two-year delay is not good enough. I will urge my constituents to impress upon the Government that it is just not good enough.

The next matter to which I will refer is also of extreme importance to my constituents in the north-eastern suburbs. Unfortunately, on a prior occasion, I was not able to place the relevant data before the House. I refer to a question I addressed to the Minister for Environment and Planning in relation to Tilley Park at Golden Grove, which is presently on the edge of housing developments at the extreme northern section of the north-eastern suburbs and adjacent to the proposed Golden Grove development. It is a park which—

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** The Liberal Party did more about it than the Labor Government.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** That is certain. One only has to ask my constituents which Government led the development of Golden Grove. At the moment, Tilley Park is not large enough to allow full use of its facilities. It was built many years ago, long before the suburbs of Surrey Downs, Fairview Park and Banksia Park were as developed as they are now. Although its facilities were adequate in the past, that is no longer the case.

I have been approached by individual constituents, sporting organisations, and members of the management committee of Tilley Park, seeking my assistance in approaching the Government for additional land from the Golden Grove development. The land sought is immediately adjacent to the park itself and is under part-ownership or control of the Government. The Government could guarantee that land be made available to Tilley Park if it wanted to. The park is used for organised sport, various forms of individual recreation, and it is also the site of the annual Golden Grove Show.

The Golden Grove Show is extremely popular and attracts thousands of visitors each year. When the show is held, all the land within the park is utilised purely and simply for stalls, displays and organised competitions. The area is very poorly served in relation to car parking facilities. When people attend the show, either as competitors or visitors, they are presently able to park their cars on land contained within the Golden Grove development. However, unless some of that land is made available to the park when the Golden Grove development proceeds, that area will be lost and that will create tremendous problems for those who want to park their vehicles adjacent to the show grounds. As a result, the quiet and attractive suburban streets in the surrounding area will virtually become parking stations.

I am sure that all members who have projects within their districts that attract large numbers of people will acknowledge that when people park in public streets they are not very careful about the way in which they consider residents' interests. It would be highly undesirable if people wishing to attend the Golden Grove Show were forced to park their vehicles in the surrounding streets: it would have a deleterious effect on the quiet pleasant suburban areas there.

It has also been put to me that, unless alternative arrangements are made, the attendance will almost certainly drop significantly, because people will experience difficulty in parking. Additionally, further space is needed in the park itself for the extension of existing sporting facilities. Tilley Park, being adjacent to a rapidly expanding area, will be subject to even greater demands over the coming years. It has been put to me by constituents who have approached Government departments on this matter that they have been told that there is no need for the Government to provide additional land at Tilley Park because within the Golden Grove development allowance will be made for additional sporting and recreation facilities.

However, that response begs the question, because it is not additional facilities that are needed. Already at Tilley Park there is an excellent facility which, unfortunately, has outgrown itself. Even if 60 hectares is allocated for recreational use throughout the rest of the Golden Grove development, it will be of no value to the users of Tilley Park. Therefore, for Government officers to tell constituents (and this information has come from more than one source) that they do not see it as a request of any substance is incorrect: it is a request of very real substance because, if the land is not provided, the future effectiveness of Tilley Park will be severely reduced, and it will jeopardise the future of the Golden Grove Show and also reduce significantly the number of organised sporting functions presently held there. Local sporting bodies have made clear to me that, unless land for expansion is granted, their ability to service the residents of this growing area will be severely reduced.

I have been told that Delfin Management Services, which is part of the consortium along with the Tea Tree Gully Council and the South Australian Government, is most sympathetic to the proposed expansion of Tilley Park. Constituents have told me that the only area where they are running into difficulty is with the South Australian Government. Their approaches to the Tea Tree Gully Council have met with a totally positive response, as have their approaches to Delfin Management Services, whereas their approaches to the South Australian Government have been met at best with the statement 'Thank you for your approach. We will consider it.' Alternatively, at worst the response has been 'Thank you for your approach but we do not think that the extra land is necessary'.

I suggest that a much closer review of the situation should be undertaken by the Minister for Environment and Planning and his personal staff, because extra land is no doubt desperately needed at Tilley Park. It has been pointed out to me that it has been agreed that 60 hectares be set aside within Golden Grove development for reserves and recreational use. The Tilley Park Management Committee says that three hectares would be a real benefit, but if the Government agrees to six hectares that would be even better. Delfin Management Services has said that it will transfer the land free of charge to Tilley Park if the Government's requirements for reserves in the Golden Grove development area can be reduced by the area granted. In other words, if the Government would agree to 54 hectares being a requirement for reserves in the Golden Grove development, six hectares (to make up the 60 hectares) would be granted by Delfin Management Services to Tilley Park free of charge.

Then, Tilley Park could develop its services as it wanted to.

Had it wanted to, the Government could have made its decision long ago. I wrote to the Minister on this matter weeks ago, but as yet I have received no reply. I raised the matter in the House last week with the Minister, but he could only say, 'I cannot give you a categorical assurance that we will give the land to Tilley Park. We will continue to look at it and let you know.' I am afraid that that is fairly typical of responses from this Government. Constituents in the north-eastern suburbs have a need that can be easily met. All the Minister needs to say is that his Government agrees to reduce the area of open space in the Golden Grove development by six hectares and those six hectares can go to Tilley Park which, of course, will be open space. This area is adjacent to and has a common boundary with the Golden Grove development. In other words, there would still be 60 hectares of open space within the Golden Grove development.

Why will not the Minister give me or my constituents an answer on this matter? Just as the Government has absolutely no interest in providing as soon as possible a rapid public transport system to the north-eastern suburbs, so it has no desire to meet this totally reasonable request, the granting of which would benefit residents of the north-eastern suburbs. I can only urge the Minister and the Government to make a positive decision, to come back to the Tilley Park Management Committee and the residents of the north-eastern suburbs, and to say, 'Yes, we agree to your request. It is reasonable.' I see no reason why that decision cannot be made now.

I now address myself to a third matter which I have also taken up in writing with the relevant Minister. Indeed, I took it up in writing with the Minister of Education when he was Minister in charge of the Banksia Park Family Centre, and I have also raised it by way of question to the Premier, whose Department now controls that centre. The Banksia Park Family Centre is presently a kindergarten situated on the campus of the Banksia Park Primary and Junior Primary Schools. It is an integral part of that campus and has long been regarded by professional staff, parents and residents whose properties are adjoining the area as part and parcel of the school itself. However, the kindergarten is controlled by the Kindergarten Union. It is unique in that it is staffed by both Education Department staff and Kindergarten Union staff. In every other instance that I know of where there is a similar set-up the centre would be a child-parent centre. I say that because the kindergarten itself is actually on the school campus, and is partially staffed by Education Department teachers; in fact, 50 per cent of the staff is Education Department controlled.

That kindergarten has approached the Minister directly and has also contacted me to approach the Government requesting that the kindergarten be placed in the same category as a child-parent centre and thus be able to remain under the control of the Education Department. I see that as a perfectly reasonable request. It is for all considerations identical to a child-parent centre about which this Government has already said wherever a child-parent centre is established it will not come under the new hat of the Premier but will remain within the control of the Education Department. That is what my constituents want to happen in relation to the Banksia Park Family Centre.

They have very sound reasons for placing that request before the Government. Unfortunately, the only reply that they have had back is once again, 'We are considering it.' Weeks ago this matter was taken up and all that parents have been told is that it is being considered. Why is it that this Government cannot make decisions? What more does it want? Here is a centre which to all intents and purposes

is exactly the same as a number of centres about which a decision has already been made, namely, they will remain under the care and control of the Education Department. That is all this centre wants. Surely that is not an unreasonable request or a request which is difficult and which takes weeks and weeks of this Government's time on which to make a decision.

Once again, I would urge the Premier to come out and make a decision so that the parents and the management committee of the Banksia Park Family Centre can plan for the future. I believe that it is imperative that their request be met in the affirmative, and I would hope that it will not be too much longer before the Premier will make the only logical decision that can be made in this case.

I now turn to one aspect that I was fortunate to be able to look at closely during the last recess of Parliament, namely, overseas developments in the nuclear fuel cycle. Having returned from a study tour which took me to the United States and Europe, I have come home absolutely convinced that the present South Australian Government is burying its head in the sand as far as its uranium policy is concerned. I was able to see in the United States the most recent developments of the mini nuclear power stations and was able to see, at the city of Phoenix-Scotsdale (a city of identical population size to Adelaide), a nuclear power station which has been developed to supply the needs of that city and surrounding areas. Let us make clear that it is absolute nonsense to say that Adelaide and/or South Australia is too small an area to be supplied by nuclear power.

There are already nuclear power stations overseas servicing communities of that size, and it was put to me when in Switzerland by the Swiss authorities that the big move through the world at the moment is toward the mini nuclear power station—in other words, instead of the huge developments putting out thousands of kilowatt hours, the move is toward the smaller more regionalised station around 250 kilowatt hours. This is the way the rest of the world is going but not the way that the South Australia Government wants to go.

Let us look closely at the South Australian Labor Government's policy on uranium. We could not turn to a much better source than the *Herald*, which calls itself 'South Australia's Labor Voice'. I was most interested, although extremely concerned, to read in that paper of the recent decisions of the South Australian branch of the ALP. Let us go through some of these decisions and relate them to what is going on in the rest of the world. The report states:

The Convention passed a detailed anti-uranium motion but gave recognition to the reality of the Roxby Downs mine in South Australia.

Once again, we see the two-faced stance of the Labor Government on this matter. Uranium which comes from Roxby Downs is clean!

**Mr Ferguson:** What is your policy?

**Mr ASHENDEN:** I am delighted to hear that interjection. My policy is quite clear cut, namely, to allow for the exploration, the mining and the enrichment of uranium in South Australia.

*Mr Ferguson interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Of course it is Liberal Party policy—we have espoused it for years. We went into the 1982 election with a policy that everybody knew. When the Labor Party was in Opposition between 1979 and 1982, did not members opposite get up and lambast Roxby Downs? It was 'a mirage in the desert', to quote the now Premier's own words. There were no jobs or investment in it. There was nothing in it. We find the Premier now standing up and saying what a marvellous development Roxby Downs is, it must go ahead, we must mine uranium there and it is vital to the future of South Australia! Of course, at the same

time Honeymoon and Beverley are not important to South Australia.

*Mr Becker interjecting:*

**Mr ASHENDEN:** That is right. The uranium from Roxby Downs is obviously a pure type of uranium and does not affect the policy of the Labor Party, whereas the uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley is dirty stuff, and under no circumstances can we dare to allow companies to mine that uranium. We know that one of the mining companies spent more than \$10 million in developing its work at Honeymoon, and this Government just stepped in and said, 'No more.' Did this Government reimburse that company for the cost it incurred? No, Sir! This Government, through the Minister of Mines and Energy, has the nerve to get up and say that it is encouraging mineral exploration in South Australia when it has closed down two mines and made quite clear to any potential explorer that, if uranium is found, it has to stay in the ground.

How many companies will spend money on exploration when they have that sort of weight hanging over their head? Let us now come to the next quote from the *Herald*:

The motion opposed new contracts and endorsed Federal policy for the phasing out of existing contracts.

In other words, the Labor Party in South Australia has made quite clear that not only is it out to stop any future development but it will, if it has its way, phase out contracts already entered into. What sort of reputation do members opposite believe that this will give South Australian and Australian companies overseas?

**Mr Ingerson:** Tell them what was said overseas.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** The member for Bragg has led me to make a point that I had intended to make later. We were told in all countries that we visited and where we studied the nuclear fuel cycle, namely, the United States, France, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands that they could not understand why Australians had hang-ups about the mining and export of uranium. In France the greatest exponents of the nuclear fuel cycle are the socialist Parties. They said that it was incomprehensible that we have a resource worth thousands of millions of dollars yet, for some reason, the Government is preventing its development and sale overseas. They also made quite clear that, unless we develop these mineral resources within the next two years, we will have missed the boat because there are now many countries overseas which have discovered uranium but which do not have the purely political hang-ups that the Labor Government in South Australia has. They have made clear that, unless Australia goes ahead and develops these resources now, thousands of millions of dollars of export income will be lost, along with hundreds of jobs.

When we look at what is said in 'South Australia's Labor Voice', I become even more concerned. This is the next quotation:

The Premier, John Bannon, moved an amendment which accepted the reality of the Roxby Downs mixed ore deposit in South Australia.

I like that! It is a mixed ore deposit, which makes the uranium all right.

**Mr Ingerson:** Pragmatic politics.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Yes, pragmatic politics—the honourable member could not put it better. Anyway, it is a mixed ore deposit, and therefore it is quite all right for the uranium to be sent overseas because that uranium will not have any of the alleged problems that uranium from Honeymoon and Beverley will have. The article continues:

John Bannon told the Convention: 'We've acted in accordance with our Party policy.' He said that the South Australian Government had refused licences to two new uranium mines, endorsed the position of not accepting nuclear power as an option and also ruled out uranium enrichment as part of future industrial development of the State.

I wonder how many South Australians realise what a blow that is to the future of South Australia—ruling out uranium enrichment as part of future industrial development of the State. When we were at Tricastin in France it was made very clear to us that uranium enrichment is an extremely profitable undertaking. It was pointed out that the uranium enrichment process they are undertaking has been worth hundreds of millions of dollars both during the construction phase of the uranium enrichment plant and from profits generated by the enrichment of the uranium ore.

It was also pointed out that hundreds of jobs were created when the plant was being built and now that the plant is in operation. We here have the Premier writing off a potential investment worth thousands of millions of dollars to South Australia. Private enterprise would have invested thousands of millions of dollars in South Australia; it would not have cost the Government anything. This would create thousands of jobs. But, the Premier proudly boasts that he will not allow that development in South Australia. In the article, the Premier continues:

Our record in Government is an example to the world in relation to this problem.

I suggest that the Premier and members opposite should visit overseas experts in the nuclear fuel cycle and they will soon have pointed out to them what a ridiculous, absurd and hollow statement that is. The article continues:

Recognising that the provision of Australian uranium to the world nuclear fuel cycle creates problems relevant to Australian sovereignty—

but it does not say in what way, and that really confuses me—  
the environment—

and I will address that shortly because the effect of the nuclear power cycle on the environment is far less in its impact than coal, yet that is conveniently overlooked by members opposite—

the economic welfare and civil liberties of our people . . .

The Labor Party says that its uranium policy is for the economic welfare of the community. All it is doing is ruling out thousands of millions of dollars of investment and thousands of jobs. How that can be seen as logical, I do not know. The article then continues and addresses the alleged technical problems associated with the mining of uranium and the development of nuclear power.

Again, I suggest that members opposite travel overseas and talk to the experts who are involved in the most recent developments. They will there find that uranium is by far the safest form of electrical power generation that is available today, in many circumstances the most economical and is the form of power generation that is growing most rapidly throughout the world. The article refers to:

(a) The proven contribution of the nuclear power industry to the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the increased risk of nuclear war.

That is one of the reasons given for rejecting the development of uranium resources in South Australia. Again, it shows the absolute and abysmal ignorance of members opposite because it was made perfectly clear to us when we were overseas that uranium that is enriched for use in power stations is totally unsuitable for use in nuclear weapons. Nuclear fuel for a power station has an enrichment level of about 3 per cent. One must have an enrichment level of at least 90 per cent before uranium is remotely of any use as a weapon. Therefore, any uranium enriched for power generation is totally unsuitable for use in nuclear armaments. That lays item (a) in this article to rest. Another reason for rejecting the development of uranium in South Australia is:

(b) the absence of procedures for the storage and disposal of radioactive wastes adequate to ensure that the dangers posed by such wastes to human life and the environment are eliminated.

Again, I suggest that members opposite travel to Tricastin and see the way in which the spent nuclear fuel is disposed of. It is perfectly safe and there are no problems. The environment in Europe is suffering horrendous damage from acid rain that has resulted from the burning of coal in power stations throughout the United Kingdom and Europe. It is acknowledged by environmentalists throughout Europe that action must be taken to remove this real—not imagined—danger to the environment. One never hears members opposite addressing themselves to the effect on the environment of the generation of electrical power by coal. It is far more damaging to the environment than is nuclear fuel generation. What is more, far more deaths have been caused by the mining and provision of coal for power stations than have ever occurred in the nuclear power industry. The third reason for opposing future uranium development in this State states:

(c) the technical deficiencies in the design and operation of nuclear reactors.

