

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 16 August 1984

The **SPEAKER (Hon. T.M. McRae)** took the Chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

PETITION: KINDERGARTEN UNION

A petition signed by seven residents of Hawker praying that the House urge the Government to reconsider its intention to disestablish the Kindergarten Union and to allow it to remain under the care and control of the Minister of Education was presented by Mr Gunn.

Petition received.

PETITION: HENS

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

Petition received.

PETITION: VOLUNTARY SERVICE AGENCIES

A petition signed by 19 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to subsidise charges to voluntary service agencies and to keep any price increases within the parameters of wage indexation was presented by the Hon. H. Allison.

Petition received.

PETITIONS: EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Petitions signed by 33 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to ensure that the course in early childhood education at Magill Campus of the South Australian College of Advanced Education be retained in its present form were presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold and Mr Becker.

Petitions received.

PETITION: CHILDHOOD SERVICES

A petition signed by 36 residents of South Australia praying that the House urge the Government to improve childhood services without jeopardising funding for kindergartens and consult the Kindergarten Union before legislating for any changes was presented by the Hon. Lynn Arnold.

Petition received.

QUESTION TIME

STATE TAXES

Mr OLSEN: Does the Premier stand by his widely reported and repeated statements made after this year's Premiers' Conference that State taxes will not rise in the Budget? If he does, will he give an immediate assurance to the House that motor vehicle registration fees and drivers licence fees will not be increased? I ask this question in view of the Premier's statement, reported in this morning's *Advertiser*, that he regarded registration and drivers licence

fees as a charge rather than a tax. This is not the attitude that the Premier had when Leader of the Opposition.

In a press release of 2 February 1982 he referred to motor registration fees as a tax. In this House on 31 August 1982, during a Budget debate, he referred to motor registration fees as a tax. The Commonwealth Grants Commission regards these imposts as taxes for the purpose of calculating revenue raising by the States. The Australian Bureau of Statistics, whose figures on taxation the Premier quoted in this House last week, also regards registration fees and drivers licence fees as taxes. The media interpretation is that it is another case of the Premier's complete lack of credibility on taxes—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now debating the matter.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I do not wish to get into a semantic argument with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Olsen: Where's your credibility?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask honourable members on each side of the House to come to order.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: The Leader well knows that for the purposes of statistical analysis a large number of measures are shown. It is very much a question of judgment as to what is a tax in that sense of the term and what is a charge. I will explain the definitions that have been consistently used and applied. If an impost is regarded as simply part of the general revenue raising of the State, such as the tax package introduced or announced in this House on 4 August last year (which contained a number of elements, including FID), if it is a revenue raising measure in the nature of pay-roll tax then, as I have said, the position is clear. I said after the Premiers' Conference that I did not believe that we would find it necessary to increase such imposts in this coming Budget. However, if one is looking at those charges or imposts that are levied by the Government in order to provide specific services to the community, and if the cost of those services is covered to an extent by the user-pays principle, clearly one must look at setting the level of those charges at a reasonable level in terms of the deficit so incurred. The issue of back-door taxation is a phrase that I coined, and it is worth explaining.

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader is now flouting Standing Orders.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: It is back-door taxation, for instance, if in charging people for fares for riding on our public transport system the fare collected is greater than the actual cost of providing that public transport system. For instance, if in the present situation fares were raised by about \$2 or the like (which is the user pays principle which members opposite want to implement) and the Government was getting a net rake-off in revenue, clearly we would be using fares on buses, that is, a fee for service, as some kind of back-door taxation. It is not the intention of my Government to do that and we will not do it. Those imposts that we raise will be raised in order to fund specific areas of public expenditure.

This morning I was quite enlightened listening to the shadow Minister of Transport (and I suggest he is also shadow Leader of the Opposition). I appreciated some of the points he made in relation to freeways. I think his points were quite valid. The Minister and I are pleased to have his support for the decision announced. In response to interjections the member for Davenport made a number of points and said that he was not opposed to the road being built but that he would like to see the time table shortened considerably. He also said that more needs to be done more quickly. However, that involves many millions of more dollars. In response to another caller who was asking about

public transport, the same shadow Leader of the Opposition stated:

Yes, I agree with you—these public transport services ought to be available in those areas. They ought to be extended and available after 7 p.m.

Of course they should, but that, too, will cost money. I am certainly looking, when the Budget comes out, to some sort of support from that member of the Opposition about what we are doing.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

Mr GREGORY: Will the Minister of Mines and Energy provide a progress report on the implementation of the Government Energy Management Programme announced earlier this year?

The Hon. R.G. PAYNE: Yes, and I thank the honourable member for raising the question. Perhaps it would be prudent and worth while if I reminded honourable members that, when this proposal was announced earlier, its aim was to save something like \$6 million of the Government's annual energy bill of some \$60 million. Similar efforts in New South Wales appear to have had that sort of success, and I believe that all members of the House would support such a programme.

The co-ordinating group, which will oversight the programme, has been staffed and is now operating within the Department of Mines and Energy. The Energy Managers, who will have the specific responsibility for energy management within each Government department and authority, have been appointed. Members will be interested to know that a total of 47 departments and authorities is involved in the programme.

An all day seminar for Energy Managers was held on 3 August, and it examined in detail the responsibilities of each unit within the programme and the resources that will be available to assist in achieving effective energy conservation. The co-ordinating group has held introductory discussions with the permanent heads or directors of all the organisational units within the programme.

A Technical Resources Group has been established within the co-ordinating body to provide advice and technical aid for participating units. The technical group comprises engineers and technical officers with skills and expertise in energy conservation and energy monitoring in buildings and industry. A wide range of scientific instrumentation is available to this group to collect data for investigations carried out as part of the programme.

The Technical Resources Group can also provide assistance in obtaining funds for energy conservation projects. That is an interesting aspect of this programme. Applications can be made for capital to fund projects designed to reduce expenditure on energy provided that an adequate return on investment can be shown and the Technical Resources Group supports the proposal.

REGISTRATION FEES

The Hon. E.R. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Premier now confirm that registration fees will increase in the State Budget and will he retract the statement that he made after the Premiers' Conference in view of his answer today?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I suggest that the honourable member wait for the Budget.

LEGAL JARGON

Mr FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Community Welfare, representing the Attorney-General, inform the House

whether his department would be prepared to investigate ways and means of eliminating jargon and gobbledegook from consumer contracts? The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs stated on page 37 of last year's report to Parliament that gobbledegook is described as 'pompous, official or professional jargon'. We are also informed that consumers are often criticised for not properly reading contracts. Unfortunately, examples of the wordy, unclear, pompous and dull style of consumer contract is within everybody's reach. Mr A.H. Hermann, a correspondent with the *London Times*, in reference to this subject has stated:

The charitable answer is that lawyers cannot write. They are in love with cliches and even fonder of photo-copying chunks of old documents and up-dating them by adding a few badly chosen phrases.

Strenuous efforts have been made for reform in this area in both the United States and the United Kingdom. Similar criticisms could apply to Acts of Parliament.

The SPEAKER: As the Minister is a practitioner, I call on him with some trepidation.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question, although it contained some untimely remarks about the profession of the law. However, I think all honourable members would realise that the point that the honourable member is making is a valid one, particularly with respect to consumer contracts. Indeed, this Parliament has over the years taken many initiatives to minimise the ill effects that occur as a result of consumers being unable to understand the contracts into which they are entering. What the honourable member asks is easier said than done, however, because contracting parties do require some degree of certainty of law, and that must be contained in writing and must be reasonably precise at law.

It is obvious that this matter is of particular interest to legal practitioners. I will refer it to another practitioner to get his comments for the honourable member. I point out to the House that considerable steps have been taken in this direction in this State over the years and that, in fact, this State has led Australia, and indeed most parts of the western world, in improvements in consumer relations.

TROTTERING CONTROL BOARD

Mr INGERSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport table the letter, as he agreed to do yesterday, relating to the appointment of Mr Harry Krantz as Chairman of the Trotting Control Board? On what date did Cabinet decide to appoint Mr Krantz to the Trotting Control Board and the TAB? Also, will the Minister confirm that Mr Krantz subsequently offered his resignation to the Minister?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I will be pleased to table the letter. However, I will read it to the House before I do so. Dated 10 July 1984, the letter is addressed by the Director of Recreation and Sport, Mr Graham Thompson, to Mr K.W. Porter, Secretary of the South Australian Trotting Control Board, as follows:

Dear Mr Porter,

I have been asked by the Minister of Recreation and Sport to advise that, in accordance with sections 10 and 11 of the Racing Act, 1976-84, Cabinet has approved the recommendation to His Excellency the Governor, for the appointment of Mr Harry David Krantz as the Chairman of the Trotting Control Board, with effect from 1 August 1984. Mr Krantz will be replacing Mr R.G. Rees, who has tendered his resignation from that date.

As Chairman of the Trotting Control Board, the Minister believes that Mr Krantz should also represent the Trotting Control Board on the Totalizator Agency Board and would, as a matter of urgency, appreciate comments of Board members prior to appointment to the Totalizator Agency Board. Mr Krantz is well known in the community and is associated with various community activities. Mr Krantz has been Secretary of the Federated Clerks Union (S.A. Branch) for a period of 43 years and will relinquish

that position in early August. The Minister believes Mr Krantz is a person ideally suited both in experience and in administration to adequately fill the role as Chairman of the Trotting Control Board and as the Board representative on the Totalizator Agency Board.

I now table that letter. I thought I made clear yesterday that one must understand the internal politics involved in the trotting industry. I mentioned a figure of two applicants yesterday. However, I also point out that Mr Rees was anxious to continue as Chairman of the Board. I believe that some members of the Board have acted quite disgracefully—in fact, dishonourably—in this matter. I wrote that letter on 10 July seeking urgent comment. A fortnight later I received a one-liner back from the Board, although I had had telephone conversations with some Board members (I cannot remember the exact details of that letter) saying that the Board wished to nominate Mr Trennery as the representative of the TAB.

The Board does not make those appointments; the Government does. The Government and I acted correctly concerning the appointment of Mr Harry Krantz. There is much more behind the scenes, and I do not want to use this place for personalities. Some members of the Board deliberately did not reply to the letter simply because I indicated that the matter was urgent because of the time factor involved in appointing Mr Krantz to that position. That is what the Government did.

DEAF CHILDREN

Mr HAMILTON: Is the Minister of Education aware of an article that appeared in the *News* on 31 July when Br McGrath, head of the New South Wales School of the Deaf, stated:

... children's deafness is being diagnosed too late and then they are not taught language skills comparable with the rest of the world ... bad Australian education was directly responsible for the poor performance of deaf children.

Can the Minister elaborate on the policy and intentions of the Government concerning the education of the deaf in this State? As the Minister is aware, in my electorate there are many deaf persons who attend the very worthwhile speech and hearing centre at Woodville. Will the Minister assure parents of deaf children in this State that the Government will see that every effort is made so that these students can reach the intellectual potential and capacity that they are capable of so that they can have every opportunity to take their place in society and the work force?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, because I was concerned to read the report that appeared in the *News* regarding this matter. It is regrettable that Br McGrath, who is not in the South Australian school but in the New South Wales school, should have gone to an overseas conference and determined at that conference that what is happening throughout Australia is apparently, in his opinion, not adequate.

The honourable member asked that I assure this House that what is happening in the South Australian education system, both in Government and non-government sectors, is attending to the needs of those who have hearing impairment. I most certainly give that assurance. If any member has any doubt about this he should talk to parents of children, particularly from speech and hearing centres, and seek from them an assurance that they believe things are in very good heart. That is not to say that, as with any area of endeavour in education, we are doing everything as perfectly as we always might. Certainly, improvements can be made, but that is something that always happens in education—we always seek to improve on what we are already doing.

What we are already doing is very good indeed and focused on many children in our society who have hearing impairment. I know that members on both sides of the House would agree with that contention. Of course, the needs of those with hearing impairment are attended in a variety of ways. First, we have speech and hearing centres that are for those whose education should be totally in the context of that education mode—withdrawal or partial withdrawal. The speech and hearing centres are located adjacent to schools so that children can have some integration into the schools that they are next to. Also, there are children with hearing impairments in other schools throughout South Australia, be they primary or secondary education.

In most cases we are conscious that teachers in classrooms are aware that children may have hearing impairment. About 10 years ago a concerted effort was undertaken in the Education Department to educate all teachers in all classes of the State about understanding the particular problems that children with hearing impairments may have. That was a very good campaign and did a lot to educate teachers throughout the system that a child whom they may have thought was disinclined, deliberately not listening or slow with his or her work may be suffering hearing impairment. That major campaign was successful and has shown its effects ever since.

We also consult with health authorities to ensure that hearing tests are available for children in schools, and we do endeavour to pick up these situations as early as possible. In fact, in the pre-school sectors services are available to try to identify disabilities, including hearing impairment, so that it can be ascertained right at the start of a child's schooling that that particular problem exists. If that is identified we then try to do what we can either to remediate it or to develop educational strategies that will respond to that impairment. So, I reject without qualification the article and the allegations made by Br McGrath. In South Australia I believe we are attempting to meet the needs of those people with hearing impairment. We want to develop this aim, as we want to develop all areas of education. It is not being neglected and has not been forgotten in any way.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: Has the Premier sought assurances from members of the Young Labor organisation that they will observe ALP policy of support for the Roxby Downs project and will not participate in the blockade? Last week the Premier told the House that he expected all members of the Labor Party, including those in Young Labor, to observe Party policy on Roxby Downs. The Premier also told the House that all the Government's efforts behind the scenes were devoted to ensuring that the demonstration required the minimum resources and that he hoped that there would be co-operation with those involved. In view of those statements, I assume that the Premier has asked members of Young Labor to not participate and that they have agreed.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I have nothing to add to my answer of last week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SKATELINE

Mr KLUNDER: Can the Premier indicate what has happened to the application for a Government guarantee—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Newland.

Mr KLUNDER: I shall start again, as I am sure that honourable members could not have heard what I was saying. Can the Premier indicate what has happened to the application for a Government guarantee by the South Australian Chapter of the Australian Federation of Amateur Roller Skaters with respect to the Skateline, Modbury? The Modbury Skateline is a roller skating rink in my district that caters for some 70 000 admission per annum. It is a respected institution in the north-eastern suburbs and is known to be a safe place to which one can send one's children. There is a current attempt to turn the rink into an indoor cricket arena, and the offer by the roller skating body to purchase the rink is a direct result of that. As the rink has now been closed by the mortgagor, Beneficial Finance, the matter of a Government guarantee is now urgent.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am certainly aware that the honourable member has had a keen interest in this matter for some time and that he has had discussions with the Deputy Premier and with officers of the State Development Department about matters related to the closure of Skateline. The Department has assisted in the preparation of an application for a Government guarantee which, as honourable members know, must go to the Industries Development Committee for its consideration. That application has been forwarded and considered and I understand that the committee's recommendation for approval of this project is on its way to me. I can assure the honourable member that it will be given very urgent consideration.

TROTGING CONTROL BOARD

The Hon. MICHAEL WILSON: Does the Minister of Recreation and Sport's answer to the question asked by the member for Bragg mean that he refused to accept the resignation of Mr Krantz when it was offered?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I do not know where the members for Torrens and Bragg got their information, but I have been reliably informed that no member of the Trotting Control Board has asked for Mr Krantz's resignation at all. So, whoever the informant is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: No, I have had no approach about Mr Krantz's resignation, and my information is that no member of the Board has had that request made, either.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Mr GROOM: Has the Minister of Education seen a recent propaganda newsletter circulated by the Federation of Parents and Friends Associations of Independent Schools of South Australia Incorporated? Will the Minister advise as to the appropriateness of such material being sent to parents through the agency of schoolchildren? This Goebbels-type newsletter was authorised by the following member schools: Annesley College, Concordia College, Fountain Centre Christian School, Immanuel College, Pembroke School, Pilgrim School, Prince Alfred College, Pulteney Grammar School, Scotch College, Seymour, St Andrew's, St Peter's, Walford, Westminster, Wilderness, and Woodlands.

It is a propaganda leaflet relating to private school funding expressed in emotive terms and displaying a clear drift towards extremism and away from rational debate. This leaflet is being sent to parents through the agency of school-

children and is continuing to be circulated as late as yesterday, notwithstanding Tuesday's announcement relating to funding. I have no objection whatsoever to the schools—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now coming perilously close to debating the issue.

Mr GROOM: While schools have the clear right to assert their rights in an appropriate manner, I object in the strongest possible terms—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order. The Minister of Education.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Yes, I have seen a copy of this newsletter that has been circulated by the Federation of Parents and Friends. I am greatly disappointed about a number of things contained in it, because I have appreciated during the time I have been Minister the consideration that the Federation of Parents and Friends Associations of Independent Schools has shown to me in meeting with me to discuss issues regarding the financial arrangements for the non-government school sector in South Australia, as well as discussing matters relating to Federal funding policies. Our discussions have always been fruitful and useful. We have not always agreed on every issue but I have appreciated their giving me the advice that they have, and I believe that they have appreciated the opportunities I have made available to them. So I make these comments about an association for which I have respect and for whose members I have respect.

However, I did have cause last year in answer to a question from the member for Unley about this same matter to indicate my concern about the manner in which information is disseminated on issues such as this. In fact, I addressed a meeting of the Federation of Parents and Friends at Pembroke about March last year and I also wrote a letter on this matter advising that I did not support the use of schoolchildren to disseminate information that can be termed blatantly political or partisan. That is a stand I have taken with consistency with Government and non-government schools. I am not applying a rod to one part of the sector that I do not apply to another part of the sector.

I indicated that the use of that agency—children to take home material that is blatantly political—is an irresponsible use of the relationship of the school with the children and with the parents. However, I did say, and I advised them, that it is another thing for schools to send home factual information about a situation as they see certain events. I had no qualms, for example, with the leaflet sent home, as it happened, by the Catholic Education Office before the last election. That set out the answers to five questions and the issue with regard to State Government funding. It was entirely dispassionate and put the viewpoints of both sides. I understand both sides, and certainly the Labor Party had the opportunity to see what was happening, and I believe that the same applied to the Liberal Party. It was a dispassionate statement saying, 'These are the facts; it is for you to make a decision.' That is an entirely proper way for that matter to be handled. The sad thing is that this report makes, for example, the following comment:

In the State sphere, because of current stated policy, funding to our schools will be reduced drastically, unless you as individuals act now.

Sadly, in volume 1, No. 9, of the *Parents News* it has no statement about what in fact State policy is. There is the urging of an action without advising people what they are acting on. That is a most regrettable course of action.

The other point I am concerned about, and I think the general terminology of the report is most unfortunate, is that it does not reflect well upon the Association. It makes such statements as:

It may be a salutary reminder to a Prime Minister that personal popularity will count for nothing with an enraged electorate. It

could take just one main issue such as this infringement of civil liberties to topple a Government.

It continues to talk about toppling Governments, and I believe that that is a totally inappropriate way to handle a debate about the issue of funding for non-government schools. May I suggest that it begs a response that would not be welcomed by non-government schools. That is the kind of debate to which Governments which are threatened with being toppled by such issues and which in fact are not toppled will react by saying, 'Well, you were not successful in that matter, and you will now get a very aggressive response.' I do not believe that that is a positive educational way of responding to that kind of issue.

The other thing that concerned me was that the leaflet was apparently being sent home as late as yesterday, and yet I referred in the House on Tuesday to the Schools Commission recommendation that has been accepted by the Federal Government, which gives the lie to information contained in the pamphlet. So, the pamphlet was still being circulated after the assertions contained in it were quite categorically refuted. Again, that reflects very poorly on the Association. I regret having to make these comments, but obviously I will have to repeat them—

The Hon. H. Allison interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Well, the honourable member says that. I have said to the Federation of Parents and Friends and to SAIT that any such use of schoolchildren, that is, in having them take home political propaganda, is inappropriate and I do not support it. I say that quite categorically: I have said it before, and I do not vary at all from that policy on this occasion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TROTTING CONTROL BOARD

The Hon. JENNIFER ADAMSON: Will the Minister of Recreation and Sport say by what means Mr Krantz offered his resignation to the Minister—by telephone, letter or in person?

The Hon. J.W. SLATER: I have not had any telephone calls from or any other means of communication with Mr H. Krantz regarding his offering his resignation.

Mr JAMES REID DICKSON

Mr PETERSON: I wish to direct a question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House must be courteous enough to listen to the member for Semaphore.

Mr PETERSON: I direct a question to the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Correctional Services in another place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Mr Krantz has nothing to do with the honourable member's question.

Mr PETERSON: Thank you, Sir. My question is directed not to the Minister of Recreation and Sport but to the Minister of Tourism, representing the Minister of Correctional Services in another place.

Members interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: This is a serious question, so shut up and listen! Will the Minister of Tourism ask the Minister of Correctional Services the position in regard to the parole of Mr James Reid Dickson? For some 12 months and during the office of two Ministers of Correctional Services I have pursued the case of Mr James Reid Dickson, who was found guilty of murder in 1978. At the time of the crime Mr

Dickson inflicted wounds upon himself which have permanently blinded him and which make it necessary for him to be fed by syringe by some other person.