The member for Morphett, the member for Bragg and I were fortunate enough to be taken to the very core of a nuclear power station in Zurich, Switzerland. I do not think that it is an exaggeration to say that it would have taken us at least half an hour to get through all the security measures that are taken to enable a person to get to the heart of the reactor.

Later the article contains the spurious argument that terrorists could get in, steal this 3 per cent enriched uranium, take it away and make 90 per cent enriched uranium out of it—no mention is made of how this could happen—to make bombs. That statement shows absolute ignorance. I did not count the number of security procedures that we had to go through to get to the core of this reactor, but there were many. We also had to pass through a very strong envelope, if I can call it that, that is designed to withstand any melt down so that, even if the worst happened and there was a melt down, there could be absolutely no escape of any radioactivity into the atmosphere. Let us not talk nonsense about alleged technical deficiencies. The article then continues with a number of equally spurious arguments as to why there should be no further development of the nuclear fuel cycle in South Australia.

The article states quite categorically that a Labor Government will be totally and unequivocally committed to close down the uranium industry in Australia. What encouragement does that give to potential investors in this country? Why should they waste their money finding mineral deposits worth developing if they have them closed down? As long as we have socialist State and Federal Governments, overseas countries will be reticent in any dealings with us in relation to the nuclear fuel cycle. The article further states:

A Labor Government will not grant new exploration licences for uranium and it will revoke existing uranium exploration licences.

It goes on and on and then relates to the Roxby Downs decision, made purely and simply because the Government knows full well that if it refused permission for Roxby Downs to go ahead it would be soundly defeated at the next election. Let there be no mistake about this: the Bannon and Hawke Governments have allowed Roxby to go ahead purely for purposes of political expediency. No other explanation can be given whatsoever. It seems that it is all very well to have ideals (with the Labor Party allegedly being anti-uranium) but, when it suits the ALP, it decides to allow uranium to come from Roxby Downs. The only reason for that, of course, is that it knows that, electorally, any decision against Roxby Downs would cost it both Federal and State Government.

I would say that, fortunately, 99 per cent of the teaching profession in South Australia is extremely professional, and

I join with many members here who have said that in South Australia we have the best and most professional group of teachers anywhere in this country, and probably anywhere in the world. Therefore, the comments I am about to make are not addressed to that very great majority of responsible and professional teachers.

I am very concerned about a small hardcore group of teachers who are using the classroom to place before children totally unfounded and biased comments in relation to the nuclear power cycle. I refer to an article published in the *South Australian Teachers Journal* of 30 May 1984 in which a teacher espouses all sorts of anti-nuclear nonsense. I want to refer to some of the things that this gentleman had to say. He states:

Why has there been opposition to uranium mining? The mining, milling, enrichment, transportation and disposal of uranium presents contamination danger to workers and their families in the industry.

I point out to him that if he is going to start putting that sort of viewpoint across in the classrooms of South Australia he should also point out the extreme dangers involved in coal mining. He then goes on to refer to alleged accidents that have occurred at nuclear power stations as follows:

December 1952, Chalk River, Canada. Millions of gallons of radioactive water were released.

However, he does not go on to refer to the degree of contamination, which, of course, was negligible. The article continues as follows:

October 1957, Windscale, United Kingdom. A technical mistake led to the igniting of 12 tonnes of uranium radioactive iodine. It contaminated two million litres of milk.

That has been long since proved to be an absolute mistruth. He continues:

October 1966, Enrico Fermi Plant, United States. A reactor was partially melted down. One engineer commented, 'We almost lost Detroit.'

What a load of nonsense! All that accident showed was that, because of the protection that is built into the nuclear power stations, when a fault occurs any contaminating material is kept within the confines or envelope of the plant and is unable to escape into the atmosphere. To cite that incident as an example of a disaster is ludicrous, because it proved that safety systems work. I also refer to the nonsense put forward by this gentleman and others, that the melting down of the core means that there will be a nuclear explosion. I point out that if there is a melt down no nuclear explosion will occur. It just cannot occur with 3 per cent enriched uranium as that just cannot explode. It is as simple as that. For that to occur it must be over 90 per cent, and even then special conditions must prevail. So, let us stop this nonsense about the danger of a nuclear explosion occurring in a power station if there is a melt down. Further reference to these alleged accidents is made as follows:

January 1969, Lucerne, Switzerland. Radioactivity exploded.

That is all that is said. The gentleman does not even know what radioactivity is. All it is is a measure of the emission of various particles (some of which are gamma rays) from elements, which is what we call radioactivity. It cannot possibly explode. That is the sort of nonsense that is being crammed down the unsuspecting throats of some of the children in some of our schools. The article continues:

March 1975, Brown's Ferry, U.S.A. A fire destroyed safety devices. Damage cost \$150 million. The station was fined \$50 000 for poor fire safety procedures.

The cost of the damage amounted to \$150 million, but absolutely no radioactivity escaped into the atmosphere. It further continues as follows:

March 1979, Three Mile Island, U.S.A. The worst accident in nuclear history.

The emotionalism of this nonsense is incredible. It continues:  
The plant nearly melted down.

This again shows this gentleman's abysmal ignorance of just exactly what comprises a nuclear power plant. The only thing that can melt down in a nuclear power plant is the core. It was further maintained that:

Radioactive gas leaked and radioactive water was dumped into drinking supplies. Millions of lives were threatened.

That is the sort of emotional nonsense that was peddled by the anti-uranium lobby in the United States, all of which has since been disproved. A fortunate aspect that arose from the incident at Three Mile Island is that because of what happened there steps have now been taken at all other nuclear power plants to prevent anything like that incident ever happening again. At Three Mile Island they had to change the water in the core itself. The water was drained and a switch connected to the computer programme was put on to indicate the need to replace the coolant in the core. It was indicated that that switch was on, but what the computer had not been programmed to show was whether in fact water was entering or not.

On that occasion water did not enter the core, it overheated, and there was almost a meltdown. All computer programmes at nuclear plants throughout the world have now had their programmes altered so that the switch actually indicates whether or not the process is working. So, as a result of an accident an improvement in safety methods has been implemented. To allege that millions of lives were threatened is emotional nonsense. In this biased and quite ill-informed information put before teachers, who were asked to place it before their children, further statements were made as follows:

As South Australians, are we prepared to supply uranium to an industry with such a life threatening track record?

The life threatening track record of the coal industry is far worse than that of the nuclear industry. It continues:

Surely we oppose the myth that the uranium industry provides needed jobs to keep S.A. Great.

This gentleman is saying that there are no jobs involved. He really should go overseas to find out the truth of the matter; he would then realise that thousands of jobs are being generated as part of the nuclear fuel cycle. The article continues:

Massive expenditure provides relatively few jobs for an equivalent investment in manufacturing or education.

How one can manufacture if there are not adequate power supplies is beyond me, and the gentleman does not address himself to that at all. Nor does he address himself to the problem of acid rain and many other problems associated with the way in which power is presently generated throughout the world. He completely misses the point that, throughout the world at the moment, many countries are expanding the number of nuclear power stations which they have and many countries are developing their first nuclear power stations. There is no doubt that there are many countries that, if nuclear power was not available to them, would not be able to continue with industrial development.

I seek leave to have three statistical tables inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them. One shows the countries that use nuclear power to generate electricity; the second shows countries planning a nuclear power programme; and the third table shows the contribution of uranium fuelled electricity generation in user countries.

Leave granted.

#### Uranium for electricity generation

The countries listed below use nuclear power to generate a percentage of their electricity requirements.

Country	Number of nuclear power reactors	
	Licensed for operation	Under construction
Argentina	2	1
Belgium	5	2
Brazil	1	2
Bulgaria	4	2
Canada	14	11
Cuba	0	1
Czechoslovakia	2	6
Finland	4	0
France	36	27
Germany DR	5	8
Germany FR	15	12
Hungary	1	3
India	4	5
Italy	3	3
Japan	25	14
Korea RO	3	6
Mexico	0	2
Netherlands	2	0
Pakistan	1	1
Philippines	0	1
Poland	0	1
Romania	0	2
South Africa	0	2
Spain	4	10
Sweden	10	2
Switzerland	4	1
Taiwan	4	2
United Kingdom	32	10
U.S.A.	86	52
U.S.S.R.	40	31
Yugoslavia	1	0
Total	306	220

Sources: Various—1983. Including International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); Australian Atomic Energy Commission (AAEC); Atomic Industrial Forum (U.S.A.); European Nuclear Society; Japan Atomic Industrial Forum; Canadian Nuclear Association.

#### Other countries planning nuclear power programs

Country	Number of nuclear power reactors planned
China	5
Egypt	8
Indonesia	1
Iraq	1
Israel	2
Libya	2
Portugal	2
Saudi Arabia	1
Turkey	1
Total	23

Source: Australian Atomic Energy Commission, February 1984.

#### The contribution of uranium fuelled electricity generation in some user countries.

Percentage produced from nuclear power stations (The figures obtained are only those released in various publications as available information is limited).

Country	Per cent	
	1982	1983
Belgium	27.7	
Bulgaria	25	
Canada	10	
Finland	40.3	
France	38.7	48
Germany DR	12	
Germany FR	21	
Italy	3.8	
Japan	20.3	21.7
Korea RO	6	
Netherlands	9	

(Figures to hand as at 31.1.84)

Country	Per cent	
	1982	1983
Spain	8	
Sweden	39	
Switzerland	28.2	27.3
United Kingdom	16.7	
U.S.A.	12.5	12.6
U.S.S.R.	12	

Sources: Various, including International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); Atomic Industrial Forum (U.S.A.); European Nuclear Society; Canadian Nuclear Association.

**Mr ASHENDEN:** Those tables show clearly the importance of the generation of nuclear power throughout the world, and they show also a wide and expanding growth in the generation of nuclear power. Unless Australia, within the next two years—and these are not my words but the words put to us by the nuclear fuel cycle experts overseas—moves into this area, it will be too late. All of the present power stations and the planned power stations which have requirements for uranium will be obtaining it from countries other than Australia, unless we allow the development of that resource in our State and in our country within the next two years. In two years time it will be too late. However, by that time, there will be Liberal South Australian and Federal Governments, and one can only hope that that will be in time for contracts to be entered into to enable the vast mineral resources in this country to be utilised to generate the thousands of millions of dollars that are lying in the ground and create the thousands of jobs available to us purely and simply for the picking.

I point out to honourable members opposite what mineral wealth can do. In Alaska the mineral wealth of that State has resulted in the residents not only not paying tax but each resident who has resided there for more than three years receives about \$3 000 back from the Government each year because of the wealth generated in that State by its mineral resources. Some Canadian Provinces are moving in the same direction, so there is no reason why South Australians should not enjoy the vast wealth that lies underground in our State.

I would urge this Government to reconsider its position before it is too late, because in two years time, unless action is taken, it will be too late and thousands of millions of dollars and thousands of jobs will be lost in this country. Countries overseas, including socialist countries, cannot understand the 'head in the sand' attitude of the socialist Governments of Australia.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN (Elizabeth):** I think the honourable member who spoke before me said quite enough. I look forward to the opportunity in a few moments to put right one or two of the things he said. Initially, I would thank the Governor very much for providing me and other members of the House with the opportunity to speak in this debate. If it were not for the Governor's Speech we would not have the opportunity of speaking in reply. I thank the Governor for that; it is very decent of him.

**Mr Lewis:** It's your last chance.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I do not think that it will be the last chance I will have to speak in this place and, on the off chance that it is, I do not know that there is a precedent whereby people giving their final speeches are given the same courtesy as are those giving their first speeches, but in case there is I would like the honourable member to show a little courtesy, in any event.

I place on record my condolences and congratulations as are appropriate. Before turning to the more serious matters, I want to deal fairly quickly with a few things that the member for Todd had to say. I make this point quite sincerely: I congratulate him on the fact that he has learnt some little amount about the way of the procedures of this

place and the way to present his case—'a little amount', as I said, but if things go the way I hope I may have the opportunity in the near future of being able to provide him with a little more guidance, and show him a little more light about the way of Parliamentary procedures and practices.

I listened with great interest to the way in the first half of his speech he went on at great length about the need to establish child care facilities and other community services in the electorate of Todd, and then proceeded to spend the last half of his speech carefully explaining one almost certain way of demolishing those resources by providing uranium to the world and thereby running the risk of bombing those resources into obliteration. I could not see much justification in that, except of course when one knows the practices of one of his colleagues and associates who, after having in some way or another been associated with burning down much of the Hills, then proceeded to convert his business to building enterprises so that he could proceed to assist in repairing the damage that had been done.

I also noticed that while the honourable member was speaking, his opponent at the next election (Ms Gayler), who undoubtedly will be successful and replace him to represent the people of Todd in this place, was sitting in the Gallery.

**The Hon. D.C. Wotton:** You're not supposed to refer to the Gallery.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am not supposed to refer to the Gallery. I noticed that she was paying particular attention.

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Whitten):** Order! Whilst the member for Todd was speaking he was heard in near silence, and I ask the member for Todd to afford the same privilege to the member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** He did not have anything to say, and since I have been making a few points the dogs have started barking pretty vigorously. The future member for Todd was listening very carefully to what was being said. I do not think there was anything said that would have given her anything but the utmost confidence that she will be the representative of the good people of Todd in this Parliament after the next State election. When I heard the member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes, the member for Newland. I correct the record to that extent. When I heard the honourable member suggesting that there was going to be a Liberal Federal and State Government after the next election, I thought that he was being the ultimate in optimists but I then realised—and I know I am not allowed to say that he handles the truth badly or anything like that—that he has a Goebbels complex about the way he approaches these questions of what Party will be the next Government of this State and of this nation. There is no doubt that the opinion polls and every other poll one cares to conduct indicate clearly that the people of this country have great confidence in both the Federal and State Labor Governments, and there is nothing to indicate why they will not continue to do so.

*Mr Baker interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I wish the member for Mitcham would stop with his moral humbug. We have had quite enough of that in this debate. Honourable members will be pleased to know that I have just about finished with them, and I turn now to more serious matters affecting this State and this nation. As such, they can retire to wherever they normally go when they sink out of the House.

**Mr Ingerson:** I thought you weren't supposed to read—

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If the honourable member is taking that point, I would be very interested in the Opposition's setting that precedent, because plenty of its members have great need for copious notes. I do not particularly have the need. As honourable members know, I could give a penetrating analysis of the problems of this nation for an hour or more without the need for notes, but I have a few facts and figures to place on record this evening, so I thought it would be useful to prepare some material in advance. I see nothing wrong with that. I know that it presents an intellectual threat to some members opposite—the thought that they might actually be forced to prepare speeches. However, I am not going to concern myself with that.

I want to speak about what I see as the worsening position of the poorest members, economically and socially, in our society. I have had the honour of representing the people of Elizabeth for the past 12 years now, and that constituency unfortunately contains some of the poorest people in our State and in our nation. It has always been of great concern to me to try to express as best I can the problems that confront those people and what I see to be the solutions to those problems.

In Australia it is commonly assumed that our political processes ensure at least a minimum degree of representation to all citizens; that is, of course, our elected officials or representatives are supposedly able to identify and articulate the needs of the population, and (again, supposedly), irrespective of the diversity of power relations within the population, it is assumed that everybody eventually has some influence within the system. Yet, it is increasingly obvious that those with the most power invariably have the most influence, and that those with the most power invariably are the most wealthy, or at least those with the most influence are people who are capable of commanding substantial incomes for the work they undertake.

At the other end of the scale, of course, those who have least in the way of the nation's wealth and resources are the most dependent upon the decisions of others more powerful than them in society's scale. The poor, for example, the low income earners, pensioners and the unemployed, find themselves on the receiving end of the hard knocks dealt out by our economic system. The ability of the poor to withstand some of these blows has, prior to the onset of the current depression, been ameliorated to some extent by the efforts of Australian Labor Party politicians, the Party itself, and the trade union movement.

Such efforts did not increase necessarily the power of the poor to improve their own lot, but did enable the poor to improve their position relative to the affluence of our society. Their powerlessness was, in fact, reduced to the extent that they were at least able to enjoy some of the benefits created by our economy and our society. The onset of the current depression—and I might say that there are signs that we are now climbing out of it—and the changing political climate of the mid 1970s ripped away the veil of power-sharing that had applied until that time.

Not only was the powerlessness of the poor there for all to see, but the poor had their position as victims in society reinforced to an even greater extent and to a greater extent, I think, than has occurred since the Depression. They are victims, I say, in two ways: first, the poor were on the receiving end of the economic changes that have occurred in our society (I think there can be no doubt about that); secondly, and quite viciously, the poor in some quarters have been blamed for the economic problems of the late 1970s, which, of course, were no fault of theirs.

They became both the victims and the victimised and, particularly under the Fraser Government, the poor became the target of the more powerful, the whipping post of the

well to do. The class divisions of our society were proudly exploited by the Fraser Government. The poor were made to pay for the well-being of the rich and powerful. Wages were attacked, social service benefits were cut back, education funding was slashed, health care was ignored, and unemployment spiralled. With the election of the Hawke-led Labor Government in March 1983, a new deal was felt to be just around the corner for the poor and disadvantaged of our society.

**Mr Baker:** Here comes the crunch. I am waiting.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Just constrain yourself, and everything will be all right.

**Mr Baker:** We want to hear the pronouncement of his divorce from the Hawke policies.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Whatever drivel the honourable member is trying to interject into the debate, I am sure he will see the error of his ways if he just contains himself for a couple of moments.

*The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I cannot win: on the one hand, if I disagree to any extent with any of the Federal Government's policies, this is to be expected; if I am to agree with them, according to the Deputy Leader, it is some sort of bid for the Ministry. I cannot win either way.

The first thing, of course, that the Hawke Labor Government undertook was the calling of the national economic summit, a four-day meeting of Government, politicians, individual capitalists, industry group representatives, trade union officials, and one lone spokesperson for the welfare sector. No-one, in effect, was there representing the interests of the unemployed directly, although many spoke on the question of unemployment. Nobody represented the interests of women directly, though many spoke on the labour force, the economic recovery and the position of women in relation to that. Those who were most disadvantaged by the current system were, unfortunately, in a direct sense excluded from the process which was to provide the basis for national economic recovery and the process which has now been seen to be so successful in doing that.

**Mr Baker:** Are you saying—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Read *Hansard*, if you do not understand it. The only person whose presence could be regarded as directly representing the poor was the spokesperson for welfare, Mr Bruce Mackenzie, President of the Australian Council of Social Services. He pointed out that the very poor in our society, namely the pensioners and unemployed, were not part of the summit's overall ambit. Mr Mackenzie was also one of the few to argue for the summit to address the issue of structural changes necessary to achieve a just and humane society.

In the aftermath of the summit it is clear that the articulation of such goals remained submerged in the concern for a national recovery. But, whose recovery indeed and how were the benefits of this recovery to be distributed? These questions are yet to be adequately dealt with. The summit has been described by some cynics as just a public relations exercise. But, it was far more than that. It was a reaction to the divisiveness and confrontationist approach of the sheep farmer with the big stock whip. The national economic summit was an attempt to try a different and more conciliatory approach to solving the nation's economic problems.

The main business of the summit was, however, focused on three things. The first was the relationship between capital and labour and how to keep it from disintegrating; in other words how to get unions and business to agree that they are all in this together, their interests are mutual, and so on. Secondly, it was to attempt to endeavour to achieve

a prices and incomes arrangement—how to keep incomes down, basically, while allowing more latitude for prices.

Thirdly, to ensure that Budget deficits and inflationary forces were kept at some sort of reasonable level. The result of the summit was the public statement of the economic communique. The central proposal was to establish an Economic Planning Advisory Council to advise the Government. In addition, wages were to be fixed and prices placed under some sort of control.

In essence, the summit was an affirmation of the accord. Those who are most disadvantaged at present will eventually receive the benefits once the economy recovers. Such benefits for the poor were seen as a consequence of economic recovery rather than as an integral part of the recovery. However, it was deemed that there was no need to redistribute the wealth because economic recovery would eventually eliminate poverty. This was the central message of the summit. I now refer to the prices and incomes accord, because that is clearly for the State and the nation; it is the centrepiece of the economic recovery which is now occurring in Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am sorry if this speech is a little boring for members opposite, but I know that none of them will leave because they are in fear that at any moment I might introduce some element into the debate which they fear they will miss if they leave the Chamber. I am pleased to keep them on their toes through their fear that they will miss something if they leave the Chamber. I can assure the Opposition that I intend to take the whole hour tonight to explain the sort of rational economic policy that they ought to be applying. If members opposite contain themselves, I assure them that there will be a few more jibes and points of wisdom that they will pick up along the way, if they pay attention.

Of course the accord is essentially about preserving the conditions of those who are either employing or employed. The accord does not directly include those who are unemployed within its parameters, because it is a contract, if you like, between the Government and the unions in this country, or the ACTU, the council of the unions. It does not directly involve the unemployed, the poor, the pensioners and the like. Although it speaks of poverty, unemployment and the like, it fails to specify how those who have to endure poverty can escape from such conditions. It certainly seeks to ensure that, through the compact between the trade unions and the Government, eventually the poor and the disadvantaged will benefit.

The point I am making is not a direct criticism of the accord itself. My point is that no-one involved in the negotiations directly represents the interests of the poor, the poverty-stricken and unemployed. Certainly, the trade unions seek to do this, but they do not represent directly such people.

**The Hon. B.C. Eastick:** Does the Prime Minister?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The Government clearly represents the interests of the whole community. Surely the honourable member can understand the point that I am making without trying to take obtuse points. I know that he is a past master and has shown great ability in taking obtuse points. In fact, he shows a continuing ability in that direction.

**The Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy:** Don't be rude.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** The honourable member may have misunderstood me: I said 'obtuse' and not 'obese'.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I never lose my place; I have never lost my cool, either. The poor have become poorer and the wealthy have become better off. Employees have maintained and, in some cases, improved their position as a result of the accord. We have not yet seen very much

improvement in the position of the poorest members of our society and the accord, to date, has not really challenged this state of affairs. On the contrary, to some extent it acquiesces in them by predicating its plans for the elimination of poverty on the general hope of an economic recovery.

Unemployment and underemployment has tended to be concentrated in working class households. Occasionally one runs across a middle-class unemployed person, but, largely, the working class has suffered the most. The members of such households have worked in low-paying jobs with few or no fringe benefits, very little job security and little or no control over the labour process. The effect of this, of course, is that when they have become unemployed they have had little in the way of savings, little security and little to bolster them through the period of unemployment, even if they have been lucky enough to have a relatively short period of unemployment.

Analyses of income distribution data in the late 1970s demonstrates that most unemployment fell heaviest on low-income earners. In January 1983, 603 000 people were receiving unemployment benefits in this nation. In addition, about 350 000 children and spouses were directly dependent on unemployed people. Nearly 1 000 000 people in total were expected to survive on amounts of money well below the poverty line. If one includes the under-employed, the part-time workers, and the pensioners, the number of people living below the poverty line in this country is nearly 3 000 000—a figure which is a total disgrace in an affluent, well-to-do, richly endowed country such as ours. In fact, one person in five Australians lives in poverty.

Yet, solving the problem of poverty is considered to be a by-product of any economic recovery. The unemployed are not victimised simply because they are out of work, the consequences of unemployment are far-reaching. In July 1982 the Australian Bureau of Statistics revealed that the wives of unemployed males had an unemployment rate of 33 per cent and a labour force participation rate of 32 per cent. This compares with the wives of employed males who had an unemployment rate of 5 per cent (33 per cent against 5 per cent) and a labour force participation rate of 52 per cent (32 per cent against 52 per cent).

In addition, only 21 per cent of unemployed husbands had an employed wife, whereas 50 per cent of employed husbands had wives who were employed. The low level of employment of wives of unemployed males is explained by the fact that the guidelines for unemployment benefits keep low-income earners trapped within a cycle of poverty.

Low-income earners are least likely to be able to withstand long periods of unemployment because their income precludes a margin of safety in terms of savings. In addition, aggregating the income of spouses to determine benefits has a twofold effect. First, preventing wives of unemployed males from attempting to gain employment because of the effect this will have on unemployment benefits; and secondly, keeping unemployed people perpetually in poverty.

The children of unemployed people also find themselves grossly disadvantaged in this situation. Young people in families where either parent is unemployed are twice as likely to find themselves unemployed when compared with the children of employed parents. Areas of high adult unemployment are also characterised by high levels of youth unemployment. Single adults without dependants receive low unindexed benefits. It is highly probable, given what I have just said, that single unemployed people will tend to be concentrated within families with few financial resources to provide support. It is also likely that single unemployed people, especially single youths, will be drawn from the more lowly paid and more insecure jobs.



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

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** As I was saying before the tea break, or 'dinner adjournment' as some prefer to refer to it (some may well prefer to call it the 'claret break', but I certainly would not be referring to it as that in my case)—the unemployed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I call upon members opposite not to rise to the occasion when I mention the word 'claret'. I was saying before the tea break that the unemployed are effectively excluded from concessions such as rent allowances, and so on, unless they happen to fall into some other additional benefit category. Therefore, even to the extent that they are poor and disadvantaged, the unemployed do not even have the same minimal level of sustenance as the people on pensions and the like.

I want now to spend some moments referring to some of the problems that exist in Elizabeth. In Elizabeth West at the moment 80 per cent of those receiving an income receive less than 55 per cent of average weekly earnings—that mythical figure that always seems to be chased by the working class in an effort to find the people who are actually earning the average. Of the people in Elizabeth West who are working, 97 per cent earn less than 65 per cent of average weekly earnings. For the record, the main sources of income in Elizabeth West are 29 per cent from employment, 26 per cent from pensions and 28 per cent from unemployment benefits—pretty disastrous statistics in anyone's language.

In Elizabeth generally, in June 1981, 13.2 per cent of all families were lone parent families compared with 6.5 per cent for the State—double the State average. Unemployment as at June 1981 stood at 13.9 per cent of the workforce of 25 596, compared to 8.2 per cent for Adelaide. I realise that some of these figures are out of date, but I wanted to be able to compare all the figures so I had to go back a little further. Youth unemployment stood at 30.6 per cent of all school leavers aged 16 to 19 years who were unemployed for six months or more, compared to 15.2 per cent for Adelaide as a whole. Again, the youth unemployment rate was double the average for Adelaide.

Elizabeth is particularly hard hit by the downturn in manufacturing, of course. The vehicle building and home building industries have taken a serious battering. The recent upswing in home building has yet to be felt in Elizabeth to any substantial degree. Manufacturing is yet to improve to a point where unemployment can be substantially decreased. Manufacturing has declined to a point Australia wide where it now employs less than one-fifth of the labour force. This, I suggest, does not auger well for areas such as Elizabeth where manufacturing tends to be a significant employment force.

One of the areas where the poor are grossly disadvantaged in our society relates to education. This, of course, has an impact on society at large in this country. In Australia 59 per cent of 16 year olds are continuing on with full time education. This rate compares to 89 per cent in Canada and 92 per cent in Japan. When one looks at figures like that, one sees that they start to give some key to the reasons why we are performing so poorly in competitive economic terms with some of our major trading partners.

The retention rates in schools tends to be greatest in areas of low unemployment. Areas of high unemployment have high drop-out rates. The cost of children in low unemployment areas staying on in schools is at the expense of the poor and unemployed who usually cannot afford to keep their children at school until the end of the high school years. In fact, what is particularly disgraceful at the moment is a drop-out rate of 81 per cent—or, if one likes, a retention rate of 19 per cent—in one high school near my electorate that services children from my electorate. That is absolutely

appalling, not only in sociological terms but also in terms of the future of this nation. That sort of waste is a gross example of inefficiency in the way in which we run our country and society. That compares with statistics—

**Mr Whitten:** How does that compare with Burnside?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I would like to compare it with St Peter's College, which has a retention rate of 91 per cent. When one considers a retention rate at one of the schools that services my area of 19 per cent and a retention rate at St Peter's College of 91 per cent, it indicates that something is dismally wrong in our society.

*The Hon. Jennifer Adamson interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If anyone thinks from what I am saying that I want to level down, they are grossly wrong. I am determined to see a better effort to ensure that children in schools, such as the one near my electorate to which I referred, are able to have a better opportunity than they presently have. I have no desire to level down, as some members suggest.

**The Hon. Jennifer Adamson:** I have no argument with that.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I am glad to hear that members opposite have no argument with that, because I want to say something about the elements of the scheme that the Liberal Party, from time to time, has flirted with in relation to educational funding—the scheme sometimes known as the voucher scheme.

*The Hon. Michael Wilson interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** If the honourable member will hear me out, he will see that I have a variation on it that I think has some interesting possibilities. An interesting variation on the voucher scheme would be a scheme where a child, on registering at a high school, brings to that school a notional amount of money of \$3 000 multiplied by five (and I am told that the cost of educating a child in high school is presently \$3 000 a year) so that \$15 000 would then be accredited to that school. This would result in schools with a very high drop-out rate being able individually to arrange for a higher teacher/pupil ratio and to employ more resources in the lower years of high school. Therefore, children who, because of their own personal ability, decide to go on would have smaller ratio classes (if not one for one) and there would be a higher retention rate. Obviously, those schools that have a higher retention rate would have to spread the expenditure over the whole five years to a much greater extent. But, there would be a fairer distribution of the education dollar. There is no way in which anyone can argue against the proposition that working class people are discriminated against in economic terms through the education system.

It is well known that the children of the working class do not use the education system as much as the children of the middle or upper class. This is not an argument about State aid to private schools, I hasten to add: it has nothing to do with that. It is an argument about there being greater equity in the sharing of resources throughout the system, whether in regard to Government or private systems. I believe that such a reform is long overdue. I have just mentioned the high school area; of course, working class kids almost invariably do not get any tertiary education. I have not seen statistics in relation to universities since the Martin Report in the 1960s. The position may have improved a little, but in the 1960s, of students who went to universities 1.2 per cent came from blue collar working class homes, whereas, of course, blue collar working class people in those days made up about 40 per cent of the population.

**The Hon. Michael Wilson:** Only 17 per cent of kids go on to what we call higher education, anyway.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Sure; but I think the point I am making is clear in regard to those statistics. I am not

suggesting for a moment that all people in society do not gain through the university education system. Of course we all need doctors, and some of us probably need lawyers and other professionals who are trained at universities—there is no question about that. I just want to make it clear that I am not suggesting for a moment that by some strange quirk of economics we can do without universities or make them fully paid for. However, I make the point that there is no doubt that in economic terms the working class is seriously discriminated against in the education area, and I think that a lot needs to be done to provide for needs-based funding of one sort or another across the board. This would ensure that working class kids have a better opportunity than they have had in the past to participate in the education system at the higher levels and would ensure that the system copes better in providing opportunities for the working class kids and for better class size ratios, particularly in schools in areas such as Elizabeth, thereby ensuring that across the board a far higher proportion of the population can go on to tertiary education.

The problems confronting teachers (for example, in schools in poorer areas or working class areas) are pretty horrendous. The distribution of educational resources between areas of low and high unemployment tends to favour schoolchildren in areas of low unemployment. For example, teacher pupil ratios in the latter tend to be more effective: they can have slightly larger schools and therefore have more specialist teachers. This is often the case, whereas in schools in working class areas, because of the fact that social problems are brought into the classrooms, the teacher needs to be not only a teacher but also a nurse, a social worker, a disciplinarian, and a family counsellor as well. In those circumstances the teacher effort is diluted very substantially.

This is a problem that we have all known about for a long time, but very little has been done about it. Far more effort needs to be made in this area to try to ensure that working class kids get a fairer go and that we break the poverty cycle that so obviously afflicts far too many families in this society. In high unemployment areas teachers find that the wider social problems greatly affect the quality of classroom teaching. Although class sizes are generally on a par with those in schools in low unemployment areas, the level of social problems brought into the classrooms is far higher, and consequently teachers must divert much more time towards coping with problems that are not of an educational nature. I think that that matter needs to be investigated urgently. The problems generated by poverty mean that the quality of education is continually at risk, despite the best efforts of teachers and other support staff.

**Mr Baker:** This sounds like a good Liberal speech.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** I have not heard too many members opposite talk about the poverty that confronts our society.