Since being in prison, Mr Dickson has been shuttled back and forth in the system with no prison establishment wanting him because of the extreme difficulty in caring for him in relation to his feeding, and so on. His wife is anxious for his health and welfare. He has been injured on several occasions because he cannot be cared for properly. His wife is willing to care for him in his own home. I am informed that a dispute has arisen, at the point of parole being granted, between the Crown Prosecutor's office and the Parole Board over the capacity of the Board to grant parole—perhaps a reflection on the legislation passed in this Parliament. Meanwhile, the fears of members of his family for his health are increasing to the point of desperation. It has been put to me that the man is in a prison of his own and can do nothing. He is absolutely blind and cannot feed himself. It has been suggested to me that the system just cannot cope with a person such as Mr Dickson. No prison wants him. I ask that the case of his parole be taken up and given urgent consideration.

The Hon. G.F. KENEALLY: I will certainly take up that matter with my colleague in another place as a matter of urgency. I am very well aware of the honourable member's concern for the rehabilitation of Mr Dickson and of his approaches over some time. I am also aware of the severe disabilities that Mr Dixon suffers as a result of his physical condition. It is true that there are problems in coping with an inmate who has such disabilities. I will obtain a report from my colleague and make it available to the honourable member as quickly as I can.

ROXBY DOWNS BLOCKADE

Mr LEWIS: Can the Deputy Premier say what has been the response of the organisers of the Roxby Downs blockade to the request by police to establish a liaison committee to discuss on site tactics and other problems, and have the organisers offered their full co-operation?

The Hon. J.D. WRIGHT: It is my understanding that the organisers and the police will meet this afternoon or tomorrow morning.

HALLETT COVE AND KARRARA KINDERGARTEN

Ms LENEHAN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the Kindergarten Union has any immediate plans to build a kindergarten in the Hallett Cove and Karrara area? Last year I presented a petition to this House on behalf of 318 residents of the Hallett Cove and Karrara areas calling for the provision of adequate educational pre-school facilities for the area. Presently, a child-parent centre is situated at the Hallett Cove South Primary School campus which currently caters for 17 five-year-olds with four sessions a week. There are 77 four-year-olds of whom 49 receive three sessions, 20 receive two, and eight receive one. Presently, 10 students are on the waiting list. Also, 144 children in the 0-4 age group attend play groups at the centre. Also, in excess of 45 pre-school age children attend other kindergartens out of the area, and 110 four-year-olds are currently not accommodated by any pre-school facility within their area.

A recent meeting was held, comprising children's service providers, educational planners from the Education Department and the Kindergarten Union, community representatives from the Hallett Cove and Karrara Progress Associations, the local councillors of the Marion Council,

the Labor candidate for Bright, and myself. I subsequently presented a report to the Minister of Education outlining, on behalf of this group, the educational and other children's services needs for the Hallett Cove and Karrara areas and requesting the Minister, among other things, to urgently request the Kindergarten Union to undertake the establishment of a kindergarten in this area.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, I have received approaches both from her and, as has been mentioned, from Derek Robinson (candidate for Bright) and from residents in the local area. I appreciate the work that has been done in the local community, assisted very ably by the member for Mawson in identifying the actual educational needs that exist in that community. The work that has been done on assessing enrolment problems that may occur in the short or medium term has been very useful to the Kindergarten Union and the Department in determining what response we should make.

In fact, I received from the member for Mawson a detailed submission on this matter outlining the various issues involved. It was, as I said, a very useful document. That issue was forwarded to me on 23 July, as a result of which I asked the Kindergarten Union to provide me with a report on the Karrara pre-school proposal, one particular aspect that had not been identified correctly in the submission. At that stage, I did not have a proposal before me from the Kindergarten Union, but the Kindergarten Union very soon got the proposal up to me that it had been working on and said that its research likewise showed very real enrolment pressures.

I have had similar reports from the Education Department about the Hallett Cove South Child-Parent Centre which is under very severe enrolment pressures. So, as a result of the advice received and working on the programme recommendations that have been forwarded to me by the Kindergarten Union, I recently approved the construction of a new kindergarten at Karrara in the 1984-85 year at a cost of about \$150 000. It is anticipated that if all things run smoothly the kindergarten will be available for operation at the commencement of 1985. Of course, as with any project there may be certain problems that would affect the exact opening time. So, it is our anticipation that it will be available from the start of next year, and we hope that that will ease what are very severe enrolment pressures on pre-school facilities in that region.

ADELAIDE GRAND PRIX

Mr BECKER: Can the Premier say why his Department took over from the Jubilee 150 Board arrangements relating to the application for a formula 1 grand prix event in Adelaide? I understand that the Jubilee 150 Board was instrumental in proposing a grand prix for the City of Adelaide for 1986 and that arrangements have developed to such an extent that the event could be held in September 1985. On one radio broadcast, I believe that Mr Kym Bonython said that it was only a matter of the Government's signing on the dotted line and Adelaide would be allocated this important racing event to be held for the first time in Australia. I understand that the cost estimate of providing the event is about \$5 million and that it would be necessary for the Government to enter into a contract for three years. The all up cost would be between \$15 million and \$20 million.

I am also informed by various persons supporting this project (and I add my weight to it, because it is a tremendous opportunity for the State to attract world-wide publicity) that a tremendous number of people would visit Adelaide

from interstate. This would more than justify the event, especially as the attention of the world-wide press would also highlight Adelaide as a focal point for an important and exciting sporting venture. As I am surprised that it appears that the Premier's Department has taken away the arrangements from the Jubilee 150 Board, I would like to know the reason for that.

The SPEAKER: Before calling on the Premier, I want to make an observation about a practice that is increasingly growing in Question Time. It relates to the explanations of questions. All honourable members know that in explaining their questions they are fully entitled to lay out the facts as they know them or put the allegations as they understand them. Certainly, there is no effort on my part to prevent any of that. Equally, all honourable members know that there must be no debate of the matter. Whether that Standing Order is fair or unfair is not for me to comment on, because it is the Standing Order that honourable members have asked me to enforce: it is not mine.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a fine dividing line. I ask honourable members to approach their task carefully, because I have received one complaint this morning about what was considered by one member to be possibly deferential treatment. I hope that I gave a reasonable explanation of that. In future, if I am in doubt and if this practice continues, I will immediately withdraw leave.

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I appreciate the honourable member's support for the grand prix project. It is not quite as simple as just signing on the dotted line: what is above the line has still to be determined, that is, the precise terms and conditions under which the financial arrangements can take place. As the honourable member says, the amount of money involved is very large. Of course, the revenue-earning potential is equally large, but the State Government will have to commit itself to a certain extent. That extent is still to be determined, and fairly intensive negotiations need to take place. Obviously, because those negotiations will involve the State Government and its obligations, the State Government must be the leading party in them.

There has been no taking away of the project as such from the Jubilee 150 Board. In fact, the Board sponsored the idea and got it rolling. On its recommendation Mr Bruce Dinham is Chairman of a working group developing the Grand Prix project. Dr Hemmerling of my Department (the Director of the Cabinet Office) is actively involved as the chief Government negotiator and the person in charge of financial and other arrangements. A number of people are involved in what is a very big project.

When originally conceived we regarded it as a 1986 project. As members will have seen from recent publicity, the grand prix has been provisionally programmed to commence in 1985. We are not entirely happy about that because it considerably shortens the preparation time needed to make arrangements. If our only chance of having the grand prix in South Australia is to commence the series in 1985, so be it—we will work on that basis. However, it will be some months before all negotiations and the terms are finalised and we can be quite sure that we are getting a grand prix. The Jubilee Board will be kept fully informed and involved in those developments.

Mr Dinham and his committee, along with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, will also be involved. Because of the complexities of some aspects, we may have to spread the net wider. Obviously, a number of State Government departments are required to provide co-operation and, of course, the Adelaide City council is absolutely crucial. In fact, the council has already adjusted its capital works forward road programme to accommodate the expenditure necessary in preparing the track. A number of groups and

organisations in the community are working to the common purpose to secure what would be a spectacular event and a major promotion for South Australia.

INSULATION

Mr TRAINER: Will the Minister of Housing and Construction advise whether the Government intends, at this point in time, to adopt the proposal of the Fibreglass Insulation Manufacturers Association of Australia for mandatory thermal insulation for the walls and ceilings of new dwellings? I wish to quote from a brochure which I believe all members would have received from the Fibreglass Insulation Manufacturers Association of Australia, the member companies of which are Bradford Insulation, ACI Pink Batts, Boral Insulwool and Insulco Fat Batts (which sounds a bit sexist). The case for mandatory insulation is laid out in the brochure, as follows:

There is a growing realisation that the best and cheapest resource available in Australia—be it energy, water or even people—is conservation. We are at least a generation behind almost every other developed country.

The Association then gives several reasons why it believes regulatory measures of a mandatory nature should be initiated, as follows:

1. It is effective. California introduced standards in 1977 that halved the usage of energy in new houses. Second generation standards recently introduced are again halving the new house energy usage, so they have reduced domestic energy requirements by three-quarters in new homes.

2. It is easy. All that is required is a change to building regulations, to demand a minimum thermal performance level through insulation of ceilings and walls in all new dwellings.

3. It is quick. Once implemented, mandatory insulation begins immediately to save energy.

4. It is popular. Recent Australian surveys and reports show that most people understand that thermal insulation is an effective means of attaining comfort and conserving energy. Less than 3 per cent of the population—the people who are building new homes or going into new flats and units—are affected in any given year.

5. It is cheap. Insulation pays for itself in between five and fifteen years, depending on climate. From then on it saves energy and money for the life of the dwelling. More important, it reduces or delays the need for massive capital expenditure on new generating capacity.

6. It is socially responsible. Australia wastes more domestic energy per capita than most other developed countries. Do we have so much? Furthermore, a minimum thermal performance is particularly important for the growing stock of rental property in Australia. In general, people who rent are least able to pay high heating and cooling bills.

Mr Mathwin: Why don't you table it?

Mr TRAINER: The honourable member should put his teeth back in and quieten down. The brochure further states:

7. It is possible. The Standards Association has recently issued a minimum standard for bulk insulation in ceilings.

Finally, in summing up, the Association makes some additional recommendations:

Additional recommendations are that educational campaigns be stepped up (with participation from FIMA) and that the principles embodied in energy efficient house design be fostered.

The main recommendation seems to be that there should be mandatory thermal insulation for the walls and ceilings of all new dwellings.

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: Yes, I read the report with much interest. I am supportive of many of its recommendations. As the report states, insulation is a wonderful thing that can make life very pleasant for South Australian households, both in winter and summer. It can obviously reduce energy costs. However, the Government does not intend to make the recommendations mandatory at this point.

CASINO OPERATION

Mr EVANS: Is the Premier aware that the Northern Territory Government is compulsorily acquiring the casinos run by Federal Hotels in Darwin and Alice Springs because of operating difficulties? As Federal Hotels is applying for the casino licence in South Australia, are there any potential difficulties in the operation of the proposed South Australian casino?

The Hon. J.C. BANNON: I am aware of the press publicity about this matter, which has been covered fairly extensively in recent times. I understand, from what I have read, that it is not that operating difficulties are being experienced but that there is a disagreement between the Northern Territory Government and Federal Hotels over the extent of promotion and marketing of the casinos and whether or not Federal Hotels was prepared to be involved in further developments.

I think that the Northern Territory Government is saying that further capital expenditure on a much larger, expanded project could be undertaken. Federal Hotels is either not willing, or has not the capacity, to do that. Whatever the reasons for this happening, I am certainly aware of the situation. However, so far as the consideration of applications for our casino licence is concerned, that is a matter for the Lotteries Commission. The Government has been very careful to ensure that it is not involved in that consideration—it is the prerogative of the Commission. I know that there are four applications under active consideration. When the Commission is ready to report it will do so, but the Government is not interfering in that process.

LANGUAGES IN SCHOOLS

Mr HAMILTON: Can the Minister of Education advise the House whether or not all South Australian school children will have to learn two languages? An article appeared in the *Advertiser* of 13 July stating that two languages may be taught to all students. As the Minister is aware, his colleague, the Minister of Ethnic Affairs in another place, has released a report entitled 'Education for a Cultural Democracy'. Among other recommendations, the report states that there has been a belated recognition of the importance of retaining and developing languages other than English as a national resource. Can the Minister advise the House about the progress that has been made in relation to this matter and the likely implementation date for the proposal?

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The recommendation referred to in the article quoted by the honourable member was contained in a report released by the Minister of Ethnic Affairs when he was acting Minister of Education while I was overseas. The report, may I say, is excellent. It explores many issues involved in multi-culturalism, particularly in respect to education. I commend the report to the attention of not only all members but also the community for serious consideration of the recommendations contained therein.

Of course, we want to hear the response of the community to the recommendations contained therein before determining what changes we will make to the education system in South Australia. The report deals with not only primary and secondary schools but also pre-schooling, TAFE and other sectors of the tertiary education system. We want to hear the response of the community to these matters. When the press article talks about having to learn two languages, one must remember that one of the languages referred to is English. The article talks about students having skills and expertise in the *lingua franca* of the other country and also having an opportunity to learn that other language.

So, it is not two languages other than English: it is English plus another language. The other point is that there has been much discussion in Australia over the past five years that we suffer educationally, and indeed in many other ways, because we have relatively few people who are bilingual. That is a matter of cultural deprivation for us—not a matter of pride that we all speak one common language. It also ignores the fact that many people in Australia for whom English is a second language live a day-to-day existence in a bilingual situation. The strength of bilingualism is attested to by many successful examples throughout the world, and I hope that the community grows in its acceptance that we all should be able to speak another language. It would not be the same language, because we would all choose different languages, be they Asian, community languages spoken by significant communities in Australia or other languages that are not spoken by the significantly sized or geographically close communities.

This recommendation should earn the serious consideration of the community, and I hope that at some stage in the late 1980s or the early 1990s we will be able to say to parents that at all levels of education we can offer to their children the opportunity to learn another language and can then, of course, take on the issue of whether or not we should require all children to learn another language.

CRISIS ASSISTANCE

The Hon. H. ALLISON: Can the Minister of Community Welfare advise the House what proportion of funds for crisis assistance and youth accommodation were allocated by the Federal Government to South Australia in July 1983 and were committed to his portfolio? Also, how much of that money was expended in the 1983-84 financial year? In July 1983 the Federal Government allocated \$4 million for women's emergency services, \$4 million for crisis accommodation, \$20 million for mortgage and rent relief, \$400 000 for family support, \$2.1 million for youth services, \$2 million for children's services and \$11.4 million for the homeless persons' assistance programme. This State might have expected to receive some 10 per cent of these allocated funds, but I notice in the area of women's emergency services that only \$300 000 was received here. On 2 March an article in the *Advertiser* under the heading 'Boost in funds for women's shelters' stated:

In July last year [1983] the Federal Government said it would allocate \$4 million this financial year to establish the programme—that is for women's shelter assistance—

The \$300 000 is South Australia's share of the \$4 million.

The State Government, among others, had been resisting putting in a matching \$1 for \$1 subsidy and the Minister, in defending that action, said:

South Australia already provided more than \$1 million annually to the State's 11 women's shelters.

How South Australia's share of the \$4 million would be allocated had been decided.

However, the extra funds will improve the working conditions for shelter staff and enable the employment of workers to support families of non-English speaking background.

In view of the current protests—as current as today—by South Australian women's shelters that this latter promise was not kept during the last financial year, will the Minister report to the House on the extent of money committed to his portfolio and the expenditure actually achieved during the last financial year in each of those crisis care areas?

The Hon. G.J. CRAFT: The honourable member asked a series of questions, many of which he seems to have answered and others that will require further detailed information to be provided to him. Most of the funding to which

he refers is Commonwealth funding which is transferred to the States to be administered for various emergency programmes related to those in the community who come under the broad heading of 'homeless persons'. The point that the honourable member raised in the final question concerned the women's emergency services programme. I point out that the Commonwealth Government, for the first time since the Fraser Administration, refused to fund women's shelters at the Federal level, and therefore the States have assumed greater responsibility.

The Federal Government has provided an allocation in the current Budget for this important area of activity. An amount of \$352 000 was provided to South Australia, the allocation varying from State to State because it was allocated on a complicated formula which was fixed on a needs based principle. All of the allocation received by this State has been allocated except for a small amount, some \$36 000, which is the subject of negotiation between women's shelters, the ethnic community—which it is intended to serve—and the Government. Those discussions are continuing.

I have enjoyed, and continue to enjoy, good relations with the women's shelters. It surprises me that the Opposition has raised this matter in a political way (it was raised yesterday in the other place and now today). The comments made in the other place indicate that the Liberal Party is supporting a proposal that would not achieve the desired degree of accountability and participation by the ethnic communities in the delivery, administration and policy formulation of those programmes. This is not an easy area of negotiation. Many of the staff of those shelters are hard pressed; they operate in a very difficult area in the delivery of welfare services and have had a most unfortunate background in fighting for proper and just funding.

However, I am confident that an agreement can be reached in the very near future to allow the allocation of that money and for the appointment of those ethnic welfare workers. I think it is worth while going through the appropriate procedures at both the Commonwealth and State levels with those groups so that a programme is achieved that will allow the expenditure of that money in a proper and responsible manner and so that we can ensure that the people who most need the assistance of those workers will receive that assistance. I am confident that that can be achieved in the very near future.

With respect to the broad brush of Commonwealth funded programmes that are administered at State level, I advise the House that tomorrow I will attend a meeting of State welfare Ministers and the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security to discuss this issue. I do not expect that decisions will be made at that meeting, but the Commonwealth Government has advised the States that it is providing additional funding for these programmes, and that is very welcome indeed. That will require a restructuring of existing programmes and will be the subject of discussions tomorrow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr BAKER (Mitcham): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BAKER: I refer to remarks made by the member for Peake last night during his Address in Reply speech. In a statement prepared by his colleague the Minister of Housing and Construction the honourable member made a number of assertions as to my character and motivations in raising a matter of public concern. I found those comments both offensive and of little intelligence.

I spent some time in the Address in Reply debate looking at the difficulties being caused in the housing industry by

an excessive demand situation. I took this House very carefully through the supply and demand factors which affect the market. I also explained the problems of an overheated market and the price we have to pay as a result of that. All members on both sides of the House wish to see a healthy and viable market, and I mentioned that in my speech, as well as saying that steady growth was the most admirable outcome that we could achieve. I find it quite offensive that members on the other side of the House have to attack a member who is attempting to educate some of these same members as to what is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. The honourable member has been given leave to make a personal explanation. It seemed to me that he was on the track. However, at the moment, he is giving a statement of grievances. If I might say so with respect, if he could indicate where he has been misrepresented and merely state that, he will be within the Standing Orders.

Mr BAKER: There were a number of statements made in the Address in Reply debate, which can be read in *Hansard*. I do not wish to repeat those statements to the House; it only gives some credence to the comments made by the member concerned.

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.
(Continued from 15 August. Page 325).

The Hon. H. ALLISON (Mount Gambier): In the few minutes remaining to me this morning I wish to resume on the subject of women's shelters, to which I referred a few moments ago by way of question and to which I was just beginning to address myself yesterday evening. The Minister in responding to my question this morning said that he was surprised that the matter had been raised both here and in the other place. He should not really be surprised, and I think that part of the problem has been a lack of communication on the part of the Minister or his departmental officers. After all, what we are looking at is a Federal Government promise that was made in July 1983 to commit \$4 million to the then newly established women's emergency programme, and it was clearly the intention of the Federal Government to allocate some \$300 000 of that Australia-wide allocation of \$4 million to South Australia.

As part of that Federal Government programme, the Federal Government said that it would provide funding for the employment of some full-time ethnic or bilingual social workers to be shared among the 11 shelters in South Australia. The Department of Community Welfare was given responsibility for dispensing those funds to the shelter movement, with the funds to be committed to be expended before 30 June last year. The Minister, by admission this morning, told us that the funds had not been expended. It is now 14 months since the funds were committed by the Federal Government and part of the problem was that the South Australian Government simply refused to accede to a Commonwealth request to match the \$300 000 on a \$1 for \$1 basis.

The Federal Government stated that this matching requirement had been intended to encourage the States to increase assistance to refugees and shelters. The Opposition entered the debate because the women's shelter movement in South Australia approached the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in another place as recently as yesterday, and she raised the

matter on their behalf in the Legislative Council. The women's shelter movement stated that it was cross that the Minister had, first, refused to say why he had not yet expended those year old funds for the purpose for which they were intended in South Australia and, secondly, refused to give any reason at all for his inability to commit the funds within the prescribed time, that is, during the 1983-84 financial year.

In case honourable members think that this is a storm in a teacup, I refer once again to the matter I canvassed yesterday, namely, family and personal relations. The need for women's shelters not only in South Australia but across Australia has increased dramatically over the past two years. As I said yesterday, there has been a 25 per cent increase in the number of couples seeking marriage counselling from voluntary counselling agencies over the past 18 months. The Department for Community Welfare Crisis Care service has noted that marital discord is the most significant problem in which Crisis Care is involved quarter by quarter; 94 per cent of restraint orders under the Justices Act are against those who inflict domestic violence; and 94 per cent of orders were made against men, implying that women's shelters will be in much increased demand. Naturally, there was an increase of 11 per cent in the number of women admitted to women's shelters from 1981 to 1983, with a much more substantial increase expected when the report for the last financial year comes out, simply because of the relevance of the statistics I have just quoted.