**Mr Trainer:** They usually deny that the working class even exists.

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes, there is no such thing as class in our society.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Another matter with which I want to deal briefly is the working class, which is heavily discriminated against, and there is a quite unfair cross-subsidisation that occurs in many instances between the poor and the very poor. An example of this is the way in which the Housing Trust applies its rent schedule. Those people who pay the full market rent are in the business of subsidising those who are on reduced rentals, and this is a cross-subsidisation that occurs within the Housing Trust.

The Federal Government, in moving towards ensuring that all subsidised rentals are paid for out of the Federal Budget, is acting in a proper fashion. There is no reason

why the poor people who live in Housing Trust houses but who are employed and pay the full market rents, as they are known, should have to pay those rents so that people who are very poor, on unemployment benefits and the like, can receive subsidised rentals. The Federal Government is to be congratulated for removing that example of discrimination where, as I have described it, the poor are subsidising the very poor.

Another example is that in my electorate I see the way in which people who are receiving minimum incomes or who are unemployed are forced to drive old vehicles that are often reaching the end of their economic life. Although these people often have no choice in economic terms, they find that they are often pulled up by the police and have their vehicles defected. They are then required to pay not only to have the vehicles repaired but also the cost of going to Thebarton to have the defect notices removed. Also, in some cases they are fined for having a vehicle that is not in a particularly safe condition. I am not arguing that people should drive unsafe vehicles, but it is an example, in a sense, of discrimination against the poor. Because they are poor, these people feel that the only way in which they can get transport is to drive old bombs, with the result that they are fined, in effect, for being poor. That is a very sad situation.

Another matter about which I feel very strongly concerns the Electricity Trust and its bond scheme. If one happens to be a middle class person buying a house with a mortgage, and if an application is made to ETSA to have power connected, in most circumstances ETSA does not say that it requires a \$300 bond. Those people are offered the facility of electrical connection without paying a bond. However, the people who are required to pay a bond, which sometimes can be a formidable amount (recently a woman was asked to pay \$300), are the poorest people in society who must rent—people on pensions and the like. When such people tell ETSA that they are renting the property, they are asked to pay a bond, on the basis (and I can understand that it is a business proposition from ETSA's point of view) that ETSA has statistics to show that people who rent houses are more likely to be bad payers or non-payers. However, some of those people do pay their bills regularly and effectively, and they should not be discriminated against in that fashion. There should be a method by which ETSA's bad debts are spread across the whole organisation and not sheeted home to the identifiable poor, as now happens.

There ought to be a scheme to ensure that that sort of thing happens. That is an example—not a deliberate example, of course—of discrimination against poor people. It compounds further than that. A woman came to see me on Thursday of last week. She came to my office during the day. She had five children and was living alone. She had just moved into a Housing Trust rental house and ETSA had asked her for the payment of a bond of over \$300. She is on a pension with five children and could not possibly afford it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Yes, absurd. She came to my office on Thursday and sought my assistance. I was down here at Parliament House. My electorate assistant rang me. I made arrangements to contact ETSA. The Trust, on hearing from me, was quite reasonable about it and said, 'Look, in the circumstances we understand and we will drop it.' But it should not have to go to the point where a member of Parliament has to intervene. In the circumstances, ETSA said that it would not demand the bond, but between the phone call from my office to ETSA and the woman getting home that night the internal communications in ETSA had broken down and it had in fact cut off the power. She finally got on to me, very distressed on getting home at

about 5.30 p.m. I was still here, fortunately. I rang ETSA's emergency number, and they explained to me reasonably politely that they were really there for those sorts of emergencies when power lines come down. I explained that in the circumstances there ought to be a bit more co-operation. They were very decent about it and got somebody out to her house and made the reconnection, but that woman was very distressed when she rang me from a phone box because she believed that she would have to spend the night in a dark house with her five children, the oldest of whom was 13. That sort of situation should not occur in our society.

Another area where the poor are grossly discriminated against institutionally is in relation to the law. One of the more unfortunate side effects of poverty is that poor people tend to come into conflict with the law and its agencies far more frequently than do those who are better off. People who are unemployed are 10 times more likely to appear in court than is the population at large. In particular, young unemployed people find themselves very much at risk. One of the most common ranges of offence in areas of high unemployment is that related to so-called public order: crimes such as offensive behaviour, vagrancy, drunkenness, loitering, offences against order, failure to provide name and address when asked, etc. In the period 1 January to 30 June 1982 the number of recorded offences for such crimes was, by local government district: Elizabeth 163, Enfield 262, Port Adelaide 268, East Torrens 5, Stirling 5, Walkerville 4.

If one looks at the overall rate of offences per 1 000 of the adult population in local government districts the figures are as follows: Elizabeth 39.2, Enfield 20.2, Port Adelaide 30.2, East Torrens 7.6, Stirling 6.5, Walkerville 5.4. The average for the State was 12 per 1 000 adult population. Those figures are fairly revealing.

I have not got the unemployment statistics to match, but I do not think that anyone would be in any doubt that the unemployment level in Stirling is about one-third, probably, of that in Elizabeth. The link between poverty, unemployment and crime is undeniable. The victimisation of the poor, however, does not end with their appearance before the courts. In many cases the poor or unemployed are unable to pay a fine and thereby end up facing imprisonment. Of course, they are not gaoled for being poor, but for non-payment of fines, which is deemed to be a crime. Some 15 000 people in Australia each year are gaoled for non-payment of fines.

The level of fine imposed takes no account of the person's capacity to pay. In fact, the courts are not permitted to take into account capacity to pay under the system as it stands at the moment. In many cases, the level of fine is predetermined by the legislation dealing with the crime. A person earning \$18 000 a year who is fined \$200 is in a far better position than is someone who is unemployed and fined \$200.

I believe that we have to work towards a system that operates in many overseas countries where fines are income related. I do not think that any member of the Parliament would seriously disagree with that. What we are concerned about, and many members opposite have expressed concern about this, is to ensure that the penalty fits the crime. If a wealthy person chooses to park anywhere around Adelaide and has to pay only a \$10 fine, as some of them do, that is hardly an effective method of upholding the law. One has to have a situation where the fines are, to some extent, income related. It is a complex and difficult question. I am not putting forward a catch all method of dealing with that tonight, but many other countries overseas, States in the United States of America and Provinces in Canada, for example, have come to terms with the question of income

related monetary penalties. I think that we have to move towards that situation.

The vast majority of people gaoled for non-payment of fines tend to be unemployed. Many attempt to make some payment of their fines but find that providing for necessities such as food, rent, heating, and clothing takes precedence. Very often the available money cannot be stretched to pay the fines. When people come into my office with those sorts of problem I usually take the liberty of writing to the Attorney-General or other law enforcement officer saying that this family has X-amount of dollars available this week and that they intend to spend it on food, clothing, rent, and so on. Quite clearly, they have not got enough money to pay the fines. I ask whether I could be advised whether they wish the family to do without food for this week or if they should not pay the rent or electricity bill in order to pay a fine. It is surprising how many fines get written off when I apply that sort of test to the appropriate law enforcement officer.

The law is supposed to be for the protection of all people. We are continually being told that the law enforcement effort must be increased, yet there are some who are not only not protected but very often are the victims of the workings of our legal system. For the most part, the law and its enforcement agencies are seen as agencies of social control. Certainly, many poor and unemployed people can attest to that.

Yet the law, particularly the field workers, can also function as an instrument of redistribution of income and power. This can be achieved by influencing the activities of low level welfare administrators and social workers; by withholding the threat of prosecution and exploring alternative solutions to potential conflict situations; and also by effecting punishment which is humane and which does not exacerbate the social situation of the offender. In particular, the law and its enforcement agencies could provide support and protection for battered wives and children. The apparent reluctance of law officers to intervene in so-called domestic disputes (or at least to provide adequate protection when it is requested) is in some instances quite appalling. This particularly affects working class women who usually have nowhere to go to escape the violence in their lives.

The lack of money, employment opportunities, affordable child-care facilities, and so on, mean that most women facing domestic violence have no alternative but to endure it. The few women's shelters which exist do so very precariously. They are generally overcrowded, understaffed, underfunded, and have more people applying for refuge than can be accommodated. In addition, shelter workers, as well as the residents themselves, must continually risk the threat of male violence. But even here, the law affords little protection or security for the women concerned.

Finally, I deal with the question of legal aid in relation to the poor. Legal aid is available mainly for criminal matters. But where unemployed and poor people end up in court they often do not qualify for legal aid. In the courts of summary jurisdiction, in cases which can be decided within a day, nine out of 10 people plead guilty. In such cases lasting less than a day, more than three-quarters of the defendants do not have legal representation. Once a case lasts more than a day, the issue of legal representation changes: only 25 per cent then do not have legal representation. The interesting thing is that the offences against order, vagrancy, drunkenness, loitering, and so on, are the most likely cases to involve only one court appearance and a hearing of less than a day.

**Mr Lewis:** Is loitering still on the Statute Book?

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Of course it is. These are the offences most likely to involve the unemployed and other poor people. The lack of an articulate voice to present

their case leaves people at the mercy of the legal system. It also means that poor people are most likely to be punished for their poverty rather than their 'crime'. Legal aid is not just a question of legal representation; it is also a matter of advice on procedures and conduct. Yet the fact that legal aid is generally restricted to serious criminal matters means that legal advice on more minor matters is harder for poor people to obtain. The patchwork of legal-aid services needs to be overhauled so that a comprehensive State-wide legal-aid service is available for all who cannot afford proper legal representation.

I was very pleased to hear recently comments by both the Federal and State Attorneys-General that they were intending to overhaul the legal-aid system to ensure that legal aid will be more readily available to the citizens who need it. I would like to refer to one aspect of legal aid that needs urgent attention: it is not in relation to the very poor but it relates to people who are lower middle class or middle class people and who are confronted with major legal bills. Often they find that they are confronting financial ruin and there ought to be schemes whereby these people can obtain legal assistance.

I have spent my time in this debate placing on record some of the things that I believe confront the poor and the disadvantaged people in our society. I must say that I do not think nearly enough is said about their problems in the debates in this Chamber and in this Parliament. The tragedy for the poor in our society is that they are unorganised and do not speak with one coherent voice: they are not able to appear as a group before tribunals and they are not represented as a group in any of the powerful councils of the nation or the State.

*Mr Lewis interjecting:*

**The Hon. PETER DUNCAN:** Fortunately, I have not had to put up with the inane interjections from the member for Mallee for the past 12 years. Those people are not in the position where they are able to represent themselves effectively. This Parliament and the national Parliament should do more to look after the poor and they should consider particularly the problems confronting children of the poor. If we are to have a better, more decent and fairer society in the future, the most important thing is to provide equality of opportunity for the children of the poor in order to break the poverty cycle which grinds them down and which ensures that in most cases they do not get a fair go in society and that their children then go into the poverty cycle. It is an appalling situation and one that we should not tolerate.

**Mr INGERSON (Bragg):** First, I thank the Governor for giving us the opportunity to speak in this debate. Unfortunately, I was not in Parliament when the former members who passed away in the previous couple of months were here, but I would like to take this opportunity to pass on my personal condolences to their families. I would like to make a few comments about the Governor's Speech.

I point out clearly that one of the initiatives in the Government's first Budget, the increase of funds for public buildings, has, in fact, been very beneficial for the State. There is no question that the amount expended in that area has caused an increase of building in both the public and private sectors and that there is also a spin-off into general construction and building in this State, even though the construction area is operating at a much lower level. The Government should be commended for going down that track and for making sure that more money was made available to the building sector. There is no question that, if the building sector is efficient and working effectively, there will be a spin-off effect for a large number of businesses.

In the document there has been an obvious and deliberate attempt by the Government to note the areas in which it has been able to manage successfully, as it believes. However, the Government has deliberately not referred to the effects of the wage freeze instigated by the Tonkin and Fraser Governments. That wage freeze obviously was to have a lagged effect, which did not take place until well into the term of this Government. It is disappointing that, in a document such as this, the Government does not note that other factors have significantly affected the conditions of the market and the economy today.

I refer to another matter which was not given enough emphasis in the Speech, namely, the breaking of the drought. In this State our economy revolves considerably around an effective, efficient, productive and profitable rural sector. It was a little disappointing that insufficient emphasis was made in relation to that point. In the Speech the need for industry to be more competitive locally, interstate and internationally was stressed. The Speech reflects the attitude of the Government, but it is interesting that it should state that we need to be more competitive. Yet, during this Government's term of office we have experienced cost increases that have directly affected the competitiveness of business, both small and large; in particular there have been increases in charges and taxes. It seems a little odd that the Government should place such great emphasis on the need to be competitive, while at the same time dramatically increasing charges and taxes in this State, resulting in increased on costs.

The story is put forward that the Budget or the economy was in a mess when the Government took over. In a few days we will be able to consider the Government's ability to manage its funds and to see how it has managed its expenditure in order to ascertain whether all of the furphies it has put forward have been managed in a better way than it suggested other Governments managed them.

I refer now to the Small Business Development Corporation. The Corporation was a specific and strongly stated policy initiative of the previous Government in its election platform. It was interesting that that policy was put forward in November 1982. The legislation was passed in Parliament in April 1984.

However, some 18 months later this very important policy direction decision of the Government, this setting up of the Small Business Corporation (something that was going to help this new found area from which the Government was going to make mileage) has not been implemented. This is an area that concerns me. I find it difficult to understand, when a considerable number of organisations have put forward the names of people to be on the board and when the Chairman has been appointed for some three months, that the names of the board members have still to be announced. How can a Government be fair dinkum about its push to help small business when it takes 18 months to set up such a corporation to help this group?

I turn now to another area referred to in the Governor's Speech—recreation and sport. The Government has said that extra facilities will be provided in this area. I look forward to that, because facilities are the biggest single problem for sporting and recreational groups. Governments, both Federal and State, have spent many years paying lip service to support for athletes. By this I mean money in sport and the ability for our top athletes (and often our top junior athletes) to compete, to be trained and to receive sustenance. That is a disgrace in this country at present.

At the moment we are all riding on the back of a wave of sporting enthusiasm. Politically, it is a good thing to be in Government at the moment because one can always have one's photograph taken with an Olympian or with a major athlete. However, the truth of the matter is that half of

those athletes had to go on the dole or receive sustenance payments during their training campaigns. However, politicians and members of the public are prepared to stand up and say 'Now that you have done so well we are prepared to ride on your back.' I think that that is a disgrace. I hope that in the near future something will be done nationally for these people because I believe that that is where such an initiative needs to start.

I now turn to the subject of uranium. It is interesting that at the moment this mirage in the desert, this thing that was not going to mean anything, has become the most pragmatic decision and the most necessary evil for this Government to survive. It would be interesting to see what would happen if this Government faced up to its uranium policy and told the people of this State what it really believes. It is probably the best example of political pragmatism that I have seen. I suppose one needs to congratulate them because at last members of the Labor Party have realised that if they go against this one issue that would be the quickest way back into Opposition.

I turn now to my concerns after being in this place for 12 months. It seems only a short time ago in one respect, but a long time ago when I think back to some of the things that I could have done in the past 12 months. First, I refer to the rising public debt interest payment by the Government. The official journal of the Australian Chamber of Commerce, *Canberra Comments*, contains an article headed 'The Sleeping Giant: Australia's rising public debt interest burden'. The article states:

Australia's rising public debt and the associated interest burden is placing great strain on responsible budgetary management. There is no sign that strain will be eased in the future. The recent experience of rising public sector deficits and public sector borrowing will lock Australia [and obviously South Australia] into a succession of structural deficits for years to come because of the lagged effects of a rising public debt interest burden.

As all members would be aware, the principal reason for public debt is the massive borrowings that have taken place by Governments in the past 10 years. In 1972-73, the interest paid on public debt by the Government was \$75 million. In 1983-84, that same line represents \$220 million—an increase of \$155 million over a period of ten years. When one thinks about it, that is a \$155 million loss right from the beginning. As anyone in business would know, one of the major problems is how much interest one has to pay before one starts running a business.

One of the major implications of not doing much about the public interest debt is that the rising debt adds to the structural component of the deficit, which will not be immediately reduced by any upturn in the economy. Even if the economy turns around there is definitely no guarantee that this area of the Budget will improve.

To put the amount of public interest debt in perspective, Mr Phil Ruthvens at a recent conference in Sydney stated that when one adds together the debts of all governments (Federal, State and local), in 1972-73 the collective debt represented \$3 500 per household across the nation, but in 1982-83 it represented \$25 000 per household. This increase over the past ten years concerns me very much. When governments borrow large sums of money for any purpose they should remember that the interest has to be paid. This insidious interest bill takes much away from the taxation source.

The other area that has concerned me this year is the conditions of employment in the Public Service. In the past week the report on the Superannuation Fund was presented. The report clearly sets out the problems existing in the current scheme. One of the major reasons that we have this problem with superannuation is because of some trend-setting legislation dating back to the Dunstan Government of the early 1970s. At that time it was often said that public

servants in this State would have the best superannuation scheme and conditions of employment in Australia. Whilst one should not criticise the fact that people should have reasonable conditions of employment, one has to remember that someday someone has to pay—there is no such thing as a free lunch. The report clearly sets out that last year there was a deficit of \$19.5 million, but that that is not a major concern because, in relation to most funds, it is not a big debt. However, what is of concern is that to achieve that point some \$53.7 million had to be contributed to the fund by the Government.

That contribution by the Government is a matter about which we are all concerned; it will increase dramatically every year. Obviously a better method for sharing costs is required. The choices available as set out in the report are that either benefits must be lowered or contributions must be increased. It seems to me that both of those options ought to be made available to the individual, with the understanding that one of those options must be taken because otherwise the Government, and consequently the taxpayers, will have to foot the Bill. Another obstacle to the efficient running of the Public Service is permanency of employment. That is a major area for attention, and I hope that something is done about that soon.

In regard to the operation of Parliament, I am concerned about the presentation of financial matters to Parliament. We receive Budget Estimate papers once a year at the end of August and matters relating to them are debated at the end of September and the beginning of October. It is interesting that the board of perhaps the largest business in the State is not fed information in the same way as that required statutorily in regard to directors of public companies. Once a month we expect them to have placed before them figures setting out the financial state of their companies. However, in regard to the State Public Service only once a year does the Parliament receive figures that it can analyse and question.

I believe that we should be provided with at least quarterly budgets that set out clearly the estimates and actual payments relating to the various departments. To maintain that that cannot be done is absolutely ridiculous because those sorts of figures are provided to Government. The computer age is here, and on a monthly basis, if not more often, Government Ministers know where they stand. I believe that the Parliament ought to be provided with details of payments and income of the Public Service more frequently.

While we were away overseas recently, we were able to look at the operation of the Parliaments in Ontario and London. The thing that impressed me most was that during Question Time the member who had asked a question was subsequently able to ask supplementary questions. That seemed to me to be a much better procedure than that which we have in this Parliament where a member has no opportunity to ask further questions after having asked a Minister or a representative of a Minister in another place an initial question, unless of course a member sets up a series of questions. It has been pointed out to me by the member for Chaffey that that opportunity is given in the Legislative Council. We ought to seriously consider that procedure for this House because I am sure that that would enable members to use Question Time more beneficially and would enable the Opposition to question the Government more directly. It would prevent what I have seen occurring on many occasions, that is, the putting off of an answer or a non-answer. With the opportunity available to ask supplementary questions that could be avoided.

Another matter that concerns me is in regard to Bills and regulations. It seems incredible that after Parliament has considered a Bill, some two, six or 12 months later the

regulations suddenly appear out of nowhere and are not considered by Parliament.

It is almost unbelievable that consideration of regulations cannot take place until well after the Bill has been considered. This Parliament does not have the option to debate those regulations and that needs to be changed, particularly in relation to new Bills. The process used to consider regulations for an Act that has been functioning for some time may be effective. However, in the case of a new Bill, such as the Controlled Substances Bill, the overall framework of the Bill was debated but the regulations, the nuts and bolts, still have not come before this Parliament. I would like to see regulations debated by this Parliament so that issues can get a better airing.

**An honourable member:** We'd have to spend a lot of time.

**Mr INGERSON:** I do not care about the time. It will make the Government of the day prepare itself properly so that the regulations and the Bill are presented to the Parliament at the same time.

Another matter of concern is the provision of only two research officers for 69 members of Parliament. As Ministers probably have their own research staff, it leaves 56 members in the hands of two research staff. That is quite unacceptable. If we are serious in this place about debating issues and being properly prepared to put arguments forward in debate, better facilities should be available for research. The current onus placed on the two research officers is unacceptable.

I would like to deal with a couple of matters concerning my electorate; first I refer to school maintenance. In many public schools in my area, as well as across the State, the assets of the Education Department are being allowed to run down, and that is unacceptable. Painting and repairs, the upkeep of the yards and buildings, needs to be carried out. If properly maintained, these assets will look after themselves in the long term. It is an area that the Government should seriously consider in the Budget.

Computers in schools are currently being funded by school councils. There is talk about the need to drag this country into the future, into the information age, yet parents of schoolchildren have to fund the computers. Parents who have the ability to put the money forward are able to do so but in areas where funding cannot be raised nothing happens. As was mentioned earlier by the member for Elizabeth, it is a system which totally discriminates against those who cannot pay. The State and Federal Governments ought to be doing something about this matter. It is a Federal issue because that is whence most money will come.

The other area that concerns me from an electorate point of view is the differentiation that is made between superannuants and pensioners. People who during their working lives make contributions to a superannuation fund and end up with a benefit of, say, \$110 or \$120 a week, which is roughly the same as a pension, find that this Government and the Federal Government issue no benefits to them whatsoever. The Electricity Trust tariff is not reduced; the transport passes are not available; the gas rates are not reduced; and council rate reductions are not available to them. Yet a person who is getting a pension, for whatever reason, on the same income has all those options and fringe benefits available. We are discriminating again in society against people who have made the effort to save but are on lower levels of saving, and this ought to be corrected as soon as possible.

Recently, I had the privilege of making an overseas trip with two other members of Parliament. During that time we looked in America at small business administration, as we did in Toronto. We looked at the nuclear industry in France and in Switzerland. While I was in Los Angeles I spent a little time in the drug area looking at a specific area of interest. I will talk a little bit about the detoxification

unit that I looked at in Los Angeles. I was asked (it is probably more accurate to say that I was pestered) by a constituent to look at a detoxification unit in Los Angeles where they treated drug addicts and alcoholics. It was a very depressing unit. It worked on a sweatbox technique, where people were put in sweatboxes (that is really what one could call them) for some eight hours a day and were kept under medical supervision. Vitamin B1 and calcium supplements were used, and these people were virtually kept in such conditions for a week. That was a very rough way of attempting to, as they put it, sweat and dry them out.

On that same afternoon I had the privilege of being taken to a company called Detox, which had taken up this same very rough method. Three doctors had got together with a physiotherapist and a young scientist, taken this very rough method that had been put together and converted it into a very scientific approach. I will read the method that they have used and how they have changed this very rough method into a very positive system. It is as follows:

The detoxification regimen consists of seven components: (a) Physical exercise, preferably running aerobically, for 20-30 minutes immediately prior to sauna exposure. (b) Forced sweating by sauna at 140-180°F for 2½ hours daily, immediately following the physical exercise.

The exposure was as close to five hours as could be comfortably taken. The sauna was done in one period each day with short breaks for a cooling shower or additional exercise permitted. Thirdly, a nutritional supplement centred around gradually increasing doses of vitamin B1 kept to strict proportion with other vitamins and minerals, which included the A, D, C, E and B complex.

That is principally a multi-vitamin type preparation, and they also used minerals as well. The fourth thing was that they used water, and salt and potassium was taken as needed to avert dehydration or salt depletion.

I suppose that most people would know what the dehydration effect would be after watching the Olympic Games for the past few days. After that they administer from two to eight tablespoons of polyunsaturated oil daily. They add a calcium and magnesium supplement, then they move into a very regular daily schedule for balanced foods and adequate sleep. They make sure that there are no drugs, medication or alcohol, and within a week of this sort of treatment there has been about a 90 per cent clearance rate with their patients.

When the balance of this information comes back from America, I would like to submit it to the Minister of Health and ask him seriously to consider this sort of method for the treatment of drug addicts. It is a very rough and tough system. However, it does not involve treatment with narcotics, such as we currently use, and I think that it is the sort of method at which that we should look as an alternative.

I would like now to refer to the time that I spent looking at small business in America. In fact, I would now like to read from a few notes that I made after that trip and follow that by some comment. The world is in economic turmoil today, largely because we have entered into two new phases simultaneously: first, we are in the very midst of an economic revolution that may well be as radical as that experienced at the time of transition from an agricultural to an industrial society. In a publication entitled *Who Creates Jobs*, Professor David Birch of Massachusetts Institute of Technology said:

We are moving from manufacturing to services, from hardware to thoughtware from large scale capital intensive companies to smaller labour intensive companies and from a dependence on physical capital to a dependence on human capital. Secondly, we are in a phase of 'economic uncertainty' which is consistent with the typical 'long wave' pattern of economic change.

Professor Forrester, who also comes from that institution has suggested that the American economy is now in a phase of economic uncertainty, characterised by declining investment, high unemployment and a disproportionate increase

in public and social expenditure. He believes that this phase will continue through the 1980s and will end with the beginning of a new period of growth lasting up to 30 years, assuming that during the 1980s the necessary technical, managerial, economic, social and political innovations demanded by the underlying revolution, are produced. The 'long wave' pattern of economic change propounds that when capital investment build-up in the wave ends, as it has certainly done in Australia, people are left in jobs that can no longer be justified on economic grounds, while diverse unfilled tasks exist which could improve the quality of life in a country. Capital producing sectors need progressively less employment. Overhead activities such as Government and the service sector grow too large and too many people live on welfare payments, unemployment compensation and retirement income.

How accurately that describes the Australian scene today, and indeed the scene in most Western countries. The theory does, of course, see the doors opening again to a bright new future phase as the stored up innovations and accumulated new ideas that have generated during the previous period are tried and developed by the initiative of newly emerging entrepreneurs and the creation of new products and business. There is no question that large firms and industries will continue to be very important for underpinning the growth and expansion of economies, their capacity to generate wealth and the creation of new firms of all kinds, but it is now generally agreed worldwide that the bulk of net employment growth in the foreseeable future will and can only come from smaller and new firms.

The key to maximising the opportunities of the next high in the 'long wave' is small enterprise. For Australia, where we are unprepared for the revolution that has overtaken us and where the conflict of interests in trying to preserve what we have 'regardless', rather than shake out the economy in a positive fashion, may prolong the economic uncertainty which so strongly prevails, it is critical that we thoroughly reassess our total economic structure and its components to ensure that we catch the next wave at the critical point, and that we ride it all the way to the beach.

To create the appropriate environment for this growth to occur, must be a shared responsibility. Government needs to play a strongly supportive role by concentrating more on micro and less on macro measures to influence the balance of the private sector. Large business must acknowledge the revolution and be more positive and amenable to a new direction for the economy and the emphasis on the creation of new small enterprise activity, as is now happening in both Europe and the United States of America, with the involvement of many large enterprises in local and regional schemes to provide aid and encouragement to new firms.

Small business itself must likewise play a more dynamic and creative role in leading the revolution and fostering greater entrepreneurship, technological innovation and adaption, higher levels of skill in management and the expansion of existing enterprises and the development of additional business units and new firms of all kinds within a growth oriented environment.

The union movement, which represents less than 50 per cent of workers in small business, will have the opportunity to positively assist Australia in coping successfully with the revolution and in pulling the economy through a period of uncertainty. By moderating its excessive demands; by seeking only a fair share of the cake—after it's baked; by ceasing its everlasting disruption of economic activity; by ensuring that it takes its own initiatives to train and retrain its members to cope with the demands rather than relying on the general taxpayer to do the job; and by thinking of Australia first and the union movement next: if unions do not face these realities Australia may well never see the full

light of the new promised day and may simply fall further behind the rest of the world in the tough race for sustained economic growth and low unemployment.

Australia is a small country with a small work force, but with very high expectations for the good life, generated unfortunately, in part, by fortuitous economic conditions of the past two decades in particular.

The standards achieved in that period have been somewhat precariously based as we have been finding out in recent times, so that some moderation of future expectations is essential if we are to consolidate, regroup and launch a successful new economic onslaught. A new or changed economic base must come from new industries appropriate to our environment; from the rationalisation, reshaping and activity shedding of some of our larger existing industries; from the creation of new regions for economic growth and from decentralisation, both of which will give immediate impetus to a host of new small firms; from specialisation in areas which have natural advantages; and from the development of brainpower, skills and motivation to match. But how well equipped are we to capitalise on this potential for growth with its inevitable emphasis on small enterprises? Tragically, we do not even have a data base for the large and vital small sector in this country.

When one looks at the data base available in America where there is an annual report by the President on small business that sets out statistically the market movement, one realises that that is the sort of thing that we ought to have in this country before we can talk seriously about the problems of the small business area. Research is still minimal. Governments have consistently refused to allocate the relatively small level of human and monetary resources necessary to provide the basic knowledge on which positive, realistic policies for economic growth in the small sector can be developed.

It is economic suicide for countries to continually avoid these fundamental facts of economic life, as Australia has done in recent years. A national and State inquiry into the future role of small business is necessary. All we can do at present is look at the best available model—the U.S.A.—where data and research have been developed so that the role of the small sector can be better understood and effectively incorporated in economic policy.

The United States, as also major European countries, is undergoing radical change. Some experts describe this as a change from an industrial society based on energy and raw materials to an 'information society' based on grey matter and the flow of data. It was interesting to hear recently former Minister Amaya saying something similar about Japan and suggesting that Australia pay heed to the power of the brain when setting a new course for our own economy. In the U.S.A. 'human capital' is becoming the primary resource, as we noted earlier. However, there is a shortage of entrepreneurs, managers and skilled workers in the growth industries, many of which are or will be high-technology related or dependent.

So, there is a situation where economic redeployment is handicapped by the lack of individuals capable of creating new businesses in those industries being spawned by the revolution, and capable of directing their growth and job generative capacity. At the same time relevant skills are seen to be lacking in a growing proportion of the labour force which means that businesses are unable to seize opportunities; bottlenecks are occurring in production; and mismatching of labour demand and supply is increasing and adding to and creating further unemployment at a time when growth potential is not being fully exploited because of underskilled human resources. That is a message Australia (in particular, South Australia) must not ignore in its planning for future employment.

The United States Bureau of Labour Statistics has analysed the impact of the transformation of the United States economy upon occupations for the period 1978-90. Among the 20 occupations with the fastest percentage growth, seven were directly related to 'high technology' and of those seven, six were among the 10 leading occupations, namely, data processing equipment; mechanics; analysts; programmers; computer technicians; and aerospace engineers and technicians. It is interesting that the latter is included, as that industry has not got off the ground in this country. It was an interesting aside that 'prison guards' were eleventh on that latter list—no doubt needed to control the high technology bred and trained criminals.

However, when we look not at percentage growth but at the 20 most job-creating occupations we find the top 10 are: nursing auxiliaries and female household workers; sales administration staff; cashiers; restaurant waiters/waitresses; office staff; nurses; cooks and fast food restaurant staff; secretaries; truck drivers; and miscellaneous employees (tertiary area primarily). These lists highlight the two major groupings of labour market opportunities afforded by this new economic order which is appearing in the U.S.A.:

- (1) jobs as producer or maintenance specialists for high technology goods and services; and
- (2) jobs in health, catering, security, information processing and transport. Importantly, jobs in these latter fields are seen not as low-skill occupations for the most part, since they are or will be affected by high technology, and access will therefore be difficult for the so-called 'illiterates' of high technology.

The \$64 question is: who is creating these jobs? David Birch's MIT study based on the period 1969-76, as confirmed by two independent research teams, concluded that:

- (1) 66 per cent of the net gain in employment was achieved by firms with less than 20 employees (80 per cent by firms with less than 100); and
- (2) 80 per cent of the new jobs were created by firms less than 4 years old.

Using the Birch data and Department of Labour Statistics, it was shown that in the period 1970-80:

- (1) 50 per cent of all job creation was accounted for by businesses with not more than 20 employees, the next highest being Government with 18 per cent and businesses with over 50 employees only 17.5 per cent; and
- (2) 89 per cent of the net gain in employment in this period was achieved by the services sector. The manufacturing sector managed only 11 per cent.