So the Minister should not express surprise that the Opposition takes up this issue when, in fact, his own Government resisted matching Federal funds and therefore delayed by some nine months the allocation of moneys to South Australian programmes. While the money was available from March 1984, several months later the funds have not been allocated to those extremely pressing needs. Women in distress in South Australia say that they are in desperate need of such funds. I would like to refer to a range of other issues, but in view of the very limited time available to me I will conclude my remarks.

Mr MAX BROWN (Whyalla): I, like other speakers, turn my attention to former members of this House who passed away during the recess. I did not know Mr King, so I could not refer to any matters regarding his passing, although I offer my sympathies and condolences to his next of kin. However, I had a long association with the other members who passed away. I was associated with Mr Howard O'Neill for a very long time, both as a friend and as a colleague. In fact, I can say quite honestly that Mr O'Neill probably played the most important part in my being in this House. Whether or not that is a good thing, I am not sure—I will not comment on that. Howard was associated with me in my industrial career. I found him a basically good industrial advocate. He was responsible for many good things with respect to the working class people of this State.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, when speaking in this debate, summed up the late Charlie Wells very well. Charlie was a rather forceful sort of guy and a very colourful person. I always believed that, although he was colourful at times, he certainly knew the problems of working class people. He may not have been like me or other representatives of working class people. We do not always express ourselves in the best possible English or in the way that our academic colleagues do; nevertheless, Charlie Wells, like so many of us who have come from the trade union movement, he certainly knew all about the problems of the working class.

Maybe some of my more learned colleagues will forgive me if I say that, with the passing of such people as Charlie

Wells, I believe that working class people (not only in this State but in this country) are the losers because, despite what may be said, people who are perhaps more affluent and more capable of expressing themselves in the English language than I or Charlie Wells certainly do not have the experience of knowing working class people as Charlie Wells did.

I now turn to a gentleman whom I really did not get to know until the infamous visit by the Land Settlement Committee to Kangaroo Island; that Committee was made up of people from all walks of life. My learned colleague, the Minister for Environment and Planning, might disagree with me when I say it was a motley crew. We had a seaman and, I suppose, someone whom one might call a land shark; we had a couple of old broken down boilermakers and we had a very influential local member. He came along with us as did, of course, the late Mr Claude Allen.

I found Mr Claude Allen to be a very quiet gentleman, but he was very astute in his knowledge of the rural industry and land generally. I very much appreciated his being with us and the part he played in that land settlement investigation on Kangaroo Island. Also, it was very well known amongst members of the Land Settlement Committee that we really went to Kangaroo Island far too late. The problem had been allowed to get worse long before we were called in to try to do what we could to settle the various problems of the settlers. For example, a former member for Mitcham (now Mr Justice Millhouse) criticised the Land Settlement Committee and its visit to Kangaroo Island quite unjustly. He wanted to make political capital out of a very delicate problem that the settlers on Kangaroo Island were experiencing.

I recall, going back to Mr Allen, twice when he was of great assistance to me on Kangaroo Island. I remember the situation very vividly in regard to one property which was owned by a rather funny old gentleman. He reminded me a little of old Windy, who acted with Hopalong Cassidy in the western films many years ago. He was quite a pleasant gentleman and had a herd of cows which came into the yard while we were on the property. Having looked at the herd, I could not describe the breed. I did not know whether it was even a beef herd.

The farmer had a dairy herd and, as they were not paying, he decided to breed from a Hereford bull. He was therefore developing a beef herd from his dairy herd. I said to Claude Allen, 'Claude, I do not know how this guy will get on. How will he become viable?' In reply, Claude said, 'Max, you would be rather surprised with what one can make with this herd of cows. There is still potential in regard to money-making.' I was relieved that Claude Allen was there, because I could not possibly see how this herd of cattle could ever be made viable, yet for Claude Allen this was a distinct possibility.

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mr MAX BROWN: That is right.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: It might be the Heinz variety.

Mr MAX BROWN: It went further than that. The point got across, and I was grateful for Mr Allen's advice. I remember going to another property a little further on during that visit to Kangaroo Island. I do not mean any disrespect to the property owner, but that was the first, and I hope the last, time that I will ever see two sheep drop dead before my eyes. I was absolutely appalled at the situation. I remember the situation as if it had occurred yesterday. When I told Mr Allen, 'This is not very nice,' he said, 'Max, he has obviously allowed his sheep flock to deteriorate. However, I am amazed that he does not immediately shear the sheep that are falling because in that way he will at least get some return.' Here was another example where Claude Allen had given me sound advice.

Having said all that, I believe that Claude Allen was a member who went about his business in this House in a very quiet and responsible way. Often he would get little credit from the powers that be or even in some cases from his own electorate. However, I am sure that Claude Allen, to whom I wanted to pay my respects, would have been missed by his electorate and the people who knew him.

Last, but certainly not least, I wish to pay some respect in this debate to a gentleman who was never a member of this House but who was a member of the Federal House of Parliament, and a very close colleague of mine. I would not say that he was always a friend of mine—we always seemed to get to the stage where we agreed to disagree. I refer, of course, to the late Laurie Wallis, the Federal member for Grey, which covers a very large section of the State of South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: A great worker in that electorate.

Mr MAX BROWN: I am glad that the member for Light made that interjection, as it was generally known amongst all political people that Laurie did a very fine job in looking after his large electorate. I know that, for the many years I was a great colleague of Laurie, he was always working along in a quiet, unassuming way, but making an important contribution on behalf of the people he represented.

He was a person who perhaps, like myself, did not always express himself in the best traditional English, but he nevertheless had a very great understanding of the people he represented. Certainly, I have missed Laurie. In fact, I go on record in saying that, on the day that I attended Laurie's funeral (as so many people did), I made up my mind that I would not seek another term in this House because, if Laurie did anything wrong in his life, it was that he left his retirement too late.

I wish now to return to a couple of matters involving my electorate. The powers that be might criticise me for not talking about unemployment or something of that nature. I simply say to them or anyone else that the problems of unemployment continue and I am continually involved in such problems. I turn to a matter which disturbs me in my electorate and which has developed to a stage where it could be described as a serial or saga resembling 'Blue Hills' or 'When a Girl Marries'.

The Hon. H. Allison: They've both finished.

Mr MAX BROWN: I assure the member for Mount Gambier that, if it were not so serious, I would liken it to the once famous radio serial 'Dad and Dave: On Our Selection'. I refer to the continuing attempts by the Whyalla City Council to rate Santos at Port Bonython. I wish to go back into the history of the development of Port Bonython. I always supported the development of Stony Point. Over that period I have certainly shown my concern and have taken up certain questions such as the provision of readily accessible roads to the site. That has a long history into which I am not prepared to go today.

I was also involved in the possibility of an access road to the shack area at Port Douglas; hopefully, that is beginning to show signs of some response. I have also been involved in the matter of Santos, using local labour and local construction firms. I could go on about my involvement with Santos, but simply point out that the development, in my opinion, is a credit not only to Santos but also to the bipartisan political attitude adopted by the Parliament.

When the Liberal Government was in power, the attitude of the Labor Party in Opposition and the Liberal Government was bipartisan and a credit to the Parliament. I believe that the development by Santos has shown this quite clearly. It would do credit to every politician if he or she visited the Santos plant at Point Bonython because it shows quite clearly what can be done by an Australian work force that has been under considerable attack over many years, and

what can be done by Australian industry. It shows that the trade union movement can accept such a development in real terms without having disputes that some people might call unnecessary (if any dispute is unnecessary). In fact, this project was practically free of disputes.

I return now to my involvement with local firms. Members of the House can probably see that I have quite a large portfolio of correspondence showing my involvement with Santos. I do not intend, for the sake of *Hansard*, to go through all the correspondence with which I have been dealing. However, I do want to deal with certain matters and to read a letter that I forwarded to a leading light at Santos, Mr Mike Stone, on 15 January 1982. I will read part of this letter, because one of our desires when Santos was to kick in was to use as much of the local industry from the city as possible on that project. My letter states:

Following upon your telephone conversation with me in verbal response to my correspondence to your company regarding concern for employment in Whyalla and request for favourable consideration for local firms in respect to tendering for contracts for your Stony Point project, I have to advise that I have personally approached available firms established in Whyalla who, I believe, are most eager to have the opportunity to tender and are in desperate need for work opportunities.

I went on in that correspondence to list nine interested firms. I concluded that letter by saying, in part:

As stated, these are the firms available in Whyalla. I can assure your company of their eagerness to tender and their readiness to talk to representatives in Whyalla. I sincerely hope that your co-operation and theirs will be of great assistance to the City of Whyalla and its people.

That was the foundation of better things to come so far as local firms were concerned. Further to that request, I took up with Santos the possible use of amenities to be provided by that company for its work force. Unfortunately, my request was not granted. In fact, the company saw fit not to accept my approaches. I believe that it will auction all, or certainly most, of the amenities it built. I think that that is a crying shame, because it has a part to play in providing an amenity for the City of Whyalla. The letter I sent to the Manager, Planning and Development, of Santos on 26 January stated:

A recent article appearing in the media has inferred that your major contractor, Davy McKee Pacific, will be providing certain facilities and amenities to its workforce by way of setting up within its proposed campsite a wet canteen with a beer garden, swimming pool, basketball and tennis courts etc.

This move is applauded by the writer, but it is believed by the writer that the facility, where it is currently to be sited, will be of no immediate or future benefit to the people of Whyalla and this aspect concerns me a great deal.

I put to your company that the proposed siting of the amenities be placed in a more favourable position which would afford reasonable access to the general public of Whyalla, particularly after your project is completed . . .

At that time I believed that, if Santos was spending this huge amount of money, surely the facility should not be wasted in years to come. This is not to be and, unfortunately, Santos intends to sell all or part of the project. Concerning the saga of the rating of the Santos site, I asked the then Deputy Premier and the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Hon. E.R. Goldsworthy), who at that time was the Minister of Mines and Energy, a question seeking clarification of the land value so that a clear picture could be obtained of the base rate. In reply to my question a letter written by the then Minister of Mines and Energy, in part, states:

I have now been advised by the Valuer-General that the value on the land, containing approximately 100 hectares in terms of unimproved value, was \$2 500. However, the final purchase price that Santos will pay for the Stony Point site has not yet been established as it depends on the costs to be incurred by the State in making the site available to Santos.

I am also informed by the Valuer-General that the concept of 'unimproved value' has now been abolished and the concept of 'site value' will now be used for rating purposes . . . The 'site

value' applied by the Valuer-General for Stony Point as at 1 July 1980 is \$450 000. It is expected that the 'site value' will be \$500 000 when all the services are provided. The \$450 000 is the value that the Whyalla Council would apply until the next general valuation if it adopted the Valuer-General's valuation.

I was pleased to receive that reply because it cleared the air. I then released a press statement, as follows:

Mr Brown said the site valuation given by Mr Goldsworthy was \$450 000, and this figure could be taken for local government rating purposes. As Santos had developed the particular land quite extensively, even at this point, the rating of the land was indeed a very urgent necessity and to continue the uncertainty and deliberations of the ultimate rating of this property was becoming, firstly, a disgrace, and secondly, placing Santos in an even more favourable position than they currently hold.

That press statement was released on 3 June 1982. I have tried to indicate to the House and to my electorate the extent of my involvement in this matter. When Santos first indicated its intention to go ahead with the development of Stony Point, I made it perfectly clear that I believed that the Government of the day should have built into the indenture a base rating for local government to be regarded as a proper reimbursement to the community (in this instance, the Whyalla community), similar to that applying to the Port Stanvac indenture. It is obvious to me, although obviously not to the Whyalla City Council, that the Government of the day was not prepared to seek that sort of rating reimbursement and that the Whyalla Council did not understand the position, did not want to understand it, or perhaps did not want to obtain the sort of reimbursement that I believed to be appropriate.

I have been attacked about this matter a few times, but I make no apology for seeking reimbursement of between \$300 000 and \$400 000 as a base rate, as I believed that that was not unreasonable. As I have said on many occasions, the people who invest in our natural resources have a responsibility to the people in the area affected and to the workforce that they employ. If a provision similar to that which I have suggested were built into the indenture, we would not have the hassles that are presently occurring in regard to the local council. Furthermore, in my opinion, it would have provided us with a proper base rate on which to work in future years. Whether or not we like it, the indenture provides quite clearly that discriminatory factors in regard to Santos cannot be involved.

It is clear to me that, if one continues to hold an argument on principles and keeps hitting one's head against a brick wall because of those principles, usually one finishes up with a gigantic headache. I believe that that is exactly what the Whyalla City Council is experiencing at present. Of course, it is desirable to obtain the best deal possible. I can only repeat what I have said previously, namely, that in my opinion, the best deal possible would have been a base rate of between \$300 000 and \$400 000. However, that did not eventuate.

It is desirable to obtain the best deal but, as I have said on many occasions, if the best deal is not possible then common sense, consensus and conciliation is the best avenue to explore. I have considered this question at great length because the saga of establishing a rate for Santos has gone on for too long. This minority of the council (and I understand there is only a minority which is holding out; unfortunately, like all local government bodies, it needs a clear majority for the establishment of a rate) seems hell bent on forcing the city into confrontation with Santos, thus gambling very heavily with ratepayers' money in what could only be described as anything but a sure thing. I have a bet now and again, and I always like to be on a sure thing, but obviously some members of the Whyalla City Council does not believe in being on a sure thing.

Some of the remarks which have been made by some people in Whyalla and which I have read are appalling. It

is commonly known in this House that there is in existence in the City of Whyalla a gentleman—and I would not describe him as my friend, anything but—who I believe is a gay pretender concerning the interests of the decent working class people. I refer to the person who stood against me at the last election. Mr Murphy, who simply pretends to have the interests of ordinary people at heart. He has jumped on a bandwagon of trying to put forward a viewpoint about which he has done no homework and knows nothing. A long statement made by him about me particularly appeared in the local paper. In relation to my concerns about the rating situation, he said:

Mr Max Brown, M.P., appeared to have no opinion on this matter.

In other words, Mr Murphy is saying that I have no opinion on the question of the rating of Santos. Considering my involvement on this question of the Santos rating, I find the remark from this pretender absolutely unbelievable. He does not know what he is talking about, and I wish that sometimes people like him would have the decency to go home, do some earnest reading and give some thought to what is happening around them.

An article in the *Whyalla News*, highlighting the wheelings and dealings of certain councillors, refers to the problem of rating and it will give honourable members an understanding of what makes certain councillors tick (although I am not too sure whether they are ticking). The article is headed 'Council warned it could lose case on Santos rates'. The council sought, literally, a legal opinion on its right to pursue a certain rate from Santos. The Crown Solicitor's Office has advised that, under the indenture Act, if council pursues the proposed rating, it will get done in a court of law. In other words, at the end of the road there is a brick wall and, unfortunately, by the time the council gets to that brick wall, the cost to the ratepayers of the City of Whyalla will be about \$100 000. That is probably a reasonable estimate of the cost, but it is certainly not a reasonable estimate of the ultimate cost to the City of Whyalla over a period. The article states:

Whyalla council has been told it would 'lose the case' if Santos went to court over the rates issue. A representative of the Department of Mines and Energy, which has been obtaining advice from the Crown Law Department, said council could not win if the courts were asked to take on the case.

This is the incredible part:

In response, Councillor Kathy Bradley said the matter should take its course and council should seek the help of the Local Government Association. She believed council would win the case.

In other words, the opinion of the Crown Solicitor's Office and the lawyers (and perhaps even your opinion, Mr Speaker) have had absolutely no impact on Councillor Bradley: she is much more conversant with the law than are any of the lawyers.

The SPEAKER: I am sure that she was not reflecting on the Speaker.

Mr MAX BROWN: Maybe not—I might have been unfair in that instance. It becomes even more remarkable when one notes that the rate pursued is no less than 29.6c in the dollar. It was further stated:

Councillor Andy Fleming agreed with Councillor Bradley and said a rate of 60c in the dollar was not discriminatory.

Either he is crazy or there is no need for any lawyers. We could do what the old Irish gentleman Rafferty did and bring in our own rules. We could throw all the rule books out the window. The article further states:

Santos has told council it would consider any rate for the Port Bonython fractionation plant as discriminatory if it was above the maximum commercial/industrial rate in the city. Santos has offered to pay 150 per cent of the maximum rate, and it would not challenge such a rate in court. The oil company has left no doubt it would challenge a higher rate, however.

At least that remark involves an area of conciliation. I believe that that is an area the council should explore now. Despite the fact that it wants between \$300 000 and \$400 000 in rates from Santos, that is an impossibility at present. The best possible deal should be obtained. It seems to me that that statement by Santos gives us an area for negotiation.

Finally, I will leave this topic by reading part of an editorial that appeared on 30 July 1984 of the *Whyalla News*. However, before doing so I say that I have not agreed with what has been published in the *Whyalla News* on many occasions, but on this occasion I do believe that it is a very fair editorial about the situation in which we find ourselves. It reads, in part:

In recent years there have been quite a few examples of Opposition Parties threatening to block Supply of funds to an elected Government. At least once these threats have been put into practice and the Government has been forced to go to the polls because it has been unable to continue to govern without the funds to continue providing the services people have come to expect.

It is absolutely essential for funds to be available to Governments as required if they are to be able to carry out their functions properly. Federal and State Governments raise money through various taxes and charges and, in simplified terms, as long as they can pass legislation to obtain these funds for the various purposes they can function in their own right. These transactions are mainly paper notations, and the balancing is not the same week to week concern of the average householder who must balance expenses to income over a specific period depending on the regularity of the income.

Local government is in a different category than either State and Federal bodies as it has to work on budget lines very similar to the householder, except its income comes at the start of the year in rates. This rate revenue is the same for councils as it is for the Treasury benches for the higher echelons of Government—access to the money has to be regular and guaranteed. If the council is not getting rate revenue, the services it offers suffer in direct proportion, just as surely as any individual's activities are limited by their finances.

Therefore, just as any blocking of Supply in Federal or State politics must be viewed with concern, so must any unnecessary delay in declaring and collecting of council rates. This is the situation the Whyalla council has placed itself in by being unable to declare a rate for the coming year. The delay in setting the Santos rate is still well remembered. By deferring any decision on setting a rate at two council meetings the Whyalla council has effectively put back or delayed the date it can start to use its funds. Its Supply is blocked, or at least delayed.

The editorial continues, but my point is that as late as last Monday night, although the Whyalla City Council set a rate for the whole of the city, Santos was excluded. At least it will not hold up the rating of the city, but the council is in a similar position to that in which it found itself last year. An *ex gratia* payment will be made by Santos, but it is doubtful whether it is not less than Santos should pay, anyway. I believe that the City of Whyalla is the loser by not setting a rate. I will not go further than that.

Of all the things in which I have been involved in my district for the past 12 months—and there have been plenty of them—that was the most serious. It is time that people in the minority on Whyalla City Council came to grips with the problem. In the last few minutes of my speech I will return to the remarks of that wizard of understanding in this House, the member for Mallee. He is—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: —a very effective member.

Mr MAX BROWN: The member for Alexandra says that he is a very effective member. He is effective, all right! I will agree with that. But the member for Alexandra and I probably part company as to what sort of effect we are talking about. The member for Mallee, in his few words in this debate, got into the argument of the proposed submarine development.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Were you in the House?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: What?

The SPEAKER: I was calling the honourable member for Alexandra to order.

Mr MAX BROWN: I would think you would, too, Sir. For the benefit of the member for Alexandra, I was in the Chair, unfortunately, when the member for Mallee spoke in this debate.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in His Excellency's Speech about the honourable member for Mallee.

Mr MAX BROWN: I point out to the member for Alexandra that the member for Mallee went to great lengths to convince not only me but the other members present in the House at the time that we were on the wrong tram as far as—

The Hon. Ted Chapman: He was right, too.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: The member for Alexandra is also going to get into the argument. I was fortunate enough to meet Mr Jim Duncan, of the Premier's task force into submarine building. He has spent a long and distinguished period in the Navy, and has quite a history of knowledge and experience in submarines. If one were to look at his credentials one can be only very mindful of his ability. I have looked at the credentials of the member for Mallee, and at no time have I found that he is at all credentialled in submarines of any description, and I have some doubts as to whether his credentials would enter into any other field.

The Hon. D.J. Hoggood: We could arrange a submarine trip for the honourable member.

Mr MAX BROWN: I was going to suggest to the Minister that I could probably convince the Premier to send the member for Mallee overseas on a fact finding mission; unfortunately, I could not convince him to bring the member for Mallee back. I will not enter into that sort of fiasco.

Mr Trainer: Perhaps he could be a deck hand.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair has already determined that the member for Mallee has nothing to do with this debate.

Mr MAX BROWN: I have brought the member for Mallee into the debate only because he was so explicit in his remarks that he knew all about submarines. If he knows all about submarines, then the Government has made a mistake—

Mr Trainer: Perhaps he thought you said dead marines.

Mr MAX BROWN: Perhaps. The member for Mallee went to great lengths, telling us that we were all wrong, that we should purchase or build nuclear-powered submarines.

The Hon. Ted Chapman: Of course we should.