There are a number of important reasons for this latter situation which need to be clearly recognised when economic policies are under consideration:

- (1) Job generation is a cheaper, simpler process in the less capital intensive service producing industries.
- (2) There are relatively few barriers to entry into a large part of this sector.
- (3) Many of the service industries provide custom designed services, the production of which tends to be quite labour intensive.
- (4) The demand for general business, health and personal services of all kinds has risen dramatically.

Four other characteristics of the job generating firm were isolated from the American studies. They are as follows:

1. New firms created as offshoots of existing firms generated about as many jobs as firms created from scratch.
2. Independent firms generated most of the employment gained from the expansion of existing businesses.

3. The job generating firm 'pulsates' constantly between growth and decline and is not the stable firm—that is the one more likely to fail in the end.

4. More than half of job creation was provided by between 12 and 15 per cent of firms.

Since the typical job generating firm is both small and young the task of picking it out as the winner from the rest is by no means easy—any more than picking winners in the larger industrial sector of Australia in the context of the restructuring phase is easy.

The basic findings of this research have altered public opinion in the United States from the President down. Small business is now held in high regard for the contribution it is now acknowledged to make to the economy and to employment, especially given the revolution that is occurring. Small business is now providing the impetus for policy measures and public and private initiatives to boost employment in the short, medium and long term. Significantly, the American model has been recognised as broadly valid in the European context.

During the European Year of Small and Medium Enterprises (1983), which was conducted at the direction of the European Parliament, a detailed report of the United States experience and research was prepared under the auspices of the OECD. It will be used as a basis for consideration of measures to be adopted in the co-operative action programme on local initiatives for employment creation in France and other EEC countries and in the development of new economic growth policies. Research in the United Kingdom has shown that the broad elements of the Birch findings are relevant to economic growth and job generation in that country also. It is demonstrably clear then that in Australia emergence from the current period of economic uncertainty and the successful handling of the concurrent economic revolution will be principally the responsibility of the small sector, supported and aided by Government, big business and the unions.

How will we cope? In the United States of America there is already a well developed network of institutions, public and private, at regional, State and Federal levels which can provide tremendous support to individual businesses as well as to sectors of small business in their preparation for the role they must fulfil in the future economic growth of the United States. The Small Business Administration has for a long time been at the heart of small business encouragement and development in the United States and South Australia has simply got to face up to the reality that a far greater share of State resources must be allocated to the development of the small sector overall than the token offerings made to date. The research carried out by Birch has highlighted the necessity for developing a 'rifle shot' rather than a 'shot-gun' approach to economic growth. I will finish with those comments on the small business area.

The other area that I will briefly touch on now is that of industrial relations and how they affect the small business sector. There is no question that the arbitration and conciliation system as it exists is commonly called 'the club'—the club which has the commission, big government, big business and big unions as members. Out of that sort of club there has quite clearly developed a non-involvement of the sector that will create most of the jobs in the future: that is, the small sector.

As was said recently when the redundancy pay decision was brought down by the Federal arbitration system, we now have a Father Christmas. What should have been said is that we now have a Father Christmas in cuckoo land, because here we have decisions being made by big business, big government, and big unions with the small business sector being the major group affected. There is no option or opportunity for that small business sector to put its case.



There is no question that the small business sector has been omitted from that historic decision by the 'club'. One needs to recognise that one must be able to cater for industrial decisions that are made, particularly backdated decisions that will cause future difficulties for the economies of small business.

The other problem with the current arbitration system is that it is so centralised that this decision was totally inflexible. Having supported the redundancy claims in the Federal arena, the State Government has said that it will support the same sort of claims at the State level. It is unbelievable that this is going on with no consideration being given to the future potential of the job-creating sector—the small business sector.

It is often said that one needs to worry about the arbitration system and needs to make sure it works. I am not too concerned about big business, big government and big unions. If they cannot look after themselves, having organised themselves to work together in this system, nobody should worry too much about their concerns. We need to worry about the small business sector—the people who are not organised but who have to wear the lunatic decisions made by the 'club'—by the commission, big government, big unions and big business. The whole system needs to be changed and brought to the stage where the commissioners have to take into consideration in their decisions the economic reality of the ability to pay. When commissions make decisions which are backdated and which no business can economically cater for, then those commissions should be brought to task.

Turning my attention now to my trip overseas, during which I looked at the nuclear industry, I will not go into the detail that the member for Todd did, when he clearly put forward how he saw the situation in France and Switzerland. The French Government has made the decision that by the year 2000 the country will have between 90 per cent and 95 per cent of its total electricity generated by nuclear power. The Swiss Government has made the decision that by the year 2000 the country will have 25 per cent of its electricity generated by nuclear power. At Tricastin, in France, the French, Germans, Swiss, Dutch and Danes all share the plant that enriches uranium for 100 nuclear power stations. That plant would not enrich the uranium that we will not be selling to France.

It is interesting to see other countries deliberately setting up their enrichment plants so that they can cater for all the needs of the EEC. As a nation we have made a decision that we will not supply the French with uranium and yet that country is vitally involved in the enrichment of uranium which will be used by other countries to which we might sell uranium. It is also interesting to note that in France those on the extreme left (which is the equivalent to the extreme left group—or probably more left—here in Australia) are talking about breeder reactors and about wanting more nuclear power stations. They have recognised that the economic reality is that power is required up to and past the year 2000 and that nuclear power is the cheapest and most economic. Anyone who has recently been through the Black Forest in Germany will have seen clearly the problems that Europe is currently experiencing due to the use of coal in power stations. In the Black Forest one can see the tragedy in relation to the many thousands of trees that have been killed because of acid rain. Here in Australia we have made a decision that for ideological reasons we will not supply the biggest single user of uranium in Europe, that is, France.

I want to support the comments made by the member for Todd in regard to the attitude expressed very clearly by the Swiss, the French, and more particularly by the British, about the need to recognise very quickly that the use of uranium is a reality. They find it rather unbelievable that at this stage in our development we have still not recognised

that in fact nuclear power plants are being built and used throughout the rest of the world. I suppose we need a little time to realise that uranium is a source of energy, that it is a safe method of producing electricity and that it is being used by almost every European country, in particular in great volume by the Soviet Union which has the most nuclear power stations in the world.

We have often heard that the reason for not going ahead with the developments at Honeymoon and Beverley is that there is no world demand for uranium. Certainly, the Canadians have realised that there is a demand, because in the past 12 months three new uranium mines have come into operation in Canada. Why would it open three mines if there was not sufficient demand for uranium? Every time we turn our back on the reality of the situation we are in fact turning our back on the children of tomorrow and on the social benefits that can be provided in South Australia. One of the major natural resources in South Australia is uranium. Only fools would turn their back on the fact that in this country we have in the ground one of the best economic opportunities to provide for our own future and that of our children.

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

**The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier):** First, I express my thanks to His Excellency the Governor for giving us this opportunity to express our views on the promises made by the Government for the next session. Secondly, I join with my Parliamentary colleagues in expressing my very deep regret on the death of several former Parliamentarians. I did not know Mr King who was a member for Chaffey, but in regard to Howard O'Neill and Charlie Wells on the ALP side of politics, I admired and respected them for various reasons: Howard for his quiet contribution to the proceedings of the House and Charles for his at times vociferous and sincere and certainly dedicated to the Labor Party politics attitude.

Last but not least I pay tribute to my formal Liberal Party colleague, Claude Allen, whom I always found to be a very sincere, dedicated gentle man and who I am sure would qualify for a place among those quiet Australian achievers, since he always paid the utmost attention to the members of his electorate and represented that very large proportion of South Australia with great credit. I know that he was missed by his electors when he retired from politics and he is certainly missed by his former colleagues on the Liberal side of the House. To the members of their respective families I express my sympathy and hope that all goes well with them in the future.

I listened with some interest only an hour or so ago to the contribution made by the member for Elizabeth and I found to my surprise that for the first time in almost a decade I was agreeing with a considerable amount of what he said. I intend to canvass a lot of the same ground, although I believe with a slightly different approach and certainly with different statistical evidence. However, our conclusions are very much the same.

One of the things that the honourable member did not really develop was his alternative approach to educational funding. The member for Elizabeth referred to the possible voucher system under which all South Australian students would receive the approximate value of the cost of educating a State school student. The figure he referred to was about \$3 000 in the secondary area and it would be somewhere around \$2 000 in the primary sector. The honourable member did not develop this theme very effectively in the House, and I do not know whether he actually investigated it as comprehensively as members of the Liberal Party did some seven or eight years ago.

The voucher system was first brought to my attention in detail in 1977 or 1978, when I was the shadow Minister of Education, by Professor Richard Blandy, who was then and still is at Flinders University. Professor Blandy was at that stage expounding the idea that every family in South Australia with children be given a voucher which the family could then take to a school of its choice, a school which suited its educational style and requirements. They would present the voucher for a years education with the option of changing that education at the end of the year. So what would happen, in effect, would be that both public and private school students would receive the same amount of money.

This is quite a radical departure from the theories currently being expounded by the left wing element of the Labor Party which were overruled as recently as yesterday by the Prime Minister, who has allocated a much more substantial amount of funding to the private sector than was originally suggested. However, under the voucher system of funding no debate of that kind would be possible, because every student would have the same allocation of funding. The parents would then have the option of choosing a Government or a private school.

As shadow Minister and subsequently in 1979 to 1982 as Minister of Education, I had the option of examining this proposition in some detail. One of the reasons why I declined to accept it was that it presented some considerable problems for the State school system. After extensive discussion with a number of people involved in education administration and with parent bodies we looked around at the number of schools in South Australia within the State school system which were currently over subscribed for students. Quite a substantial proportion of those schools continued to teach over decades in the solid traditional way as well as being innovative, schools such as Norwood High, Adelaide High, Wirreanda, Unley High and others.

Those are just a few; I am not being selective. Many more are over-subscribed. These schools would have no trouble at all in attracting students to their doors. It would be possible, however, that parents would vote with their feet and schools that they regarded as under-achievers would lose students. The Education Department would be faced with the problem of having to decide whether to close schools and provide additional accommodation at those schools which were very much in demand.

The various problems in addition to those that presented themselves were such that at least for the time being we decided to defer any further consideration of the voucher system, but that is not to say that there is not considerable merit in the proposition. Early in 1982 the Education Department considered making specific funds available to some of the departmental schools so that they could operate more in the manner of private schools; that is, by controlling their own funding. However, the question of hiring and firing of departmental staff has not yet entered into that proposition.

The member for Elizabeth showed a surprisingly liberalised approach to education. A few years ago the Liberal Party rejected that approach, but it is certainly worth further consideration. I certainly share the member for Elizabeth's idea that by improving the educational standards of young people in sociologically underprivileged areas of South Australia and Australia we will better the general well-being of Australia itself.

It is self-evident that we have traditionally tackled educational problems from the wrong end, generally by looking at the universities and the secondary schools to decide where to spend those considerably large additional sums. Nowhere is that more self-evident than in the tertiary area, where after the Second World War, first in Britain and subsequently

in Australia, decisions were made to expend considerable sums in increasing the number of free places in tertiary institutions, in expanding the general availability of places at tertiary level, and in removing the fees which had formerly been payable by students or their parents. The idea behind that was to encourage the students of lower socio-economic families to attend universities. The end results after some 20 years of experimentation have shown that very few additional students have emerged from the poorer sections of society. In fact, the majority of places have continued to go to the middle class and more affluent sections of the world's society. Therefore, that social experiment has obviously failed.

Surely the true aim of education is to ensure that the youngsters in primary school are able to cope. This is a theory which I as Minister of Education propounded very strongly. That theory was shared at national level by the Australian Council of Educational Standards, under the chairmanship of Professor Leonie Kramer, as she was then. The theory was that, if we improve the educational standards of all of our primary school students so that by the time they enter secondary school they are both literate and numerate and able not only to deal with figures and numbers but also to comprehend them, we will have youngsters who are better able to cope with the more sophisticated and faster moving life in secondary school, who will wish to remain at school in the upper levels because they are coping, and who will then present as increased numbers from all the cross-sections of society—the wealthy down to the lower socio-economic sections.

They would present in greater numbers across the whole spectrum for universities, colleges of advanced education and institute of technology studies. I still believe that that is the way that we should be going. I have one closing comment on education which, of course, is not my shadow portfolio, but it is an area in which I shall continue to have tremendous interest. A great deal of attention is now being paid, or at least being given lip service by educationists, industrialists and others, to the area of high technology and computerisation.

I venture to suggest that while many of us are fearful that South Australia shares the problem of the Western world in having entered into computer technology in education some 10 or 15 years late, I do not believe that that is an area for massive concern. In saying that I suppose that I am diametrically opposed to the attitude of Lee Kuan Yew (Prime Minister of Singapore) who says that Australia is so far behind that we have already lost the race and that almost every student in Singapore is currently hands on with computer technology in primary and secondary schools.

I simply point to the impact which the ordinary audio tape recorder made in our schools when it was first introduced. Students rapidly latched on to it and used it while staff tended to be rather trepidant. This fear of technology later progressed into the area of video tapes, which were introduced at the cost of the Federal Government and Malcolm Fraser (the then Minister of Education in 1979) when he introduced triennial funding, to provide video recorders for all secondary schools in Australia. Once again, students rapidly seized this new technology. Of course, I suppose almost every home in Australia will have a video recorder within the next two or three years.

We have the highest growth in the ownership of video recorders of any country in the Western world. The fact that technology can quickly and easily be absorbed into our society is already there. I believe that, as computers of various kinds come on to the market in ever increasing numbers and as they become cheaper, it will not be a question of schools having to decide once and for all on a specific computer because they have committed themselves

both to the hardware and the software. Instead, I believe that computers will become more and more adaptable and that the interchangeability of computers will become more and more popular. We will rapidly overcome the difficulties of only two or three years ago associated with the computer technology available to schools.

Already, it is obvious that young people are anxious to absorb the skills associated with the manipulation of computers. I do not think that staff need fear very much. One does not need to be able to repair or comprehend the inner workings of computers or be able to prepare one's own software in order to be able to use one of the modern computers. All of this technology is readily available. I believe that in a very short space of time an increasing number of families will have home computers and that schools will have children who bring their home computers to school. They already do that with their home calculators and their cassettes. It is simply a part of the rapidly expanding field of technology. In fact, it has already made its way into our schools. Developing that theme, I believe that any fears that we hold for our South Australian schoolchildren should be dispelled.

What I would emphasise once again is what I was emphasising in 1979 to 1982 from the Ministry of Education—that it does not matter what you expect a student to be able to do when he or she leave school: unless that student can communicate in language and in numbers, and unless our schools continue to attack those vital areas of communication, we will still finish up with primary and secondary schools doing our students a disservice.

I still believe that the major problem in education lies not with technology but with the relatively low numbers of students, particularly in those sociologically underprivileged areas of South Australia, who fail to present at Leaving and Matriculation level and who fail to qualify for university admission because of home and peer group pressure, and under-achievement in the classroom. It is in those areas, as the member for Elizabeth stated, that we should be expending funds. It is those areas of need where funds should be spent in order to equalise our society, and equalise it upwards, not, as I have traditionally associated with socialism, downwards.

We should be aiming for standards of excellence in whatever we do. If there is any strange anomaly in that, I remind the House that in the Ministry of Education I was assailed by members of the Institute of Teachers, by members of the teaching profession and others who kept saying that the competitiveness of the classroom was simply not on, that we should be letting children progress at their own rate, and achieve against their personal standards.

However, now we have the Premier leading a cavalcade on Friday that will contain members of the South Australian sporting community who have achieved excellence, some of them by attending the South Australian Institute of Sport and others, the National Institute of Sport in Canberra, both of which were established by former Liberal Governments. Surely there is a contradiction in terms when we have a socialist Premier applauding an achievement of that kind, and yet in the classroom we are saying that in many cases we should be striving towards mediocrity by removing the competitive spirit.

The outside world is most competitive and children must encounter it when they leave school. There is no doubt about that. They are competing almost for the very air they breathe if one listens to all the environmentalists. So, it is in the classroom at school where we should be encouraging children to recognise that 'competition' is not a dirty word, that competition and achievement of excellence is what we should all be about. After all, the human brain in the average person, when he or she retires permanently from

this life at the age of 73 for men and 78 for women, generally goes back to its Maker largely unused. There is tremendous scope for development of that particularly brilliant computer. Primary and secondary schools are the places for that to be done.

Next, I address what I consider to be the more important area for the time being, as addressed by the member for Elizabeth. He and the Premier (the latter a couple of days ago in answer to a question in this House) claimed that South Australia is steadily climbing out of a depression. I find that sentiment hard to share for a variety of reasons. If the Premier is using only one sector of society on which to base his opinions, I suggest that he have a good look at the sector of society to which the member for Elizabeth paid considerable attention this evening, that is, the lower socio-economic area.

Pensioners of many kinds and those who are earning the basic wage or above, but who find that in earning the basic wage they are worse off than those on pensions, are those to whom I refer. If the Premier and others believe that this sector of society does not exist, I simply point to petitions I presented to the House over the past few days solicited from my office by poorer sections of the South-East society. They came to me some months ago and asked if I would make up a petition requesting the present Labor Governments at Federal and State levels to heed their plight and to acknowledge that, whilst a number of factors militate in favour of the Premier's belief that we are improving our lot, nevertheless they are worse off than they have ever been. They simply asked that the State Government consider that, whilst a certain sector of the community was able to manage reasonably well, their own lot as pensioners was tightly constrained and they found that, day by day, week by week, they had less and less money with which to meet their daily needs—not to provide any surpluses but simply to live.

I believe that the Premier, in saying that we were improving our lot steadily, had ignored a document which he commissioned from the South Australian Council of Social Services, a document which was presented to him only a few weeks ago, the contents of which he would be well aware and which I intend to read in part to the House. I will not read selectively—I will read good and bad. The document is a public one and is not something which I will use and which will then be unavailable for checking. I suggest that the Premier and others at the Federal level are trying to ignore the fact that in Australia we have a very divided society.

As the member for Elizabeth said, there are one million poor acknowledged in Australia: that is, parents on pensions, those on a basic wage or slightly above and their children. In addition (and the figures I agree with), another two million would be very near the poverty line, many of whom do not register for unemployment or other benefits. Some may be unable to register—they may be women whose husbands are working, and they are not eligible to apply for benefits although they would like to enter the work force. They resist the temptation to apply for employment until things improve. The member for Elizabeth and I share the concept that there are some three million people in Australia currently at or below the poverty line. If one thinks it is an exaggerated figure, I point out that some 15 to 20 years ago a fellow called Harrington in the United States wrote a book called 'The Other America', pointing out that, in the United States, which we have considered to be the most affluent society in the world, 50 per cent of the population were living below the poverty line and 50 per cent above it.

So, South Australia's three million people compares quite favourably with that percentage, which has never been disputed in the United States. It is possible for a society such

as ours to develop along the lines of the United States society where we have extreme affluence on the one hand and extreme poverty on the other, grading down through the social spectrum. Amongst the reasons given to me by the pensioners and others for their own plight was the fact that, in the past 12 to 18 months, the indexation figure has come down (and pensioners are tied to the indexation figure), and wages, following the accord which was reached by the Premier, employers and unions and which has largely been honoured, have tended to stabilise.

As a result, pensions have been kept at a relatively low and stable level. However, the area where people are really critical of Governments is that of charges. The Federal Government has imposed the Bank Accounts Debit Charge. The State Government has imposed the financial institutions duty and a number of other State charges have increased over the past 18 to 20 months since the present Government came to power. There have been increases in almost 130 State charges in all, yet the Premier said in his pre-election promise that there would be no increases in taxes during the life of the present Government and that there would be stabilisation of State charges. They were the platforms on which he was elected—promises that have well and truly been broken.

Several new charges have been introduced into South Australia for the first time in a decade. As a result, the poorer people, those with very little money to play with, have been hardest hit. I will mention one or two of the costs that are literally shattering a number of homes. Water rates have increased. One would think that if people were poor they might not own a house. However, over 70 per cent of Australians own homes, and South Australia is well in the van with home ownership, so a large number of people, especially pensioners, are home owners. There has been a 22 per cent increase in the cost per kilolitre of water, the minimum rate increasing 16 per cent to \$60. Sewerage charges have increased by 26 per cent. Even though pensioners gain some remission they have still faced the same percentage increases in the amount being paid for these charges as other people have faced.

The South Australian Gas Co. levy was reintroduced by the present Government. That increase was not absorbed by SAGASCO but added to gas charges, which apply right across industry down to the poorest pensioner. ETSA costs have increased in two 12 per cent hikes in the past 18 months—a 24 per cent increase since December 1982. State Transport Authority charges, where pensioners do receive some assistance, have increased across the board by 46 per cent. The Minister for Transport said today that we would have to wait for the Budget before he could tell us whether or not drivers licence charges would increase. He seems to have forgotten that drivers licence charges are increased by regulation. It has never been the practice of socialist Governments to wait until Budgets are presented before licence charges are increased. They have generally been increased in mini Budgets some weeks or months before the regular Budget has been brought down. It is not a Budget issue but simply a question of Government policy—whether or not Government licences will be increased.

The fact that the Minister hedged in relation to this matter indicates to me that these charges will rise. Many pensioners and the poor are dependent on their vehicles to look for work. The financial institutions duty is imposed on bank accounts. Some people might think that it is stretching the truth to say that pensioners and others are affected by this charge. However, I draw members' attention to the situation of a person who came to see me. This man has two children and another on the way, his wife is working, and he is unemployed. The wife pays compulsory superannuation to the Federal Government. They have been in the habit of

paying her pay cheque into a bank account and drawing from that account to live from week to week. The gentleman came into my office a few weeks ago saying that the financial institutions duty had affected him. He said that he had left a little over \$5 in his cheque account in order to pay for his shoes to be repaired. He had gone to the bank to withdraw his \$5 to go to the cobblers to pick up his shoes only to find that only a little over \$3 of the \$5 in the account had been deducted as a quarterly or a two-monthly charge on the financial institutions duty.

That charge was quite unexpected and meant that that man could not collect his shoes that day. This man came into my office and, as a result of this unexpected tax, has been asking fellow pensioners to sign the petitions asking that the State Government look at the whole range of taxes and charges that are affecting the poorest people in the community. If one thinks that FID is not affecting the poor, one needs to think again. If money is put into or taken out of bank accounts, or even if it sits in an account and nothing is done with it, it attracts a tax at Federal level.

Another gentleman who put money into an account at a certain level to attract a higher rate of interest found that the Federal tax took his investment to the lower figure, which did not attract the higher rate of interest. He found that for the first few months his money was attracting a slightly lower rate of interest. This person had done nothing but put his money in the bank. Those are just two examples of how the poorest section of the community can be affected by Government actions.

Another area to which I draw the attention of the House is the Medicare levy. Of course, the CPI has come down, but one of the factors that has reduced it is the Medicare levy, which affects people three times, not just once. Previously, one was able to claim a tax deduction on the amount one paid to Mutual Health or other organisations. That tax deduction is no longer applicable if one wishes to subscribe to a health organisation. If one wishes to insure for private hospitalisation over and above the State standard hospitalisation benefit, there is an additional charge of \$250 to \$300 per family, depending on how comprehensive one's cover is.

Another factor that raised the ire of pensioners and people on the basic wage who came to see me was that a large number of them not only had the Medicare levy deducted from their salary but also had decided to be covered for additional benefits under a private health scheme. These people found that in spite of the two levies—one optional and one compulsory—they were quite unable to cover for the 15 per cent gap. Once again, families with little money to spare and who seem to attract illness (the wife, husband and children can be ill with a whole range of adverse things affecting them) find that each time they go to a doctor they are billed for the 15 per cent gap.

Of course, the best intention of the Medicare scheme was that doctors would settle for 85 per cent of the scheduled fee and not bill for the balance. The vast majority of clinics in Australia have over the past 10 to 20 years established an excellent accounting system and developed the habit of sending out individual accounts, which practice has been continued. Most people are having to pay the extra 15 per cent gap. As a result, the health scheme that has been taken away from the CPI index is still a very large component that affects the living standards of our poorer people.

I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the petitions to the State Government will keep coming in. People are regularly coming in to my office with petition forms or to sign the petitions that I have in the office. These petitions are simply a request to the Government for kinder and more humane consideration for an impoverished section of the community.

I found myself agreeing wholeheartedly with much of what the member for Elizabeth said earlier this evening. It appears that, despite the television performances of discord followed by harmony, showing that the accord is really the best thing for Australia since sliced bread was invented, Bannon and Hawke are nevertheless not really the answer to a pensioner's dream. I venture to suggest that in that very large sector of the community there is not accord but rather increasing discord and unhappiness.

The South Australian Council of Social Services (SACOSS) some many months ago addressed a plea to the State Minister of Community Welfare and the Premier, reminding the Government that currently over 4 000 voluntary social service organisations are working in South Australia alone. If ever there was a reason to praise volunteerism, I think that that statement alone would be sufficient. If it were not for those voluntary organisations, which are tapping enormous reserves of caring and goodwill in South Australia's community, there is no way that the State Government through the Department for Community Welfare and the Federal Government through the Department of Social Security could ever provide even reasonable standards of living for socio-economically underprivileged people. Literally tens of thousands of individuals are involved—in toto, 3 million, as the member for Elizabeth pointed out—who are looking for assistance of one kind or another, many of whom no longer are too proud to accept it. I think that that is another sad reflection on the Australian way of life, that is, that many people, including middle aged men and women who have been in the work force all their lives now at the age of 50 and upwards are finding themselves retrenched or dismissed and they simply cannot afford to be proud and to stand aloof. They are having to look around and go cap in hand for assistance. Only a few weeks ago the Minister of Community Welfare announced that he had discovered the United Way, a private enterprise system of achieving voluntary funding to various organisations. One of the ways of doing this is to make deductions from salaries. I simply point out that had the honourable member looked at a news release of 10 February 1984 he would have seen that the Hon. John Burdett and I had previously propounded this way of raising financial funds. I stress that they would be additional funds and not funds replacing Government funding for the South Australian Council of Social Services.

**Mr Becker:** I have been talking about it for years.

**The Hon. H. ALLISON:** Yes. I believe that the member for Hanson drew this matter to the attention of the Hon. John Burdett and me in the first place. The Minister has now come out as if he has invented the wheel. However, the United Way has been operating in Los Angeles for quite some time. The figures from Los Angeles indicate that an average of \$7.50 was donated voluntarily by each person to the United Way in order to help various voluntary organisations. That was a tremendous sum of money, involving tens of millions of dollars in a year involving deductions from pay rolls and voluntary boards, Government licensing, and the approval of organisations which collected and disbursed the funds. Generally it is a satisfactory way of supplementing welfare funds without necessarily each fund having to go cap in hand to authorities for funds or having to have phone-ins, flag days and various other collections to which people tend to become resistant after they have been going on in an increasing number over a year. Some tend to come out better dressed than others, which, in itself, is bad, because I think fair play should prevail.

Further, I believe that with over 4 000 voluntary organisations in a State as small as South Australia there is a tendency for some of the organisations to compete with each other for the self same clientele. Therefore, it could be that there is a better way of rationalising the work of the

various voluntary organisations. Certainly they should not be curtailed, but they should be encouraged, because I believe that volunteerism is one of the finest aspects of help within a Christian society. If volunteerism is knocked off, the Government must play the role of Big Daddy, of being extremely paternal. There is no way that any Government could afford to replace voluntary care, which symbolises a very healthy society. Yet, some moves have been made by socialist Governments and by unionists to restrict volunteerism in a wide number of fields of human endeavour. That seems to be a sad reflection. I thought that we were all working towards helping the poor and needy.

The South Australian Council of Social Services prepared a paper which it dropped at the Premier's doorstep in June. I received a copy of it very early in July. The material was released to support the State Government's case at the Premiers' Conference held in Canberra on 21 and 22 June. I hope that the Premier used these papers to good advantage, because South Australia's picture is not an attractive one.

South Australia has the highest dependency on pensions and other Federal and State Government benefits of any State in Australia. South Australia has 425 per 1 000 in the labour force who are currently pensioners or beneficiaries as against the Federal average of 373. That is a very substantial surplus over the rest of Australia. The nearest, as one might expect, is Tasmania, which has 424. Of course, Tasmania has unique disadvantages: an island State, small population, very little industrialisation, and power problems which have extended over decades—hydroelectricity has been generated from water supplies in an unreliable rain shadow area in the centre of Tasmania. These disadvantages can hardly be said to provide the base to establish any reliable industry.

However, South Australia is a mainland State with a very long history of being highly competitive as regards taxes and charges and skills in the workforce. South Australia should be able to maintain that advantage in the face of competition from other mainland States. It has not done so, and members of this House have debated the reasons for that for some time.

The Liberal Government was returned in 1979 because the former Government had failed to keep South Australia at its pre-eminent position. In spite of the promises made by the present Government at the last election, South Australia's unemployment level continues to remain at a higher level than it was when the Liberals lost Government in 1982, that is, despite promises and firm commitments made by the present Government to improve the situation. It is no good saying how many additional jobs have been created when there are so many additional students leaving school, when there are so many women wishing to enter the workforce and when there is a hidden pool of women who have not yet registered. Unemployment in South Australia is still above the 1982 average—9.3 per cent at the last statistical census and the SACOSS report says that if the discouraged workers who have not registered were added to that number the unemployment rate would be higher by over one-third.

Sadly, unemployment is increasingly striking at the older male worker who is disillusioned (shattered, in fact) by the realisation that having worked most of his life he is faced with impoverishment at a time when he thought that he would be retiring happily and devoting the rest of his time to more pleasurable activities than joining a dole queue. South Australia has a higher percentage of people employed for nine months and over. It is very close to that of Tasmania. A little over one-third of South Australia's unemployed, 33.4 per cent, have been unemployed for nine months and over. This implies that South Australia's unemployment problem is likely to be a very long-term one.

There is not all sweetness and light over the horizon as the Premier tried to imply only yesterday when he was lauding the efforts of his Government to improve South Australia's lot.

I also point out that, sadly, we have a very high proportion of children in South Australia in poverty. While the relative significance of children under 15 years is declining as a proportion of South Australia's population and our aged are increasing in significance, nevertheless the number of children in families on poverty line incomes or below is more than 8 per cent above the national average. In South Australia, 232 children per 1 000 under 15 years of age are recipients of pension support through aged parents, invalid parents, widows, unemployment benefits, supporting parent benefits, or other family income supplements, as against a national average of 214. I simply repeat that, whatever one looks at, South Australia is more disadvantaged than is the rest of Australia.

Most of the major statutory and non-statutory providers of emergency relief and financial assistance in South Australia reported a growth in demand in 1983. In some cases it was 60 per cent to 70 per cent above that of the previous year. I was taken to task by the present Minister of Community Welfare for quoting a figure of 100 per cent as if that were an across the board figure. In fact, that was a specific figure for just one part of relief demand, but 60 per cent to 70 per cent increase across the board is still a highly significant increase and I will not extend too large an apology for that aberration on my part.

I admit that the rate of growth during the current year has slowed a little, but the real problem lies not in the rate of growth of numbers but in the fact that the amount of money sought and paid out has increased dramatically simply in order to maintain the same effective levels of assistance as were being provided in 1982 when the Liberal Government was in power. It has been necessary for Federal funds to be injected into relief agencies in order for them simply to survive. The relief agencies themselves in South Australia are looking for over 100 per cent increase in State and Federal assistance in order to manage next year.

One area that sadly affects a great number of unemployed lies in the fact that they simply cannot budget. Many of them are under-educated; many of them have never experienced financial crises before. So we find that the demand for financial counselling has also increased dramatically in the past two years. The Department for Community Welfare's Budget Advisory Service and voluntary organisations across South Australia claim that demands on them have almost doubled during 1982-83 and yet the increase in funds during the past financial year was \$50 000. It went up from \$100 000 to \$150 000, which is really a pittance when one considers the vast number of people who are looking for advice in that field. So there is obviously great room for additional assistance to be given.

Not the smallest area of need lies in the increased number of people who are being taken to court on account of their debts and who need advice from budget advisers actually within the courtroom on the day on which they present to defend themselves for not having paid accounts.