Mr MAX BROWN: Obviously, he has a phobia about nuclear power. For the sake of the member for Alexandra I want to say this: in my discussions with Mr Jim Duncan he pointed to three areas where the proposed submarine design that South Australia is after is superior to nuclear design. First, if one has done any homework at all one would know that the waters surrounding Australia are much shallower than are those in other areas of the world, and for that reason the development of the submarines that we are looking at is much superior to nuclear-powered submarines. Secondly, nuclear-powered submarines have to spend much more time on the top of the water than would the proposed submarine that we are seeking to build. That is an important factor in regard to defence strategy.

Thirdly, the nuclear-powered submarines are apparently much noisier and more readily detectable than is this submarine that we are trying to build. On those three grounds I thought it was interesting that he made those remarks. In regard to the nuclear submarine, the member for Mallee might have been dangerously close to the truth for the first time in his life.

New Zealand has shown a great deal of interest also. Of course, New Zealand has come out quite strongly on the side of being anti-nuclear. I will not go into the pros and cons of that but, if a nuclear submarine base is built, New Zealand would not have any interest in it. That is important as far as this proposal is concerned. I will go further and say that some dialogue is going on between Australia and such countries as Malaysia, which is interested in this type of submarine. I wanted to raise this matter because I would not like the member for Mallee to be in a position to mislead.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

Mr MAX BROWN: I know that he can mislead the member for Alexandra quite easily, but I would not like anyone to get the idea he can mislead any members of the Government. I do not intend to go any further in this debate. I have spent much longer than I anticipated.

The Hon. Ted Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MAX BROWN: I am pleased that I have been afforded the opportunity of mentioning these matters that are dear to my electorate. I support the motion.

[Sitting suspended from 1.43 to 2 p.m.]

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Murray): I am pleased to support the motion. Also, I extend my condolences to the families of the late Charles Wells, Claude Allen, Howard O'Neill, and Mr King. I did not have an opportunity to know Mr King personally, but I certainly knew the other three members to whom I have just referred. I always appreciated the contributions Charlie Wells made so forcefully in this House. He was a great debater, he used a lot of emotion in debate, and many times he contributed to the liveliness of the debate in this place.

I knew very well my colleague Mr Claude Allen. I have referred many times, probably during this type of debate, to the people who had been members for some time and who showed a fatherly approach to younger members as they came into this Chamber. Claude Allen was certainly one of those people. He always found time as a back-bencher to answer questions, to provide advice, and to show the way to new members as they came into the Parliament. I will certainly remember Mr Claude Allen for those reasons. Since my involvement in Murray Bridge I have also come to know other members of Mr Allen's family and have respect for them, and my sympathies go to them at this time, particularly to Claude Allen's widow. I knew Howard O'Neill as a member of the Labor Party. I did not have much to do with him but I respected his contribution as a member of this Parliament.

In addressing myself to the Governor's Speech I will refer specifically to many matters that relate to the portfolios for which I am responsible in Opposition but, first, I refer to matters pertaining to the South Australian Police Force. In this regard the Governor's Speech states:

Earlier this year the Commissioner of Police introduced the first of a series of annual strategic plans to direct the approach of his officers to the task of modernising and further improving the Police Force. My Government has endorsed this strategic plan and has undertaken to provide the resources necessary to implement it.

I certainly endorse that plan. I have studied it closely and have discussed it with senior officers in the Police Force. It is an excellent plan, which provides a new but worthwhile direction for the police in this State to follow. I believe that the Police Commissioner should be commended for the work that has gone into that strategic plan and the direction in which it will lead the South Australian Police Force for many years. The Opposition supports that strategic plan, and it also supports the Government in its endorsement of

the plan and its undertaking to provide the resources necessary to implement it.

That is all that we learn from the Governor's Speech regarding the police, although there are other matters to which I would have thought reference would be made. For example, I should have hoped to see something about the legislation, of which we have heard for some time, to widen the powers of the police in this State, and Opposition members have had much to say on this matter. The present Government promised to introduce legislation last session to amend the Police Offences Act. In fact, we were told that it was to be one of the major pieces of legislation introduced by the Government. Last year, the former Chief Secretary (the member for Stuart) promised the legislation, and indicated that it would be introduced before the end of 1983. However, we did not see it.

I thought there might have been a reference in the Governor's Speech indicating that we would see that legislation this session, but there is no word of it. I understand that discussions are taking place between the police and the Government regarding this matter, but nothing final is to be seen at this stage. I suggest that there are reasons why we are not seeing that legislation introduced, one being the deep divisions within the Australian Labor Party that have gone a long way to delaying the introduction of legislation to give the police wider powers.

The left wing of the Australian Labor Party has recently been stepping up its crusade against the police, and questions have been asked. I refer, as I have referred before, to questions asked by the member for Elizabeth and by the Hon. Anne Levy in another place during the last session of this Parliament. Those questions were most critical of police activities, but no evidence was given to justify their being asked. In fact, in reply to a question in this place, the Deputy Premier, who is responsible for the South Australian Police Force, indicated to the member for Elizabeth that the honourable member would have to provide evidence to back up his claims. The Deputy Premier said that the Government had no evidence to support the claims that had been made by the honourable member that abuses of police power were becoming increasingly common. He told the House that the member for Elizabeth should produce any evidence that he had to support his claims.

Just prior to that, at the launching of a book by the South Australian Council of Civil Liberties, the member for Elizabeth said that there was a blatant disregard of the rights of citizens to attend to their own affairs free from official harassment. The Deputy Premier indicated that the honourable member's comments about the police had not been made on the Government's behalf. He said that, during his period of Ministerial responsibility for the police, he had received three or four allegations about police behaviour, that two of them had been unfounded, and that the other one or two were still being investigated. So, it was up to those in this place who were claiming that there had been harassment from the police to provide detailed evidence to back up their claims. Clearly, the Government has been unable to win the approval of Caucus for long overdue changes to the Police Offences Act. Last year, I introduced legislation to widen police powers.

The Government opposed my Bill and said at that time that it would introduce its own legislation as a matter of urgency. However, it has failed to do so. Under existing legislation these powers are limited in several important areas. I do not need to spell out the fact that the community is generally very concerned with increasing violent crime and the effect of that crime on victims and the families of victims in South Australia. As has been pointed out so many times before, the police must be given appropriate tools of trade if they are to maintain law and order in South

Australia. That is certainly expected of the Government. We always hear from those who are concerned about civil liberties that further police powers will create more harassment and more interference to individuals.

However, I think that it is recognised that increased powers will have little or no effect upon law abiding citizens but that they are needed because, if police are to effectively discharge their onus and increasing commitment to criminal investigation, they must have positive and contemporary legislative power. I am sure that the vast majority of South Australians support the granting of such powers. Again, I call on the Government to give a commitment to bring in such legislation as quickly as possible. The police have made known that they are concerned about the Government's delay in introducing legislation to at least clarify their powers. The Secretary of the South Australian Police Association, Mr Brophy, said recently:

The Association has told the Government of its concerns about the uncertainties in the Police Offences Act. The Government has promised to invite the police to consider proposed changes when they have been drafted.

He went on to say that the Association is concerned with preserving existing powers, particularly those dealing with public misbehaviour. I know that that is a general concern: it is not only a matter of extending police powers but also of retaining the present powers of the police. For some time we have heard rumours about changes to legislation in regard to loitering, for example. The Opposition is particularly keen to see such amending legislation brought before the House so that it can understand fully just what the Government expects of the police, and the nature of the powers that the Government wants to provide for the police in South Australia. Mr Brophy went on to say:

Uncertainty about powers had been illustrated by the confusion surrounding the effects of loitering during the Roxby Downs protests in August and September of last year [that is, the previous protest] and the recent problem of magic mushroom hunters in the Adelaide Hills.

He said:

The Association has no argument with the Government, which had promised consultation. However, there is a need for the Government to move.

I hope that in the near future after appropriate consultation we will see the Government's making that move to bring in legislation that is very much needed in South Australia in order to give some backing to the Police Force. The next point to which I refer concerns the axing of the Special Branch within the South Australian Police Force. We learnt a short time ago that this branch was to be disbanded. When the Attorney-General made the announcement, he stated:

A new unit is to be set up within the Police Force to operate in areas of terrorist activity, the protection of VIPs and visiting dignitaries, and to deal with violent behaviour between or within community groups.

The Attorney-General pointed out that the police should have no role in matters of national security. He said that the new unit would be responsible to a Minister of the Crown, subject to a periodic independent audit. Quite a bit of concern was expressed about that decision at the time.

It was suggested that there should be greater debate on that subject, and that the Government had rushed into making that decision. More than anything else, it had taken that action without providing any justification for the abolition of Special Branch. Of course, that announcement was made on the eve of the ALP State Convention. It was suggested at the time that it was made simply to keep the lid on the left wing of the ALP, and I am sure that there was no other reason for the action taken so hastily in that case. That decision was nothing more than a hysterical over-

reaction to ill-founded attitudes of some sections of the Labor Party about Australia's security services.

That sort of thing has been apparent every now and again from members opposite who had a real thing about security and the way that it was being handled by Special Branch. In this case it is obvious that the left of the ALP has had a win, and I have no doubt that the member for Elizabeth and some of his friends were very pleased about that decision. If one looks back through *Hansard*, one finds that on a couple of occasions the member for Elizabeth asked questions about Special Branch. Not so long ago he asked about the current status of the Government's review of the present arrangements regarding the guidelines for the operations of Special Branch. He wanted to know when the review was begun and when it was expected to be completed, as well as the names and the positions of the persons conducting the review. On earlier occasions in this House he had something to say about his concerns about Special Branch. The Premier told this Parliament in June last year:

The Government has no plans to change the guidelines in the nature of Special Branch.

The guidelines to which the Premier was referring were drawn up in consultation with the Commonwealth and reflected the need to maintain co-operation between the State and the Commonwealth on genuine security measures.

I repeat that the Attorney-General has produced no evidence at all that Special Branch went beyond those guidelines or that it operated improperly. This is another move by the Labor Party to interfere, for ideological reasons, with legitimate activities of the Police Force. It is quite obvious that the Government in this State prefers to avoid confrontation with the left wing of the Labor Party rather than having regard to the need to maintain the means to guard against genuine security risks.

I was interested to read the comments of a previous Police Commissioner, Mr Harold Salisbury, who was questioned about the axing of Special Branch. Everyone would recognise his involvement and the fact that he was dismissed by a previous Labor Government because of Special Branch activities. Speaking from his home in England, he described the State Government's plans to disband the South Australian Police Special Branch as wholly political. He said:

It was something that could happen only in a place that did not know what is going on in the rest of the world. He said that there was more to security than plain violence. It was pointed out in the article to which I referred that at the same time Mr Salisbury was asking for more details of the latest bomb outrage against the Family Court judge, Mr Watson, and his wife, who was killed. Mr Salisbury believes that the attack against the South Australian Special Branch has been wholly political in line with left wing attacks on all Australian security services. We are anxious to find out what the Government will put in place of the Special Branch in the new unit being set up. When we know what it is, we will certainly have more to say on the subject.

I now want to refer to the setting up of an authority to inquire into police complaints. Only recently the Government indicated what it intended to do about this matter. We read some time ago that it intended introducing legislation in this session to set up such an authority. However, again nothing was mentioned in the Governor's Speech about the introduction of such legislation. I hope that the Government is proceeding in relation to this matter and that the legislation will be introduced urgently. In May last year the Government appointed a committee to investigate this matter, following the ALP's election promise to establish an independent authority to deal with complaints from the public about police activities.

The committee's report was handed to the Government as far back as last August—12 months ago. The Chairman

of the committee (Mr Grieve, SSM) said at that time that it had studied procedures in the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales and Queensland. It had also studied how those procedures could be applied in South Australia. He indicated that he believed it would be appropriate for similar procedures to be introduced in this State to meet our requirements. The Government has been sitting on that report for 12 months, yet we have still not seen the legislation. We have learned from the media something of what the Government has in mind. In fact, when police officers have been given the opportunity to comment, they have done so favourably. But, the point is that we still have not seen the legislation. We still need to consult with the Police Force to determine its attitude once the legislation has been brought to this House.

It is imperative that legislation be introduced as a matter of priority. Only recently, I asked the Deputy Premier in this place to provide reasons for not approving some of the recommendations. I was told that it was a Cabinet decision and that it was none of my business what the Cabinet decided to accept from the recommendations of the Grieve Report. I am especially concerned about that, but I will not spend any more time on it because an opportunity will be provided to speak further when the matter comes before this House. I repeat that it is important that the legislation be introduced so that an authority can be set up.

I now refer briefly to two other issues: the first relates to the delay in deciding policies in regard to the use of police handguns. Last year the Government received a submission on this matter from the Police Association. The Deputy Premier has had plenty of time to reach a final decision. He told Parliament some time ago that he would have discussions with the Police Commissioner as a result of the report.

Of course, this follows last year's decision by the ALP Convention to require all police handguns to be concealed. After that, the decision was referred to arbitration following widespread police and public opposition. It is interesting that very recently an anonymous survey was released referring to the public's attitude about whether police should carry exposed firearms in South Australia. The result of that public opinion poll (which, in fact, was conducted on behalf of the Police Association to gauge the public attitude to police officers wearing exposed handguns) was most satisfying. In fact, it showed that 66.6 per cent of the public approve, whilst 26.8 per cent disagree and the remainder do not care or do not know. If that does not indicate to the Government where the general public stands on this issue, I do not know what would. It needs to look carefully at its policy on this matter and needs to clarify the situation for police in this State.

I understand that a copy of the survey report has been forwarded to the Deputy Premier for his information in light of the fact that a review of the Government's present policy in respect of sensitive areas is taking place. Again, a real need exists to clarify, on behalf of the police, the Government's policy on this matter, as it has been going on for too long. Not long ago we read that an officer was charged with a breach of discipline for refusing to conceal a Smith and Wesson revolver. On another occasion, following discussions between the Government and the police, I was informed that police going into so-called sensitive areas had been either disarmed or told to wear concealed the .308 Browning automatic which has been on issue for about 30 years and which is now regarded as an outdated and inefficient weapon.

I also know that it is a matter of long-term and greater concern to the police that the Government may determine a policy on this matter that will require them to conceal any handgun. Until this matter is clarified and until the

Government says quite clearly that it supports the decision made by the arbitrator and that that is its official policy, there will always be confusion; hence the need to clarify the situation.

The other matter to which I wish to refer briefly concerns stress within the South Australian Police Force. In March of this year we learnt that a major study on stress affecting South Australian police officers was being planned. That was at a time when there was growing concern about stress-related health and mental problems amongst police officers in this State. We are aware that a committee was formed by the Police Association, in conjunction with the Police Department, to make a wide-ranging and on-going inquiry into stress in the Police Force. The problem has often been highlighted and it is something about which I believe the police are very concerned.

A recent major study found that Australian police have unusually high rates of psychological problems and ill-health because of stress. That six-year study involved police in South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia and the Northern Territory and was commissioned by the Victorian Police Association. Its findings, presented last year, went to the Victorian Government.

It is necessary because it is of concern to the police and I believe to the general public in this State that we learn more about that matter and that the police themselves should be aware of the Government's response to any report that might come out as a result of that study that is being carried out into stress affecting members of the South Australian Police Force.

Another matter that has continued to cause me concern, and I know is causing concern to the Police Force, is the number of assaults against police in this State. I have only just been told that research is now under way for the purpose of preparing a submission to the Government for a review of penalties, and goodness only knows we have been talking about the need for a review of penalties (and this goes back to what I was saying earlier about the need for legislation to cover so many of these areas); there is certainly a need for a review of penalties and a review of the law in respect of offenders found guilty of assaulting police. With that report being carried out and with it being made available to the Minister responsible for police, the Deputy Premier, I hope that action will be taken, particularly as it relates to assaults against police. I do not think there would be many in the general community who would not be concerned about the increase in assaults on our Police Force.

There are a number of other industrial matters about which the police are concerned. They are most concerned about the lack of progress in a number of areas, such as pensions, the 38-hour week, manpower and assaults against police. The police have pointed out shortages in regard to operational personnel in some areas, particularly in regard to relief, and there is concern in regard to what appears to be a soft line being taken on persons convicted of assaulting police. They are matters of which I know the Minister responsible is aware and on which the police are waiting for some positive action.

I turn now to the Roxby Downs demonstration and the problems that that small minority of people is causing the Police Force in this State. Much has been said about it in the House over the last few days and I am sure that more will be said in the future as reports are brought in officially by the Government in regard to this matter. But there are so many areas to which we could refer, one being the cost to the taxpayer. We have been told at this stage that the cost will be \$1.8 million, but when the Deputy Premier brings down the final report we might find it is more than that. That is a lot of money that the taxpayers will have to fork out to allow this demonstration to proceed.

Also, there is the fact that the police have to accept this responsibility, because there is no alternative. They have to go up there to protect the safety of property; that is why they will be there. The lack of effective policing that will result is no secret because of the large number of policemen who will be going to Roxby. I understand that the first contingent will leave early tomorrow morning. Not much has been said about the inconvenience that will be caused to police officers who will be responsible, in that they are going to forgo leave and they will have to leave their families when they go into this situation.

The Opposition and I are concerned about the 'no arrests' policy that is being adopted. We have recently questioned the Premier and the Deputy Premier, who is the Minister responsible, about this matter, and we will pursue it. In a question to the Premier today, I indicated that, although the Premier had reportedly sought an assurance from members of the Young Labor Movement that they would observe ALP policy, we wanted an assurance from him that he had in fact talked to those members and had convinced them that they should not participate. Further, we sought an assurance that members of that organisation had agreed not to be part of this demonstration. However, we were absolutely snubbed by the Premier this afternoon; he refused to comment further on the subject, which is one of concern.

If he says that he expects that people will act responsibly, that the demonstration will require the minimum resources, and that he is looking to people to co-operate, surely to goodness he can ensure that part of his own Party structure, through the Young Labor Movement, does not add to the problems concerning the provision of resources. However, today the Premier refused to assure members that he will take a stand against the Young Labor Movement in this matter.

The final matter regarding the police to which I wish to refer, and to which I have often referred in this House, concerns the need for an improved communications system within the Police Force. I am aware that some finance is being provided to enable a start to be made on this improved system, but there is still a long way to go. I especially refer to a part of the communications system that is closer to my base: the construction of the new police communications tower at Mount Barker. When I asked the Deputy Premier last week whether he supported the Police Force in its need to construct this tower, he assured me that he did, that he saw the necessity for it to be built, that he was consulting with the Minister for Environment and Planning, and that once a decision had been made there would be no stopping the construction: it would be all go.

Of course, this has not happened and we now find that, the unions having imposed bans, the work on the tower has stopped. Last week, in this place, I referred to an editorial in the *Courier*, a provincial paper published at Mount Barker. I now refer to part of this week's editorial in the same newspaper on the same subject, headed 'Mount Barker Summit. Credibility at Stake?' The editorial states:

After careful consideration, Environment Minister Dr Don Hopgood has given his approval for the police radio tower on Mount Barker Summit to go ahead. He has made this bold commonsense decision in the face of emotional outbursts about the despoiling of the summit and its heritage as an Aboriginal sacred site. He has recognised that the tower is designed to play a vital role in police communications, in fact, without it, disaster planning in the Hills will be seriously jeopardised. And in order to satisfy demands that the summit not be unduly disturbed, it has been agreed to prevent public vehicular access to the tower site, and to ensure it blends in with the environment as much as possible. People will still be able to walk to the summit as they have always done—with no protests in the past from environmental groups or 'Aboriginal Cultural Defenders'.

However, Dr Hopgood's commonsense solution has been thwarted by the activities of extremists and now the unions, who have put a ban on the tower's construction. While it may well be

that the summit was used as a burial site, serious doubts must be expressed on its significance to the Aboriginals, in that hitherto there has been no objection to the many and varied uses of the area. The fact that its sacredness has come to light at a convenient time for the anti-tower lobby seems to be a remarkable coincidence, to say the least. In addition, it is unusual for sacred sites and ceremonies to be discussed in the presence of a woman.

In fact, a woman is leading the protest in relation to this at the present time. The editorial continues:

And if the site is of such great significance, how come it is only a few non-Aboriginals who are now maintaining the picket? Why the unions have become involved we are at a loss to understand. Rarely before have they shown such concern for Aboriginal heritage, which indicates some alternative reason for their disruptive actions. If the ban is merely a show of strength, then it is an insult to the very people they claim to be supporting, and if there are other reasons, we would be most interested to hear them.

However, we can be sure that if any union members should be in need of police or other emergency service, they will expect it instantaneously. It is a sad indictment on our society that we elect a Party to govern, and when it makes a decision it is prevented from having it carried out by unions who have little interest or concern for the issue at hand.

Those who are opposed to the tower, whether on grounds of environmental impact or desecration of a sacred site would do well to look at why it is needed. The whole plan to protect the Hills, in the event of disaster, is dependent on communication. Without the tower, communications in many areas will continue to be very difficult.

As I mentioned in the House last week, many of the problems that occurred on Ash Wednesday last year resulted from problems with communications within the Hills district. The editorial further states:

And if essential messages cannot get through on a day such as Ash Wednesday, it is inevitable that lives will be lost... and possibly also the so-precious vegetation on the summit itself.

The police have looked for suitable alternative sites, only to discover there aren't any. The protestors have held up construction long enough. A commonsense solution has been reached which will provide the essential communications we need, and also preserve that part of the summit which most people visit.

Surely the unionists and protestors can find some other target for their disruptive efforts, and let the tower go ahead in the interests of saving life and property in the next disaster. Otherwise the sacred summit might well become a monument to man's stupidity and inhumanity to his fellow man.

I support those comments very strongly. One of the difficulties in the situation concerning the Mount is that it is so difficult for a credible argument to be put forward. I know that some of the people who live in the area have genuine concern and have expressed their desire to have further consultation with the police about the siting of the tower, but all the hoo-ha being put forward at the moment by a very small group of people has made it virtually impossible for those responsible for the erection of that much needed communication tower to indicate what is really needed and the requirements that should be met. I could say much more about this matter but I do not intend to do so.

I now want to refer briefly to matters pertaining to correctional services. There is much I could say about my concerns in this matter, but I do not intend to go into great detail at present. However, I will certainly do so later in the session. The Opposition has continued to refer to its concerns about automatic parole and the leniency now shown to offenders through the introduction of the new parole legislation and regulations. The public generally continues to express concern about that legislation. The Government continues on the other hand to show no respect for the victims and for those who are being disadvantaged as a result of that legislation being introduced.

I refer to a letter from a person within my district and, without going into a lot of detail, it relates to a situation in the town of Mannum, which is usually a very peaceful law-abiding town. However, in recent times, there has been a considerable disturbance as a result of a particular person who has been flouting the new parole legislation. Much has been said about this, and the police are fully involved.

However, this is the type of letter that I have received, and it is one of a number from concerned residents in that area. It states:

As a concerned parent and community minded person I am writing to you regarding the social problem that seems to be plaguing the town of Mannum at the moment.

This has always been a concern but when it affected my closest friend recently, whilst she was happily visiting me for the afternoon, I came to realise how unsafe our lives and possessions are, even though we choose to live in a remote area to avoid the 'nasties' of city living.

Many people over a period of time are convicted of breaking into homes and businesses but it appears that the offender in Mannum can do this as often as he chooses, and yet no law keeps him out of our society for any more than a few hours a day at the maximum.

Never before have our townspeople been afraid to sleep at night in houses or the men reluctant to leave their women at night. I feel very concerned that the law doesn't protect any of us from this type of life. Is there no way that we can feel secure again, and if enough of us show our concern, will it help? Trusting that you appreciate the fear that seems to be affecting us as a community and that you can help advise us on a course to follow to improve our lifestyle.

As shadow Minister I receive many similar letters from people who express concern about the lack of law and order throughout different parts of the State. This case I refer to is one where the offender has been allowed to flout the new parole laws and has been able to get away with much that is causing concern. The Government is aware of the circumstances surrounding that case and I only use it as an example because there are so many others that could be referred to at this stage.

Regarding the unrest at Yatala and Adelaide Gaols, I refer especially to the concerns pertaining to Yatala, particularly now that the \$12 million security gaol, which was to have been built near Murray Bridge, has been shelved pending an analysis of prison numbers. We are continually reminded of the problems concerning Yatala and Adelaide Gaols, and we are continually told by the Minister responsible that this is as a direct result of overcrowding. I received a letter from the wife of a prison officer at Yatala that I think spells out fairly clearly the concern that some people have. The letter states:

I am the wife of a prisoner officer and I wish to back up statements which have been made to you concerning conditions in Yatala. First of all concerning the escape—

and this of course relates to the six escapes earlier this year—

it was reported by more than one officer, of a flaw in the razor wire in one particular spot and therefore a potential way of escape. Someone did escape—

of course, we are aware that there was an escape prior to the six going out a couple of weeks before that incident—

a couple of weeks ago and nothing was done before the mass escape a week later... This is only one of many things that are reported and no action is taken. It is true that the prisoners control the gaol. All discipline has broken down, and they are given more and more privileges. If a prison officer is doing his job correctly, and by this I don't mean with brutality, certain prisoners will complain to the management. The management then removes those prison officers to a different job out of the way. If an inmate is taken or reported to the management for any offence, they (prisoners) are not even reprimanded in most cases, and prison officers are made to look stupid. Consequently, this causes apathy amongst prison officers and frustration because there is no dialogue between the officers and management. The officers feel they know the prisoners and their problems, and have a better understanding of their concerns than a social worker would. Their advice, however, is never sought. Most of the prison officers would like to have closer liaison with the prisoners but don't get any support from the management.

What is most important is that the prison officers must be in charge, otherwise the prisoners have the upper hand and they know it, and that is just what is happening. The officers don't need guns, they just need more men. The latest dispute over 'escorts' is not quite correct and has been wrongly reported by the media. The officers as you know want two men to escort one person to hospital, etc.

When asked to do an 'escort' the men refused, and one by one they were suspended. Eight men were suspended in one day, but the media reported that they were on strike—suspended without pay. However, because they are short-staffed they had to take them on again the next day. I would like to add one more very important point. There are at the moment about fifteen prison officers off work, on 'compo'. Most of these are stress related illnesses.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: One of my constituents was knocked about.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON: I am very much aware of the predicament of the person referred to by the member for Light. The letter continues:

But the stress does not come from prison officer tension, but from management. Prison officers feel they are the filling in the sandwich, being pressed on both sides.

The letter concludes with a comment about hoping that I continue to bring some of these matters to those responsible. In the time that I have left, I refer to a copy of the newsletter released through Yatala in Adelaide from the elected representatives of the Prisoners Representative Committee. A copy of this report has been made available to me, and I think it makes rather interesting reading. The report is dated 1 June 1984 and reads:

This is a report from your elected representatives. We have deliberately not called a meeting for the last couple of weeks because, whilst our negotiations with the administration are continuing on quite a promising note, no real results have as yet been achieved. When dealing with a bureaucracy it is unfortunately necessary to be patient. But as we have not encountered any deliberate stalling or any of the piggish negativism which used to be so evident in even the recent past, we propose to continue with our present approach for the time being. One of the features of our recent meetings is that certain subjects are no longer taboo—in other words everything is open to discussion and negotiation. This in itself is a big step forward. For the information of those many new arrivals—

of course, that refers to new inmates—

who have come to this prison in the last few months, we feel it necessary to make these points: the comparatively (to Adelaide Gaol) civilised hassle and free existence we live here has not come about by accident, nor was it handed to us by a benign administration. It is the result of fire, sweat, blood, and effort on the part of crims in this prison over the past two years. But the real capital was made by an elected committee which could only function so successfully because of the staunch and total solidarity of the crims who supported them through thick and thin.

The newsletter goes into much more detail. I will refer to a couple of points. It states:

There are two things in particular on which the rules and penalties have not changed. The consequences of being discovered will be horrible.

In other words, if any prisoners step out of line with the solidarity and confidence in this prison structure, they will certainly pay for it. It further states:

Whilst on the subject of majority agreements it is well to tell you this: The life-style we enjoy at present was the direct result of crim solidarity. It is all we have. Let's stay solid.

I guess it is fine for a newsletter to be going around from the Prisoners' Representative Committee, but I would have thought that a need existed for a much more positive approach than has been the case to which I have referred.

I would like to have referred to a number of other matters related to the correctional services portfolio and to the environment and planning portfolio, and I will refer to them on a future occasion. I will briefly refer now to some subjects that I will discuss in future. The first is, my concern about the Government's clean air legislation. I strongly suggest that a need exists for the Government to review that legislation and to pull back the regulations relating to it, at least until there has been more consultation with local government. I am aware of concern now being expressed by councils in many different parts of the State, councils that now indicate quite clearly that they have not had appropriate opportunity for consultation.

The provision of the Bill has now been forced on them. They have to administer them and pay for the administration at a time when people throughout the State are complaining about increasing rates for local government administration. A need exists for more dialogue and I will be taking up the matter personally with the Minister on another occasion. A need certainly exists for more discussion with local government on the legislation which, when introduced, people in authority made quite clear would be extremely, difficult, if not impossible, to administer.

A concern I have with the environment portfolio relates to the announcement made recently about the new generation of parklands to be investigated in this State by a study commissioned by the State Government. As I have said often, everyone recognises the need for open space, but the study announced only last week by the Minister for Environment and Planning indicates that the Government will be looking at areas in the fringe around the city, including private land, for more open space.

The fact that this might involve compulsory acquisition is causing much concern to people who live in the fringe areas of the Adelaide Hills. I am aware of the concern raised on previous occasions when the Government indicated that it intended to take certain action which might involve compulsory acquisition. I would strongly suggest that, before the Government moves much further, it not just consult with public servants but also with some of these people who perhaps own property that could be included in the area under study. It is very important that these people are included in a conference with the Government so that they know what they will be able to achieve as a result of that particular study.

Mr PETERSON (Semaphore): I support the motion. Before I speak to the motion, I would like to tender an apology for my outburst during Question Time today. It was unwarranted and I apologise to the House and to members for that. It was totally out of character and I apologise. I did feel strongly about that matter, and I was a little concerned that the message would not get across. I apologise. Paragraph 6 of the Governor's Speech states:

The main thrust of my Government's economic development strategy will continue to be directed towards encouraging South Australian industry to become more competitive both interstate and internationally; in developing new markets for goods and services; and attracting and assisting the development of new industries of benefit to the State. Particular efforts are being concentrated on ensuring that South Australia is selected as the site for the manufacture of submarines to replace the existing submarine fleet of the Royal Australian Navy.

Several members have spoken today about the submarine building programme and I will speak about it later. The whole emphasis of that statement was on the development of industry in this State. I was sad to see on the television news last evening that Simes and Martin, heavy engineers in Port Adelaide, is closing. It was the last of the heavy engineers of the old Port Adelaide. Beck and Jones, Giff and Miller have also closed down. The Premier said yesterday that the real concern in this State is for heavy engineering industry, and those three companies were leaders in that field at one stage and they are now gone.

One document to which I would like to refer is the *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal* (an excellent journal put out by the Department of Marine and Harbors), because it highlights what I have been putting to this House for five years—the important part Semaphore plays in the development of South Australia.

The Hon. B.C. Eastick: Do they acknowledge that their member has the balance of power?

Mr PETERSON: I can say in jest that I have been offered the front bench. This journal highlights time and again the

importance of my district to this State. Every page of this journal contains a reference to Semaphore, what is going on in Semaphore and the benefit of it to this State.

The Hon. R.K. Abbott: Does it say anything about a second crane?

Mr PETERSON: No, it does not, but I will try to cover that as I go through the journal. The front page has a heading 'Cement slogan supports Roxby Downs'. We all do now; we have been through that trauma. The cement slogans are on the bags of the Adelaide Brighton Cement Company which has facilities at Angaston and at Birkenhead and which also happens to be in the District of Semaphore. Major cement developers in this State are poised ready to go into action as soon as the State's economy moves and we are developing again.

Another headline on the front page is 'All stops out in South Australia's bid for submarine contract'. We all agree on that as well. I learned recently about a new microchip that has been developed in this State. On 'Towards 2000' I saw a feature about the defence establishment at Salisbury and the development of a decoy rocket for use on vessels to counteract the Exocet. Again in Semaphore we have the ability to come up with something to help the defence of this country.

The editorial in this month's issue of *South Australia Ports and Shipping Journal* is aimed at the imbalance in the approach to attracting overseas liner shipping, and that means attracting ships to our ports. For many years South Australian Governments have been fighting very vigorously to get shipping here. Only a few months ago I raised in this House the matter of concessions offered in Victoria to shipping lines using their ports so that shipping lines would be attracted to them. The concession offered amounted to \$90 a box. For some time those negotiations were under cover but they have now come out, and I am pleased I might have contributed to this debate and moved us along the road towards solving the matter, although I do not know how we will overcome the \$90 bulk concession. The editorial covers that subject very well. I do not know whether the Minister has an input into these editorials at all, but if he does I congratulate him. I congratulate whoever wrote it. The editorial also refers to a symposium of the Australian Shippers Council to be held on 26 September at which this whole matter of interstate rivalry and concessions will be raised.

The editorial also discusses the 800 kilometres of single rail track between Adelaide and Melbourne. Many Federal politicians want to put in two tracks. We have to be careful because if we put in a standard gauge to Melbourne we may be putting ourselves further behind in the shipping stakes.

On page 4 an article discusses the economies of Australian ports and it refers particularly to containerisation now that standard shipping is lessening. When one talks about containerisation, one is talking about the District of Semaphore because the terminal is No. 6 Outer Harbor. There is also talk about putting in another crane, which will give us two cranes. That should help us in our search for further work. I hope as much work as is humanly possible in the building of that crane will be done in this State because we have the expertise and skills for it to be done here.

On page 5 there is an article on the *Troubridge*. When we get the replacement for the *Troubridge* which is planned for the near future, it will be based at Outer Harbor, again, in the District of Semaphore.

An honourable member: I'm getting the feeling it's the only port in South Australia.

Mr PETERSON: To many of us it is. Another page has a photograph of the development at Gulf Point Marina. To those who do not know it, North Haven is a marvellous

development at the northern end of LeFevre Peninsula. The article states:

A 40 hectare site of the Gulf Point Marina, formerly known as North Haven, is undergoing construction preparatory to establishing 800 prestige home sites and an artificial lake.

That is another major step forward in this State. The only other lake development is at West Lakes and I think that is now fully developed. This new development, including an artificial lake, will create housing, which is a priority in this State, in a unique setting. The article continues:

The \$20 million development being undertaken by Gulf Point Marina Pty Ltd headed by South Australian construction company, A.W. Baulderstone, was made possible with the State Government's \$6 million sale of the site last year. When the project is completed around 200 home sites, apartments and townhouses will front the artificial lake, with some entertainment areas jutting out over the water. Many sites will have private jetties, while the whole marina will be able to accommodate around 1 000 small craft. Around September, 80 sites will be placed on the market, even before the developers begin constructing the large saltwater lake. The developers are hoping to convert the area into 'Australia's most exclusive boating playground'.

This will certainly be a development of note and a credit to this State. In this locality facilities that are not available in any other part of the State will be provided. The publicity says that this will be the largest man-made harbour in the southern hemisphere, although I cannot vouch for that personally. The publication also contains an article on the uniform standards to be introduced for the increasing number of sail planing vessels on the South Australian coast. Indeed, a sail planing vessel is being built in this State: at North Haven on LeFevre Peninsula, in the Semaphore Electoral District.

At page 8 of the publication there is an article regarding an engineering project on LeFevre Peninsula that will benefit the State generally. *Philanderer III* is being built on a site at Osborne on LeFevre Peninsula. When constructed, it will be a ferry for the Kangaroo Island trade. It is expected that the craft will be built by Christmas.

The publication contains an article on museums. Although the Maritime Park is currently in a state of limbo, it is expected to be developed into a worthwhile venture on Cruickshank Point on the Port River. There is an article on the *Sir Wallace Bruce*, which was previously used as a pilot boat. It is now moored at the Marine and Harbors Department dockyard at Glanville, which is on LeFevre Peninsula in the Semaphore Electoral District.

Indeed, the Semaphore Electoral District is a significant area, and I am not saying anything new when I tell members that this area has contributed to the economy of this State for a long time. The first shipbuilding yard was on LeFevre Peninsula. The Electricity Trust and the South Australian Gas Company established their plants at Osborne. The peninsula also houses the industrial complex of Imperial Chemical Industries of Australia and New Zealand, as well as the oil depots. All these establishments have serviced this State for many years and we look forward to further development in the area. I hope that the Government will do all that it can to sponsor such development. On the peninsula we have the ability, the skills, the people and the land: give us the task!

Although the proof range near Port Wakefield is not in my district, I am concerned that it may be extended because Port Adelaide professional fishermen fish in that area and, if it is extended, it will affect their livelihood, as well as seriously affecting some fine recreational facilities. The northern beaches of Port Parham and Webb Beach, toward Port Wakefield, provide excellent recreation facilities. Those facilities may not be tennis courts and cricket and football ovals, but they are in the form of open beaches where people can spend a day enjoying a barbecue and crabbing. This is probably the only area in the State that provides blue crabs

in great numbers. Another advantage of these beaches is their proximity to Adelaide: they can be used easily by people living north or south of the city. It is a matter of great concern to many people that the proof range may be extended, because this would mean that many people would be prevented from using these beaches.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Where does the Government stand in this regard?

Mr PETERSON: In the *Advertiser* of 20 July, the Premier is reported as saying that he would oppose the extension of the range, but I must be cautious because he is also reported as saying, 'I will not support this full southern extension.' I am not sure what that means and I will ask the Premier when I have a chance, because I want to clarify this matter with him. However, he is a busy man and I will have to catch him so that I may speak with him soon.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: The Premier should be concerned.

Mr PETERSON: I would think that we were all concerned. Anyone with an interest in this State's recreational facilities should be interested. I am pleased that the Premier has made the statement to which I have referred and I will seek to have it clarified.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: So long as his opposition is effective.

Mr PETERSON: Only time will tell. I have spoken with the member for Goyder about the proposed extension of the proof range and he has given me statistics for which I thank him because we have a common apolitical interest in this matter. About 188 holiday homes have been built at Port Parham and Webb Beach, so hundreds of thousands of dollars have been invested in the area. I understand that some people live there permanently and that some of the houses are substantial structures. The beaches are tidal beaches and I suppose that most metropolitan members have been crabbing there at some time or other, because the beaches are famous for crabbing and fishing. Some professional fishermen have lived in the area and worked off these beaches. Port Parham and Webb Beach attract people from many areas, including the Barossa Valley and the Murray Valley, because they provide a day out and enjoyment of an attractive facility.

If these beaches are closed, no other maritime facilities will be available in this area. St Kilda could not cope with the same numbers of people and there is no beach in the north to provide similar facilities. Only one round needs to be fired into the area and these beaches will be closed forever. It has been calculated, I think by the Army, that in the area of the proof range it would take about 2 000 man-years of work to clear the land of live shells, so that would be an impracticable exercise. Once a shell is fired there is no way that anyone will get into the closed area because of the unexploded ordnance in the area.

The matter of shortage of area on which to build houses has been mentioned many times in this House. I believe that a drift to the northern areas must occur. It is the only substantial area still available. Not long ago an article was published in the *News* referring to 1 000 hectares of productive rural land at Two Wells being on the market. It was considered to be a good buy at about \$1 000 a hectare, except that it may soon be part of Adelaide's proposed new international airport. If there is a proof range involving the firing of ordnances in the area I do not know how the activities associated with an international airport, if relocated and placed in that area, which I assume would operate on a 24 hour a day basis, could take place. How could aircraft be synchronised through the ordnance activity if the wind was blowing in a certain direction? Aircraft must use the wind patterns for loading and taking off. I have no idea how the firing from a proof range could be synchronised with that.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You are saying they are incompatible?

Mr PETERSON: I certainly do not think that 155 mm shells and an aircraft carrying 300 people is a compatible mix. If the land near Two Wells is not used as an airport (although many of us think that it will be used for that purpose eventually) it will have to be used for housing, but the possibility of the proof range cannot be discounted totally. Figures that I have been given indicate that the metropolitan area of Adelaide is steadily reaching northwards. The population of the District Council of Mallala since 1976 has increased by more than 23 per cent, while until then the State population had increased by only 3 per cent, which indicates that the population in the area to the north is growing all the time.

It will not be practical to further expand the settlements in the region in the future if there are shells there. As a matter of fact, I know a man who has a farm near Port Parham. Apparently during the Second World War there was a bomb range just in from the beach from Port Parham. The other day while ploughing a field he dug up a bomb. I do not know whether it was live or dead as I did not stay long enough to find out. This sort of ordnance lasts a long time and the land cannot be used for anything afterwards. It occurs to me that the Edinburgh Airfield is not that far away from the range which I believe is used for weapons testing.

I became interested in this matter due to the concerns of professional fishermen. I received a letter referring to 114 fishermen from Port Adelaide. I am sure that they do not all fish the area involved, but certainly a lot of fish is taken from that area. I think official figures from the Australian Fisheries Industry Council (AFIC) indicate that about 48 per cent of the catch of those fishermen comes from that area. Over the years bit by bit the area available to fishermen has been reduced. They have been cut out of Angas Inlet—perhaps at the time not without good reason. However, if the range is extended they will be banned totally from the area. There simply will not be enough frontage of water from which to make a living.

Further, there is not sufficient room in other areas to absorb the activities of those fishermen. They cannot impose themselves for example on Port Kenny, Streaky Bay, Edinburgh or Port Vincent, the scope just is not there. So, this involves some 100 fishermen and their families. They may have to go on the dole. They will have equipment that they cannot sell. Their licence will be of no use to them as one will not buy a licence unless one can catch a fish. They will be put totally out of business. In fact, the cost of fish in Adelaide will rise. That may not be a great concern to people in this House, but it will be yet a further increase in the cost of living.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: These recreational areas right on the doorstep of the bulk of the population of South Australia are needed.