Let us look at what happens in housing, too. Almost invariably when we have rumours that there is to be a pension increase, the Housing Trust will be one of the first to hear definitely that a pension increase is on the way. Of course, pensioners are told generally two or three weeks before their pension is actually increased that the Housing Trust rents will go up by an amount that is very close to the increase in pension. In other words, their living standard (or at least their income) is being kept static, yet the Government increases its charges by vast amounts far in excess of the cost price indexation. Little wonder that pensioners,

Housing Trust occupants and others keep coming into members' offices (and I am sure it happens on the other side of politics too) to complain that they are going backwards at a very fast rate.

Applications to the Government for rent relief in 1983-84 to March this year were well over double the number for the equivalent period in 1982-83. Commonwealth rent relief was introduced in 1982, of course, so that in just 12 months the applications have doubled. That speaks volumes for the decline in living standards of our poor.

Another sad area is in the field of human relationships—family and personal relationships. Voluntary counselling agencies have reported an increase of up to 25 per cent in the number of couples seeking marriage counselling in the past 18 months. The Department of Community Welfare Crisis Care Service reports an 18 per cent increase in requests for intervention from 1981 to 1983. Marital discord amongst the 19 to 40 year old age group has become the most significant problem requiring crisis care intervention each quarter.

Restraining orders made under the Justices Act on those perpetrators of domestic violence or harassment reached an all-time high in the March 1984 quarter with 485 orders being made, which is 20 per cent more than the previous peak in the December 1983 quarter. So, there is a vast increase in personal and family relationships breaking down, I suggest largely as a result of the traumas experienced through rapidly increasing impoverishment and the great stress, strain, and tension that families experience simply because there is not enough money for husbands, wives and children to make ends meet.

I do not think one needs look very far, even in this House, where members would have been closely associated with families who have reported experiences of this kind. We look for a humanitarian approach from Governments. Almost 94 per cent of restraining orders were made against men, with an increasing majority resulting from family and domestic disturbances. An 11 per cent increase was recorded in the number of women admitted to South Australia's women's shelters. That is an area on which I would like to spend some considerable time, but since I do not have that time this evening, I seek leave to continue my remarks later.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**The Hon. J.W. SLATER (Minister of Recreation and Sport):** I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

**The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey):** I want to take the opportunity tonight to canvass some of the issues surrounding the controversy that exists between Mr Jim Lucieer, of Meningie, and the Minister of Fisheries. The plight of Mr Lucieer, of which I am well aware, has been brought to public notice and attention. During the past 30 years Mr Lucieer has built up a business on the Lakes and the Coorong, principally in the cray bait industry, catching fish for that industry. This business has developed as, I said, over the past 30 years. During that period he has had a licence for 780 nets, and to effectively work those 780 nets naturally he has built up the necessary plant and equipment.

At this stage he has invested in the industry between \$300 000 and \$400 000. Much of that development was as a result of encouragement from the Department of Fisheries in past years. In fact, Mr Lucieer has a large vessel, which cost many thousands of dollars to build, and was specifically designed for this industry.

The new schemes of management that came out under the 1982 Fisheries Act and the new regulations have reduced Mr Lucieer's nets from 780 to 100. Let me state at this point that the schemes of management are widely supported by the fishing industry and are generally accepted, but in 1 per cent or 2 per cent of cases there are situations that cannot be coped with effectively under the regulations. Mr Lucieer is in that situation: his nets have been reduced from 780 to 100. As a result his business is totally overcapitalised and he has made numerous attempts to have his situation considered.

I refer to an *Advertiser* report of Monday 13 August which sets out clearly Mr Lucieer's position. I have no argument with the position set out in the *Advertiser*. In fact, earlier this year I went down and put in a day or so with him to look at his operation and the extent of the build-up of assets in relation to his fishing venture. There is no doubt that the assets that he talks about are certainly there. In response to the position that Mr Lucieer put on Monday, the Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Frank Blevins) stated on Tuesday that the fishing laws are fair.

In broad terms there is no argument with that. In regard to 98 per cent of the industry the new regulations are fair, but in Mr Lucieer's case they certainly are not fair. The Minister goes on to say that Mr Lucieer could have sold his processing business at Meningie. Obviously, if the Minister was to go down to Meningie, put in a day with Mr Lucieer fishing on Lake Albert, and look at his business and his freezer set-up, he would readily recognise that the freezer processing side of the business cannot be utilised effectively in any other way. It is there for the one purpose, and there is no way in which he can realise on that processing business.

So, for the Minister to say that that business could be sold off independently is ludicrous. That is just not the case. The Minister should go down and have a look. The article containing Mr Blevins's response states:

Mr Lucieer was allowed to own as many nets as he wished, but he was permitted only 100 nets at any time to be utilised in the fishery.

Prior to the introduction of the regulations Mr Lucieer was able to use 780 nets. Obviously, he has been distinctly disadvantaged. In fact, it more than halved the value of his assets that he has developed over the past 30 years. I am not arguing with the regulations, but certainly this is a glorious example of where a Minister should exercise his Ministerial discretion and make provision for a person who has been actively involved in the industry for the past 30 years and who has developed his business to that size. The Minister can use his Ministerial discretion to cover such circumstance.

I am quite certain that the rest of the fishing industry would agree with that. If the Minister is not prepared to use Ministerial discretion in such instances, the whole Parliamentary political system by which we are governed and controlled in this State and the rest of the British Commonwealth is an absolute waste of time. We might just as well leave the total decision making in this State and country to the Public Service. That is not the way the system operates. The Minister does have that discretion. I believe the only way that this matter can be satisfactorily resolved so that justice is done for all concerned, particularly in Mr Lucieer's case, is for the Minister to go down to Meningie, look at the operations of this person and spend a day out on Lake Albert, as I did, in order to gain first-hand experience and knowledge of exactly what is happening.

I believe that the Minister has been asked on numerous occasions to go down there and look for himself, but he has declined to do so. That is just not good enough. It is clearly an instance where the Minister should step in, where

he should exercise his Ministerial discretion and see that justice is done rather than leave a situation where a family has been cut off at the knees, with most of their working life put into the venture being a write off.

I cannot see how any Minister can just stand by and not at least go down there to look at the situation and make a first-hand judgment for himself. It is a complete miscarriage, of justice, and I have said so to the Minister in correspondence I have had with him. I urge the Minister to go down there and do the right thing.

**Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park):** I wish to go on from the question I raised today in Question Time concerning matters raised by the member for Mallee in his Address in Reply speech in this House on 9 August. I found it absolutely appalling that a member of this Parliament could stand in this place and make an assertion, without doing any homework at all, causing unnecessary concern not only to the staff and the administrators of the rehabilitation centre but also to the administration section of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. He said, in relation to the Alfreda Centre:

It will at least be phased down and will probably end up being closed down in the long run, anyway. I am referring to the Alfreda Clinic started by Commonwealth funding during the Whitlam years and which has subsequently been taken over by the State Government and found a niche in the Health Commission.

The Minister put the lie to that proposition put forward by the member for Mallee. It concerns me that anyone can stand in this place, make assertions like that, cause unnecessary concern when, if he had done an ounce of homework or had some recall with his memory, he would know that on 23 March 1984 an article headed 'Pool battle a victory for handicapped' appeared in the press. Written by Diane Beer, it stated:

A \$300 000 disabled persons hydrotherapy pool will be built at the Western Regional Rehabilitation Service, Royal Park. An Albert Park MP, Mr Hamilton, is celebrating a four-year fight for approval for the project.

The article went on to state:

The Health Minister, Dr Cornwall, approved plans for the therapy pool and building costs will be included in the 1984-85 capital works programme. People needing exercise through industrial injury and exercise for disabled people will be possible at the new pool which will be 25 m by 10 m and deep enough for swimming to rehabilitate back and leg injuries.

The member for Mallee has repeatedly stood in this Parliament and made inane and foolish statements which have been brought to account time and time again by the Government. I think that it is about time that he recognised the undue concern that he has raised, not only in this instance but also in many other cases in the past. When one reads the context of the member for Mallee's contribution, it clearly demonstrates that he has an intense dislike for the trade union movement. The thrust of his contribution was that the trade union movement would take over this centre. To the best of my knowledge, and from information that I have searched out from people who run the rehabilitation centre at Royal Park, he never even telephoned those people to determine their intentions or their concerns in respect to the future of the rehabilitation centre.

I am absolutely appalled by so called intellectual people (I was going to use a term 'something-academics', which is common among the working class) doing such things. I think the member for Mallee typifies that. I now turn to a more important issue, namely, the question of granny flats. As members of this House would be well aware, I have continually raised this issue. I went to Victoria and looked at the granny flat situation there. I repeat for the record that in Victoria the granny flat scheme was first introduced by the Minister of Housing in 1975 as a new form of housing for the elderly. It was unique in that it enabled elderly parents of home owners to be accommodated on

the same block of land as the family house in independent, self-contained accommodation.

The granny flat can be sited on a property anywhere in Victoria where the Minister of Housing has exclusive handling of the distribution and tenancy of these units. The planning aspect of the granny flat scheme is such that when the scheme was first introduced special State legislation was required to overcome land use zoning which prohibited more than one dwelling on a residential block of land. This was achieved by classifying the units as temporary hire units, to which I will return later. Control of the distribution and contribution tenancy of the units is vested in the Minister of Housing. Those people eligible for the granny flat scheme include those who owned, were buying, or in some cases were renting a house anywhere in Victoria. Those people may apply for a granny flat to house either a pensioner couple, a single person who receives the full Australian Government aged pension or a repatriation service pension, or a person who has applied because of special circumstances (for example, a relative or friend who receives an invalid or widow's pension).

Granny flats always remain the property of the Minister of Housing. However, there are two ways in which a unit can be financed: the Minister can pay for the construction of the unit from his budget allocation or the occupants of the unit can enter into a rental agreement and pay a weekly rental. The current waiting period for granny flats financed by the Minister in Victoria is 15 to 18 months.

In terms of private finance to reduce the waiting time for units, it is possible to privately finance construction. The purchaser negotiates with a contractor approved by the Minister of Housing. The unit is erected under the Ministry's supervision and upon completion the purchaser enters into a purchase agreement with the Minister. Therefore, ownership of the unit is transferred to the Ministry of Housing. The purchaser hires the unit at a nominal rate of \$1 a year until it is no longer required by the approved applicant. At that stage the Ministry repurchases the unit for either the initial purchase price or the Valuer-General's valuation at the time, whichever is the lowest. The major benefit of using private finance is that a unit can usually be ready for occupancy in two to three months from the time the application is approved. The units have a market rental rate of \$30 a week. However, no occupant pays more than 20 per cent of his or her income. Rental rebates are also given where applicable.

For aged single pensioners with no other income the rental is \$15.90 a week and for aged pensioner couples the rental is \$25.80 a week as at October 1982. At 31 March 1982 a total of 688 moveable units had been installed throughout Victoria on a rental basis. I have spoken on this matter many times, and I know that the Minister is sympathetic towards this cause. I believe that this scheme should be introduced in South Australia. Of course, legislation is necessary to ensure that some of the initial problems encountered in Victoria are overcome in this State.

Last Friday I met with the Western Regional Organisation at the Woodville Council chambers and discussed problems in the north-western suburbs. Because of the ageing population, the question of aged accommodation has to be addressed, whether by this Government or by successive Governments. We have to provide the wherewithal and the facilities to assist aged persons in this area, who are increasing at 4 per cent per annum.

When I spoke with a number of elderly people in Victoria I found that they were satisfied with their accommodation and that the relatives on whose property they were living were more than satisfied because they could keep an eye on them. At the same time, those elderly people have freedom to move around their unit, to watch their own television,

cook what they like, go to bed when they like, and have their friends to the unit. From talking to these people and the Victorian Minister of Housing I found that the system works very satisfactorily. I hope that within my lifetime—and in the near future—a similar scheme can be introduced in South Australia. I believe that it could greatly assist the many aged people looking for accommodation in this State.

**Mr GUNN (Eyre):** The first matter that I will raise in this adjournment debate is the way in which Ministers have back bench members of the Government ask Dorothy Dixier questions. The Minister of Public Works cannot attract any questions and has to organise this with his colleagues. On 9 August he excelled himself in relation to a question concerning repairs to this Chamber.

For a long time I have thought that not enough questions are asked in this Chamber. Twice the number of questions would be asked in 20 minutes in the House of Commons. It is a complete waste of time, because these foolish Dorothy Dixier questions cannot be justified. If the Minister has to organise Dorothy Dixier questions so that he can get to his feet, he should ensure that his press secretary draws up original questions.

I want to raise one or two matters in relation to my electorate. For a long time I have been very concerned about the lack of money that has been spent in country areas, particularly on rural arterial roads. I was most perturbed after reading the headlines following the release of the Public Accounts Committee Report into the Highways Department. It would be a sorry day for country people if the Highways Department dedicated funds were transferred to the Treasury, because I believe that, if that occurred, less money would be allocated to those isolated parts of the State than is currently being made available from the Highways Department funds. Many people could say that that is not possible. In my judgment, if the money is taken from the Highways Department, handed to Treasury and then handed back, I wonder what will happen in those country areas. I could list chapter and verse in this House details of dozens of roads which should be sealed or upgraded. Recently I received a letter from the District Council of Mount Remarkable, based at Melrose, in relation to the decision of the Commonwealth Government not to index the money to be made available for the Bicentennial Road Programme, which in part is as follows:

Therefore, to deny indexation on this assistance, is retrograde in the purpose for which the legislation was designed.

A concerted effort should be made by concerned politicians to—

- (a) ensure that the interests of road users Australia-wide are taken into account, particularly the safety factor;
- (b) ensure that local government receives the financial assistance it justly deserves to undertake an effective construction programme within its area;
- (c) ensure that those moneys already granted to local government are indexed to maintain 'real' share of the ABRD funds, and maintain 'real' value in productivity; and
- (d) ensure that the 'sunset' legislation be withdrawn and that the 'user-pay' principle of road funding, remain (that is at least 2c per litre of fuel purchased is allocated to a road trust to be distributed in a similar basis as the ABRD Programme on a continuing programme after 1988).

It concerns this Council that without the 'user-pay' philosophy for road construction, the entire responsibility for funding rests squarely upon the ratepayers of the district.

I point out that the local government rating base is diminishing at an alarming rate as it cannot maintain the ability to absorb the rapidly rising costs in road construction—let alone all other services necessitated by local government.

On behalf of the District Council of Mount Remarkable and local government generally, we appeal to you to ensure this valuable source of road funding is not diminished or lost in total.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to seeing some positive action in obtaining 'adequate' funding for Australia's road systems.



I could refer in detail to the recently released report on road funding which details the sorry situation that currently exists, but time does not permit me to do so. During the Budget debate I intend to outline that matter in some detail, because I am concerned about the condition of roads in country areas, particularly in relation to those in my electorate.

Ever since I have been a member of this place I have been most concerned about problems facing people in isolated communities in obtaining for their children a reasonable standard of education. To highlight the sorts of problem that some of my constituents living in isolated communities have, I want to quote from a letter that I received a few weeks ago, which states:

My son has been a boarder at a college for the past four years. He is now in his fifth and final year. Each year I have applied for the education grant and each time have been refused on the grounds that he was by-passing the local area school. For the past three years I thought that that was fair enough, except that at the time the local school did not cater for Matriculation which is what my son is aiming for.

Now they have Matriculation. Last year was the first year it would have been possible to bring him back to the local school. He has chosen not to do Matriculation but to do an alternative course called Transition which is not available at the local school. He has chosen the course because he wants to do a trade and this course offers more technical work and work experience which would be beneficial for the student.

I explained this when I applied for a grant but I was still refused on the ground that it was bypassing the local school. I understood that assistance was available for students doing a course to advan-

tage their career but the Education Department seems to ignore it. I know it won't help my case as it has already been refused this year but I know of two other families here who have experienced the same problems.

This is a real problem, even in those areas fortunate enough to have a Matriculation level available. Most of the courses are restricted owing to the size of the school. I am not being critical. Unfortunately, many schools in my area do not have Matriculation courses available, and I intend on another occasion to detail the exact nature of those problems.

I wanted to highlight this matter because many parents who are trying to do the best for their children and making sacrifices to send their children to Adelaide or other centres believe that in some way they are not getting a fair go because the courses that they want their children to undertake are not available at their local schools, yet they cannot obtain any assistance either from the Commonwealth or the State through the isolated parents assistance scheme. The Tonkin Liberal Government introduced that assistance a few years ago.

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

Motion carried.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 16 August at 10.30 a.m.