Mr PETERSON: I have said previously that the southern metropolitan areas have just about reached capacity and that we must move north. If that area is not treated sensibly we will find ourselves with many problems in future. I believe that the Commonwealth Department of Transport has authorised money to be used for sealing the existing Port Parham road. Of course, that will not occur if this project goes ahead because there will be no necessity for it. That highlights the complexity of the operation of Government departments, where one is trying to close a road while another is trying to seal it; no-one seems to know quite where we are going. I think some 400 people attended a meeting of concerned residents of the Port Parham beach areas. They expressed their dissatisfaction in regard to the situation. I know that the member for Goyder has taken up

the matter with the State and Federal Governments, and I think the Federal member for the area is also involved. I am not sure what has occurred, but I know that the feelings in the area are very strong, as they are amongst the people I represent.

I hope that I have covered this matter reasonably well in clarifying the fact that there is concern. I could speak further on this matter but I do not think that is necessary as I have made the point about the value of that area to South Australia. I understand that in the United States of America they do not use a proof range system, but use something like a sand dune to fire the round into and then test from that, exactly as we do with the recovery principle here. Apparently, the recovery is not necessary on all rounds fired and only certain rounds need to be recovered for tests, while the others that have not detonated on contact are exploded. Although they are supposed to detonate on contact that does not always occur and there may be many rounds still lying in the shallows of the area. Let us hope we can get the matter resolved.

I want to refer now to the matter of a maritime museum for South Australia. Again, I have a very deep interest in things maritime. Over the years I have taken the opportunity to look at maritime museums in Australia, and, by courtesy, I have even had a look at them overseas. On the Australian scene I have looked at the maritime museum and park in Brisbane, where the *Diamantina* is in dry dock. Also, recently I went to Sydney to visit the exhibition that was on show at Birkenhead Point, where there were four steam vessels. They have now taken on the task of restoring a sailing vessel, the *James Craig*. It is a huge project for them and there is a lot of work to be done. It is to be prepared for the Australian bicentenary.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: That was recovered from Tasmania.

Mr PETERSON: Yes. It is a big project involving a lot of work and millions of dollars, but it will be a worthy showpiece for that museum. Instead of there being just a few boats, the *James Craig* will provide a particular item of interest. It has just been moved to another dock in order to finish the work on it, and it will be a show piece.

The only other sailing ship that has been restored in Australia is in Victoria and that was carried out by the National Trust. For the museum to be effective in this State there needs to be a vessel of some stature, otherwise it would be a case of only a few vessels lying around for people to walk on. There needs to be something of interest for the maritime museum or maritime park. If we are to be realistic about it, there needs to be a vessel of some substance.

I understand that a vessel called the *City of Adelaide*, built for the South Australian trade some years ago, is currently being used as a naval cadet vessel somewhere in Scotland. A vessel such as that which could be refurbished would make all the difference. I have been fortunate enough to see a few overseas exhibitions and one in particular was a London exhibition of vessels in a maritime park which was established on a site called St. Katharine's dock. I am not sure whether any other member has seen it, but it is an eighteenth century dock built at the height—

Mr Gunn: I have been past it.

Mr PETERSON: The honourable member should have gone in; he missed an experience. The dock was operating at the high tide of British overseas trading and as the shipping patterns changed and vessels changed in style and size it went out of business as a dock and the area was taken over in a very interesting way. The old parts remained. It was very close to much of the area that was devastated in the Second World War. The eighteenth century warehouses were left standing and new developments occurred around the area, such as office blocks and accommodation. However,

the dock was untouched and there is now a cross-section of vessels there which were used over the years in that dock. The key vessel was the Royal research ship *Discovery*, which was used by Captain Scott on his Antarctic expedition. There are also sailing vessels, barges, schooners and topsail schooners which make all the difference in that type of exhibition.

Recently I attended an exhibition at the Constitutional Museum called 'Grabbing the Trade'. Everyone would have seen that and if they did not they should have. It is an exhibition about South Australia, its ships, how the trade and work were done, the type of vessel used, the development of ships and shipping and the stevedoring and servicing of ships over the years since South Australia was established. It covered the Murray River paddle steamers, and everyone knows how important they were to South Australia. I am sure the member for Goyder would be interested in the Yorke Peninsula development and the small ketch that existed there over the years, and how it developed and serviced the State.

Mr Mathwin: Is there a picture of your grandfather there?

Mr PETERSON: My grandfather did not sail; my father did.

Mr Rodda: How are those old jetties going?

Mr PETERSON: The jetties were an important part of our heritage and it is interesting to hear people ask how they are. They are usually looked at only for fishing or crabbing but without them the development of trade would not have occurred either intrastate or interstate. They were needed for the development of this State and they are ignored a great deal.

In pamphlets I picked up yesterday at the Constitutional Museum there is reference to the Black Diamond Line, which many people know about but some do not. It is a part of our history that is generally lost. It is not something that people see and look at and think about, because generally people do not take an interest in it.

Mr Mathwin: Do you think I should go and have a look at it now?

Mr PETERSON: Before the exhibition is closed very shortly every member should go and look at it, refresh their memory, and think about the past in this State and the great responsibility taken by the seafarers and the people who serviced the ships over the years. This State was settled and developed by sea and even today, the day after 150 years since the Act of Parliament was passed in the House of Commons for the development of the State, we are still fighting for shipping. The problems have not been solved. Also at the exhibition there is a display of cartoons by a Mr Chinner.

Mr Hamilton: I like cartoons.

Mr PETERSON: It is not Tom and Jerry; it is different. Some people think that 'cartoons' means Tom and Jerry but I mean the true cartoons as they used to be. One of the drawings shows an octopus from Sydney grasping the country, trying to take all of the business and the centre of Australia to Sydney. The same situation applies today with regard to shipping. Facilities are built in every port that can cope with the trade. As I said earlier, there is the Melbourne situation of a \$90 rebate to keep containers there and we are still fighting for shipping. The importance to our State is not recognised and it has been allowed to slip away and we are fighting to get it back. An interest has to be established and an awareness developed in people.

Mr Mathwin: There is a terminal here.

Mr PETERSON: Of course, there is the terminal and if the honourable member had been here earlier he would have heard me say that. It is in the electorate of Semaphore. It is very important to this State and it is a key to our development, as is the proposed new crane. It is a marvellous

terminal with acres of industrial land and it needs to be developed, but awareness is needed first and there is a need to develop that interest. The museum needs to be established as part of our history so that people can see how South Australia developed and see the things that were of importance to it, such as the Black Diamond Line. What was it? No-one in the House knows. It is not a quiz programme but I posed that question in the sense that there are not many people who know. I am not being critical when I say that generally many people are not aware of how shipping in this State developed and the fact that a shipping line was registered in Port Wakefield.

Mr Mathwin: I arrived here by ship.

Mr PETERSON: Some people may question the importance of it if certain people came by ship. However, they did and there have been many people who have, and that is another aspect of it.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: That is an interesting comment about being the biggest shipbuilders. The *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal* has an interesting section on the migrant ships that came to South Australia for the migrant trade. Shipping has been until recently the only way to travel: one had to go by ship, there was no choice. The West Coast of this State would not have been developed without ships, and I am sure that the member for Eyre would agree. Ships used to service that area and sheep were taken off and goods were brought in by lifeboats.

Mr Gunn: And the women and kids!

Mr PETERSON: Yes. There were not tractors then; it was the horses, goats and chickens that were taken there. Shipping did that; it was not helicopters or road transport. I ask honourable members from the South-East—what about Robe and Beachport?

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: You don't have to convince us.

Mr PETERSON: I have 20 minutes left. I need to take advantage of it. Robe has a small museum.

Mr Mathwin: Let's talk about submarines instead.

Mr PETERSON: I will move on to that. This is the trouble when people do not pay attention from the start. A submarine project was mentioned in the Governor's Speech. In fact, such a project was reported in the *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal*. Of course, we know that such a project must be non-partisan and non-political. We must make sure that we get that project, because it will benefit each one of us.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: Mickey Mouse submarines.

Mr PETERSON: I hear some interjections which I know are out of order. I heard Mickey Mouse submarines mentioned. The member for Whyalla mentioned the submarine project of which Mr Duncan will be in charge.

Mr Mathwin: Is that the man who is standing for the Federal seat?

Mr PETERSON: No; I presume that is a reference to the member for Elizabeth.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hamilton): Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr PETERSON: Mr Duncan is overseas selling the concept that South Australia can do it, which we can. However, we have made a few mistakes along the way.

Mr Mathwin: Those that go on elastic.

Mr PETERSON: I assume that the mumble from the other side is related to the difference between nuclear and diesel-powered submarines.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is out of order. I am very interested in what the member for Semaphore has to say about the north-western suburbs.

Mr PETERSON: I draw the attention of the House to the benefits for the north-western suburbs if a project like

this was to go ahead. It will not only benefit one area; it will benefit the entire north-western area of this fair city of ours, apart from all the other benefits that will flow into the community. More goods will be made and sold as a result of this project. Those benefits will flow to the seaside areas.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: Whatever part of South Australia members represent and whatever those areas produce, benefits will flow from the project. We should all work together to make it work.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold interjecting:

Mr PETERSON: I cannot see how a Parliament such as ours can possibly affect or influence the type of submarine we build. Earlier today I heard a comment that a certain member would not know anything about submarines. I fall into that category; I do not know much about them. Our Premier can probably tell us more because he has been aboard one, inspected it, and has been under the sea in it. Perhaps we should talk to Mr Duncan or the Premier if we want to know about the technicalities.

An honourable member: It's the difference between horse-drawn vehicles and cars.

Mr PETERSON: There is a long drawn out argument about submarine capacity, whether they be nuclear or conventional, such as diesel powered. Some four years ago I was fortunate enough to take a voyage from this port to Hobart on the USS *Oldendorf*, which is an American destroyer. I was fortunate to see the equipment on that vessel, which included a search and destroy capacity for submarines. I do not care whether one rides a bike under the water, the equipment on that type of vessel can find it. In fact, that equipment can virtually fingerprint submarines from the sound of their propellers—not from their motors, or by detecting whether they are nuclear or diesel, or whether they have paddles. The equipment indicates exactly what it is from the sound of the propeller. Therefore, members opposite need not go on about the difference between nuclear and diesel.

The Hon. P.B. Arnold: One is silent and one is not.

Mr PETERSON: That makes no difference, so far as detection is concerned. However, I agree that is probably an advantage of one type over another. I do not think that the experts would argue with that.

Mr Mathwin interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is continually interjecting. I am most interested in the member for Semaphore's contribution, but I cannot hear what he is saying.

Mr PETERSON: I am not aware of any submarine ever having visited Glenelg, so I cannot support or dispute the comments made by the member for that district. In Port Adelaide we have the potential, ability, skills, space and will to make submarines. I am sure that my colleague in the neighbouring district agrees with me.

Mr Mathwin: You've even got the water.

Mr PETERSON: We have plenty of water and sand. Speaking of beaches—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: How's Taperoo beach going?

Mr PETERSON: I think I should give due respect to members opposite who over the years have—

The Hon. D.C. Wotton: Contributed greatly.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, I do not dispute that. They have certainly assisted me, as has the present Government. I have never had any difficulty in approaching members of either political persuasion. They have always assisted me. Talking about Taperoo Beach, it has improved out of sight. It has been filled, landscaped and planted. It will be a very attractive area.

Mr Mathwin: What about the seaweed?

Mr PETERSON: We still have a seaweed problem, but the smell has been removed to a great degree as a result of the filling. I mentioned excavation earlier.

Mr Gunn: Repetition is out of order.

The ACTING SPEAKER: And so is the member for Eyre.

Mr PETERSON: The Gulf Point Marina development is very attractive. Excavation is taking place there in order to create an artificial lake.

Mr Mathwin: Your lifesavers and mine are much better off now.

Mr PETERSON: Yes, they are. I am very fortunate. I have a very efficient and competent group of lifesavers who are well catered for in the new facility. I think they are very happy. I am very pleased that we were able to provide the facility for them. The lifesavers offer a wonderful service, which is often ignored. It is a very efficient organisation which needs all the assistance we can give it. I will now comment on a couple of other points raised in the debate.

The member for Peake made a good speech about the northern areas of South Australia and their potential for tourism. That is a point I have made to other people. He mentioned in particular Leigh Creek, which has great tourist potential. Overseas they put people on a bus, show them something, and tell them what a great thing it is. The Leigh Creek development is a great development and people in this State should be able to see it. It feeds the State and supplies the energy for much of our electricity, and it should be set up for tourism.

Mr Mathwin: Is it right in your district?

Mr PETERSON: I do not know whether it is imperative that one keep one's comments to one's own district. I certainly have never been reluctant to comment on my district, but also believe that, as an elected member of this House, I have the right to expand my comments beyond the boundaries of my district, and I shall.

Mr Hamilton: You're a statesman.

Mr PETERSON: The term 'statesman' has been used. If one can look beyond the boundaries of one's district, one can be called a statesman. I refer also to the speech made by the member for Albert Park. It was a fine speech, and reminded me of one I made a couple of years ago in which I referred to tourism potential in the north-western area of our fair city which, for too long, has been ignored.

I refer again to the *South Australian Ports and Shipping Journal*, which contains a paragraph in the centre spread and also shows a scene from the film 'For the Term of his Natural Life', part of which was shot in the district of Price at Port Adelaide in the wool stores. The report states:

Ports are rich in history, providing links back to settlement in many cases, and the port of Adelaide is no exception.

Port Adelaide is, of course, a core area and has been recognised by several alternate Governments. I mentioned the Maritime Museum over which I have some concerns and we need to look much more broadly at it to make it worth while. The points made by the member for Albert Park were valid, particularly those regarding Fort Lambert and Fort Largs.

Mr Mathwin: I was given my first cup of tea in Australia down at Port Adelaide.

Mr PETERSON: It is interesting to hear that the member for Glenelg had his first cup of tea in Australia in Port Adelaide. That highlights the significance of the area. It illustrates the courtesy that was proffered to him as a new migrant to this country. Somebody went out of their way to give him a cup of tea and welcome him to our State and country. It was a wonderful gesture. It is illustrative of the attitude and spirit of Port Adelaide, the compassion and willingness to help somebody in need. The historical aspect of that cannot be allowed to slip.

There will be a memorial occasion in December of this year on the foreshore at Semaphore for the *Protector*, our only navy gun boat. These things are being overlooked and slipping by without our generating an awareness amongst ourselves and the people of South Australia. In this State we need more awareness of our history. I hope the message I have been trying to get across today will be heeded. I hope that members are now aware of the historical significance of Port Adelaide. I am sure members will be aware that the Customs House at Port Adelaide is part of our maritime heritage. That building was once the house for the Port Adelaide Maritime Museum that is now above the Port Adelaide Council Library. We match the development of this museum to ensure that it becomes a significant part of our life. People must become aware of it even without the support of people of this House or the support of the public. Without an awareness and support it will not work.

I have looked at other maritime museums and parks of some significance in the world. I was fortunate enough to see a vessel recovered from the Stockholm harbour after 300 years. We have the *Zanoni* up in the gulf and the possibility of its being raised and put into a museum just as was the *Wasa* recovered from the Stockholm harbour. I also saw the Norwegian long boats being recovered after 600 to 900 years. The vessel used in the exploration by John Eyre across to Western Australia is in the Murray River. There is another vessel off Glenelg foreshore, probably all gone, although there may be enough to recover. We have hundreds of wrecks around the coast.

We must use our heritage—we cannot afford to let it go. Every year we let it go it becomes less possible to recover and use. However, it takes a huge commitment to make it work along with a lot of money. Maritime organisations depreciate all the time. There are a couple of displays in the port, with one held in trust by the Port Adelaide Council above the library. It has a wonderful collection of figureheads, which need fully refurbishing and bringing up to scratch. It takes a lot of money and one has to find it.

I was fortunate enough to see the *Cutty Sark* with its 40 or 50 figureheads. We have some of equal quality, although they need a lot of attention. We must look to maritime restoration, recovery, and presentation very seriously with a mind to how much it will cost. We will not do it cheaply and, as a State, we need to do it properly otherwise it is not worth the effort. It will only rust or fall away unless we present it properly, make it interesting for people, and make it a feature that people want to see.

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

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I support the motion. I was very saddened to learn of the passing of the member for Frome, the late Claude Allen. Claude was a member of this House when I first came here in 1970 and I found him to be a very kind, patient, sincere, hardworking member. Claude was one of those gentlemen you could talk to and seek from him in a friendly way support and advice, and in those early 1970s we had some traumas on this side of the House. I found that Claude was one to whom I could go or he might come to me to give wise counsel. I found him to be a fine example of a good, honest, hardworking back-bench country member of Parliament. It was very sad indeed that he suffered some serious injuries in a car accident a few years ago, and he is now no longer with us. I want to thank Claude's wife and family for lending their husband and father to this State through the years that he was a member of Parliament.

The biggest shock was the passing of Charlie Wells. Charlie, the member for Florey, came in when I did in 1970. I really did not get to know Charlie until we worked on the Public Accounts Committee together. With the member for Eyre,

I joined that committee following the resignation of the member for Alexandra and Mr Bill Nankivell, the member for Mallee. At that time the Public Accounts Committee was investigating the Hospitals Department. The investigations had been proceeding as normal until they ran into what was known as the 'pork chop affair', an issue that came to light during the election campaign in about 1977. Many allegations were made, and it must have been a very difficult time for Charlie to chair that committee. Elections were then held and the member for Eyre and I were appointed to that committee. Having been on the committee for only a few weeks, I was not prepared to sign the report because I was not satisfied in my own mind as to the accuracy of some of its statements. We spent some months tracing steps including the 'pork chop affair' and found that there was nothing in it. It was an absolute waste of time. Allegations had been made that someone had seen someone delivering meat to a certain location but there was just nothing to prove any of it. What annoyed me and what made it very difficult for Charlie to chair that committee during that traumatic period were the allegations made against some members of the committee, and I was one of them. It was alleged that I was talking to people trying to obtain evidence in one way or another.

There was correspondence between that committee, the former Premier, a Minister and public servants making some of the most scandalous allegations against me that have ever been made. They were strongly denied and it did those people no good whatever. I believe this was the first attempt to intimidate that committee. I felt sorry for Charlie Wells during that time until we delivered the Public Accounts Committee report to this Parliament. I do not think anyone realised what would happen from then on, the amount of publicity that it would attract, and the emphasis that was placed on the recommendations. Several recommendations highlighted waste and mismanagement in the Hospitals Department without affecting the quality of patient care. I am sure the whole committee was very concerned to ensure that what we recommended would not affect the quality of patient care. After the report had been tabled in the House and there were several outbursts, Charlie passed me a note looking for a bit of support and help and he had it from me. I admired him because he had the courage of his convictions. We as a committee were non-political, we brought down what we believed was an impartial overview of the Hospitals Department. The Parliament owes a tremendous amount of gratitude to Charlie Wells for ensuring that a fair and reasonable report was brought to this Parliament.

The effect of the report has been a saving of about \$30 million a year in the Hospitals Department, and it has not affected the quality of patient care at all. The document went further. It went to the Federal Government and to all State Governments and it was the forerunner of similar investigations in other Parliaments, particularly in New South Wales. After a lull of many years, the New South Wales Public Accounts Committee came to South Australia to discuss our investigations, and the Chairman of the committee went back to Mr Wran in Sydney and said that that is what he would do. He brought down similar recommendations to ours. That committee had found some tremendous problems within the health system in New South Wales, and after the tabling of that document the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee was promptly made the Minister of Health, that person being none other than Laurie Brereton, a member of the Wran Government and a member of the Labor Party, a person for whom I hold a good deal of respect. I believe he did a good job. He was criticised within his own State but he believed, as I believe Charlie and all of us did, in a fair go for taxpayers' money, and a fair go

for the Administration, but at the same time insisting on the quality of patient care.

I know that Charlie did not enjoy good health, and we were mindful of that. I only wished for him a longer happy and healthy retirement but it was not to be. I want to thank Mrs Wells and her family, on behalf of the Parliament and taxpayers of South Australia, for lending their husband and father to the Parliament. I do not think that Charlie was ever given sufficient credit for steering that report through and ensuring that there were peaceful negotiations by the committee at all times. I believe we have benefited by those two members in some way. They have made contributions that not everyone is fully aware of, and I hope that in time they will be given due recognition for what they did for the people of this State.

Of all the difficulties and problems caused by the recession, the hardest time must be for young people within our community and within our society endeavouring to fulfil and pursue their ambitions. It must be very difficult for young people who cannot obtain satisfactory employment to live an independent life if they can. Some months ago I asked the Minister of Housing a question in relation to Housing Trust rental accommodation. I asked a question on 8 May 1984, and the question and answer, which appear on page 4302 of *Hansard*, are as follows:

1. How many persons are currently awaiting various classes of rental accommodation offered by the South Australian Housing Trust?

2. What is the current waiting time?

3. How long will it take for the Trust to provide the accommodation required and what is the estimated capital cost?

4. Will there always be a waiting list for rental accommodation offered by the Trust?

The Hon. T.H. HEMMINGS: The reply is as follows:

1. At June 1983 a total of 28 744 applicants were listed for Housing Trust rental accommodation. Of these, 25 142 were awaiting pensioner accommodation.

That statement means that, of the total number of applicants for Housing Trust rental accommodation, only 3 602 received an income greater than the pension, so there is a tremendous impact on the State Government in its endeavours to provide suitable accommodation for 25 142 persons—it is a very real problem. The Minister's reply continues:

2. Current waiting times vary depending on house type and location. For example, the application dates of those currently being housed in line in three bedroom housing in Adelaide range from December 1978 in the inner metropolitan area to April 1981 in the northern suburbs. In Elizabeth/Salisbury application dates range from December 1980 to July 1982 and in the Noarlunga area those currently being housed in the three bedroom family accommodation applied in September 1981. Similar variations occur between country areas with, for example, Mount Gambier applicants who applied in February 1983 and Port Lincoln applicants who applied in mid-1982 currently being assisted in family accommodation.

3. During the current year the Trust has received sufficient funding to add 3 100 dwellings to its rental stock. The Government is seeking funding to further increase this number during 1984-85 and subsequent years. Provided that the existing programme can continue to be expanded and an expected 3 800 vacancies occur per annum in existing rental dwellings, it would be possible to house in excess of 29 000 households over four years.

That represents a tremendous ambition and a great aim for this Parliament and for the Government to try to achieve. We must aim for that figure and help these young people as well as those dependent on the pension. The Minister's reply continues:

4. It is the aim of the Government and the Trust to reduce the waiting list for Housing Trust rental accommodation and considerable effort is being applied to achieve this aim. Despite these efforts the length of the waiting list at any time in the future will depend on the many complex social, economic and demographic factors which contribute to the numbers of households seeking public housing assistance. It should be noted that there has been a 50.7 per cent increase in applications for Trust accommodation over the past three financial years and therefore it is

anticipated that the waiting list will continue to grow in the immediate future.

That highlights the difficulties and problems created by a recession and indicates its impact on those less fortunate than the majority in the community. As a result of my concern for the plight of young people and the difficulties they were experiencing, I placed a further question on notice because I had received complaints about a property on Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park, so I asked the Minister of Emergency Services the following questions:

1. How many complaints have the police received during the past 18 months concerning the behaviour of tenants of the flats at 133 Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park, how many persons have been arrested and for what offences as a result?

2. Have police received complaints from neighbours alleging abuse, rubbish being dumped over their fences, broken wine and beer bottles, bottles thrown on rooves, firing of air guns, yelling, screaming, fighting on balconies, disturbances in the early hours of weekend mornings from wild parties and terrorising of persons and, if so, what action have the police taken to protect neighbours and what further action can be taken to ensure peace, law and order is maintained at all times?

On 9 July 1984, the Acting Minister of Emergency Services (Hon. Frank Blevins) sent me the following reply:

I refer to your Question on Notice No. 510 concerning the number of complaints received by the police regarding the behaviour of tenants of the flats at 133 Anzac Highway, Kurralta Park. I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police that accurate figures for the past 18 months are not readily available. However, since 6 October 1983 police patrols have been asked to attend the premises in response to complaints on 27 occasions. The address has been visited on a further 50-odd occasions in the course of routine police patrol and inquiry work.

So, the police have visited the premises 77 times in nine months. However, it must be borne in mind that the Commissioner of Police has admitted that accurate figures concerning the number of visits made over that past 18 months are not available. The Minister's reply continues:

In all, 41 persons (22 by arrest) have been reported for various offences including drug-related breaches, outstanding warrants, assault (including assaulting police), breaches of the Firearms Act, dishonesty, Road Traffic Act breaches and other various behavioural offences. The address in question is a block of 84 low rental flats and complaints of behavioural incidents made by residents in the neighbourhood include:

- excessively noisy parties;
- noisy quarrelling between tenants;
- missiles being thrown into neighbouring yards;
- assaults involving tenants;
- illegal parking of motor vehicles.

As a result of police discussions with management of the flats and the local residents on 6 October 1983 a special operational campaign was mounted to control the situation. Since that time, there has been a marked improvement and complaints of behavioural problems have been reduced. It is proposed to continue the present campaign until 18 July 1984, when the situation will be re-assessed after discussion with interested parties.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Blevins, MLC,

Acting Minister of Emergency Services.

I have since written to the Minister of Emergency Services again asking for a continuation of the arrangements to which the Hon. Frank Blevins referred, and I have been told that those arrangements will continue until about November this year. It is a terrible tragedy that there should be 84 low-rental flats in one group on Anzac Highway, although I admit that there is a need for low-rental accommodation. However, the poor young people who must accept this accommodation are experiencing terrible difficulties in trying to settle down and lead what we consider to be a normal suburban life. Something must be done. The Community Welfare Department offered to put a person down there full time at one stage, but no-one can guarantee the safety of a person who attends the flats to deal with social problems. This is not a locality where one would choose to walk after dark.

When I told a local reporter about my concern and suggested that she let local residents know that I was trying to help them, she interviewed some of the tenants and then wrote the following article:

There's a hopelessness in the very atmosphere of Kurralta Flats. But, the hopelessness has not become defeat—instead it has turned to anger against a society which has not fulfilled its promises. There was no-one in the flats office when I called—the manager was out and staff had been told not to discuss the matter. Also out was the caretaker who, unlike the manager, lives on the premises. A double flat at Kurralta Flats costs \$68 a week and singles are \$64. That means there is a weekly income of about \$5 500 a week for owners and yet the flats have a slightly shabby look. The staff may have been instructed not to talk to the press but the residents had plenty to say.

A woman in her mid-thirties said: 'I'm moving in a couple of days. The place is too noisy and I don't like the way residents throw rubbish over the balconies. My car was pelted with eggs. These things happen mainly at night, but I don't blame the landlord.'

A young mother, who heard gunshots in the grounds recently and is now planning to leave, said: 'The flats are not worth \$68 a week. They are supposed to be fully furnished but all we found was a fridge, table and two chairs and a box for a bed. There's no room for a washing machine—we all have to use the flats' laundry.'

A young couple, disturbed by people tooting their horns late at night and early in the morning said: 'We got up and quietly asked them not to beep as we've got a 19-day-old baby and they stopped.'

Next door to the flats is a boarding house for men, some of whom are handicapped or mentally retarded. The manager said eggs and beer bottles were thrown into the property regularly: 'One mentally retarded man who lived here liked dancing in the garden and the people in the flats found that good sport,' she said. 'They threw eggs at him and shouted obscenities, their language is terrible.'

That report contains only a few of the allegations that have been made about the conduct of people in Kurralta Flats. Indeed, because of their very nature, I would not like to record in *Hansard* some of the other allegations dealing with the missiles and happenings at the flats. However, I must say that there has been continual harassment of neighbours over a long period.

At least the situation has been brought under reasonable control at present, with continual surveillance being undertaken by the police and the special committee. I do not blame the landlords. Our planning legislation does not assist local government. The building of 84 flats in such a location must lead to some problems. I agree with the comments made in the report. I believe that society and the Government of the day through the Parliament must provide answers for these young people. There is a need for low cost housing and to provide help, guidance and assistance to young people so that they may have a fair and reasonable start in life. Landlords do have problems. I think that land agents sometimes contribute to the problem. Over the past few years I have received several complaints about a certain land agent from whom I would have expected better. Recently, a young single parent came to see me and explained that she was having difficulties with the cost of her accommodation and that her child had asthma. She explained that it was necessary for her to vacate the premises at which she lived and to find alternative low rental accommodation. In June, I appealed to the Minister of Housing to try to have this person's application put on the priority housing list. Admittedly, she had applied only in January 1982, but I felt that this action was appropriate in view of her son's health, and the fact that her own health was starting to deteriorate because of the problems she was experiencing.

The Minister acknowledged that he had received documentary support from a specialist, a social worker at the Adelaide Children's Hospital and also from a general practitioner. The Tenancy Office of the Housing Trust advised my constituent that at that stage it was not prepared to put her on to a priority list. Following my constituent's request to the Housing Trust, she received a letter from her land

agent seeking an increase in rent. The letter from the land agent was not dated. I forwarded to the land agent a strictly private and confidential memorandum asking how it was that he could ask my client to pay an increased rent on a certain date when his letter had not been dated. I also mentioned that she had a disabled child, that she needed some consideration and that given time the Housing Trust might be able to assist her. I also pointed out that it would be appreciated if the premises could be attended to, the salt damp rectified and the poor standard of accommodation improved. In reply to that letter the supervisor of the Letting Section of Peter Daniels wrote back in a typical manner when handling clients and stated that 14 days extra time would be given before the increase was to be effected. A few days later my constituent received a notice of termination.

That is an attitude that is typical: in other words, if one complains, questions or queries anything, one runs the risk of being evicted. So, the 120 days notice stipulation has now been served on my constituent by the landlord's agent, Peter J. Daniels. In this regard I think that my constituent has been victimised, and I would have expected more of the agent involved. There are many similar cases involving the harassment of young people.

Reference has been made to the building boom and to the wonderful opportunities that young people have to purchase a new home. Sure, some excellent concessions have been granted and opportunities provided for young people. However, I refer to the case of a young couple who thought that they would take the opportunity of buying a block of land on the south coast and of building a new house on it. After making inquiries they were told by a builder that they should sign a contract straight away because there was to be a price rise in the following week and that they would save \$800. They signed the contract, but a few weeks later found that they could have purchased a better house at a better price. They wanted to cancel the contract, but, as I explained to them, they could not do so. I asked whether they had read the contract. It was a 15 page contract, which is the standard Housing Industry Association building contract. I also asked whether they had understood it. They did not have any idea at all. I have been through the contract twice, clause by clause in an attempt to explain to my constituents what it means. The tragedy is that they have no idea of what the contract means; they cannot comprehend it.

The husband involved is a person from another country and, although his wife has a reasonable standard of education, she is not a business person. So, for such people, from a financial point of view such a contract could very well be the beginning of the end. Such contracts are signed largely to buy a \$30 000 house, but, for instance, in the case to which I referred there were extra costs involved, such as travel and cartage costs because of the south coast location. Fancy a builder coming up with a fixed price for a house and then adding on another \$1 000 for travel and cartage costs because of the location! Further, there is an added cost of \$950 for a septic tank, an extra \$350 because it is all electric, provision for site costs and footing costs, above builders standards (called prime costs—in other words, a rough estimate) amounting to \$1 000, and State Bank specification costs, \$120. Thus, the total amount is over \$33 000. That is the beginning.

Such a couple then goes to the State Bank and applies for a loan of \$36 000, but they are advised that the maximum loan on normal lending is \$31 030 but that if the loan is supported by mortgage and insurance cover it is increased to \$36 510, and that amount includes the relevant premium of \$552 and stamp duty of \$44. That means that the net loan available towards the purchase cost of the home is

\$35 914. I do not object to the State Bank's making long term low interest finance available; it is a good scheme. But a 100 per cent loan is not in the best interests of young people. The types of loan being offered by the State Bank to obtain business may not be in the best interests of young people. It is all very well if they can carry the costs and the additional costs that are not explained to them in the building contract, which comprises, say, 15 pages with details of things like 'owner's warranty of title: description and access', with many ifs, buts and maybes; for example:

If the physical delineation of the site is imprecise at the time of commencement of the works the builder may at his option engage a qualified surveyor to survey and adequately peg or delineate the said site and the position of the said works thereon and the additional cost thereof shall be a variation.

No young couple would have any idea what that means. It continues:

(c) Unless it is otherwise expressly stated the owner shall provide for the builder suitable all-weather access to the site and to make the site available to the builder in a vacant condition by the date detailed in item 7 of the schedule hereto.

(d) Unless it is otherwise expressly stated the owner is responsible for the cost of any statutory authority's, municipality's, or utility's requirements in connection with services involving poles, pipes, crossovers, kerbing, culverts, footpaths, nature strips, roads, and the like, calculated in accordance with clause 15 hereof.

2. The price for the said works shall be the amount set out in item 5 of the schedule hereto (hereinafter called 'the said price') which shall be subject to the adjustments herein provided for. The said price so adjusted shall hereinafter be called 'the contract price'.

There is the prime cost price. It continues:

The contract price provides for the cost of footings calculated upon the following basis—

It then goes into jargon in relation to adequate draining and the levels and pricing of the foundations. It continues:

14. In every case where the letters or words 'provisional sum' or 'prime cost' or 'P.C.' or nominated subcontractor shall appear in the documents together with stated sums the same shall mean that a provisional sum of that amount has been provided for in the said price in respect of the items so indicated and if the cost incurred by the builder in respect thereof shall not be equal to the amount specified as aforesaid the difference in cost shall be deemed to be a variation. If no sum or amount is stated in respect of such item then the cost of that item shall be a variation.

15. A 'variation' other than a variation as defined in clause 13 hereof shall be calculated as follows:

(a) if the amount is additional to the said price it shall be equal to the cost of the labour and materials supplied together with other costs properly incurred as a consequence thereof plus 10 per cent of such additional amounts added to the said price.

(b) if it shall result in a decrease in cost the amount of such decrease shall be deducted from the said price and shall be equal to the costs of labour and materials and other costs properly saved.

The contract then deals with 'aggrieved party's right to terminate' and one would not want to study that too well because at one stage my constituents decided that they would pull out of the contract after only a few weeks, and they were told that it would cost \$2 000 to cancel the contract. I rang the Housing Industry Association, and officers there said it would probably be more likely to be in the region of \$750 to \$900. Nothing had been done at that stage as far as the purchase of materials was concerned that we could ascertain but it would still cost \$900 to get out of the contract. So, my constituents are in the position of being saddled with this contract. After receiving the funding they then received this letter, dated 16 July, which states:

We wish to advise that by council demand and industry recommendation the area in which your residence is located is now classified as category 2 terrain. This broadly means that you are likely to experience wind conditions during a storm which could blow rain under your roof tiles. To prevent damage from water intrusion you will require sarking under your roof tiles. This is a

reinforced aluminium foil which redirects water intrusion to the gutters. The charge to sark your roof at cost is \$376.

As builders we are obliged to inform you that should you decide not to have your roof sarked then you will waive any claims which you may have against ourselves and the roof tile supplier in respect of any claim for damage or compensation arising from water intrusion through the roof area. We require your signed authorisation to proceed with the sarking and acceptance of the charge or your written advice to the contrary within seven days. Please recognise that we are representing your best interests in this matter and not attempting to introduce an unnecessary cost.

That was a circular letter with a roneod signature. A couple of weeks later my constituents received another letter, which states:

At the time of contract documentation, we obtained on your behalf, a preliminary soil report. This assists us in advising anticipated site costs within the parameters of past experience. However, the engineer is unable to complete a footing design until he is presented with a final drawing of your residence with a contour plan detailing the position and extent of site works.

We have established this courtesy procedure in as much as we forward copies of both reports to you at this time and itemise points of difference which are likely to result in reductions or increases of costs to you.

That was a circular, a normal standard letter, with this addition:

In this instance we estimate that your addendum PC sum \$1 000 for site costs will be exceeded by \$1 400.

One suddenly finds that \$1 000 becomes \$2 400. It continues:

However actual expenditure will be advised as invoices come to hand or on your final statement. Whilst regretting any additional costs, we trust that our early advice will be of assistance.

That was a little bit late because my constituents had already been to the bank for finance and could not obtain any additional finance. Another week later they received this letter:

Further to our discussions regarding additional site costs due to solid brick constructions we wish to advise that rise and fall will apply in respect of your building contract if you do not advise your intentions within seven days in writing.

Our offers are as follows:

1. Return to brick veneer construction with a charge of \$200 for new plans, construction report, etc., and resubmission to council, plus rise and fall during new council approval with a credit of \$3 500 for solid brick surcharge.
2. Cancellation of contract \$8 000.

Within a few weeks of signing the contract the cancellation cost was \$2 000, which hopefully could be negotiated to \$900, but within two months it had jumped to \$8 000. No doubt some of the materials would have been purchased but it was a standard design house offered by this company. The letter continues:

3. Proceed as is with additional site costs above \$1 000 PC—loaned to you by mortgage with fees by you payable over one year at an interest rate of 12 per cent per annum, repayable in 12 monthly instalments.

I believe that under the terms of the finance that could not be done with the State Bank. What a terrible situation these people were placed in, thinking that they would build their dream home, to find that what they thought was a fair and reasonable price was suddenly increasing here and there with no provision having been made for these additional costs. When I asked them, 'What figure do you believe you will have to pay out at settlement when the house is finished?' they had no idea of what I was talking about or of the additional costs that may be involved as they see little things that they may want.

I contacted the Master Builders Association representatives who believe that it is a fair and reasonable contract. There are probably only a few solicitors in Adelaide who would know anything about it. Mr Noblet, from the Consumer Affairs, is not happy with this type of form and what is happening and the experiences that these young people are being put through.

Yes, they can go to Legal Aid, the Master Builders Association said, and they can get assistance at the cost of \$2 for 20 minutes to see whether the contract is fair or not. We all know that if one goes there one is only told to go to a solicitor or that one has no hope, anyway. There are only a few solicitors in Adelaide who deal with these types of contract. It is extremely expensive. I asked: 'What sort of profit would a builder make?' If the climate is good, it will be about 10 per cent. If it is slow, it will be about 2 per cent. But, of course, that can vary quite markedly.

I said, 'What about setting up an advisory service? There is none available.' But, this person said that he spends about an hour a day answering questions from various people about the ramifications of current builders' contracts. There is an admission by a representative of the Master Builders Association that at least he is dedicating an hour a day to answering questions and queries on the Association's documentation. I believe that we should establish a housing building contracts advisory service. I cannot come up with any abbreviated name for that. I hope that the Minister of Housing and Construction will take this on board. But, I believe that such an advisory service should be sponsored by the Housing Industry Association, the banks, building societies and the Consumer Affairs Department.

I hope that the South Australian Housing Trust would have some input into it as well. I also believe that we should have legislation providing for a seven-day cooling off period on the signing of a contract to build a new home. I say seven days because I think it is necessary for young people with average education to be able to go along to an advisory centre or advisory service and have spelt out the meaning of each of those clauses in a 15-page contract. I do not believe that there are salesmen who do it.

All they come up with is, 'If you sign it this week you will save yourself a couple of hundred dollars,' and \$800 turns out to be \$2 000 somewhere along the line. Building costs are alleged to be going up 1 per cent a month. I do not know whether that is so or not. I think that is the figure added on. Generous lending by banks and building societies does not necessarily help the people we want to help. I found that when I was in the bank. Each time we put up the maximum amount of the loan one could bet one's socks that the price of housing would go up accordingly. I appeal to the Minister and to the Government to set up an advisory service for young people so that they can go along with their building contracts or plans and get the best professional advice available. I do not think it has to be sponsored or paid for by the Government. I believe that the industry involved should sponsor it and should be made to put in a contribution towards it.

I believe that we will help these young people in this way. I do not want to see the situation where, if interest rates rise again—heaven forbid—these young people will be placed in the terrible situation of meeting their repayments of their financial commitments. Let us avoid it and give assistance now. It is easy to say that it should be done in high school. We can include somewhere at high school or during secondary education a useful course so that they can be made aware of these contracts, but I do not think that solves the problem. I believe that the problem is there, and that it is in the industry's best interests for every building contract which is signed—and this builder told me that they sign 14 to 18 a week at the moment, because they are enjoying boom conditions—and to which the parties are committed, there should be no hassles whatsoever. Every time I get on the phone it holds them up and costs them time and effort. It is in the interests of the industry to ensure that they are there to serve those who need the help. They are not there to dictate to the market. In that way I think we will achieve something.

I noticed in paragraph 14 of the Governor's Speech mention of the role of the South Australian Sports Institute, and the work that it is doing. The comment was that because of the success of the Sports Institute in South Australia the performance of South Australian athletes internationally, of course, was proving its worth. This Government is enjoying the benefits of the success of the Sports Institute, and so are many young South Australians. But, probably the person they should thank is Don Dunstan, initially, because I needed and annoyed him long enough until he established a Ministry of Recreation and Sport. At that initial stage I set down what I believed was the formula for that portfolio and what I believed was necessary, in that we should have our own Sports Institute, and the way that we should go about it is set down.

I am pleased that it was established under our Government. It is being continued and improved by the current Government. I hope that when the Budget comes down additional money will be made available to it. The Australian Institute of Sport in Canberra has been a great success in some areas. However, it has failed in one area. It involves one of my constituents and quite a few other young people who have had the opportunity to win a scholarship and go to Canberra. We have to face facts. It will cost a lot of money to keep the Institute of Sport going in Canberra, as it will in South Australia. But, if we offer a scholarship, we must provide a liveable income for those people. Again, whether this can be done by encouraging sponsorship by large Australian and South Australian companies, and by the community, should be investigated.

We cannot put young people into these institutes, pay for the use of the facilities and hope that they can get part-time jobs, because it is just not on. Several young people who went to the Olympic Games were penniless; they did not even have any spending money. They would not have had any pocket money; they had no opportunity to get it. The financial drain on their parents was great. The member for Victoria may know some of my constituents who did everything that they could over the years to help their son attain selection, which he did. It was a wonderful experience. It is the investment that we are placing in these young people now from which we will reap the rewards in probably another 10 years. It is tragic when one hears of so many of these young athletes who go over there and have to sell their furniture; one athlete had to sell his pet because he could not afford to carry on. So the scholarship must include a percentage of the average wage, and it has to be a wage that allows these people to live without being paupers.

Again, I was pleased to receive a reply from the Minister of Recreation and Sport, on page 4043 of *Hansard*, to my question concerning the State Government's application for the Commonwealth Games. In the 1970s I begged Don Dunstan to apply for a Commonwealth Games for Adelaide. Had he done so we could have been allocated the 1982 Commonwealth Games; we could have had a great chance. Instead of that, Brisbane got the games. Of course, they were a tremendous success and a great boost for Australia, but I rightly believe that they could have been held in South Australia.

I now believe that we must do as they did in Los Angeles: plan for the next opportunity, whether it be Commonwealth or Olympic Games. The only sites that we could look at would be for the Commonwealth Games. Los Angeles established a committee in 1939 to apply at the first opportunity to have an Olympic Games. It took them until 1979 before they knew that they would have the 1984 Olympic Games, and they have to be considered quite a success in many respects. I do not go along with the American way of doing a lot of things, but certainly it gave a lot of athletes a chance to represent their country and to have the experience. I do

not think that the medals count; they do not mean all that much. It is the experience and the opportunity to meet, fraternise and learn from others who excel in sport in their respective countries.

The Minister has informed me that South Australia is considering applying for the 1994 Commonwealth Games. Unfortunately the 1990 Commonwealth Games have been allocated to Auckland, New Zealand. As we had the 1982 Games in Brisbane and as the 1986 Commonwealth Games will be in Edinburgh, Scotland, and the 1990 Games will be in Auckland, New Zealand, it is fair to expect that the 1994 Commonwealth Games will go back to the Northern Hemisphere; they could well be in Canada or back in Britain. Therefore, it makes it difficult for South Australia to be an applicant for 1994.

I urge the Government to consider applying very strongly for the 1998 Commonwealth Games. They would then come back into the Southern Hemisphere; they are the Games that we should be looking for. It gives us sufficient lead time to build on our existing facilities and to provide the facilities that we need. The Minister told me that a list of projects in priority order has been prepared for international standard sporting venues. It is proposed that a more detailed plan be prepared in 1984-85 so that at least there is some plan. He said that a small number of venues will be suitable for Commonwealth Games events if temporary seating and additional or updated facilities are provided: for example, the Olympic Sports Field, Adelaide Oval, Football Park, Wayville Showgrounds, West Lakes rowing basin, Hindmarsh Stadium and the Apollo Stadium.

I believe that we should decide that they will be the venues. We can then begin upgrading them to at least international or Olympic standard so that, if and when the opportunity arises, the cost in the early 1990s will be nowhere near as great and the impact will be much less compared to what it is today. The Minister stated:

Investigations are under way in order to develop the following venues. Whether construction commences on any or all venues is dependent on the availability of funds, a suitable site and design work being completed. State Aquatic Centre . . .

I do not think that the swimming centre at North Adelaide is the answer, because we need more Olympic swimming pools in the metropolitan area. In fact, we need one in the north-western suburbs and one in the southern suburbs. Last week we had a meeting of various councils in the western region. The meeting agreed that an application in relation to a \$5 million aquatic centre in the area should be top priority. I would like to see such a swimming complex built and designed to Olympic standard. The difficulty in designing a swimming pool is the size: whether it should be 55 metres, 50 metres, 2½ metres deep or whatever. The design has to be flexible, as was the swimming pool in Los Angeles where the head of the pool could be moved hydraulically to the required distance.

We need a multi-purpose indoor centre. I believe that we should be looking at the Dunstan plan of many years ago for the Wayville Showgrounds where we have an opportunity of putting under one roof a huge sports and entertainment centre to seat 50 000 people. Why should not the Royal Show be under cover? There is no reason why equestrian events could not proceed as they do now. As an example of what can be done, I refer to B.C. Place, Vancouver, where the astro-turf in the stadium was taken up in 10 hours. About 400 truckloads of dirt were deposited in the stadium and a motocross course was built for 57 000 people who enjoyed the roar and excitement of motocross in an enclosed stadium. Tractor-pulling competitions, football, baseball, and so on are all held in that stadium. We can do that at the Wayville Showgrounds.

Some of the buildings at Wayville, such as Centennial Hall and so on, are deteriorating. The Showgrounds need an expensive facelift, so let us do it properly. We need a cycling velodrome and a road racing circuit. It was a shame that we lost the velodrome at Norwood. We must look for a suitable location for a first-class cycling velodrome. We have the opportunities and the climate to produce a first-class velodrome. Three of Australia's gold medalists at the Olympic Games came from South Australia—why should not we develop this area?

A small bore rifle shooting complex is also necessary. We are doing well in this area with our Olympic and paraplegic Olympic athletes. We have some excellent people representing us in this area. South Australians in this area have won trophies, including Sportswoman of the Year. Of course, we also need a weightlifting centre. It is amazing that we can produce a super weightlifting champion of the world who won a gold medal, yet he had to train in a tin shed. In Adelaide he was training at the Glenelg Sailing Club.

Mr Ashenden: A tin shed could be a sacred site, couldn't it?

Mr BECKER: I would make it a sacred site if I was the member for the area. Why we do not have a suitable centre for weightlifting is beyond me. We also have a young girl who is outstanding in this field. Many people follow this recreation and I am amazed that we have not done anything about, or been able to support, the establishment of a weightlifting centre. I refer also to the members of our men's and women's hockey teams. What an absolute tragedy to be the champions right to the very last minute only to be defeated under probably the most unfair system ever invented.

I would hate to see my favourite football team go top throughout the season and at the finals be wiped out as the hockey teams were. There would be an uproar if that occurred. Our hockey players and competitors at all levels deserve an astro turf stadium. I know that would cost about \$1 million or \$2 million, but we must provide such a stadium if we are to support such team sports. There are many many other areas that come to my mind in this regard.

Now is the time to plan: now is the time to provide the funding; and now is the time to encourage sponsorship to ensure that in 1998 Adelaide hosts the Commonwealth Games. I hope that each and every one of us will be alive to witness that occasion. The other thing that I want to say is that the young primary schoolchildren of today will be the athletes who compete in those games in 1998. Although there is a need for the Government to be frugal in its spending and mindful of costs, it seems to me that there is a role for the Government to play in encouraging private enterprise to support the development of sporting and recreational facilities in South Australia.

Mr RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): During this adjournment debate I wish to refer to two problems brought to my attention by constituents. One of those problems relates to a building firm. The only recourse one of those constituents has in relation to his problem is to take legal action. By the time that legal action has been finalised the costs involved would be so great that he would have lost any advantage such action might bring. I refer to Mr Colin R. Symons, of

45 Angley Avenue, Findon. He has brought to my attention the difficulties he has encountered in a building contract with a firm of builders known as Kaze Constructions Pty Ltd of 35 Dequetteville Terrace, Kent Town. Mr Symons, after taking advice from the Department of Consumer Affairs, determined that he would get a report from a consulting engineer about the building of his foundations before signing a building contract with Kaze Constructions. He received a report from John Sandland and Associates Pty Ltd about his proposed foundations and, after receiving the report, he determined that that firm's report would be utilised in the construction of his foundations and he signed the contract with Kaze Constructions to construct his house.

After the signing of the contract and an inspection of the site, Mr Symons discovered that Kaze Constructions had contracted another firm of engineers to provide another set of foundations, which were eventually given approval by Kaze Constructions and poured. Mr Symons then found himself in the situation that a set of foundations that were less sturdy than the original foundations to which he had agreed had been laid. The situation can be described as having paid for a Rolls Royce and finished up with a Morris Minor. To make matters worse, his original instruction to the Port Adelaide Council for the Findon construction by John Sandland and Associates Pty Ltd had been whitened out by some person in Kaze Constructions Pty Ltd and retyped with the new report by Peter Koukourou and Partners.

Mr Symons is now in the process of taking legal action against Kaze Constructions Pty Ltd for breach of contract. This matter will be settled in due course by the Judicial system. Mr Symons, however, is in the situation where he has a block of land for which he is paying charges, is handicapped because of the dispute and is paying rent on his present dwelling, and the inflationary spiral is increasing his costs day by day. He has asked me to raise this matter so that other people will take great care in choosing their contractors prior to building.

I wish to refer to a specific problem for handicapped people that has been brought to my attention by two constituents. I refer to an approach that was made to me by an elderly couple who could find only one suitable public toilet during a car trip from Adelaide to Port Lincoln. The wife of my constituent is bound to a wheelchair and has great difficulty in using toilets other than those specifically designed for handicapped people. My constituents have taken motor car trips to Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier and the only suitable toilets on those trips were at Dublin and Coonalpyn.

There is an urgent need for the upgrading of present public toilets so that they may be used by handicapped people. Local councils need to be especially aware of this problem. Unfortunately, most public toilets were built many years ago, before the increase in the number of handicapped people and the extra mobility that they now have so that, when these facilities were designed, little attention was paid to this problem. I have been in contact with the Premier's Disability Adviser (Mr Richard Llewellyn), who has told me that facilities for handicapped people in this area are very much needed.

Mr Becker: He lives in your electoral district.

Mr FERGUSON: Yes, he does. It is strongly suggested that councils, when designing these facilities, do so on the basis that they are a unisex unit, because many disabled people are confined to wheelchairs and need the help of their husband or wife, as the case may be, to reach these facilities. The other advantage of unisex units is that they are much cheaper to construct. I understand that the Australian Standards Code at present has many imperfections regarding the approval of building design for these facilities.

Recommendations have been made to the Australian Council from the South Australian Public Buildings Department to rectify the design problems and I understand that these specifications will be considered favourably.

It is very important to note that it was the South Australian Public Buildings Department which bothered to look at this problem. The problem remaining is that it usually takes up to two years to gain acceptance for any changes to the Australian standard code. Members will be aware that all Government departments are involved in this exercise and that the wheels of Government turn exceedingly slowly. Every Government in Australia is involved. Every Government has to provide specifications to the Standards Authority in Albury and, because of this, I am sure that members understand that it is hard to gather the necessary data from all States.

Mr Llewellyn is currently providing the required specifications to a committee from all councils. I understand that he is receiving very good co-operation. The problem especially relates to local government, because it is mainly public toilets in country districts that are affected. I have written to the Minister of Local Government asking him to look at the problem and see whether or not it is possible in the current Budget to provide subsidies to local councils in order to build proper facilities for handicapped people.

I refer to the appointment of a disability adviser to the Premier, who took office on 30 April 1984. Although it is a new position, it is already starting to bear fruit. The position provides a focal point for the disabled, both in Government and in the community generally. Mr Llewellyn is also looking at other aspects of problems for handicapped people, including the provision of ramps on footpaths. Not many people have bothered to look at this problem and, unfortunately, the specifications for the provision of ramps are not completely suitable for some handicapped people. Some handicapped people using these ramps are likely to turn over their wheelchairs if councils stick to the present specifications. This is another matter that will be taken up with the Standards Committee in Albury.

Mr ASHENDEN (Todd): I will address myself to the continued misinformation that members of the Labor Party are attempting to put forward to residents in my district. I specifically address myself to the development of the guided busway from Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza, and I refer to an article in the *North East Leader* of 15 August, in which my opponent at the next election states:

Mr Olsen acknowledged last May that the extensions to Tea Tree Plaza would take two years after the next State election, which is due in March 1986.

That is a deliberate attempt to put into the mouth of my Leader a statement that is quite untrue. Let us set the record straight. It is correct that Mr Olsen, as Leader of the Opposition, has stated that after the next election when the Liberal Party is returned to Government the guided busway will be extended to Tea Tree Plaza within two years. If this Government was game and were to call an election tomorrow a Liberal Government would be returned and the guided busway would then be completed within two years, namely, by 1986.

That is the point that the Opposition has been making—if we could get to the Treasury benches, the guided busway would be completed within two years. I repeat: if an election was held this year and if a Liberal Government was returned, O-Bahn would be completed by 1986. The only thing standing in the way of the completion of O-Bahn by 1986 is the present Labor Government. Make no mistake about that whatsoever! Let us consider other misinformation put forward by the Labor Party in the past. Prior to the election in 1982, the then Labor Opposition stated categorically that,

if elected to Government, it would provide a rapid public transit system from Adelaide to Tea Tree Plaza and that the entire system would be completed by 1986. That statement was made to match a promise of the then Liberal Government that it would complete O-Bahn to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986 if it was returned to Government.

Virtually immediately after the election, the Premier, Mr Bannon, announced that the guided busway was being reconsidered. We were then told that investigations had shown that the scheme was quite viable and that the Government would proceed with it, but that the Government intended to complete the guided busway to Darley Road only by 1986. A few months earlier the Premier had assured the constituents in my district that the guided busway or a form of rapid transit would go all the way to Tea Tree Plaza by 1986. Within months of his election, that promise, like so many of his other promises, was broken. The residents were then told, 'Yes, you will have a busway to Darley Road by 1986 and we will consider what to do between Darley Road and Tea Tree Plaza.' Just last week the Government announced that it would complete the guided busway to Tea Tree Plaza, but is it to be completed by 1986? No! The Minister of Transport stood in this House and said, 'We will complete the project by 1988.' I wonder whether we can believe that promise, because we must remember the previous promise that the system would be completed by 1986. I really doubt whether we can believe the Government when it tells us that the system will be completed by 1988. Be that as it may, the Government has stated that it will complete this project by 1988.

I have spoken to engineers who are involved in this project and who have assured me that there is absolutely no technical reason whatsoever why this project could not be completed by 1986. Again, the only reason why the guided busway will not be completed by then is purely and simply that this Government does not believe that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs are important enough for that vital project to be finished as was originally promised. I can assure members of the Labor Government and my election opponent that the residents of the north-eastern suburbs are only too well aware of where the blame lies as to why the guided busway will not be completed at the promised time.

It is completely specious of my opponent to say that Mr Olsen has said that a Liberal Government would complete the project only by 1988. That is absolutely false. The truth is that, if we were returned to Government tomorrow we would complete that project, as promised, by 1986. This Government could do that if it wanted to; however, the Government has chosen not to do that. I suggest that, in future press releases, my opponent tell the truth and put the blame exactly where it lies—with her own Party and with this Government. Residents of the north-eastern suburbs know the facts, and the Government does no good in trying to twist and get itself out of its broken promises. There have been broken promises in relation to the completion of O-Bahn and in relation to 'no new or increased taxes'. Let us have no more of this nonsense.

I now refer to a matter of great concern in the District of Todd, and the best way to outline my concern is to place on record a letter that I wrote to the Attorney-General on 12 July, to which as yet I have received no reply. The letter states:

Dear Minister,

I am writing to express the considerable concern that is being felt in relation to the present totally inadequate facilities at the Holden Hill Magistrates Court. As you are probably aware, the building in which the court sits was built approximately six years ago as a temporary measure. Unfortunately, that building is still in use, and I believe it has now reached a stage where it must be replaced with a permanent building that provides a facility that

meets the demand of a modern court system. A number of deficiencies in relation to the present building have been pointed out to me, and they are as follows:

1. There is virtually a complete lack of security. This is an extremely serious matter as a considerable number of prisoners from the Yatala Labour Prison appear before the Magistrate at the Holden Hill Court. I am sure you are well aware of the number of escapes that have occurred from the prison recently, and it has been pointed out to me that it can only be a matter of time before prisoners realise just how easy it would be for an escape to be organised from the Holden Hill Magistrates Court.
2. The waiting area for those who appear before the court, either to answer charges or as witnesses, is totally inadequate.
3. The present toilet facilities are also completely inadequate.
4. There are no provisions for the handicapped.
5. The conditions in No. 1 court during the summer months are almost intolerable. Although the court is air-conditioned, the system providing the cooling is so noisy that when it is in operation it is almost impossible for the magistrate to hear the evidence being given. It is therefore usually necessary for the air-conditioning to be switched off which, in turn, makes the room so uncomfortable that on occasions witnesses have almost fainted. The magistrate in court No. 1 is therefore faced with the dilemma of either working in a court where conditions are intolerable due to heat, or extremely noisy.
6. There is no privacy for counsel and their clients and, in fact, the only way in which discussions can be held in confidence is for counsel to meet with clients in the holding cells. These cells are quite inadequate for such a purpose and, again, in summer become extremely uncomfortable due to high temperatures.
7. There is a severe lack of room and facilities for staff working in the courts.
8. The car park can only be described as a disgrace. It is unsealed and during wet weather becomes what can only be described as a quagmire.

I have taken this matter up previously and have been advised that plans have been prepared for a new court at Holden Hill, but I have been unable to determine when these plans will come to fruition.

The magistrate's staff at the Holden Hill courts have been more than patient and suffered conditions that I believe many quite reasonable persons would not tolerate. Again, as I am sure you are well aware, the police station at Holden Hill has just been completely rebuilt. I frankly cannot understand why the rebuilding of the courts was not undertaken in association with the work involved in the Police Station which is immediately adjacent.

In view of the present situation, could I please ask that work be undertaken immediately to replace the present temporary building with one which can overcome the many problems presently being experienced. Could I please be advised as to when your Government intends to commence the absolutely necessary rebuilding programme of the Holden Hill courts.

I know that the Minister's office has received representations from the magistrates and their staff concerning this matter. However, absolutely nothing has been done. As I have said, the situation is quite intolerable, and this work is required urgently. The previous Liberal Government had the matter on the drawing board and it was intended that the work would be done in conjunction with the rebuilding of the police courts. However, the present Government did not do that.

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

Mr PLUNKETT (Peake): I take this opportunity to comment further on parts of the study tour that I undertook during the break. During my Address in Reply speech on Wednesday I referred to the destocking and restocking of cattle stations throughout South Australia. From inquiries that I made at various properties, and from advice I have received from the Minister of Agriculture, I have found that the owners of cattle stations and the Government have been able to work together extremely well, and as a consequence the destocking programme most certainly went off exceptionally well. The Minister has explained to me that in South Australia cattle are 98 per cent free of tuberculosis. That represents an amazing feat, because as anyone who

knows anything about the Far North of Australia, where most of our cattle are run, would know, it is very hard to muster and slaughter the affected beasts.

Unfortunately, in Queensland and the Northern Territory the eradication campaign has not been as successful because of the situation applying in those areas. Members would be aware that wild animals such as buffalo, camels, donkeys, and horses create a problem and make it much more difficult to clean up the stock on station properties.

From my talks with various property owners and the like, especially around Alice Springs, I discovered that in conjunction with all other States it is expected that by the end of 1992 Australia will be virtually free from tuberculosis in cattle. That is a tremendous feat. Some people might say that that is a long time to wait, but that shows that they do not understand the situation. This programme has worked out extremely well.

Further, I point out that an agreement has been made between property owners and the Federal Government in regard to taxation. The need for this agreement arose as a result of recent destocking when property owners were killing more stock than normal. More stock than normal were being marketed and tremendous profits were coming in over and above what would apply in a normal year on a cattle station. The Federal Government then looked at the situation and found a formula whereby tax could be spread over several years in order to allow properties to restock, which is an expensive programme.

Anna Creek Station is reputed to be one of the biggest cattle properties in Australia, and I was advised that that station had successfully destocked and was in the process of restocking. Its owners had bought a property in Western Australia from which to restock their South Australian properties. The Kidman Company owns many properties and is the owner of that station. Certainly, it was pleasing to hear people from various stations saying that they were able to work in well with the Federal Government so that this programme could be successful.

As I have only 10 minutes available to me this afternoon, I will speak further on this topic in a later debate. I now refer to Williams Creek where I spoke with people working for a South African mining company searching for diamonds. I was surprised that the mining company was after diamonds in that area. It was explained to me that the search was being undertaken in terrain at Williams Creek similar to where diamonds are found in South Africa. I thought that that information might be of interest to members of the House.

I would like to use the last part of my time this afternoon by referring to Coober Pedy, where I spent three days. I spoke to many people at Coober Pedy and found that Coober Pedy people are a little different from people in other towns. Coober Pedy is an opal mining town where people enjoy the freedom of not having their earnings subjected to close surveillance. However, with the coming of the bitumen road, local government changes are most certain to confront that town.

Many people are looking forward to that, but there are many in Coober Pedy who are not pleased with the idea of paying rates to councils and of being told how they can construct buildings. Anyone who has visited Coober Pedy would agree that its building situation is different from any other town. Many local residents will be in for a shock as far as the council and the bitumen road are concerned.

There is a warning to be had for the Government of the day because Coober Pedy is different from other opal towns that I have visited, such as Lightning Ridge and Whitecliffs, where the opal is much deeper. In Coober Pedy holes are drilled 40 to 80 ft down and perhaps only 3 ft across. Tourists who are not on guided tours and who sort through the

mullock dumps find it quite easy to step back and go 40 to 80 ft down a hole. I found as an experienced person on these fields that I had to watch my step. The State Government, in conjunction with the council, will have to monitor this situation or else there will be some bad accidents. Some of the miners in the town are not impressed with the idea of being flooded with tourists. This will most certainly occur when the bitumen road is laid. There are already many tourists visiting Coober Pedy and that will triple. It will be a very big industry.

Concerning the problem of water at Coober Pedy, the local residents wish to express their thanks to the Federal

and State Governments and also to the Progress Committee, which has raised \$70 000 towards a desalination plant and pipeline. This pipeline is a joint Government scheme with \$1.5 million to be supplied by the Commonwealth Government, \$1 million to be supplied by the State Government, and an extra \$70 000 has been already raised by the Progress Committee.

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

Motion carried.

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 21 August at 2 p.m.